about one-third of his total energy production in overcoming the force of gravity. It may interest you to know that the higher up you go into space, your weight is reduced and the pressure on the heart is similarly reduced. A simple example, which might surprise you, is the knowledge that a person's weight is a trifle less in the upstairs bedroom than in his downstairs living room. Nevertheless, I would not advise you to get rid of your one-story split-level rambler home so soon.

Another interesting point for you to know is that an athlete can clear a bar on earth (and I mean a bar you jump over, and not a certain other kind of bar) at the height of about 7 feet. The world's record is 7 feet 4½ inches. On the moon, an ordinary man can clear a bar at 42 feet. Think of it, you'd be flying around up there like angels.

Someday it may be possible to send heart patients into orbit for treatment, or they may be ordered by their doctors to live on the moon or on some small planet where gravity is weaker than on the earth. In much the same way, the radiation of outer space may be used to treat diseases, just as X-rays are used today.

A principal hazard is psychological. It arises in part from the feeling that man was not made to go into space. I'd like to devote the remaining moments of my talk to this question.

Of course, it is true—again, if you look at a man with an engineer's eye—that the human frame was not designed primarily for space flight. I have no doubt that this will prove to be the limiting factor in the manned exploration of outer space. On the other hand, was the human frame designed to climb the highest mountains—where man has been—or descend to the farthest depths of the sea—where man has been?

Astronauts and highflying aviators tell us that they sometimes have a sense of isolation out there—of being cut off from the world. They also tell us about another feeling that comes to them on such occasions—a feeling of being closer to God.

For me, the ethical rightness of exploring space was settled in 1956, when His Holiness Pope Pius XII made the following pronouncement at a special audience in Castel Gondolfo:

"The Lord God, who placed in the heart of man the insatiable desire for knowledge, did not intend to limit man's efforts in the process, as he said, 'submit the earth.' It is the whole creation that he has placed at his command and that he offers to the human mind, so that he may see it through and thus may understand always more profoundly the infinite grandeur of his Creator."

In line with those inspiring words which I have just quoted, it is my firm belief that the exploration of the moon and planets will bring vast benefits, many times greater than their cost, to the Nation, the scientific community, and to all of mankind.

Which in conclusion brings me back to my original question: Is space a challenge to religion? I do not see it as such. I see the exploration of space as a furtherance of human knowledge, as the opening of new vistas for human achievement and the attainment of abundance for all. I see it as God's hand in helping man to understand the universe in which he lives.

Space exploration is not a challenge to God. It is a challenge to man. And the challenge consists not only in obtaining knowledge, but in utilizing it properly and justly, to bring real peace on earth, according to the word of God.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 9: 4: *I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.*

O Thou who art the Creator and Supreme Ruler of the Universe, may we daily respond with faith and vigor to Thy voice of love, calling us to be workers with Thee in meeting the compelling needs of our generation.

Give us a greater sense of mission and urgency as we find ourselves challenged with the task of devising ways and means of providing for the material and spiritual welfare of humanity.

Grant that we may yield ourselves eagerly and earnestly to the promptings and persuasions of Thy Holy Spirit in order that we may rise victoriously above life's conflicts and confusions, its tensions and struggles.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 2, 1962, the President approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H.R. 157. An act to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif."; and

H.R. 8847. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

EXPANDING AND IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 330)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

No task before our Nation is more important than expanding and improving the educational opportunities of all our people. The concept that every American deserves the opportunity to attain the highest level of education of which he is capable is not new to this administration—it is a traditional ideal of democracy. But it is time that we moved toward the fulfillment of this ideal with more vigor and less delay.

For education is both the foundation and the unifying force of our democratic way of life—it is the mainspring of our economic and social progress—it is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life. In short, it is at the same time the most profitable investment society can make and the richest reward it can confer.

Today, more than at any other time in our history, we need to develop our intellectual resources to the fullest. But the facts of the matter are that many thousands of our young people are not educated to their maximum capacity—and they are not, therefore, making the maximum contribution of which they are capable to themselves, their families, their communities and the Nation. Their talents lie wasted—their lives are frequently pale and blighted—and their contribution to our economy and culture are lamentably below the levels of their potential skills, knowledge, and creative ability. Educational failures breed delinquency, despair, and dependence. They increase the costs of unemployment and public welfare. They cut our potential national economic output by billions. They deny the benefits of our society to large segments of our people. They undermine our capability as a Nation to discharge world obligations. All this we cannot afford—better schools we can afford.

To be sure, Americans are still the best educated and best trained people in the world. But our educational system has failed to keep pace with the problems and needs of our complex technological society. Too many are illiterate or untrained, and thus either unemployed or underemployed. Too many receive an education diminished in quality in thousands of districts which cannot or do not support modern and adequate facilities, well-paid and well-trained teachers, or even a sufficiently long school year.

Too many—an estimated 1 million a year—leave school before completing high school—the bare minimum for a fair start in modern-day life. Too many high school graduates with talent—numbering in the hundreds of thousands—fail to go on to college; and 40 percent of those who enter college drop out before graduation. And too few, finally, are going on to the graduate studies that modern society requires in increasing number. The total number of graduates receiving doctorate degrees has increased only about one-third in 10 years; in 1960 they numbered less than 10,000, including only 3,000 in mathematics, physical sciences, and engineering.

An educational system which is inadequate today will be worse tomorrow, unless we act now to improve it. We must provide facilities for 14 million more elementary, secondary school and college students by 1970, an increase of 30 percent. College enrollments alone will nearly double, requiring approximately twice as many facilities to serve nearly 7 million students by 1970. We must find

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the means of financing a 75-percent increase in the total cost of education—another $20 billion a year for expansion and improvement—particularly in facilities and instruction which must be of the highest quality if our Nation is to achieve its highest goals.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The control and operation of education in America must remain the responsibility of State and local governments and private institutions. This tradition assures our educational system of the freedom, the diversity and the vitality necessary to serve our free society fully. But the Congress has long recognized the responsibility of the Nation as a whole—that additional resources, meaningful encouragement and vigorous leadership must be added to the total effort by the Federal Government if we are to meet the task before us. For education in this country is the right—the necessity—and the responsibility—of all. Its advancement is essential to national objectives and dependent on the greater financial resources available at the national level.

Let us put to rest the unfounded fears that "Federal money means Federal control." From the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, originally conceived by Thomas Jefferson, through the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the still-important and still-independent land-grant college system, to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Congress has repeatedly recognized its responsibility to strengthen our educational system without weakening local responsibility. Since the end of the Korean war, Federal funds for constructing and operating schools in districts affected by Federal installations have gone directly to over 5,500 districts without any sign or complaint of interference or dictation from Washington. In the last decade, over $5 billion of Federal funds have been channeled to aid higher education without in any way undermining local administration.

While the coordination of existing Federal programs must be improved, we cannot meanwhile defer action on meeting our current pressing needs. Every year of further delay means a further loss of the opportunity for quality instruction to students who will never get that opportunity back. I therefore renew my urgent request of last year to the Congress for early action on those measures necessary to help this Nation achieve the twin goals of education: a new standard of educational excellence—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our educational system. There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education, or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering, without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education. With our mobile population and demanding needs, this is not a matter of local or State action alone—this is a national concern.

Since my message on education of last year, our crucial needs at this level have intensified and our deficiencies have grown more critical. We cannot afford to lose another year in mounting a national effort to eliminate the shortage of classrooms, to make teachers' salaries competitive, and to lift the quality of instruction.

CLASSROOMS

To meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments—increasing by nearly 1 million elementary and secondary pupils a year in the 1960's—and to provide every child with the opportunity to receive a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during this decade. The States report an immediate shortage today of more than 127,000 classrooms and a rate of construction which, combined with heavily increasing enrollments, is not likely to fill their needs for 10 years. Already over half a million pupils are in curtailed or half-day sessions. Unless the present rate of construction is accelerated and Federal resources made available to supplement State and local resources that are already strained in many areas few families and communities in the Nation will be free from the ill effects of overcrowded or inadequate facilities in our public schools.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Teachers' salaries, though improving, are still not high enough to attract and retain in this demanding profession all the capable teachers we need. We entrust to our teachers our most valuable possession—our children—for a very large share of their waking hours during the most formative years of their life. We make certain that those to whom we entrust our financial assets are individuals of the highest competence and character—we dare not do less for the trustees of our children's minds.

Yet in no other sector of our national economy do we find such a glaring discrepancy between the importance of one's work to society and the financial reward society offers. Can any able and industrious student, unless unusually motivated, be expected to elect a career that pays more poorly than almost any other craft, trade, or profession? Until this situation can be dramatically improved—unless the States and localities can be assisted and stimulated in bringing about salary levels which will make the teaching profession competitive with other professions which require the same length of training and ability—we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers.

These are problems of national proportion. Last year I sent to the Congress a proposal to meet the urgent needs of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. A bill (S. 1021) embodying this proposal passed the Senate last year; and similar legislation (H.R. 7300) was favorably reported to the House by its Committee on Education and Labor. It offered the minimum amount required by our needs and—in terms of across-the-board aid—the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. It is imperative that such a proposal carrying out these objectives be enacted this session. I again urge the Congress to enact legislation providing Federal aid for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

As noted earlier, Federal aid for construction and operation of many public schools has been provided since 1950 to those local school districts in which enrollments are affected by Federal installations. Such burdens which may remain from the impact of Federal activities on local school districts will be eased by my proposal for assistance to all school districts for construction and teachers' salaries, thus permitting modification and continuation of this special assistance program as proposed in last year's bill.

A fundamental overhauling and modernization of our traditional vocational education programs is also increasingly needed. Pursuant to my message on education last February, a panel of consultants to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is studying national needs in this area. They have been asked to develop recommendations by the close of this year for improving and redirecting the Federal Government's role in this program.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

Strengthening financial support for education by general Federal aid will not, however, be sufficient. Specific measures directed at selected problems are also needed to improve the quality of education. And the key to educational quality is the teaching profession. About 1 out of every 5 of the nearly 1,600,000 teachers in our elementary and secondary schools fails to meet full certification standards for teaching or has not completed 4 years of college work. Our immediate concern should be to afford them every possible opportunity to improve their professional skills and their command of the subjects they teach.

In all of the principal areas of academic instruction—English, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, foreign languages, history, geography, and the social sciences—significant advances are being made, both in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge and in the methods of transmitting that knowledge. To keep our teachers up to date on such advances, special institutes are offered in some of these areas by many colleges and universities, financed in part by the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education. Many elementary and secondary school teachers would profit from a full year of full-time study in their subject-matter fields. Very few can afford to do so. Yet the benefits of such a year could be shared by outstanding teachers with others in their schools and school systems as well as with countless students. We should begin to make such opportunities available to the elementary and secondary school teachers of this country and thereby accord to this profession the support, prestige, and recognition it deserves.

Another need is for higher standards of teacher education, course content and instructional methods. The colleges and

universities that train our teachers need financial help to examine and further strengthen their programs. Increased research and demonstration efforts must be directed toward improving the learning and teaching of subject-matter and developing new and improved learning aids. Excellent but limited work in educational research and development has been undertaken by projects supported by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and private groups. This must be increased—introducing and demonstrating to far more schools than at present up-to-date educational methods using the newest instructional materials and equipment, and providing the most effective inservice training and staff utilization.

Finally, in many urban as well as rural areas of the country, our school systems are confronted with unusually severe educational problems which require the development of new approaches—the problems of gifted children, deprived children, children with language problems, and children with problems that contribute to the high dropout rate, to name but a few.

To help meet all of these needs for better educational quality and development, and to provide a proper Federal role of assistance and leadership, I recommend that the Congress enact a program designed to help improve the excellence of American education by authorizing:

(1) the award each year of up to 2,500 scholarships to outstanding elementary and secondary school teachers for a year of full-time study;

(2) the establishment of institutes at colleges and universities for elementary and secondary school teachers of those subjects in which improved instruction is needed;

(3) grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of special projects designed to strengthen teacher preparation programs through better curriculums and teaching methods;

(4) amendment of the Cooperative Research Act to permit support of extensive, multipurpose educational research, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects; and

(5) grants for local public school systems to conduct demonstration or experimental projects of limited duration to improve the quality of instruction or meet special educational problems in elementary and secondary schools.

II. ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

In the last 10 days, both Houses of Congress have recognized the importance of higher education to the fulfillment of our national and international responsibilities. Increasing student enrollments in this decade will place a still greater burden on our institutions of higher education than that imposed on our elementary and secondary schools where the cost of education per student is only a fraction as much. Between 1960 and 1970 it is expected that college enrollments will double, and that our total annual operating expenditures for expanding and improving higher education must increase 2½ times or by nearly $10 billion.

In order to accommodate this increase in enrollments, the Office of Education estimates that nearly $22 billion of college facilities will have to be built during the 1960's—three times the construction achieved in the last 10 years. The extension of the college housing loan program—with a $1.5 billion loan authorization for 5 years, enacted as part of the Housing Act of 1961—assures Federal support for our colleges' urgent residential needs. I am hopeful that the Congress will this month complete its action on legislation to assist in the building of the even more important and urgently needed academic facilities.

But I want to take this opportunity to stress that buildings alone are not enough. In our democracy every young person should have an equal opportunity to obtain a higher education, regardless of his station in life or financial means. Yet more than 400,000 high school seniors who graduated in the upper half of their classes last June failed to enter college this fall. In this group were 200,000 who ranked in the upper 30 percent of their class, of whom one-third to one-half failed to go on to college principally because of a lack of finances. Others lack the necessary guidance, incentive or the opportunity to attend the college of their choice. But whatever the reason, each of these 400,000 students represents an irreplaceable loss to the Nation.

Student loans have been helpful to many. But they offer neither incentive nor assistance to those students who, by reason of family or other obligations, are unable or unwilling to go deeper into debt. The average cost of higher education today—up nearly 90 percent since 1950 and still rising—is in excess of $1,750 per year per student, or $7,000 for a 4-year course. Industrious students can earn a part of this—they or their families can borrow a part of it—but one-half of all American families had incomes below $5,600 in 1960—and they cannot be expected to borrow, for example, $4,000 for each talented son or daughter that deserves to go to college. Federal scholarships providing up to $1,000 a year can fill part of this gap. It is, moreover, only prudent economic and social policy for the public to share part of the costs of the long period of higher education for those whose development is essential to our national economic and social well-being. All of us share in the benefits—all should share in the costs.

I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges, be enacted without delay.

III. SPECIAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. MEDICAL AND DENTAL EDUCATION

The health needs of our Nation require a sharp expansion of medical and dental education in the United States. We do not have an adequate supply of physicians and dentists today—we are in fact importing many from abroad where they are urgently needed—and the shortage is growing more acute, as the demand for medical services mounts and our population grows. Even to maintain the present ratio of physicians and dentists to population we must graduate 50 percent more physicians and 90 percent more dentists per year by 1970, requiring not only the expansion of existing schools but the construction of at least 20 new medical schools and 20 new dental schools.

But here again more buildings are not enough. It is an unfortunate and disturbing fact that the high costs of the prolonged education necessary to enter these professions deprives many highly competent young people of an opportunity to serve in these capacities. Over 40 percent of all medical students now come from the 12 percent of our families with incomes of $10,000 or more a year, while only 14 percent of the students come from the 50 percent of the Nation's families with incomes under $5,000. This is unfair and unreasonable. A student's ability—not his parents' income—should determine whether he has the opportunity to enter medicine or dentistry.

I recommend that Congress enact the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which I proposed last year to (a) authorize a 10-year program of matching grants for the construction of new medical and dental schools and (b) provide 4-year scholarships and cost-of-education grants for one-fourth of the entering students in each medical and dental school in the United States.

2. SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Our economic, scientific, and military strength increasingly requires that we have sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers to cope with the fast-changing needs of our time—and the agency with general responsibility for increasing this supply today is the National Science Foundation. At the elementary and secondary school level, I have recommended in the 1963 budget an expansion of the Science Foundation program to develop new instructional materials and laboratory apparatus for use in a larger number of secondary schools and to include additional subjects and age groups; an expansion of the experimental summer program permitting gifted high school students to work with university research scientists; and an expansion in the number of National Science Foundation-supported institutes offering special training in science and mathematics for high school teachers throughout the country. The budget increase requested for this latter program would permit approximately 36,000 high school teachers, representing about 30 percent of the secondary school teachers of science and mathematics in this country, to participate in the program.

At the higher education level, I am recommending similar budget increases for institute programs for college teachers; improvement in the content of college science, mathematics, and engineering courses; funds for laboratory demonstration apparatus; student research programs; additional top-level

graduate fellowships in science, mathematics, and engineering; and $61.5 million in grants to our colleges and universities for basic research facilities.

3. REDUCTION OF ADULT ILLITERACY

Adult education must be pursued aggressively. Over 8 million American citizens aged 25 or above have attended school for less than 5 years, and more than a third of these completely lack the ability to read and write. The economic result of this lack of schooling is often chronic unemployment, dependency, or delinquency, with all the consequences this entails for these individuals, their families, their communities, and the Nation. The twin tragedies of illiteracy and dependency are often passed on from generation to generation.

There is no need for this. Many nations—including our own—have shown that this problem can be attacked and virtually wiped out. Unfortunately, our State school systems—overburdened in recent years by the increasing demands of growing populations and the increasing handicaps of insufficient revenues—have been unable to give adequate attention to this problem. I recommend the authorization of a 5-year program of grants to institutions of higher learning and to the States, to be coordinated in the development of programs which will offer every adult who is willing and able the opportunity to become literate.

4. EDUCATION OF MIGRANT WORKERS

The neglected educational needs of America's 1 million migrant agricultural workers and their families constitute one of the gravest reproaches to our Nation. The interstate and seasonal movement of migrants imposes severe burdens on those school districts which have the responsibility for providing education to those who live there temporarily. I recommend authorization of a 5-year Federal-State program to aid States and school districts in improving the educational opportunities of migrant workers and their children.

5. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

The use of television for educational purposes—particularly for adult education—offers great potentialities. The Federal Government has sought to further this through the reservation of 270 television channels for education by the Federal Communications Commission and through the provision of research and advisory services by the Office of Education. Unfortunately, the rate of construction of new broadcasting facilities has been discouraging. Only 80 educational TV channels have been assigned in the last decade. It is apparent that further Federal stimulus and leadership are essential if the vast educational potential of this medium is to be realized. Last year an educational television bill passed the Senate, and a similar proposal was favorably reported to the House. I urge the Congress to take prompt and final action to provide matching financial grants to the States to aid in the construction of State or other nonprofit educational television stations.

6. AID TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Another longstanding national concern has been the provision of specially trained teachers to meet the educational needs of children afflicted with physical and mental disabilities. The existing program providing Federal assistance to higher education institutions and to State education agencies for training teachers and supervisory personnel for mentally retarded children was supplemented last year to provide temporarily for training teachers of the deaf. I recommend broadening the basic program to include assistance for the special training needed to help all our children afflicted with the entire range of physical and mental handicaps.

7. FEDERAL AID TO THE ARTS

Our Nation has a rich and diverse cultural heritage. We are justly proud of the vitality, the creativity and the variety of the contemporary contributions our citizens can offer to the world of the arts. If we are to be among the leaders of the world in every sense of the word, this sector of our national life cannot be neglected or treated with indifference. Yet, almost alone among the governments of the world, our Government has displayed little interest in fostering cultural development. Just as the Federal Government has not, should not, and will not undertake to control the subject matter taught in local schools, so its efforts should be confined to broad encouragement of the arts. While this area is too new for hasty action, the proper contributions that should and can be made to the advancement of the arts by the Federal Government—many of them outlined by the Secretary of Labor in his decision settling the Metropolitan Opera labor dispute—deserve thorough and sympathetic consideration. A bill (H.R. 4172) already reported out to the House would make this possible and I urge approval of such a measure establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to undertake these studies.

IV. CONCLUSION

The problems to which these proposals are addressed would require solution whether or not we were confronted with a massive threat to freedom. The existence of that threat lends urgency to their solution—to the accomplishment of those objectives which, in any case, would be necessary for the realization of our highest hopes and those of our children. "If a nation," wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1816, "expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." That statement is even truer today than it was 146 years ago.

The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1962.*

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Education be permitted to hold hearings during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the calendar.

MIN-SUN CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 316) to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Min-Sun Chen.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE ANIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1352) for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. CHOW CHUI HA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ELWOOD BRUNKEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 631) for the relief of Elwood Brunken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elwood Brunken of Tripp, South Dakota, such sum as the Secretary of Agriculture determines the said Elwood Brunken would have been entitled to receive under his crop insurance policy with the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for crop losses sustained by him in 1959 had the croplands on which

such losses were sustained not been determined (after such losses were sustained) to be noninsurable by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. In determining the amount the said Elwood Brunken would have been entitled to receive, the Secretary of Agriculture shall subtract an amount equal to the amount refunded to the said Elwood Brunken by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on account of insurance premiums paid by him for the years 1958 and 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD B. SCHMUTZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 651) for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard B. Schmutz, of Salt Lake City, Utah, the sum of $1,242.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Howard B. Schmutz against the United States for reimbursement of one-half of the costs incurred by him in constructing two reservoirs on federally owned land in reliance upon the approval by the Agricultural Stabilization Committee of Mohave County, Arizona, of his application for Federal sharing of the costs of constructing such reservoirs under the agricultural conservation program for 1959: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CARL F. ROMNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8780) for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Carl F. Romney is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $2,196.80, representing overpayment of compensation he received, through administrative error, as an employee of the Department of the Air Force, Air Force Technical Applications Center, Headquarters, United States Air Force, in the period between July 13, 1958, and November 12, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Doctor Carl F. Romney, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,196.80" and insert "$1,866.40".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER SINGLEVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8781) for the relief of Walter Singlevich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Walter Singlevich is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $2,196.80, representing overpayment of compensation he received, through administrative error, as an employee of the Department of the Air Force, Air Force Technical Applications Center, Headquarters United States Air Force, in the period between July 13, 1958, and November 12, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Walter Singlevich, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "$2,196.80" and insert "$1,866.40".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY A. SEBERT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8947) for the relief of Harry A. Sebert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Harry A. Sebert, an employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be, and he is hereby, relieved of financial liability for the certification for payment by him of United States disbursing officer vouchers Numbered 66102, 19370, 1725, and 64178, in the total sum of $1,499.25, for purchase of air conditioning units for Government use in Washington, District of Columbia, in his capacity as certifying officer, Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the predecessor of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of the said Harry A. Sebert, certifying officer, with the said sum of $1,499.25.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9059) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

STANLEY HAYMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1288) for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over, without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FREE IMPORTATION OF STAINED GLASS FOR ST. JOSEPH'S CATHEDRAL, HARTFORD, CONN., AND FOR THE CHURCH OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7431) to allow the importation free of duty of certain stained glass windows for use in Saint Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Private Calendar.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 425 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6360) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and

report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that, yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 425 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6360, a bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6360 is to authorize the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce to serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary on scientific and technological matters of concern to the Department of Commerce. The bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, who cited the need for competent direction and administration of the various scientific and technical programs of the Department.

The proposed additional Secretary would be assigned administrative responsibilities with respect to the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Patent Office. In addition, he would be assigned definite staff responsibility in connection with the research and development activities carried on by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Administration.

Rapid advances in science and technology have placed additional responsibilities upon the Department of Commerce and it is felt that a specialist on these mattters is sorely needed.

It is estimated that enactment of this legislation would result in the expenditure of approximately $100,000 a year.

I hope the resolution is adopted in order that the House may work its will.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 425 does provide for 1 hour of general debate under an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 6360, which will authorize, if passed, an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

This measure was heard last year in the Rules Committee on August 22, as I remember, and I believe the rule was voted out on either a 7 to 6 vote, or a 7 to 5 vote. It now is being programed today.

Mr. Speaker, the report states that the appointment of this additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce is to serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of Commerce on scientific and technological matters of concern to the Department of Commerce. Now, those are defined further in the report as being the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Patent Office. In other words, those four separate Bureaus under the Department of Commerce will be placed under this additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

As I understand it, last year when the presentation was made before the Rules Committee there were authorized three Assistant Secretaries of Commerce.

I believe the salary at that time was $20,000 per year. Only two of those positions had been filled and there was one vacancy. Even at that time this additional fourth Assistant Secretary was asked for. I have been informed today that of the three positions, one Assistant Secretary is now filled and there are two nominations pending before the Senate.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if that is the reason why this bill has been gathering moss since last August; that is, we could not get the job filled last fall. And could that be one of the reasons why we have not been called upon to consider this bill until now?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am not the leadership and I do not schedule the program so I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am sorry I cannot answer that question.

The committee report states:

We do not anticipate that creation of the new position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce (for science and technology) will involve employment of a substantial number of persons to staff the new office. We have estimated that the total annual cost for the new Assistant Secretary (at the regular salary of $20,000 per annum) and the necessary clerical help and professional assistants will approximate $100,000 to $115,000.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that since January 20 of last year the Government has expanded and expanded; a Disarmament Agency, a Peace Corps, a new agency here or there, with an addition of perhaps 100,000 employees or more. All of that has occurred since January 20 of last year. Why this big expansion has had to take place in this short period of time is something of a mystery to me.

Last year we provided an additional Secretary of Labor, which position was created more or less for a specific individual, as I understand. We have had this bill pending since August 22 of last year. The question is whether we need this additional Assistant Secretary. Allegations are made and we hear by rumor or by hearsay—I am not on the Committee on Appropriations—that requests for additional employees are being made by department after department; requests for additional travel expenses, and the like, in very large amounts, at this particular time. We will probably have to increase the limit of the national debt within the next week or two. We are spending and spending and increasing appropriations and employing more people.

I should like to suggest that it is very questionable at this particular time that we need an additional Secretary of Commerce. I think we ought to slow up a little bit and see where we are going in the matter of hiring additional employees and in the matter of the cost of operating this Government.

Perhaps we can get a little better showing so we will know more exactly what to do. We should know what this administration is planning in the matter of employment and cost of administration, without having to take up piecemeal an item for an additional Assistant Secretary, or an item for an additional new agency, as this bill provides.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to renew my question as to why this bill has been lying around since last August. I understand a rule was granted last August and if I remember correctly the House was in session until about October 1 last year. If this new Secretary is so important, why has this legislation been left to dry on the vine for so long? Can anybody give me a little enlightenment on that subject—on either side of the aisle?

Mr. YOUNGER. I can answer that question, I think. There are three Assistant Secretaries authorized. Only one so far has been confirmed by the Senate. There are two nominations now pending before the Senate to fill the remaining positions of the three assistants that are now authorized. So they have been this long even selecting the ones to fill the authorized jobs.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman is saying that without this additional Secretary proposed here, there are two appointments pending over in the other body at this time; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNGER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the jobs have not been filled?

Mr. YOUNGER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Despite the fact that apparently there was no immediate need for the two assistant secretaries. I am going to listen carefully when the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] takes some time, as I hope he will a little later on, for a further explanation.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman. Now we may get some information—further information, let me say.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from Arkansas would be highly pleased to enlighten the gentleman in any way that he can.

First, let me say as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it is not my duty, responsibility or prerogative to schedule the program of the House. The gentleman from Iowa is as familiar with that fact as I am. In the second place, let me advise the gentleman that our committee reported the bill out of the committee during August—I think it was around the 10th of August, and we immediately applied for a rule. In due time in August, I was given a hearing by the Committee on Rules and then during the latter part

of August, or whenever it was, the Committee on Rules did grant a rule. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that Labor Day then came along and there were a few days off and efforts to get a good many bills up were not successful. This was one of them. So I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has not been dilatory in its efforts to get this bill considered by the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. This bill would have been even more difficult to justify last fall, would it not, when there were two or three vacancies for Secretaries? It would have been difficult to justify another one?

Mr. HARRIS. No; of course, it is going to be hard to enlighten the gentleman and anyone else who have their own minds made up on a matter of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. Well, you might be able to give me some enlightenment in the matter. I do not know that the gentleman would be able to convince me, but he might be able to give me some light on the matter.

Mr. HARRIS. I will try to give you some light on the matter, but I would not undertake to convince the gentleman, I can assure you of that. But, let me say to the gentleman, and to those who very likely are going to express reluctance about approving this proposal that this was not a proposal which was made to the Congress last year by this administration. A request was made previous to that time for an Assistant Secretary for this purpose. The committee has been giving study and thought trying to get information together during this time.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean when he says previous to that time? Is the gentleman trying to say that some other administration wanted an Assistant Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, under the Eisenhower administration—it was started during the administration of Mr. Eisenhower and a request was made during his administration.

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt about that. I think the first bill that was passed in the House in 1953, and I may be wrong about this, but certainly it was one of the first, was a bill to provide for another Assistant Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me another 5 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may shed a little light on one other question?

Mr. GROSS. No, I want to give the gentleman a little light now.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well; I will take time later.

Mr. GROSS. The first bill in 1953 was a bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary of State. This was the first year of the Eisenhower administration. I opposed it; I did not think it was necessary; I thought it was piling up more expense on the taxpayers.

That Assistant Secretary, you may remember, was supposed to reorganize the Department and provide economy of operation. Do you know what happened? The new Assistant Secretary hardly got his chair warm when the State Department hired the firm of Heller Associates, a consultant firm, to do the job of reorganizing the State Department. The consulting firm was paid some $200,000 to try to effect a reorganization, but accomplished little or nothing. The Assistant Secretary accomplished nothing, for the State Department bureaucracy has grown, and grown.

Mr. HARRIS. Since the gentleman has pointed his finger at me, will he not yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am clarifying this for the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. But the gentleman has mentioned my name here twice and said how I voted.

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, he knows that neither I as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or as a plain member would vote for the recommendation for an Assistant Secretary of State if I did not believe it was needed.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but you are here now asking for a new Assistant Secretary, a further buildup of the bureaucracy.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman says I voted for it. I do not recall whether I did or not, but if I satisfied myself at that time that it was necessary I did; otherwise, I voted against it. I shall be glad to look up the record and see.

Now, will the gentlemen yield for one further bit of enlightenment?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Some question has been raised—and I hope all the Members of the House will give attention to the debate in order to be informed—about the situation in the Department of Commerce. Some question was raised about the two Assistant Secretaries that have not been filled, although they were authorized last year. I think it should be noted that these matters are provided by the Congress and are, specifically, the Assistant Secretary for Transportation. That was for a specific duty and responsibility, and, therefore the Assistant Secretary for Transportation could not be filled by a man who might be a capable and qualified scientist. The fact that those two positions have not been filled and have not been utilized on the basis that they were actually needed, to me is most commendable on the part of the Secretary of Commerce. It shows a commendable economy and good business administration on his part.

But in the case of the position we are considering today, they have a man to put into that position, a man qualified to fill it. I hope the gentleman is appreciative of the fact they have saved some money.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to hear that this administration is filling all its jobs with men who are specially qualified for the jobs.

It is the first time in my experience in Washington when men are appointed on that basis and without any political considerations.

I am opposed to this bill to create another Assistant Secretary; to provide another member of the "Cadillac Brigade" in Washington.

Incidentally, I came across some interesting information yesterday. While driving down to work yesterday morning a big truck pulled alongside of me. On the door of the truck was painted "U.S. Treasury—Bureau of the Public Debt."

Add some more unnecessary Assistant Secretaries to the bloated bureaucracy that already exists in Washington and the streets will be full of trucks hauling the debris that represents the public debt.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6360) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6360, with Mr. SHELLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I present to you today for your consideration and urge your support of this bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to become technical adviser in scientific and technical matters for that great and sprawling Department.

This is an administrative bill. It was requested by the Honorable Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, and has the support of the Bureau of the Budget. I believe during the course of the hearings a good case was made for this position.

During this debate we will show that it will be in the interest of our country, in the interest of economy, and will provide greater efficiency in the Department of Commerce if this request is granted.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that I do not favor promiscuous approval of requests for such as this just to provide somebody with a job. This is not the only request we have had referred to our committee during the last few years for positions of this kind. We try to look at the requests conscientiously and carefully and when the committee

is convinced an additional position is necessary and in the interest of better government and better administration of the programs, in my opinion it is our duty to ask the House to approve.

The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, is extremely anxious for this legislation in order that he may adequately carry out his responsibilities.

He made a personal visit to the committee and testified on this proposal to tell us why he needs this additional Assistant Secretary. We are all aware of the importance of the great advances made in science and technology in the last few years. Developments have been by leaps and bounds. Progress is staggering. We know that. Yes, they are very important to the future security of our country and our own national welfare, but they are also important to the business community. The business community needs someone in the Department of Commerce as a point of contact for information on scientific developments. Just remember that. An Assistant Secretary of Commerce with the knowledge and background of a man who will be appointed to the position can effect and will effect substantial savings in money and effort by coordinating scientific activities within the Department and making information available to businessmen, much of which has been developed with tax dollars at great expense.

Now, listen to me. We feel this legislation is necessary, therefore, in the interest of good government, and urge its adoption. It did not originate, I will say to my distinguished friend from Iowa, with this administration. And, I wish he would listen to me as I try to give him this information. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I was just calling the gentleman's attention, in order that he may be advised about the origin of this program. I would be glad to convey that information because I think it would be helpful. It did not originate with this administration. It did not originate with the Eisenhower administration. This request originated with the National Academy of Sciences, which is the scientific organization in this country that is nonpolitical and has only one purpose, and that is the purpose for which it was established, to promote the development of science. The National Academy of Sciences in March 1960 recommended that within the Department of Commerce there be established an office of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to coordinate scientific and technical responsibilities of the Department. Now, the Eisenhower administration reviewed that recommendation and came to the conclusion that it was a very good request and should be adopted. Therefore, during the latter days of that Congress in 1960 the Department of Commerce sent up a request for this purpose. The gentleman from Kansas was a member of the committee at that time.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman from Arkansas knows that this gentleman from Kansas is generally greatly persuaded by the point of view of the gentleman in the well of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. And I have enjoyed a very pleasant association with the gentleman, and I am sorry he is no longer a member of the committee.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman from Kansas views that situation with some regret, too, I may say. But, notwithstanding what happened in the past, I want to be helpful to the gentleman from Arkansas. As I understood his statement to the House a few moments ago there is at this time—and the testimony before the Committee on Rules, I think, emphasized this point last spring—there is at this time pending an authorization for an Assistant Secretaryship of Commerce that is not filled at the present time and it is not contemplated that that position will be filled; is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. I was going to get to that as soon as I lead up to that point. I will say that when I was before the Rules Committee, the gentleman is correct. As I explained to them, there was a position for an Assistant Secretary for Administration that was not filled.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary or the President cannot nominate a scientist for that position. These Assistant Secretaries are authorized by the Congress for a specific work. Consequently, they could not be utilized for this purpose.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. In a further effort to be helpful to him, would the gentleman consider accepting an amendment abolishing that position which is not going to be used, and for which no appointment has been made, and then establishing this one in lieu thereof?

Mr. HARRIS. I could not commit myself to accept an amendment at this time, because I would not know just how that would affect the organizational setup down in the Department. I certainly would entertain a review and consideration of any of the Assistant Secretaries in this or any other agency that comes before our committee.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to prolong this, but if there were such a proposal entertained by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it seems very obvious to me if there is a position that is not being filled, why not abolish it? In that way I think we would overcome a lot of objection to this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I suggested that during the course of the consideration of this bill last year, and there was some comment about what it might do to the organization and the committee did not go along with it. I understand the position has since been filled.

The gentleman from California, I believe, said a moment ago that there is pending over in the Senate now two appointments for positions down there. I am not familiar with that. So I just do not know what the situation is, and I would not want to commit myself unless I did know.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly will be glad to consider it, but I would not want to do it in connection with this legislation, because I am not familiar with what the facts are in relation thereto. Nevertheless, the National Academy of Sciences has recommended it, the Eisenhower administration submitted it and requested it, and in the last Congress it was resubmitted by the present Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there are many people in this country who have any question as to the capability of Secretary Hodges, as to the business ability of Secretary Hodges, and how he feels about matters of business and the national economy. I think if there is any one person from the business community in this administration, it is the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, the committee held hearings on this proposal. We had some reluctance about it, I will say to the gentleman. After the first hearings we called representatives of the Department back for more detailed information to make sure that this was a position that ought to be approved by the House. We made a complete record on it, and I would refer the Members of the House to the hearings and report and ask their indulgence to read what is stated there regarding the need for the legislation, and the need for coordination. Also read the letter of the Secretary in which he supports and urges this proposal. I believe the Members of the House will be constrained that it will be in the interest of our country.

We know that if the Secretary needs to send a man with the ability and with the status of the man who will hold this position to talk to people who are his equal in other positions of Government and industry if the job is to be done. We know that. We know that if this man goes down to talk to the people in NASA, which he must do in order to coordinate his work with them, so far as that work affects Commerce, he has to have status equal to those with whom he talks. The same is true as to other agencies of the Government such as the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, let me take just a minute to review what those duties are. This year in the budget there are funds—and this is purely for research and development that is charged to the Secretary of Commerce—in the Patent Office, $580,000; Coast and Geodetic Survey, $839,377; Bureau of Census, $1,107,000; National Bureau of Standards, $24,500,000; Maritime Administration, $9,013,000; Bureau of Public Roads, $4,063,000; Weather Bureau, $9 million. That is a grand total of $70,670,377 in the budget for the Department. You cannot expect one man in his position to take the time to follow through on each of these items. What we are asking here is an opportunity to coordinate this work under one head, so that the Secretary can have his finger on what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this one other thing to my colleagues in the House. There are many ways in which we have experienced great waste in Government. There is no one who deplores waste in Government more than I do. We should all be vigilant in this field. But let me say to you that there are billions of dollars being appropriated every year to the Atomic Energy Commission, to NASA, to the Department of Commerce through the Bureau of Standards, and other scientific research and development programs; and there is no program anywhere in Government subjected to waste and duplication more than in these fields.

In my judgment we would be doing a great service in the interest of economy in this Government if we approve this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the following letter from Secretary Hodges gives much information of interest in connection with this problem:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1962.

Hon. OREN D. HARRIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: In connection with legislation pending in the Congress which would authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, I feel that it would be worth while to furnish you a brief picture of the research and development effort of the Department of Commerce as it would be directed by this new Assistant Secretary.

Following is a listing of the 1962 fiscal year research and development budgets of the Bureaus of the Department engaged in this field. The amounts shown do not reflect expenditures in R. & D. plant which, for the new facilities of the National Bureau of Standards alone, will amount to approximately $100 million by 1963.

	R. & D. appropriation	R. & D. reimbursements
Patent Office	$580,000	
Coast and Geodetic Survey	839,377	
Bureau of the Census	1,107,000	$150,000
National Bureau of Standards	24,500,000	15,875,000
Maritime Administration	9,013,000	5,174,000
Bureau of Public Roads	4,063,000	
Weather Bureau	9,000,000	369,000
Total	49,102,377	21,568,000
Grand total	70,670,377	

The basic research done by the National Bureau of Standards and the Weather Bureau contributes substantially to the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and the Department of Defense. Our scientific output is largely basic and fundamental. It provides foundations on which the scientific programs of these other agencies are based.

You will be interested to know, however, that, aside from the Department of Defense, the Department is perhaps the largest employer of scientists and engineers in the physical sciences in the Federal establishment.

At the present time, the management of the Department is in the hands of one Under Secretary for Transportation and three Assistant Secretaries for Domestic Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Administration and Public Affairs. Among these four men plus, of course, myself and the Under Secretary, we distribute the management and guidance of an organization of 33,000, and 20 major bureaus and offices including our 4 bureaus that we could hope to be supervised by the new Assistant Secretary (the Patent Office, Coast and Geodetic Survey, National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau). At the moment, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau report to the Under Secretary for Transportation. The National Bureau of Standards and the Patent Office report to the Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs.

Please do not hesitate to call upon me for any other information you may require concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this measure was reported out of our committee by a divided sentiment. Personally I can see no need for this additional Secretary. I want to disagree with some of the arguments of our fine chairman [Mr. HARRIS], when he says we must have a scientist as a coordinator. If that argument were followed through every university president in the United States would have to be a scientist in order to supervise and coordinate the scientific departments within that university. I say that some of the best college presidents we have in this country are not scientists. Now let me analyze this for just a minute.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman point out to me one major university in this country that does not have a head directing the scientific work of that university?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, I can point to my own university, and the head is not a scientist.

Mr. HARRIS. I am talking about the president.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is his job.

Mr. HARRIS. No, I am talking of every president having someone in the university who heads the scientific program of that university.

Mr. YOUNGER. Now you are admitting, Mr. Chairman, exactly the point I am trying to make. You are admitting that the Weather Bureau does not have a scientist in charge of it and that the Coast Guard and the Geodetic Survey does not have a competent scientist in charge of it, nor does the Bureau of Standards. This is exactly the same point we have in a university where you have a department of chemistry or a department of physics or a department of engineering or a department of electric engineering and so on down the line. If we have competent scientists in charge of these various bureaus and posts, then what you need is a coordinator within the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. If my colleague will wait for a just a moment.

Mr. MACK. I think the gentleman is quite confused.

Mr. YOUNGER. No, I am not confused at all, may I say to my colleague. We have in the Department of Commerce an Under Secretary of Commerce. That job has been filled and has been confirmed. We have one assistant for transportation. That one assistant has been confirmed. I do not know whether he is for transportation or not. We have one assistant for administration. The Assistant Secretary for Administration should be charged with the responsibility of coordinating the work within the Department, and it is not necessary for that man to be a scientist to be assigned to that duty. We have one other Assistant Secretary whose duties are not delineated by legislation according to the information I have. All three of these positions are either filled and confirmed or two of them are before the other body now and ready for confirmation. There are no new bureaus added to the Department of Commerce. There are no new officers added to the Department of Commerce. So I can see no necessity at all for another Assistant Secretary. Let me say this. Last year the Department of Commerce said that if they could only reorganize their Maritime Administration, they would be fixed. That Commission was formed and the Maritime Commission was instituted by legislation. So they ought to be well officered now by competent individuals in that field. So far as coordination is concerned, I say that good administration would hold that this Assistant Secretary for Administration, if he is a competent administrator, ought to be able to coordinate the departments within the Department of Commerce and coordinate their work with all of the other scientific departments within the Government.

As to the cost. Nobody knows what the cost of this will be. We have had this same experience right along and added and added and added to this great payroll. I remember when I came to this body in 1953, we had a Government payroll of some 2½ million and some odd thousand employees. Gradually that was whittled down until February of 1961 when it was down to 2,255,000 employees or almost a quarter of a million employees—less than 8 years previous. Already within 1 year we have added over 88,000 additional employees. How many more will be added nobody knows? Personally, I can see no necessity for this additional Assistant Secretary at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the requested creation of a new Assistant Secretary for Commerce and Technology. Basically the reason I believe it to be unnecessary is that I serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Commerce and am aware of what is happening. We are presently holding hearings in this field. I have to disagree with my distinguished friend from Arkansas in this matter because I believe, looking at the Department of Commerce and what is happening not only in this agency but also in many other agencies of the Government, we are headed for a bureaucracy in this country the likes of which we have never known.

Last year the Department of Commerce asked for 1,463 new employees;

this year the request is for 2,229 new employees. To put it in just a little better perspective, the total number of permanent positions for 1962 was 22,461; in other words, the Department of Commerce is requesting an increase, in this 1 year alone, of almost 10 percent of its total employees.

Now, to refer to the request and the need for a new Assistant Secretary, we have today, as was stated by the gentleman from California, distinguished scientists heading all these agencies; and if I heard the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas correctly, the real reason for this Assistant Secretary is to coordinate the activities of these departments so they can funnel it all together. In reading the appropriation hearings you will note that we have many coordinating committees at the present time. Take the Weather Bureau, for instance: The Weather Bureau is cooperating completely with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the satellite program in the matter of weather; we are doing this with the National Bureau of Standards. The only reason the National Bureau of Standards exists right here is to provide contacts between agencies of the Government. To put a superstructure on this and say that the head of the National Bureau of Standards, when he wants to talk to the Defense Department, has got to go through an Assistant Secretary of Commerce is totally unnecessary. Such things as this will cost a lot more money.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. MACK. I am very happy the gentleman mentioned the Weather Bureau, because that brings up one problem confronting us concerning this appointment of a person who can coordinate the activities of these various agencies. I am wondering if the gentleman recognizes that we have one of the greatest weather bureaus in the Department of Commerce to be found anywhere in the world?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. MACK. I am sure also the gentleman recognizes that the Defense Department is today spending as much money for weather information as is the Department of Commerce.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think that may be correct.

Mr. MACK. Now you are talking about coordinating; certainly, we can coordinate activities within the Weather Bureau; certainly the Defense Department or the Department of the Army can coordinate its activities in the matter of weather. But we have a tremendous duplication of effort even in this very simple problem of dealing with the weather. Does the gentleman realize that we have five separate weather bureaus operating within 25 miles of this Capital?

The gentleman has gotten to the base of the problem here and that is that we need to eliminate some of this duplication not only in the Weather Bureau but also in all agencies of the Government.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman realizes that the gentleman from Illinois stated the point very well, as a matter of fact, the reading of the Appropriations Committee hearings will bring out this very subject. I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] brought it up in the hearings last year. We are very much concerned about this on the committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and was a member of the Commerce Subcommittee, and he recognized that there were certain things in the weather field you could not possibly take away from the Air Force, and the same thing in other services. Just putting on another Assistant Secretary is not going to do the job; they are coordinating right now.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could we not get rid of this overlapping and duplication before we add more fat to the top of the list?

Mr. CEDERBERG. May I say to the gentleman, it would be absolutely unnecessary to have this Assistant Secretary try to coordinate these various officers. They are requesting 345 new people in the Weather Bureau this year. The Bureau of Standards is requesting 290, the Patent Office wants 100 more, the Bureau of the Census 319, Coast and Geodetic Survey 199. When you add them all up you have 2,229 new employees.

Of course, as far as I am concerned, as one member of the committee, they are not going to get these new employees with my vote. I think they would be thankful of they got half of them. If you can bat .500 in a baseball game you are a star. You are adding a superstructure whereby you are going to have these assistants coordinate. I think there are coordinating committees to do this between all of these agencies and I can see no value to come out of this.

Mr. GROSS. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce says this new coordinator is not going to have anything to do with coordinating the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Agency. He has read them out. He is not going to coordinate those two agencies at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to oppose the gentleman from Arkansas in the establishment of this new position. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has eloquently described what is going on in the Committee on Appropriations at the present time. We have this bill before us today. Unfortunately we are in executive session in the Committee on Appropriations and there is much that will come out in the hearings when you see the record that will amaze the members of this committee.

To establish one more Assistant Secretary in the Department of Commerce, it seems to me, is inviting an increase in the appropriation rather than a decrease. They can coordinate very easily through the Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs. There is also an Under Secretary to whom this Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs can report. Now they are building up a new title of an Assistant Secretary for Scientific Affairs. It is going to be an entirely new office.

We will have to rebuild that Commerce Department before long. We are going to have a new building, if we do not look out, because, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] said, they are asking for an increase of around 2,200 this year.

Let me give you just one example. In 1960 the appropriation for one department was $6 million-plus. The estimate today for that same department is $13 million, an increase since 1960. I have never seen an agency or establishment of Government grow in the last few years the way the Department of Commerce has.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when we better put a stop to this and start to look and listen and see whether we need these new Assistant Secretaries who can go in and build up new agencies under the office and find additional responsibilities to get new employees for. The only way we are ever going to give business a break is to find some way to give some type of tax reduction, and the only way we are ever going to reduce taxes is to reduce the cost of Government. We can reduce the cost of Government by putting up the stop sign to these increases in the various agencies. I think we ought to vote this bill down and take a good, hard look at it. I do not care whether it came through the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, or the Kennedy administration. We do not need a new Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes the appointment of an additional Secretary of Commerce, who would serve as principal adviser to the Secretary of Commerce on scientific and technological affairs. A similar bill has passed the Senate.

This proposal did not originate with this administration. A committee of the National Academy of Sciences recommended in 1960 that this new position be created. The Department of Commerce has a number of important scientific activities in the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Patent Office, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Roads, and the Maritime Administration, but the Secretary has no one to look to for help in coordinating the activities of these agencies.

In addition, private business needs a competent person with a scientific background to assist industry to get the results of various research activities financed by tax funds, especially through the Department of Defense.

The subcommittee was assured by Secretary Hodges that this position

would be filled with a person with professional competence in science and technology with administrative experience.

The Secretary urged that the position be established to permit more effective and efficient administration of certain important functions now carried on in the departments; also to provide better representation in dealing with other departments on scientific and technical matters and promoting governmentwide coordination of scientific and technical efforts.

H.R. 6360 was introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], at the request of the Secretary of Commerce.

The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance held two hearings on this bill and went into the need for this new position very carefully.

Witnesses testified that the proposed additional Secretary would be assigned administrative responsibilities with respect to the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Patent Office. In addition, the new Assistant Secretary would be assigned definite staff responsibility in connection with the research and development activities carried on by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Administration.

The National Bureau of Standards R. & D. appropriation for 1962 was $24.5 million. The Weather Bureau received an appropriation of $56 million for operations and $9 million for research in the same year. In addition, $48 million was appropriated for the new satellite program. The Patent Office appropriation for 1962 was almost $25 million of which $580,000 was for research. The 1962 appropriation for operations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey was almost $19 million of which about $850,000 was for research. For fiscal 1962, the Department of Commerce received appropriations of $304,302,000 for maritime activities. The total budget for that year for research and development was slightly in excess of $9 million. The Bureau of Public Roads, which administers the Federal-aid highway program, in 1962 had a budget for administrative expenses of more than $33 million, of which approximately $4 million was for research and development.

Rapid advances in science and technology place additional responsibilities upon the Department of Commerce. An example is the weather satellite program, which will be operated by the Department of Commerce.

The committee is aware of the vast duplication of effort in research activities in and out of Government.

Proper and effective coordination of research activities should result in important savings, not only within the Department of Commerce, but in other agencies. Savings to industry also are possible by making available to the fullest extent possible, consistent with national security, the results of research financed by various governmental agencies with tax dollars.

The committee agrees with the Secretary regarding the need for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. An Assistant Secretary with professional competence in science and technology, and with administrative experience, is needed to assist the Secretary in coordinating scientific activities of the Department, and also to serve as a point of contact with industry in the dissemination of information on science and technology. This would result in significant savings both to Government and to industry.

Under the present organization of the Department of Commerce, the Secretary has an Under Secretary. There also is an Under Secretary for Transportation. There are three Assistant Secretaries, one for Domestic Affairs, one for International Affairs and one for Administrative Affairs. At the time of the subcommittee hearing the position of Assistant Secretary for Administrative Affairs had not been filled. Since then, however, Mr. William Ruder was named Assistant Secretary for Administration and this nomination is now pending in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, my subcommittee had the responsibility of holding hearings on the proposal which was recommended by the Secretary of Commerce and which was sent to the Congress. But, we entered into the hearings with many reservations. As a matter of fact, as the chairman indicated, we reopened the hearings to secure additional information to justify an additional Assistant Secretary. Early last year the other body passed a bill which came over to our subcommittee which would have provided for an additional Assistant Secretary. It would have established the Office of International Travel under an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Our committee considered that proposal and eliminated the provision to establish an Assistant Secretary within the Department of Commerce.

So, as my chairman has so ably stated this afternoon, none of us has any desire to increase the number within the Department of Commerce and none of us has any desire to increase the number of Assistant Secretaries in any department of government. I do believe, however, that an excellent case has been made for the establishment of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Scientific and Technological Affairs. I believe that the Government would actually be saving money if we were to enact this legislation. I know that several members of the Committee on Appropriations here today talked about the number of individuals within these departments. Well, I say to them that it is their responsibility and our responsibility as Members of Congress to eliminate the additional numbers through appropriations if we have too many employees working there. I do think and I feel very strongly that we need the proper organization within our governmental agencies.

Mention has been made here today that this is a brandnew proposal of President Kennedy's. I have before me an excerpt from the President's Science Advisory Committee report of October 17, 1960, "Government Research and Development." In this statement it includes the following:

> The Hoover Commission Subcommittee on Research Activities in the Department of Defense recommended in 1955 that there be an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development in each service department.

Now, if the Hoover Commission recommended it in 1955, if the President's Science Advisory Committee recommended a similar approach in 1958, and if the National Academy of Sciences recommended it in 1960, it seems to me that there is some justification for the establishment of an additional Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Members who have expressed opinions concerning the present assistant secretaryship have inferred that the Department has never been able to fill two of its positions. That simply is not true. I asked one Member to yield to me for the purpose of correcting him when he made that statement. As a matter of fact, we do have two acting Assistant Secretaries at the present time. We might refer to those positions as being vacant, but they are active. It is true that one of them was vacant at the time we held our hearings on this legislation last year, but the other one was filled at the time. It was filled, and it has been confirmed. The Assistant Secretary for International Affairs since that time has resigned, and in his place Mr. Jack Behrman has been recommended, and he is awaiting confirmation by the other body. So we are utilizing all of our positions of Assistant Secretaries, all three of them, at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, the other question which was raised last summer involved the appointment of an Assistant Secretary for Administration. I do not know what the other members of our committee thought about it at the time, but I think the Secretary of Commerce is to be commended for not filling that position because the man that he was using to provide that service at that time as an assistant was going to leave the Government within 6 months. Therefore the Secretary did not go through the routine of submitting his name to the Senate and having him confirmed, knowing that he was going to resign at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to make to anyone concerning the present structure of the Department of Commerce. I think the three Assistant Secretaries which the Department of Commerce now has are all justified. There is no question in my mind but what an additional Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology can very easily be justified.

Mr. Chariman, my good friend from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] mentioned the Weather Bureau. That is only one case of duplication. Every agency of the Government is trying to perform the complete service. At one time we did have four or five separate Weather Bureaus right here in the Washington area. One or two of them have been closed now, but just a few years ago—just 1 year ago—we had the biggest Weather Bureau in the world here in Washington, D.C., under the Department of Com-

merce. We had a Weather Bureau out here at the Anacostia Naval Air Station. We had another one at Bolling Field. We had another one at Andrews Field. Incidentally, for a long period of time they operated two of them—one on each side of the Anacostia Naval Air Station.

Mr. Chairman, we have tremendous duplication of activity, especially in the technological areas. I feel that it is vitally important today that we have an Assistant Secretary or that we do have an additional employee to attempt to coordinate these activities with other agencies of the Government. I think the machinery has been established for that purpose. The appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce would provide the appropriate official to work with this coordinating agency.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a publication just recently put out by the Interagency Committee on Oceanography of the Federal Council on Science and Technology, which is the Council that is attempting to coordinate these activities. Oceanography? Who has the responsibility for oceanography? I thought it was the Navy. But I find out later it is the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Later I found out that the Coast Guard had great activities in this area. Later I found out that even the Army and the Air Force were involved in it as well as the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is high time that we tried to eliminate some of the duplication of services even though they are in the research and development field. We hesitate to cut down appropriations for research and development, and we are criticized when we do. However, I believe that we ought to get the most for our money, and we ought to eliminate duplications of any kind.

The appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce will make this possible. I am proud to support the bill before us today which would provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like somebody to tell me where and when the creation of a new Assistant Secretary, Deputy Secretary, or any other kind of secretary, within the meaning of the bill before us, has resulted in any economy in government. Will somebody please tell me where and when that has happened?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I know the gentleman has been on the floor listening attentively to the debate this afternoon. Let me explain this again. As we have said, there are many duplicating activities within the Department involved here. The gentleman could not expect one man—and he knows Mr. Hodges is a businessman——

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute; the gentleman spoke of Mr. Hodges.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Hodges is an estimable gentleman I am sure. But let me say to the gentleman that I think Mr. Hodges would be doing a better service to the Department of Commerce and the taxpayers of this country if he would take care of the business of the Department of Commerce instead of trying to propagandize the people of this country into the oblivion of free trade. I wish he would take care of the business of his Department instead of trying to promote free trade, all over the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. I know Mr. Hodges will be glad to have the gentleman's views on that, too. It is known that unless we can do something about the duplication of these various efforts, with the tremendous cost involved, the millions and millions of dollars in the Weather Bureau, which was mentioned a moment ago, and in the other agencies and bureaus that come under the Department of Commerce—the gentleman knows you have got to have somebody who sits on it all the time if you are going to save money. But if you let them go without somebody being able to give it time and attention you will continue to have waste and duplication.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. I do not know whether the gentleman listened to the broadcast of the news over WTOP last night, the CBS news. Following the news there was a broadcast called the "Big E for Exports," telling about how many people would be employed if we only lowered our tariffs and created more exports by lowering our tariffs. And then they said that anyone who was interested in getting more propaganda on exports could do so by writing to the Department of Commerce, Post Office Box such-and-such. I thought that the broadcast was probably sponsored by the Department of Commerce. I find that WTOP did it as a public service. But somebody is writing these radio speeches, somebody is writing these acts. Maybe they do not pay the broadcast company directly, but certainly a great deal of the taxpayers' money is going into that. I wonder if the gentleman would be as much opposed to the taxpayers' money going for this purpose in the Department of Commerce as any other.

Mr. GROSS. That is the point I tried to make a moment ago.

Mr. BERRY. I was just wondering, under the circumstances, if it is the policy of the Department of Commerce to continue this, would it not be wise, and does not the gentleman believe it would be wise, to have an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Exports?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about that. I do know that officials of the Department of Commerce are campaigning in behalf of free trade, and I say that they ought to attend to the business of the Department. I wondered a little while ago where the demand for a new Assistant Secretary originated. Then I heard the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], say that some society promoted this bill I wonder if the "Society of the Sons and Daughters of I Will Arise" comes in and wants an Assistant Secretary if we will be asked to jump through the hoop and provide one. Is that the way the payroll is to be loaded—because some society wants some "poohbah" elevated to a top job? From what source is the money to come to pay for these Cadillac-equipped new Secretaries?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, a thought occurs to me—we have not faced up to one of the real issues here. The Department of Commerce, as conceived and as administered under the present Secretary, is the businessman's department of the executive branch of Government. To show you what has been done and what can be done, if you would go down there and see how the present Secretary has made it possible for the businessmen of this Nation to get information and to get it quickly and to get statistics and to get other material that they need, you would recognize the progress that has been made. For my part, in the 4 previous years to Mr. Hodges, the Department of Commerce exhibited a dormancy which the businessmen of this Nation suffered from.

Now, we have a Department of Commerce which is saying to the business people—you have a place to come for information and for assistance.

The Secretary of Commerce has done a great job.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNGER. How do you reconcile that with the abolishment of the businessman's advisory council?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I think that was an act of administrative judgment. If you will go down to the Department of Commerce and see what they have established, you would come to a different conclusion about it. The advisory council was not producing; but the Department of Commerce of today is producing through the Business Information Office that they have established there, and they are doing a good job. I might say to the gentleman, in this particular field of science and technology, so far as I can see, the business community of this Nation—with the exception of those in manufacturing and producing establishments in this particular field of science and technology—does not know where to go or where to turn or how to use the free enterprise system or procure the profits that would naturally come from the use of our new discoveries in science in peaceful times for peaceful commercial purposes.

Here we are having opposition to one Assistant Secretary, the expenses of which are a mere $100,000 when we would give to any backward nation $100 million or $50 million and here we are hearing opposition to the efforts of this great Secretary of Commerce. Now he has been put in this position: He is a member of the President's Cabinet, and as I said once to one of the Cabinet members of Mr. Eisenhower in another day, "The fact that you were picked by the

President of the United States to do the job you did causes me to have great respect for your ability, and while I might oppose you in some things, I respect your judgment in the administration of your Department."

Here is a man who has the responsibility of running this Department—the responsibility to the businessmen in the State of California, Iowa and other States—and you say to him, "We are not going to help you shoulder that responsibility in this one particular area where it does not cost very much money." You are saying, "We are going to nit-pick at you and say that you should not have this Assistant Secretary when you say it is necessary for the good of the Nation."

What are we trying to do? We are tryng to substitute political judgment for the judgment of a successful businessman who has the interest of the business people of the country at heart. The reason for this legislation is the ambition of this Secretary and his determination, I am sure, to do something for the business people in this field of science and technology. When you talk about coordinating science and technology let me remind you that the average person in this Congress or the average man in business knows very little about science and technology. The budget of the average business man in America cannot afford a scientist or technologist; therefore, here is an opportunity for the businessman to get the service, to get coordination, to get the information, to get the advice. This bill provides the vehicle.

I favor this legislation and I hope it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend to the House the proposal to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce has indicated that he will be assigned to coordinate scientific activities within the Department of Commerce. I agree thoroughly with the belief that this position will enable the Department to administer its responsibilities efficiently and will encourage more effective Government-wide coordination as a result of better organization and staffing for scientific and technical responsibilities.

It is, of course, no secret that the importance of research and attention to science is a major factor in the national growth. Most businesses now have designated a vice president for research and development or at least a high responsible executive to be aware of trends affecting the future of commerce. The National Science Foundation pointed out just last year that employment of scientists and engineers in industry increased by approximately 6 percent between January 1959 and January 1960. This rate of growth is greater than that for total industrial employment. The rise in scientific and engineering employment was greater in research and development than in other activities.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have been deeply aware of the continuing discussion over the proper organization of science activities within the Federal Government. Certainly there is strong need for active policy coordination throughout the various agencies. The suggestion of a Department of Science and Technology and the arguments against it must, I think, be subjected to continuing study and an appraisal of the experience of existing organizations.

However, there can be no argument against the need to provide in every instance where scientific and technological change will affect the functions of Government an office of sufficient power and authority to make use of science for better Government and public service.

I believe the proposal for an additional Assistant Secretary meets this need. I am happy to see that it has received general approval, including the warm endorsement of the late chairman of our committee, the Honorable Overton Brooks, of Louisiana. I urge the House to support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further requests for time? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be in the Department of Commerce, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHELLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6360, to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 425, he reported the same back to the House without amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 169, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—231

Addabbo	Gray	Norrell
Addonizio	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Green, Pa.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Alexander	Griffiths	O'Hara, Ill.
Alford	Hagan, Ga.	O'Hara, Mich.
Andrews	Hagen, Calif.	Olsen
Anfuso	Haley	O'Neill
Ashley	Hansen	Patman
Aspinall	Harding	Perkins
Bailey	Hardy	Pfost
Baring	Harris	Philbin
Barrett	Harrison, Va.	Pike
Bass, Tenn.	Hays	Poage
Beckworth	Healey	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Price
Blatnik	Hechler	Pucinski
Blitch	Hemphill	Purcell
Boggs	Henderson	Randall
Boland	Herlong	Reuss
Bolling	Holifield	Rhodes, Pa.
Bonner	Holland	Rivers, Alaska
Boykin	Hull	Rivers, S.C.
Brademas	Ichord, Mo.	Roberts, Ala.
Breeding	Inouye	Roberts, Tex.
Brooks	Jennings	Rodino
Burke, Ky.	Joelson	Rogers, Colo.
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Johnson, Md.	Rogers, Tex.
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Wis.	Rooney
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Carey	Karsten	Rostenkowski
Casey	Karth	Roush
Celler	Kastenmeier	Rutherford
Chelf	Kelly	Ryan
Clark	Keogh	St. Germain
Coad	Kilgore	Santangelo
Cohelan	King, Calif.	Saund
Colmer	King, Utah	Scott
Cook	Kirwan	Selden
Cooley	Kitchin	Shelley
Corman	Kluczynski	Shipley
Daniels	Kornegay	Sisk
Davis, James C.	Kowalski	Slack
Davis, John W.	Lane	Smith, Iowa
Dawson	Lankford	Smith, Miss.
Delaney	Lennon	Smith, Va.
Dent	Lesinski	Spence
Denton	Libonati	Staggers
Diggs	Loser	Steed
Dingell	McDowell	Stephens
Donohue	McFall	Stratton
Dorn	McMillan	Stubblefield
Downing	McSween	Sullivan
Doyle	Macdonald	Taylor
Dulski	Mack	Thomas
Edmondson	Madden	Thompson, La.
Elliott	Magnuson	Thompson, N.J.
Everett	Mahon	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Marshall	Thornberry
Fallon	Matthews	Toll
Farbstein	Merrow	Trimble
Fascell	Miller, Clem	Tupper
Finnegan	Miller, George P.	Udall, Morris K.
Fisher	Mills	Vanik
Flood	Monagan	Vinson
Flynt	Montoya	Walter
Fogarty	Moorhead, Pa.	Watts
Forrester	Morgan	Whitener
Fountain	Morris	Whitten
Frazier	Morrison	Wickersham
Friedel	Moss	Willis
Garmatz	Multer	Winstead
Gary	Murphy	Wright
Gathings	Murray	Yates
Giaimo	Natcher	Young
Gilbert	Nedzi	Zablocki
Gonzalez	Nix	Zelenko

NAYS—169

Abbitt	Bass, N.H.	Broomfield
Abernethy	Bates	Brown
Adair	Battin	Broyhill
Alger	Becker	Bruce
Andersen, Minn.	Beermann	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson, Ill.	Belcher	Cahill
Arends	Bell	Cederberg
Ashbrook	Bennett, Mich.	Chamberlain
Ashmore	Berry	Chenoweth
Auchincloss	Betts	Chiperfield
Avery	Bolton	Church
Baker	Bow	Clancy
Baldwin	Bray	Collier
	Bromwell	Conte

Cramer	Judd	Pirnie
Cunningham	Kearns	Poff
Curtis, Mass.	Keith	Quie
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Ray
Dague	King, N.Y.	Reifel
Derounian	Knox	Rhodes, Ariz.
Derwinski	Kunkel	Riehlman
Devine	Kyl	Robison
Dole	Laird	Roudebush
Dominick	Langen	Rousselot
Dooley	Latta	St. George
Durno	Lindsay	Saylor
Dwyer	Lipscomb	Schadeberg
Ellsworth	McCulloch	Schenck
Fenton	McDonough	Scherer
Findley	McIntire	Schneebeli
Fino	McVey	Schweiker
Ford	MacGregor	Schwengel
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Scranton
Fulton	Martin, Mass.	Seely-Brown
Garland	Martin, Nebr.	Short
Gavin	Mason	Shriver
Glenn	Mathias	Sibal
Goodell	May	Siler
Goodling	Meader	Smith, Calif.
Griffin	Michel	Stafford
Gross	Milliken	Teague, Calif.
Gubser	Minshall	Teague, Tex.
Hall	Moeller	Thomson, Wis.
Halleck	Moore	Tollefson
Halpern	Moorehead, Ohio	Tuck
Harrison, Wyo.	Morse	Utt
Harsha	Mosher	Van Pelt
Harvey, Ind.	Nelsen	Waggonner
Harvey, Mich.	Norblad	Wallhauser
Hiestand	Nygaard	Weaver
Hoeven	O'Konski	Weis
Hoffman, Ill.	Osmers	Westland
Horan	Ostertag	Whalley
Hosmer	Pelly	Wharton
Jensen	Peterson	Widnall
Johansen	Pillion	Wilson, Ind.
Jonas		Younger

NOT VOTING—34

Ayres	Granahan	Pilcher
Barry	Grant	Rains
Brewster	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece
Buckley	Huddleston	Sheppard
Corbett	Jarman	Sikes
Curtin	Jones, Mo.	Springer
Daddario	Kee	Taber
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Ullman
Dowdy	Miller, N.Y.	Van Zandt
Feighan	Moulder	Williams
Gallagher	Passman	Wilson, Calif.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Van Zandt against.

Mr. Brewster for, with Mrs. Reece against.

Mrs. Granahan for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Springer against.

Mr. Houlder for, with Mr. Curtin against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Corbett against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 6360, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1456) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill the same as the bill that was just passed?

Mr. HARRIS. It is identical to it word for word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be in the Department of Commerce, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 6360, was laid on the table.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-364, the Chair appoints as members of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 539

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: RAY ROBERTS, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this resolution and do not expect to consume any appreciable time.

This bill is an open rule providing for the consideration of amendments to the Welfare-Pension Plans Disclosure Act, with 2 hours of general debate. The bill was reported out by the committee after considerable investigation by the Department of Labor into the administration of welfare plans of industry and labor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection on this side of the aisle to bringing this bill up for consideration, but I do know some questions exist in the minds of quite a few Members on this side of the aisle, and I presume on the other side also, as to certain provisions included in this bill. There is a basic question, however, as to the justification for passing the bill itself.

For example, Mr. Speaker, a number of witnesses appeared before the Rules Committee in support of this bill but they were not able to establish any tangible evidence that there was a specific need for further amendment to the Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act of 1958. We would agree that the authority and the power of the Secretary of Labor under the 1958 act is somewhat limited, but I think the burden of proof falls upon the proponents of this bill to show to the House why it is insufficient.

There was no persuasive evidence—let me say I could not say there was no

evidence, but there was no persuasive evidence—as to why the Secretary of Labor would require more authority to supervise the pension and welfare plans to the extent intended by Congress than he has under the present act.

Some suggestion has been made as to intent to defraud the recipients of the assets of these funds over the years or of some mismanagement of these funds; there is a fraud statute in every one of the 50 States that would apply, providing all the necessary authority for prosecution for fraud or misuse of assets. So that does not seem to be a compelling reason.

If it is the will of Congress, if it is the will of this House particularly, to subject all of the pension and welfare funds to the careful scrutiny of the Secretary of Labor and to subject them to his supervision to the extent that at some time in the future he may have jurisdiction over the management of these funds, then, this bill should pass and it should pass without amendment.

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

Mr. AVERY. I would be honored to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. POWELL. There are only five States that have such laws and only two of them have laws with teeth in them. One of them is the State of Massachusetts, but the law was not strong enough and they did not appropriate money for it.

Mr. AVERY. Will the gentleman listen carefully to what I said. I did not say there exists in the 50 States complete and full jurisdiction for the surveillance of the welfare funds, but there is a statute against fraud, is there not, in all the 50 States? If there is intent to perpetrate on the fund or the recipients of the fund a fraud, certainly they would be subject to prosecution under such statute in all the States.

There are a few tangibles in this bill that, if passed, can be anticipated. We are going to add 8,500 employees to the Federal payroll over a period of years. I checked with the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service and there are presently, I am informed, 8,000 more Federal employees than there were a year ago, which is an all-peacetime high for civilian employees. But we here propose to add 8,000 more.

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

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. There will not be 8,500 additional employees. There will be only 180 additional employees. The estimated cost will be about $1,500,000 for this new group. I am willing to accept an amendment to be offered at the proper time to place a limitation of $1,500,000 for salaries paid under this act.

Mr. AVERY. I would reply to the chairman of the committee in this way: This bill is getting better all the time. It is at least 95 percent better than it was 10 minutes ago. I said it was going to cost $45 million on an extended estimate. If we are going to cut that down to $1 million, then this bill has been much improved in this colloquy.

May I add, too, that I will yield to the chairman of the committee for any further improvements to the bill as we move along.

Now, I wonder if we can look at this figure of $45 million, because the bill does have a potential cost of $45 million as presently written. I am wondering how many years it would take to save $45 million if this bill were to pass? In my judgment, I would estimate it might take 45 years to save $45 million, because there was no evidence before the Committee on Rules of any gross mismanagement of the pension and welfare fund that could not be handled under the 1958 act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one further point. I do not know what allusion you may have as to where the support for this bill comes from or where the opposition comes from.

I think it is reasonable to assume that some Members might have gained the impression that this bill has the full and unqualified support of organized labor; that it is opposed by forces not always in agreement with organized labor, and that a vote against this bill is an anti-labor vote. I want to dispel any such illusion that you may have gained during the discourse this afternoon, because the United Mine Workers are opposed to this bill. Certainly there was no allegation of fraud in their various funds in any of the testimony that came to my attention.

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

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That statement is not quite correct.

Mr. AVERY. You mean there has been a question of fraud and mismanagement on the part of the pension funds of the United Mine Workers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes. There are a great many complaints on file in the committee with reference to this fund.

Mr. AVERY. Of course, I would have to accept that statement by the gentleman from California, because, as chairman of the subcommittee, I am sure he has more knowledge and familiarity with the detailed history of the United Mine Workers than the gentleman presently addressing the House. But, I would say this, I think the United Mine Workers have probably managed their affairs in as good order as any other union and, as far as I am concerned, are beyond reproach, and I take very seriously their objection to this bill as an unreasonable burden on the part of the union. Now, if this would come as any special interest to the Members, I would say it is also opposed by the Teamsters organization. I would add, further, that it is opposed by a number of small industrial unions for the reason that it would be imposing an undue burden upon the resources of those unions to comply with all of the requirements that subsequently might be made by the Secretary of Labor.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the rule should be adopted. We should debate this bill, but I would admonish the Members to listen to this debate very carefully and I would admonish them further to listen carefully to the amendments that will be offered from this side of the aisle. The chairman has very generously offered to accept an amendment, as I observed awhile ago, which would drastically improve this bill and save $44 million. I think a few more amendments in that direction might be made to make the bill worthy of favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8723, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in January of last year, before the 87th Congress opened, while examining the tasks which lay before our committee, it became apparent that one of the most obvious legislative actions needed was the amendment of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Mr. Chairman, the law, as passed in 1958 over the strenuous objections of many of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, was a misrepresentation. When former President Eisenhower signed this bill he set forth his dissatisfaction and stated he was only signing it to establish Federal responsibility in this area. The then Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, called upon the previous Congress to tighten this legislation. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] introduced a bill in the 86th Congress for that purpose. The bill before you today, H.R. 8723, which I personally introduced, drew heavily upon the Frelinghuysen recommendations and the best thinking of the present and past executive branches of our Government. I have since given the authorship of that bill to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the tremendous responsibility placed in the hands of the trustees of these pension and welfare funds which now affect the lives of over 100 million people in this country. These funds have been growing at a fantastic rate. The gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND], who is opposed to this amendment in a letter received this morning, indicates that within a few years the amount of plan assets will total $100 billion.

Today, annual payments into these funds exceed the budgets of the State of New York, the State of California, and a dozen other States, combined. Annual payments into these funds exceed the amounts invested by individuals in all the corporate securities of the United States combined. Fund reserves now far exceed $60 billion and are increasing at the rate of well over $5 billion a year.

This Congress must assure the millions of men and women who are the beneficiaries of these plans, and their families, that their money is well handled and their promised benefits properly safeguarded.

This is not done by the present law. The present law is toothless. The 1958 statute made the Secretary of Labor the depository for summary reports of plans and plan operations. He can do nothing to get true facts or to remedy abuses.

Our committee was not the first to recognize the need to fully disclose pertinent information about these plans. In New York State, where a more effective statute was passed, malpractices became apparent. We do not need further scandals to underscore the need for amendments to the present law. Requiring an accounting from the trustees of all types of plans will establish and imbue their operations with a code of conduct which will act as a deterrent to transgressors.

Some opponents of this legislation state that need for these amendments has not been shown because the Department of Labor has no evidence of irregularities. What these opponents have not considered is the simple fact that the Department has not—under the present law—any way in the world of finding out whether or not any fund is properly administered.

This can truly be called a bipartisan measure. Its principles were supported by former President Eisenhower and his Secretary of Labor; a distinguished member of our committee from the other side of the aisle sponsored such legislation; two out of the three Republican members of the subcommittee which considered the legislation supported the measure as it was finally reported out—the third member was not recorded in subcommittee. The subcommittee also sought suggestions, during the public hearings, from industry, labor, insurance companies, investment counselors, and welfare and pension plan administrators. All of their meritorious suggestions have been incorporated in the bill before you this afternoon.

A majority of the House voted in September in support of this measure—a vote of 245 to 161. I believe that the Members voted this way because they truly believe that it is fundamental in a democracy that the rights of the individual are secured by law—and under the present statute, the rights of millions of Americans to full disclosure of the operations of their pension and welfare funds are not so secured. We will deceive them no longer.

Your vote and support for H.R. 8723 is now solicited to close the glaring loopholes in the present law.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, most of the bills receiving committee attention at last session of Congress and carried over to this session have three basic ingredients: increased Federal power, increased Executive power, and increased spending. H.R. 8723 has all of these, but it has much more and I object to it for the following reasons:

The need has not been shown. Indeed, it will not be shown because it cannot be shown. Long and extended hearings developed the only instances of graft or corruption occurred in excess of 5 or 6 years ago—long before the present law was made effective and most of these were of a type which would not have been corrected by the presently proposed legislation.

THE OFFENDERS WERE CONVICTED AND SENTENCED

There has been no wrongdoing shown since the enactment of the present law. The worst charge we have is that Secretary of Labor Goldberg assumes there has been wrongdoing. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this House should legislate on assumptions or suspicion or imagination. Maybe there has been wrongdoing, but there are in every State adequate laws to punish embezzlers, grafters, and thieves. These laws apply to offenses in all kinds of transactions.

The charge has been made that thousands of plans and reports required under the present law have failed to come in on time.

Well, the hard facts are that in the very first year—and mind you, this law became effective February 1, 1959—in the very first year there were some 125,000 descriptions filed initially and the 109,000 first annual reports filed on time actually covered 118,000 of these plans.

Thus, 7,000 did not report on time. Of this 7,000, 5,000 subsequently reported or subsequently explained their failure to do so. Thereafter, 2,000 certified letters were sent to the nonreporting plans and 1,240 satisfactory plans were received.

Of the 760 who did not satisfactorily reply, 52 were carefully screened and selected as appropriate cases and forwarded to the FBI for investigation. Forty of these 52 filed as soon as they were contacted by the FBI and the remaining 12 subsequently filed after requesting time to obtain the necessary data.

How can anyone charge that this is a "massive evasion of law" or even a substantial spirit of uncooperativeness? In other words, the present law has been and is effective. Why enact so-called strengthening legislation when there are no weaknesses in the present law?

It is on this flimsy basis that we are requested to enact a law providing penalties as high as $10,000 fine or 5 years imprisonment, or both. Mr. Chairman, it is a serious thing to enact a law with these heavy penalties on so flimsy a base.

H.R. 8723 would tremendously increase the power of the Federal Government and the executive branch. This is particularly so with the Secretary of Labor, giving him not only regulatory power, but investigative power and providing criminal penalties. Here again we have another instance of a department or bureau having both legislative and executive powers.

Proponents of this bill would do indeed as they claim: put teeth into the law. And they would do it with a vengeance.

Mr. Chairman, with this added power, of course, there has to come another big enforcement staff, estimated at 8,550 and at a cost of $45 million. These estimates are based upon the cost of enforcement of present State laws of a similar character. Hence, there is a largely increased Federal expense. The expenditure of large funds of taxpayers' money could well be made if the need had been shown and if the money could be well spent. But, in my judgment, this is simply not the case with the proposal before us today.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. POWELL. I appreciate the gentleman's enlightenment that the estimated staff is 8,500 but I would like to know who made that estimate.

Mr. HIESTAND. I am happy to reply that it is in the testimony by the administrator of New York law.

Mr. POWELL. That is the New York State law?

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes, the New York State law.

Mr. POWELL. We are dealing with Federal law here and the Secretary of Labor has informed us in writing that it will be 180 employees and not 8,500.

Mr. HIESTAND. I am well aware of that. I am happy to tell the chairman that is a good estimate, if he wishes to live up to it.

Mr. POWELL. We can live up to it by putting it in the bill as an amendment.

Mr. HIESTAND. This estimate is based on a thousand such plans in New York and we contemplate the heavier supervision over 150,000 such plans.

Of course, there are other obnoxious features. Over 90 percent of the funds are managed and supervised by corporate officials. Most of the people handling funds are already under bonds and are carefully supervised by the company auditing departments. This measure would require duplicate bonds and duplicate auditing.

The present D-2 reports are, in my judgment, very complete and sufficiently detailed. The bill provides just that amount of detail. But the power to regulate would authorize the Secretary of Labor tremendously to increase all of that detail—constituting a heavy burden on a large number of the very small welfare and pension plans.

One official is quoted as saying, "this would cost us $800,000 a year and I would rather see that money put into the fund." Who is the beneficiary here—the contributor or the bureaucrat?

But, why the demand for all this increased power without justification? Could it be that certain union leaders who have publicly demanded a voice in the management of welfare and pension

funds would seek eventually to control those vast funds? Could it be that in the years ahead, when the funds are well up in the billions, these leaders would desire to direct the investment of these vast sums into the control of certain corporations, thus gaining immensely increased bargaining power? Could it be that this is simply a step in that direction?

The trend is clear. Private, well-managed control now. Government control tomorrow. Could it be certain labor leaders' control in a few years?

Like most of the setting up of other huge bureaus, we must also, of course, have an advisory council of 13 members, including 2 from management and 4 from labor and 2 from other interested groups. Need I say more?

Mr. Chairman, I consider this a very dangerous bill and urge that it be defeated.

It would give the Secretary of Labor unnecessary and broad regulatory authority, and would unduly burden the administration of pension and welfare funds; infringe upon State legislation—which is a more appropriate and effective method of handling problems involved; ignore the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which now provide effective indirect control of abuses of pension and welfare funds; disregard the rules of conduct and standards prescribed in the Taft-Hartley Act for jointly administered welfare and pension funds; and create within the Federal Government a new bureaucracy which would increase financial and administrative burdens of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, that bill became effective January 1, 1959. By June of 1959 the bill was introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, at the request of some of the bureaucrats down in the Labor Department. We had not at that time had a chance to see whether it was going to be effective or could be effective. It has been effective.

I oppose the bill and urge its defeat.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], to yield as he wishes, and to manage the bill as chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to join with the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in urging the passage of H.R. 8723, the bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The subcommittee of which I am chairman originally considered the bill and put it into the form in which the full committee reported it out. I shall accordingly describe to you some of the details respecting the background of and need for this proposed legislation and the nature of its provisions.

The Disclosure Act, enacted in August 1958 and effective as of January 1, 1959, followed studies and investigations which were undertaken in the 83d and 84th Congresses by special subcommittees, including Senator DOUGLAS' committee. These investigations revealed shocking and scandalous cases of embezzlement, overreaching, exorbitant insurance premiums, irregular insurance practices, and other forms of collusion in the operation of employee welfare benefit plans. These studies and hearings clearly demonstrated the need for full public disclosure of the facts surrounding the provisions, finances, and operations of these plans as a means of insuring that they will be honestly administered.

While nobody questions that the vast majority of these plans are being run honestly and efficiently, it became evident that disclosure legislation is imperative both as a remedy where abuses already existed and as a preventive against possible future irregularities.

During the 85th Congress a subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under the chairmanship of then Senator John F. Kennedy, held exhaustive hearings on a number of disclosure bills that had been introduced. The committee voted out the Douglas bill, S. 2888, which the Senate passed by a vote of 88 to 0. This vote makes it obvious that not only was there a dearth of opposition to the measure, but also that it had strong bipartisan support.

S. 2888 was a strong bill. Under it many of the abuses which had been shown to exist could have been detected and corrected. Indeed, I can say that if it had become law we would not be here today.

However, the House passed a much milder bill which in effect retained only the disclosure aspects of S. 2888. Gone were that bill's provisions which would have authorized the Secretary of Labor to administer the measure, to prescribe rules and regulations, to investigate and compel compliance. Dropped by the wayside were the provisions heavily penalizing willful violations and making embezzlements and kickbacks Federal felonies. This watered down version, under which the Labor Department is only a depository for report forms, was enacted into law. Three years' executive branch experience under the Disclosure Act amply shows its futility.

The tragedy of this act was aptly expressed by former Secretary of Labor Mitchell in his report to Congress on August 9, 1960, when he stated:

> To continue the law in its present form in the belief that it assures adequate protective safeguards is a shameful illusion. To abandon it entirely, however, would be an act of betrayal to the millions of Americans who have a right to a sense of security that the billions of dollars annually received and disbursed by these plans are being honestly and prudently managed.

Private employee welfare and pension benefit plans have become an economic factor of major importance. Approximately 100 million people, workers and their dependents, which is over one-half of the population of the United States, rely upon one form or another of the welfare and pension plans subject to the Disclosure Act. Typical welfare plans cover group medical, hospital and surgical, temporary disability, sickness, accident plans and life insurance. Pension plans operate on a group basis to provide income for the wage earner when his years of active earnings are ended. In other words, they protect the working men and women of America and their families when illness strikes or accidents befall; and they protect him against being an object of charity, public or private, when old age destroys his ability to support himself or when the day comes when he wants to enjoy his remaining years in a pleasant and well-earned retirement.

Beginning in World War II when employee benefit payments came frequently to be used as a substitute for wage increases, the growth in welfare and pension plans has been tremendous. Plan assets as of 1959 amounted to nearly $48 billion. In the intervening time assets have been increasing at a rate of $5 billion a year, so that it is safe to say they are now around $58 billion. It is also a safe estimate to say that by the early 1970's they will have reached the staggering total of $100 billion. Contributions to these plans reached a record high of over $10 billion in 1959, with more than $5 billion being paid out in benefits.

The gentleman from New York has given you in a nutshell the major ways in which the Disclosure Act is deficient. It has many other less glaring defects too, some of which I shall mention. In any event, these shortcomings would be attacked by H.R. 8723 with a broad program that breaks down into six component parts which combine together into a highly effective whole:

First. Adequate investigative power would be given the executive branch.

Second. Specific power to compel compliance and restrain violations of the law through civil judicial proceedings would be given the Government.

Third. Power to issue binding and authoritative opinions and interpretations of the law would be conferred on the Secretary of Labor.

Fourth. Bonding of persons who handle the funds and other property of these plans would be required.

Fifth. Three new sections would be added to the Federal Criminal Code prohibiting kickbacks and certain conflict of interest payments to influence actions of the giver or receiver, embezzlement, and false entries.

Sixth. Miscellaneous amendments of existing law, designed to improve operations under the act, would be made.

As you know, this statute is a disclosure law, not a regulatory one. Before I take up the provisions of H.R. 8723, I want to point out that it would add language to present section 9, stating that nothing in the law shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to regulate or interfere in the management of any plan.

Taking the above six items in order, I have no hesitancy in saying that one of the worst defects of the Disclosure Act is its failure to give the Secretary of Labor adequate investigative power. He lacks authority to investigate cases of faulty, deceptive, or defective reporting, or of complete failure to file. As a re-

sult, although it is a sure thing that a large number of plans have not filed descriptions and reports, it is impossible to know how many there are and—vastly more important—it is usually impossible to identify particular plans that have not filed.

Without authority to investigate, there is little the Labor Department can do to identify delinquent plans. Of course, it is possible to identify a plan that files a description but fails to follow up with the required annual reports. However, if the plan files nothing at all there is little likelihood that its identity will come to light; the actual violation of the law turns out to be the greatest safeguard against detection.

H.R. 8723 would give the Secretary of Labor authority to conduct investigations, conditioned upon certain specific standards which he must follow in deciding whether or not to act. He would be empowered to begin his investigation whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that an investigation may disclose violations of the act. In such event investigative action may be instituted either on a complaint of violation or by the Secretary on his own initiative. Further, in cases involving possible violations of section 7(b), concerning the publication and filing of reports, the Secretary may investigate only when he has first required certification of the annual report by an independent certified or licensed public accountant. This is designed to cut down on investigative costs and burdens by dispensing with them in cases where such certifications will serve all necessary purposes. Certification will often explain or clear up a complaint of alleged violation to the satisfaction of all concerned, thereby rendering investigation unnecessary. Of course, this certification is required only in section 7(b) cases where there actually is a report. It is not required where the violation is of some other section of the act or where the offense is failure to file any report at all.

In aid of this investigatory power, the bill would make the provisions of the Federal Power Act relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence applicable to the Secretary or his designee. The use of the administrative subpena is indispensable to effective investigative power under statutes like this, and it is commonly granted by such laws. A comparable provision appears in the Landrum-Griffin Act, and one was in the Douglas bill, S. 2888, when the Senate passed it in 1958.

Now, the second item; power to compel compliance through civil judicial proceedings.

A very serious shortcoming arises from the fact that the Disclosure Act relies to a large extent on self-policing by individual employees or participants to compel compliance through private litigation. This is wholly unrealistic and, as was to be expected, has proved to be wholly ineffective; apparently only one private beneficiary suit has been brought during the act's 3-year history.

I was greately impressed last year by the following statement in the report of the Commission on Money and Credit, a high-level group representing financial, business, labor, and educational organizations, and established by the Committee on Economic Development:

> The underlying premise of the Federal Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 is that the individual participant in the pension plan is expected to detect maladministration and invoke legal remedies to protect his own interest, whereas experience has shown that employee suits alone are inadequate as enforcement remedies.

Of course employee suits alone are inadequate. Individual employees usually have neither the necessary facts, money, nor the time to prosecute their own cases.

Experience has also shown that criminal sanctions alone are not enough. Under the present law a willful refusal to file a report is a misdemeanor. But imposing the criminal penalty alone would not be the real answer in securing compliance with the law. Compliance, not punishment, is the real objective, and that would be obtained by securing a court order to compel the filing of the report. Hence the bill would specifically authorize the Government to bring civil actions in which the courts could direct compliance with the law.

The third major defect in the Disclosure Act is that no Government agency is authorized to interpret it. There are many close and doubtful questions about the meaning of various provisions of the law. Administrators of these plans want the answers. They are entitled to the answers. They ask these questions in good faith and there are countless areas in which advice to them is imperative. Yet, the Department of Labor can answer only on an informal advisory basis because the law does not empower it to issue binding interpretations or instructions.

H.R. 8723 would remedy this situation by authorizing the Secretary to issue binding opinions and interpretations which plan administrators can uniformly follow and on which they can rely. Administrators who follow such opinions and interpretations will have a good-faith defense if their actions are subsequently questioned.

The fourth area in which H.R. 8723 would improve upon existing law is bonding. Every administrator, officer, and employee who handles funds or other property of a plan would be bonded.

This, of course, does not infer that any substantial number of these persons are dishonest; the contrary is true. However, just as in the case of bank employees and others handling money, bonding is necessary to take care of the occasional case of defalcation which is bound to result whenever a large group of people is handling large sums of money.

The bill prescribes maximum and minimum amounts, $500,000 and $1,000, respectively, but the Secretary could, after notice and opportunity for hearing, prescribe an amount in excess of the maximum. This is necessary because the provision expressly permits the use of blanket or schedule bonds covering many individuals. When all the employees of some of the larger trusts are combined in one bond, such bond would have to be more than half a million dollars to afford adequate protection.

The bond's obligation would be to protect against fraud or dishonesty. It would be in a form or of a type approved by the Secretary who could approve the use of schedule or blanket forms of bonds in lieu of individual bonds. The Secretary could also exempt plan personnel from any of the bonding requirements when he believes that other bonding arrangements afford adequate protection. It would be made clear that compliance with this bonding requirement would relieve the person bonded from similar requirements under any other law insofar as the handling of the funds of the particular plan is concerned.

The fifth major addition to existing law would be made by the provisions of H.R. 8723 which would provide criminal penalties for kickbacks and certain other conflict-of-interest payments and receipts designed to influence certain actions of the giver or receiver; embezzlement; and false statements or concealment of facts in documents required to be published or kept as supporting records. The need for these three provisions is plain. The Douglas committee found that these are fertile fields for abuses. Prohibitions in these areas were included in the original Douglas bill.

The committee, at the suggestion of the Department of Justice, added to the kickback section a subsection authorizing application, with the Attorney General's approval, to the court for an order compelling witnesses in court or grand jury proceedings involving this particular section, to testify or produce evidence in return for immunity. It is clear that this will materially aid law enforcement in the conflict-of-interest field covered by this section.

I will not dwell at length on the sixth category, namely, miscellaneous improvements. The more important are:

First. Establish an advisory council to advise the Secretary respecting the act's administration. The 13-member council would be composed of 1 member from the insurance field, 1 from the corporate trust field, 2 from management, 4 from labor, 2 from other interested groups, and 3 from the general public.

Second. Plan reports would be made public information.

Third. Where plan benefits are provided through the medium of an insurance carrier, service, or other organization, the carrier or organization would be required to certify to the administrator such reasonable information as the Secretary deems necessary to enable such administrator to comply with the act.

Fourth. Every person required to file any plan description or report, or to certify any information, would be required to keep adequate supporting records and preserve them for 5 years.

Fifth. When the Secretary has determined that an investigation is necessary, under the limitations which I have described above, he would be empowered to require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities. While it is intended that this authority shall not be

indiscriminately invoked, it would be valuable in certain situations.

Sixth. The present misdemeanor provision of the act would be made applicable to all sections thereof instead of being limited as at present to violations of sections 5 and 8—"Duty of Disclosure and Reporting" and "Publication," respectively.

Seventh. The Secretary would be authorized, after notice and opportunity for hearing, to prescribe regulations which would dispense with present reporting requirements covering certain information that is either duplicative, unnecessary, or impossible for practical purposes to obtain.

Eighth. As I said earlier, the new provision giving the Secretary investigatory power, subject to meeting specified standards, specifically denies him the authority to regulate plans. However, it permits him to inquire into the existence and amounts of investments, actuarial assumptions, or accounting practices, but only when it has been determined that investigation is required under the bill's standards.

Ninth. The Administrative Procedure Act would be specifically made applicable to the Disclosure Act.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that the participants of the many welfare and pension plans have a right to have their investments safeguarded. The moneys which are contributed into these funds, both by the employer and employee, rightfully belong to the employees much like wages earned belong to the employee. In fact the courts, as well as labor and management in their wage negotiations, have recognized that welfare and pension plans are a form of deferred compensation for services performed. This bill is directed at protecting these investments from mismanagement by requiring full disclosure from plan administrators.

The need for extensive amendments to the 1958 Disclosure Act has been expressed by leaders of both parties. In signing the law into effect on August 29, 1958, former President Eisenhower both recognized the Federal Government's responsibility in this area and foresaw the law's basic weaknesses, urging that extensive amendments be adopted during the next session of Congress.

After 3 years' experience with the law, President Kennedy, in his message to Congress also stated:

> Since the enactment of the act in 1958 we have had an opportunity to observe its operation and effect. This has disclosed several serious deficiencies. The act is designed to prevent repetition of abuses and irregularities in the administration of employees' benefit plans. I believe these amendments are necessary to carry out that purpose.

In summary, therefore, Mr. Chairman, the committee is presenting to the House a most moderate and fair bill the need for which has been unanimously voiced and which takes into account the many special problems presented by committee witnesses in the course of its public hearings.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. The preceding speaker, also one of our colleagues from the State of California, mentioned that bureaucrats wanted this legislation. I wonder if he included in the term "bureaucrat" the former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, and our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and all of the Republicans who voted in favor of this bill in committee?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to say to my distinguished chairman that, of course, it is the privilege of our colleague from California to refer to members of his party as bureaucrats—not an entirely complimentary designation—if he wishes to do so; but, of course, the RECORD will show that the charge did not come from this side of the aisle.

I think it would be well to point out that the matter of urgency for this measure to create more bureaucrats as referred to by my friend from California, occurred under former President Eisenhower, who recommended these provisions to Congress. I think it must be conceded that the former President has a somewhat greater stature than being a bureaucrat.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. I cannot, of course, imply that the President of the United States knew all the details in the remarks he made.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think all of us recognize that this is the second time this measure has been before this body. As the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, remarked, this bill received an overwhelming majority last year; nevertheless, because of this rather unusual procedure I think it is important that we perhaps go over some of the background and reestablish some of the legislative history of this bill and put the picture in its proper perspective.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. That was before the existence of the present law.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was, but let me point out that the situation is no better, as far as I know, and, as a matter of fact, the Secretary of Labor and Mr. Carey, appearing before our committee, stated they believe it is worse. I am going to give you the worst part of it.

Mr. HIESTAND. But he had no evidence it was bad.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is bad enough if abuses happened, and President Eisenhower said the time had come when the matter should be gone into.

Mr. HIESTAND. The fact remains that the present law has done the job.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The fact remains it has not done the job, and we have no evidence it has done the job. Mr. Mitchell, under a Republican administration, and the Secretary of Labor, under a Democratic administration, both say that the job has not been done. What more does the gentleman want? I do not know.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I think before you leave the subject which you first dealt with that I would like, as a former insurance man, to point out something which might shed a little light on the subject. I am sure that you and I both recognize, as former insurance men, that in the first year of the average life insurance policy no dividends are paid on those policies to the policyholders and similarly that the cash values in the first year of the policies are ordinarily at a minimum. I just want to set the record clear. My voting record last year would indicate support of similar legislation, but I do not think we should tell a portion of the story about the policies. In the first year they have a minimum cash value, but no dividends are paid.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. These are renewal policies, not first-year policies. Because my friend is an expert in the insurance field, could I ask him something to see if this is not the fact? Have you ever heard of the practice of trying to get a first year's commission by canceling the previous policy and rewriting it and collecting a first-year commission on that new policy?

Mr. KEITH. I have heard of that practice, but most companies have rules prohibiting it and refuse to pay any commission on policies that are sold because of surrendering other company policies. I do not know of any agent who is honorable who follows that practice. But, it had been done.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Exactly. It has been done, and if it has been done once, then we have to have a law to make sure that it is not allowed to be done again in that growing field.

Mr. KEITH. There are State laws to this effect.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There are only five State laws to this effect, unfortunately. I wish there were a lot more.

Mr. KEITH. Prohibiting the surrender of a policy in order to get a new commission?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There are laws against twisting, but this can be done, as you know, without twisting. Even in my State of California that is done today almost every day of the week.

Mr. KEITH. It is not done among professional people in the life insurance field.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is true. We are not talking about the good people; we are talking about the bad people. We are after the bad people; we are not after the good people. And, this law is not written in any way to hamper the good people. This law is trying to do something about the practice which actually exists.

May I go on and say that the House, of course, in 1958, at the conference with the Senate, yielded against a bill which was much closer to the present bill, and if the Senate bill at that time had passed,

we would not have this legislation before us and the tremendous requests from both sides of the aisle to do something about its shortcomings.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the details of the reports which are before the Congress or the committee hearings, but I should point out that there is at this time substantial regulation of a great many of these pension plans by the Internal Revenue Service. It is a long and involved process to come up with a plan that will win the Federal Government's approval. My colleagues in the Congress should know that it does not entirely escape Federal supervision at the moment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would hope that my friend was going to be a friend of this legislation. But I would like to read a statement on this subject because, of course, the committee went into this problem.

Mr. KEITH. I do not doubt the committee went into it, but I do feel that the entire Congress should recognize the fact that the Internal Revenue Service does have a real responsibility which they exercise in this field.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They went to the Internal Revenue Service and asked them whether they felt they had any ability in this field. They replied in no uncertain terms that their responsibility in this field was only for income tax purposes. They said they had no way of really knowing whether or not this would be lived up to and, so far as they were concerned, there was no duplication in reporting to the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Labor. But, on the contrary, information obtained by the Internal Revenue Service is restricted on a confidential basis whereas in our end of it, this is all public information for the benefit of the beneficiaries. This is confidential information. Even if the Internal Revenue Service found that there were certain things going on which they suspected were probably wrong, they have said to the committee that they could not do anything about it as long as the facts given to them come up to the minimum standards which they require. So they, in essence, said to us, "Look, do not give us this job; ours is an income tax collecting or a tax collecting agency and we have nothing to do with the purpose of this bill."

Mr. KEITH. They do require strict compliance with the regulations which are spelled out in some detail, and one of those regulations is that the plan in which a man or woman is a beneficiary must be conveyed and interpreted to the beneficiary in order that he knows the details of the plan. It also is not allowed to discriminate in favor of certain classes of employees—generally speaking, in plans used to supplement social security. I would be interested in knowing under what administration and under what circumstances that letter which you just read into the RECORD was obtained.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was before the Senate committee, and it was also before our committee.

Mr. KEITH. What was the date of the letter and who sent it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to ask the committee staff for that information, but I will be glad to put it in the RECORD for the information of the gentleman. I believe it was in 1961.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am afraid I am using up the rather short time available to us, but I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. It might be profitable.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CONTE. I compliment the gentleman and the members of the committee for this proposed legislation. In the State of Massachusetts I was chairman for 3 years of a commission investigating the welfare funds of the building and heavy construction unions in that State. I can say that the proposed legislation now before the House is very similar to the law that my commission wrote and which was finally passed by the Massachusetts State Legislature. Unfortunately, the Massachusetts Legislature has not appropriated the necessary funds to carry out the intent of the law. I wish to state here that my commission found many abuses. Let me give the gentleman from California one example. For the common laborers union health and welfare fund which we investigated in Massachusetts, they hired an administrator from Silver Spring, Md., a man by the name of Arthur Peisner and paid him a very handsome salary of about $40,000 a year. He came to Massachusetts and set up this fund. Then he set up a dental fund to take care of the dental work of employees in the heavy builders and heavy construction union. Through a gimmick, they paid out $412,000 in dental fees and, yet, not one person in that union ever had their teeth taken care of by a dentist in Massachusetts. This was only one small instance of many, many others. One of the trustees who happened to be a big construction employer in the State of Massachusetts and who also was an official of one of the banks, as a trustee of that particular fund in Massachusetts, took this money from the fund and deposited it in his bank interest free. This was only one of many abuses we found in the fund of the builders and heavy construction workers. There were officials both on the employers' side and on the employees' side who had their hands in the cookie jar. I think it is very commendable that we put some teeth in the laws so that such people can be brought before the bar of justice.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

I think we can all agree that this bill is nonpartisan.

There are several other things I would like to talk about, but I will reserve the balance of the time on this side for others. At this time I would simply ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and say that I will continue the debate under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily to state my own position both with respect to this bill and with respect to previous legislation in this same area which I introduced back in 1959. I would like to say at the outset that I am in favor of H.R. 8723, and I hope we are successful in passing it today.

It seems to me important that we provide the kind of teeth these amendments to the act would provide. This question, of course, goes back a good many years. In the first place, the act which we now propose to amend went into effect just over 3 years ago. On looking over my own record, I found I introduced a bill, H.R. 10124, in March of 1956, proposing the registering and reporting of these pension funds. In January 1957, at the start of the 85th Congress, I introduced another bill, H.R. 2437, which would provide for the registration and reporting of welfare and pension funds. Then in 1959, on June 2, I introduced H.R. 7489. This bill is the one which has been previously referred to. It would provide amendments similar to the ones we are presently considering.

It will be recalled, I am sure, that when President Eisenhower signed the Welfare and Pension Fund Disclosure Act in August 1958 he felt extensive amendments would be necessary in order to have effective legislation. I myself agree very much with that proposition. The bill I introduced in June 1959 actually incorporates the recommendations of the then Secretary of Labor, Mr. James Mitchell, and the administration then in power. I do not think there is any partisanship in the thinking of the many people who feel something needs to be done to improve the law we passed back in August of 1958.

The basic issue is a very simple one. It has already been discussed here at some length. The question is whether the law which was passed in 1958 is in itself sufficient, or whether we need to provide additional personnel in the Labor Department to police this act. Some argue that we have already a good piece of legislation, which in effect is policing itself.

I myself do not feel that we have done enough, that there is enough protection. I feel the Secretary of Labor should be empowered to act. The amounts involved in these funds may run as high as $100 billion in the next decade or so. Since this is the case, the national interest would seem to require that we should not take it for granted that the beneficiaries of these plans can be sufficiently protected without amending the law. It is for that reason that I firmly believe we have an obligation to move. I hope we can have a decisive margin in support of this bill when the showdown vote comes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in expressing my opposition to the legislation contained in H R. 8723, let me state that in its present form it is a misnomer, in that it is not an amendment of existing statutes, it is a complete rewriting of every section of the bill. I am predicating my opposition to this legislation largely on the testimony produced at the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on Tuesday, July 9, 1957, on which the present legislation was based. I refer to the testimony of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, a trustee and chief executive officer of the welfare and retirement fund of the United Mine Workers.

Mr. Lewis said:

We find ourselves opposed to the plan for the Congress to enact regulatory or punitive legislation affecting welfare funds as established in American industry, more or less in reprisal because dishonest men have committed dishonorable deeds as affecting certain of the welfare funds.

The scandal over welfare funds is not the only sensational incident that has occurred in every social, political, and economic subdivision of our electorate. Virtue does not exist in any one segment of American society; all men are prone to weaknesses at times.

Mr. Lewis further said:

I do not believe that the Republic, through its central powers, can regulate these voluntary associations, either in whole or in part, without of necessity expanding its powers as a central government to the point where it will become a police state, in truth and in fact.

One of our proudest boasts abroad, and much money is spent in promoting this truth, is that our labor unions are free, and that our voluntary associations of citizens are free, in contradistinction to conditions existing in other states which we identify from time to time.

The labor unions in this country are the first line of the Nation's defense in emergency; they are the defenders of our liberties. With their free forums, with their proven loyalty to the principles of the Republic and the defense of the Nation's free institutions, they need some liberty of action and they need to remain free as voluntary associations.

Mr. Lewis continued:

We believe that a representative form of government and its function endure; we have proven that and demonstrated that to the world since 1776.

He continues:

I think the Congress ought to give free enterprise in welfare funds a chance to continue. We extol free enterprise anywhere else. I am for free enterprise in welfare funds. And I recognize that the selection of wise leaders and able counselors and honorable men is just as much an obligation for a welfare fund as it is for the Congress of the United States or the lawmaking bodies of our several States. It is a constant task for the electorate to assume.

Then he added:

To undertake to enact the legislation encompassed in those several bills pending before the committee would, I think, put an undue burden upon the welfare funds, would vastly increase the cost of administration.

I might say he expressed an estimate that it would cost the United Mine Workers welfare fund approximately $800,000 of additional outlay. He stated that they were reporting to the Internal Revenue Bureau 65,000 different items unders the present law and this would probably increase it to as many as 100,000. He thought that that money, amounting to several hundred thousand dollars, would be better used in the welfare fund to pay pensions to miners, to take care of the ill and needy members of the United Mine Workers, than to use it as an additional cost of making reports.

I call attention to one additional expression from Mr. Lewis:

The United Mine Workers welfare fund is not an insurance company, per se. It does not solicit business. It does not compete with existing insurance organizations. It is merely an instrumentality set up by two parties, to wit, the contracting parties, for the mutual benefit of the individuals concerned in that industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I point out to the House that the gentleman is talking about testimony in 1957, and this bill was not drawn in 1957. What the gentleman may have felt at that time, we do not know what he would have felt about this bill, because he did not come before the committee. However, he did send two representatives, and I think it is important to note that in that testimony, which you will find on page 146 of the hearings, my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] asked Mr. Kaplan:

You have no objection to the Mine Workers fund being within the scope of H.R. 8235?

Mr. KAPLAN. Not at all.

All his testimony amounted to was to ask for a clarification of certain sections and to ask for certain limitations, and I think if the gentleman will read the new bill that followed that testimony, that we have pretty well acceded to what the Mine Workers requested.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, since the gentleman was kind enough to yield me time and took all of it, would he mind yielding me another minute to answer?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, hoping he will express his views in this regard.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not intend to comment on your remarks, but I do want to take the additional time to read into the RECORD a resolution of the United Mine Workers passed on February 2, 1962:

Whereas the United Mine Workers of America have consistently opposed legislation providing oppressive, regulatory and punitive measures affecting welfare funds; and

Whereas there are sufficient laws on the statute books to accomplish the purposes set forth in pending legislation; and

Whereas the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund and the Anthracite Health and Welfare Fund have from their inception fully disclosed their finances and operations in annual reports, including independent annual audits as now required by law, which they give wide public distribution and through reports submitted as required by law to various agencies of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the only purpose which could be accomplished by additional legislation and Federal intervention, as provided in H.R. 8723, would be to give the Secretary of Labor plenary authority which would result in a heavy financial drain on all welfare funds, and particularly the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund and the Anthracite Health and Welfare Fund, thereby depriving members of this union from the benefits which would go to them instead of to defraying the cost of punitive requirements imposed by any such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, on this 1st day of February, 1962, That the United Mine Workers of America oppose H.R. 8723 as punitive, burdensome and financially oppressive and respectfully urge the Members of Congress to vote against its enactment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I would like to point out at the outset that on August 29, 1958, President Eisenhower signed the original Welfare and Pension Disclosures Act. He indicated that he approved the act, and I quote "because it establishes a precedent for Federal responsibility in this area. It does little else. If the bill is to be effective at all, it will require extensive amendments at the next session of the Congress."

Now, it was not amended in the next session or the session after that, and it has taken up to this time to put some teeth into this law. I think it is long overdue. I share with many of my colleagues concern over placing too much power in the hands of any bureaucrat, in the hands of any public official, or administrator or whatever other term you may choose, to designate the people who will administer this act. But, I do feel that we must admit that this act needs further teeth; that we need enforcement powers here in order to do the job that was originally conceived.

Now, I would like to clarify for the RECORD several points so we will have a legislative history here that will leave no question in the minds of the administrators as to the limitations on their powers. If I may have the attention of the subcommittee chairman, I would like to ask some specific questions.

I think I know the answers, but I would like to have them clearly in the RECORD. With respect to the bonding provision provided in this act in section 13, is it the intent of the sponsors of the bill that the Secretary, in determining such standards and such bonding amounts, shall act in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act, particularly insofar as notice of hearing must be given to interested parties who shall have an opportunity to present their views and their recommendations to the Secretary?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to say to the gentleman that on page 16, section 15 of the bill, the gentleman will find the following:

SEC. 15. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to this Act.

Therefore, my answer would clearly be "yes"; it applies to the entire act, without exception.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, a further question: The Senate bill regarding the bonding provision sets a floor under the amount of bond that must be put up, but no ceiling on such bonding.

Would it be the intention of the gentleman, if the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is a conferee, to stand firm regarding a bonding ceiling in this provision?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As I am sure the gentleman knows, I believe that the bonding ceiling as we have written it here in our committee is a very important part of that provision, because it gives directives to the Secretary of Labor. If you remove that, as we are told is proposed in the other body, obviously the Secretary then acquires such broad powers that, perhaps, he would not be properly guided by the Congress. I think we should properly guide him where we can. So, I would here on the floor of the House and in conference argue the soundness of our position because I believe in it, that is, if I were appointed to the conference. Of course, I do not know.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. May I ask a final and a summary question?

The chairman of the subcommittee and I had pretty much of an exchange and colloquy on the House floor when this bill was before the House last year. I ask the gentleman if he does not agree that my questions and the gentleman's responses as legislative history to this bill are equally applicable today as they were then, and that we both endorse them as such?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman if he would cite the pages of that colloquy in the RECORD?

Mr. GOODELL. I would be very happy to do so. The colloquy appears in volume 107, part 14, pages 18261–18263 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say to the gentleman from New York that I had the opportunity earlier this afternoon to reread that colloquy, and I am completely in every way of the same mind as I was then. I stand behind every word of it. I would like to make it the legislative history of this session, and I would propose to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent that it be quoted in full in order that it be a part of the legislative history at this time.

Mr. GOODELL. I will say to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that I shall do this when we are back in the House.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The reason for this somewhat involved exchange I think is fundamentally important. We have had some testimony before our committee and some indications from various individuals that they would like to start controlling the investment policies of welfare and pension plans, and that it is their intention to move in this direction, to have the Federal Government and the Secretary of Labor ultimately control the investment policies of our welfare and pension plans. It is not our intent. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and I made it very clear in our colloquy previously that that was not our intent and it certainly is not written into this bill. We have specifically pointed out that there shall be no powers given to anyone to control any investment policies in these pension and welfare funds. We have limited the power of the Secretary of Labor in a great many ways. The first thing that must be done is that a plan must submit a report. Under present law they might submit a summary of their investment. There were people who wanted the Secretary of Labor to have the power to make the report include all types of investments—how much stock there was in General Motors or General Electric, or any other corporation. We resisted this move. We felt that what was necessary here was a general disclosure of the broad category of investments.

Only if the Secretary of Labor found reasonable cause to believe there was a violation of this act could he proceed further. In receiving these reports, which are in summary form, listing broad categories of investments, if the Secretary feels there is reasonable cause to believe that there is a violation of this act he must then require that those reports be sworn to and certified. In other words, if he does not believe the report, his first step, his first required step is to insist that it be certified by a CPA. Then when he receives the CPA certification he must again look at it and determine whether there is still reasonable cause to believe that there is a violation here. At that stage he may investigate further and require the production of other documents to prove the contentions that are made by the administrators of the plan in the report. I think this is very important. I think it is a guarantee that the Secretary cannot exceed the authority which this Congress wishes to give him and which we feel is necessary to guarantee the sanctity of these funds.

If we insist that giving any authority to the Secretary in this respect is going too far, then we are in effect saying that these administrators of plans should make no real disclosure, that there should be no control over them whatsoever as to abuses, that there should be no power to insist upon disclosure to the beneficiaries of these funds of the broad categories of investment involved in these funds.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman has come to the very crux of this bill. I would like to ask him for my own information what further burden then is imposed upon the reporting source at this point. As I understand the gentleman, the Secretary of Labor may make this determination after certification by an accountant or other accredited examiner; and then if he is not entirely satisfied with what he has found on the basis of this examiner's report, he may determine that a further investigation is necessary. Will all of the administrative and other costs be borne by the Secretary of Labor at that point or will that impose an additional burden upon the union or upon management or whoever may be the custodian of this fund?

Mr. GOODELL. The additional burden will fall upon both parties in this respect. The Secretary of Labor, if he does at this point feel that there is reasonable cause to believe that there is a violation of this act—and I would distinguish my present words from the words of my esteemed colleague from Kansas as to the Secretary not being satisfied with what he has received; he must have reasonable cause to believe there is a violation of this act when he finally decides to go further. Then at that point, and only then, he has the power to subpena records and go in and investigate the funds to verify the accuracy of the reports that have been filed with him. The only other thing he may investigate is to see if one of the crimes listed here has been committed—embezzlement, false statement of some kind, or theft.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for one more question: Other than the supplying of records and other data that might be required by the Secretary and furnishing other such testimony that he may require, no further burden would fall upon the management of the fund?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. Also I am supporting amendments which will give the Secretary discretion to make a simplified report acceptable for a number of plans where it would be unduly burdensome to require a full report. This goes along the lines of the Landrum-Griffin exemption providing that a simplified report would be satisfactory in such instances.

I might say further to the gentleman and to the chairman of the subcommittee that last year at the conclusion of my remarks I asked the gentleman from California about three amendments that had been adopted in the Senate committee, and he indicated at that time that he hoped that they would be agreed to in the conference.

I would like to go back to this point because one of those amendments was the discretionary power in the Secretary of Labor to allow simplified reports where it would be unduly burdensome to require full reports Another one was to exempt plans covering 100 or fewer participants. Finally, a third provision was to require from the Secretary of Labor full annual reports on this program. I ask the gentleman from California if his sentiments in that respect have changed since September.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to say to the gentleman until I have had a chance, of course, to look at the wording of the amendments in the other

body, which have not passed yet, I would hesitate to commit myself to any specific amendment. I would in principle have to say my sentiments are pretty much the same with the exception of reducing it from 25 to 100 because there is, I think, additional information I would want to look at very carefully before agreeing to that. However, the basic principle involved in the other two, I think are adequate and on the basis of information I now have, I would be inclined to think the subject of reducing that coverage to 100 employees is a subject we ought to go into very carefully.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendments which will be offered by me and others of my colleagues to tighten up this bill even further, but in any event to vote for this legislation as being very necessary and worthy.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made here today. The gentleman from West Virginia referred to John L. Lewis saying this was not an insurance policy but that this was an agreement between two individuals and, therefore, there was no need for the law. Is this not the reason we need a strong law, because this is not an insurance policy or an insurance company and, therefore, it is not regulated by the State or by the Federal Government, and the law needs some teeth in it so that we can regulate these things and keep a jaundiced eye upon the administrators and trustees of the fund?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman that for the most part the States do not regulate these plans and that they do need regulation along the lines provided in this bill for that very reason.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman is correct, and I think this is very clearly stated in the report. The whole record indicates that there was no intent here to have him have any say whatsoever about where these funds are invested. This is a disclosure act. It is to make sure that the investments are disclosed through the Secretary of Labor, and that is all.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one more question, was the action of the committee in any way indicated by advising these people who had testified of the changes made in the original bill as introduced?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We made it known to every witness that the so-called blue sheet, describing the bill, would be available and was available. However, as far as I know, we did not send it to anybody who did not ask for it.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. I will not impose any more on your time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, you mentioned the question of reasonable cause. I would be glad to have you explain that if you have sufficient time. I think that is a very vital part of this bill, and I would like to have it clarified. May I proceed now?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Please.

Mr. GOODELL. Under 7(b) reports, as I understand, these are the annual reports that must be filed. Now, they may be sworn to but not necessarily certified by an accountant of some kind. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Labor, if he finds reasonable cause to believe there is something wrong with the annual report, must find that reasonable cause exists before he does anything, and he may then require the report to be certified; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GOODELL. He must have it certified before he takes any other action?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the report has not been certified, he must do that before he can make any investigation.

Mr. GOODELL. Going further, assuming that a report is filed and then the Secretary of Labor requires it be certified, if the Secretary of Labor then wants to subpena any documents, I understand, it is provided in section 9(e); he still, at that stage, must have a continuing reason, reasonable cause, to believe there is a violation; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct, sir, and anybody would have that defense if he believed he did not so have reasonable cause.

Mr. GOODELL. On page 19 of the report, which is the text of the bill, there is the section giving the Secretary of Labor the power under sections 6 and 7 to require the filing in such form and detail as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. I would just like to clarify that by saying that this also requires that the Secretary make a determination that there is reasonable cause to believe there has been a violation before he makes this requirement upon the plan concerned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct; and, if the gentleman will permit—and again it is suggestion—we wrote in the specifics of what could be required in any report in order again not to allow the Secretary to ask for extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman realizes I am asking these questions to establish a bona fide unquestionable legislative history as to what the Secretary's powers are. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. These are mostly amendments I proposed in the subcommittee.

One other question: In the bill there is a provision giving the Secretary—it is on page 21 of the report:

"The Secretary when he has determined that an investigation is necessary in accordance with section 9(d) of this act may require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities."

Once again, this power in the Secretary's hands can be exercised only upon a determination that there is reasonable cause to believe a violation has occurred.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct; and we wrote it in there so there could be no misunderstanding on that point.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman's responses and thank him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just say in the very few seconds I have left, that I will put into the RECORD a rather detailed description of the need. The immediate need arises largely from the New York law which covers 3,500 out of 17,000 cases and shows very clearly that there is an immediate need to protect these plans. I would refer to testimony before the subcommittee where facts show that in New York, which has a disclosure law, with the right of investigation, an examination of a welfare fund was begun on September 4, 1958. Subsequently, the fund bookkeeper was convicted on February 26, 1959, of grand larceny first degree. On March 4, 1960, she received a suspended sentence with probation. The union president and a fund trustee also were indicted on November 19, 1959, in connection with the receipt of payments and loans from the welfare fund. On November 18, 1960, he received a $500 fine or a 30-day jail sentence, and both of these persons are no longer connected with the fund.

An examination of the reports filed with the Labor Department was made, and on their face, disclosed no information which would indicate larceny, forgery, or illegal loans. It was disclosed, however, that the report was verified by the administrator only of the fund, who was an employee of the fund, whereas regulations request that each member of the board of trustees attest to the D-1 report. Not only that, but there was a discrepancy in the figures on the reporting D-2 form. At one place, employer contributions were listed as $43,775; whereas in another place, contributions were put at $33,509.12.

I emphasize to the Members, that under present law, the Department has no right to inquire into these matters.

Another case investigated by the New York authorities, disclosed withdrawal of welfare funds, for the benefit of certain trustees and union officials. The grand jury on June 29, 1959, indicted the trustees on two counts, grand larceny, first degree, and forgery in the third degree.

An investigation of filings with the Labor Department disclosed no plan descriptions or annual reports made by this fund. Subsequent investigation has revealed some question concerning coverage of the Federal law of this plan.

The basic point in all this, is that even where the right of investigation is provided, abuses of the trust relationship continue to be uncovered. Under the present Federal law, there is no right of investigation, no protection for these 80 million participants, and their interests in this $50 billion in assets in these plans.

An analogy would be the provisions in Landrum-Griffin, dealing with unlawful trusteeships in title III, but providing no investigatory right to the Secretary; or those provisions relating to union elections.

The realistic fact, of course, is, as every single Member of this House knows, filing reports with the Department, without the right to make sure that the reports are accurate and honest, is an empty protection to the participants of these plans and to the public; or as former Secretary of Labor Mitchell stated, a "shameful illusion."

I would also note that those who say the aim of the bill is to control or regulate these plans, ignore the plain facts of the record. The bill itself in section 9(h) clearly states that nothing in the law shall authorize the Secretary to regulate, or interfere in the management of, any of these plans. The committee report on page 9 reiterates this clear statement of intention. And the Secretary himself in his testimony stated on page 18 of the printed record that:

"It is not the desire or the reach of this proposal to subject these plans to Federal control. These proposals have a very simple objective and that is to make known to the beneficiaries of these plans and to the public what the contents of these plans are and to give the Secretary the necessary authority to investigate the reports that the statute calls for."

I note that under the Landrum-Griffin law, the Secretary is given authority, but I don't recall the argument that he therefore, would be able to control or regulate union internal processes and business, or that of employers or labor relations consultants.

Similarly, the contention that these amendments would require a staff of 8,550 people and $45 million, is another illustra-

tion of flagrant disregard for the facts. The Secretary plainly testified an appropriation of $2,500,000 and a total staff of 290 would be adequate. I am now advised that because of the amendments made by the committee, the actual budget would be reduced to $1,500,000 and a total staff of 171—only 86 more than the present staff.

With respect to use of departmental forms, I have here two examples of reports received by the Department, and note that on the first there is no information filled in concerning the date of the plan year ending; or when the annual report is due; what kind of plan it is; or who is the administrator.

Looking at the second form, there is no information showing how the plan is financed; how much money goes into the plan; or even how many employees are covered by the plan.

The argument, therefore, that most plans use the Department forms, becomes meaningless, unless the information requested by the form is given; and the Department has the right to make sure that the information is accurate and honest.

Further along this line, the testimony before the subcommittee showed that over 12 percent of the forms received by the Department of Labor had deficiences on their face; that is, there were omissions of such critical information as the name of the plan administrator, what type of workers were covered and information indicating when the annual report should be filed. As a matter of fact, a considerable number of reports were not even signed by the plan administrator and many others were not sworn to as required by the legislation.

In conclusion I would refer the Members to an editorial in the Washington Daily News, of May 26, 1961, dealing with the need for this legislation. It stated:

"TEETH FOR PENSION FUND LAW

"Scandalous abuses of union pension funds, as revealed by the McClellan committee, inspired passage of a sham law which provides no real protection.

"Labor Secretary Goldberg used strong but well-justified language this week in discussing this law before a committee of Congress.

"It is, he said, confusing, toothless and widely ignored. It is a betrayal of the 85 to 100 million Americans who have money estimated at nearly $50 billion in these funds.

"He considers it likely that many of the abuses discovered before passage of the law, 2 years ago, still are taking place.

"Mr. Goldberg thus backs the criticism of President Eisenhower, when he signed the act, and of his Labor Secretary, James P. Mitchell.

"The law requires pension fund administrators to file reports showing sources of the funds and their uses; but the process stops there. The Labor Department, which receives the reports, can't do anything much about them. There are no effective criminal penalties in the law for such things as embezzlement and kickbacks.

"What Mr. Goldberg wants is power to subpena witnesses and seek injunctions to compel compliance with honest standards. For embezzlement he would fix a Federal penalty of $10,000 fine and 5 years imprisonment.

"These provisions—or even stiffer—should have been in the original law. Congress should not wait to act until there are new revelations of callous theft and misuse of these funds, accumulated from the dues of union members."

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. GOODELL, a member of the committee.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this bill. I will try to clarify some further points with reference to its provisions.

I would like to point out first of all that the original Welfare Pension Plan Disclosure Act was passed in 1958. When President Eisenhower signed the bill, which was cut back considerably here in Congress, he made this statement. It was on August 29, 1958. He said he was approving the act, and I quote:

"Because it establishes a precedent for Federal responsibility in this area. It does little else. If the bill is to be at all effective, it will require extensive amendment at the next session of Congress."

It was not amended in the next session; it has gone to this time to be amended and have some teeth put into it so that the Secretary of Labor may require those who are administering the pension and welfare plans to file a report with him to make the disclosures. We wrote a provision in here that the Secretary of Labor may not use this subpena power or investigatory power without first having reasonable cause to believe there had been a violation. The violation is that they refuse to disclose in what categories their funds are invested.

We went further and wrote in a limitation in this bill that the Secretary could not explore the types of stock, the types of bonds, the kind of companies these funds are invested in except on reasonable cause to believe that the original filing was inaccurate. That means that the filing which is called for here is to inform beneficiaries of pension and welfare plans: How much money do you have invested in Government bonds? How much in corporate bonds? How much in common stocks? How much in preferred stocks? How much in real estate? The general categories are written right into the act to be sure that that is the power of the Secretary of Labor and no more. Then if the Secretary of Labor has reasonable cause to believe that that company is inaccurate in its report and has thus violated the law, then and only then may he request a filing of a full schedule of assets and liabilities in regard to the pension or welfare plan.

May I ask the gentleman from California if he will not confirm what I have said in this respect?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not only can I confirm it but I can specify exactly where it is. It is on page 5, line 17, where it is clearly stated:

"The Secretary, when he has determined that an investigation is necessary in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act, may require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities."

Mr. GOODELL. One other point. In the early stages there was some suspicion that this was an attempt to control the investment of these funds, that maybe the Secretary of Labor or somebody else wants to tell the administrators where they can invest funds. Some union leaders appear to have such an objective, particularly one Mr. Carey, who was quoted in a newspaper as saying:

"It is our belief that the nature of the pension funds may yet require the establishment of rules by the Congress to govern the way such money is invested."

Does not the gentleman from California agree that we wrote specifically and clearly in this legislation that there is no power anywhere for anybody to tell the Administrator where he may invest these funds?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I read from page 8, line 19, where it is stated:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be so construed or applied as to authorize the Secretary to regulate, or interfere in the management of, any employee welfare or pension benefit plan."

Mr. GOODELL. I have one other question. The Senate has passed a bill in this matter and its bill is generally more favorable and more liberal in this respect than the bill that is now before us. The Senate made three major additions to this bill. One, they have exempted plans covering 100 or fewer employees, except under unusual circumstances. This will eliminate the filing of a great number of plans, and it will reduce the administrative burden considerably.

Another is to give the Secretary discretion to allow simplified reports where a detailed report would be unduly burdensome. This is in the same tradition as the Landrum-Griffin Act where a similar provision was made to cut down burdensome details. Is that correct, may I ask the gentleman from California? The Senate bill also would require full annual reports by the Secretary of Labor to the Congress. Does the gentleman have any comment on these amendments?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the Speaker would appoint me to the conference committee, I will join with my friends in hoping we can agree to those amendments.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to thank the chairman of the committee for permitting me to offer this bill in which I am very interested and the chairman of the subcommittee for the very good and conscientious work he has done in this area, and also the members on both sides of the committee who have been so considerate in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important bill. I would like, first of all, to make a few brief remarks with respect to some statements that have been made on the floor. The statement has been made, to the effect that this bill will create an undue burden on these administrators to file new reports. There is nothing required to be filed as a result of this bill that any good administrator would not file anyway. So if anyone is going to find any additional burden, it will be someone who is not doing the job they ought to be doing today. Others are already filing this kind of report. With regard to the Internal Revenue having some provisions to control these funds, I was interested in that because I happened to have been the attorney to set up several of these funds as the result of labor-management agreements wherein they agreed to such a fund. The Internal Revenue Department does require certain requirements to be met. For example, that none of the income, or none of the corpus of the trust shall ever revert to the employer and that there shall be a determinable amount available on a periodic basis for benefits and that there must be an actuarial evaluation from time to time to show that to be a fact. However, this does not in any way cover what we are trying to cover in this bill, and the protection we are trying to get at in this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. In regard to this welfare fund of the United Mine Workers, they already report to the Bureau of Internal Revenue on 65,000 items or individuals, and this would require 100,000

additional to be covered. Do you think, since they have an independent audit by certified public accountants, that it is necessary that they give this additional information?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If they have all that, all they have to do is to take a copy of that audit down to the Department and deposit it, and it need not be any great burden.

Mr. BAILEY. They have to give more details and it would require 100,000 additional items to be covered.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They only need file in summary—this is right in the bill.

If they have what you say they have, all they have to do is to go down to the Department and file a copy of it. That would place no great burden on them. If they do not have such information they ought to have it. That is the purpose of this bill.

I think I should point out that the Internal Revenue law does not cover all we are covering in this bill at all. All it does really is to prescribe that unless the employer meets certain conditions he cannot take off as a business expense the cost of such a plan. It does not attempt to do what we are doing in this legislation. Some have said some people want to regulate these funds. I think this is true, but I would like to read to you a little bit from a report. Let me first mention some names to show you the character of the people who issued this report. It is a report of the Commission on Money and Credit. There are Frazar B. Wilde, chairman, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; James B. Black, chairman of the board, Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; Marriner S. Eccles, chairman of the board, First Security Corp.; Fred T. Greene, president, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis; David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank; Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; and Jesse W. Tapp, chairman of the board, Bank of America.

The report by the commission of which they are members said:

> The underlying premise of the Federal Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 is that the individual participant in the pension plan is expected to detect maladministration and invoke legal remedies to protect his own interest, whereas experience has shown that employee suits alone are inadequate as enforcement remedies.
>
> The Commission recommends that an appropriate regulatory body should be given added responsibilities over private corporate pension funds. These responsibilities should include the power: (1) to study and develop appropriate standards of prudence in investment of the funds; (2) to enforce such standards; (3) to assure periodic disclosure to beneficiaries of the financial statements of the fund; and (4) to bring suit against malfeasors on behalf of the plan participants and their beneficiaries.

Let me point out to you that they ask for regulation. We take a more conservative approach than that in this bill. It is true, as the gentleman from New York said, that we are not trying to regulate in this bill. We are not going as far as this Commission wanted us to go.

The question raised here is what happens to these funds. It has been said that both the employer and employee group ought to be able to take care of their own funds. I point out to you that when these funds are set aside they become trust funds and do not belong to either the employer or the union any more, but create a fund out of which the beneficiaries may expect to supplement the aid that comes to them from social security. The employees are entitled to know what is happening to or has happened to these funds, just where the funds are at the present time, what interest or return the funds are earning, what is going out of the fund, and to assure that such information is available is the purpose of this legislation. So I do not think it is too much to expect that this kind of law will be passed. Those who have nothing to hide will go ahead and file these reports, and they have been, as a matter of fact; but those who have something to hide are unwilling to file these reports. So we want to put teeth into this toothless wonder. I think it is a good law and urge its adoption.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I wish the gentleman would comment on the cost of additional overhead in the Department of Labor that would be involved in policing these funds. How many reports is it contemplated will be filed?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. About 150,000.

Mr. JONAS. Of course, the mere filing them away down there will not accomplish anything

They will have to be examined, analyzed, and scrutinized and somebody will have to determine that some require attention and others may not. What does the committee study show with respect to cost?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It shows that at the present time we are spending $500,000 and that amount, in fact, is being wasted, that we should either repeal the law or we should pass some amendments here to make it effective. It shows 180 employees to be added which would mean an expense of about $1½ million. We are wasting a half million dollars at present or we can by adding $1½ million and really do some good.

Mr. JONAS. The committee thinks it would take an additional 180 employees?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. I might point out that in setting up an operation like this they have to have higher paid employees. That is on the management end of it. But that is already there. The reason the additional cost is so low in comparison to the number of new employees is that these will largely be clerical help and would permit the present employees to better act as management.

Mr. JONAS. I wish there were some way we could screen out the plans that are known to be properly managed and not have to encumber the record of the Department of Labor so as not to require a lot of handling of plans that are in proper order and do not need attention. I assume the subcommittee went into that and somebody would know of the plans that would not require examination because they are in good shape.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say to my good friend, as the bill is written there does not have to be a completely new plan filed every year. If it is the same plan the only thing that has to be filed are any changes in the plan which have to be filed in 120 days. What it affects are reports on the status of the investment under the plan so that the information may be public. The other parts will require little additional expense.

The committee did ask, not on its own responsibility, but we asked the Secretary to tell us precisely the number of additional employees and the amount that would be asked of the Appropriations Committee. I assume that the Appropriations Committee would on that basis hold him to his statements made to our committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is a right-to-know law. The billions of dollars involved belong to employees and represent deferred income. The employer could not have deducted them as a business expense unless they were in fact deferred income—yet the evidence is that some have been milked by or through administrators. This bill is needed so employees can know whether their deferred income is being milked and to provide bonding requirements to assure that the funds will be made whole if embezzled or stolen.

I am sure that in this field, we all start from the same point of view. We all believe that employee benefit plans should be financially sound, honestly administered and adequately safeguarded so that beneficiaries will receive the benefits to which they are entitled.

We are also most anxious to prevent abuses which threaten the financial integrity of these funds. Embezzlement, larceny, bribery as well as any maladministration of these funds, not only unjustly destroys the rights and interests of beneficiaries but strikes a blow at the well-being of our economy. These beneficiaries depend upon getting the pension to be provided by these funds to supplement their social security.

We, therefore, start from the premise that disclosure of information concerning these funds is of fundamental importance. If we have effective disclosure, it will be exceedingly difficult for unscrupulous men to formulate, execute and conceal abuses. Furthermore, beneficiaries as well as the public will be able to learn more about how these funds operate and are administered. This is absolutely vital if beneficiaries and the general public are to possess intelligent and discriminating attitudes regarding these funds.

Basically, this is what Congress tried to do when it passed the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act in 1958.

Unfortunately, it passed a bill which has been universally recognized as "toothless." H.R. 8723 is the latest in a series of proposals which began almost immediately after the act was passed. It attempts to restore the machinery that was left out in 1958—machinery which will effectively carry out the disclosure concept and which will deter wrongdoing in benefit plans and put teeth into the toothless wonder that is now on the books.

I would like to briefly describe what are the important elements of this machinery.

First, H.R. 8723 expressly confers upon the Secretary of Labor the power to provide interpretations so that the people who handle these funds and are affected by this law can get precise guidance as to their obligations. There is no such provision in the law today and, as a result, unnecessary confusion regarding the scope and meaning of some of the more important provisions of the law has occurred. It is also proposed that plan administrators and others affected by the act would be permitted to place full reliance upon the opinions and report forms of the Secretary of Labor. This reliance would establish a good faith defense and would protect any plan administrator or other person affected by the act from any liability or punishment for any actions in question even though these actions are later determined not to have been in conformity with the act.

This proposal is an eminently sensible rule and is the type of proposal which could well be provided in numerous other Federal statutes which require administration by a Federal agency.

Next, the enforcement deficiencies in the act would be cured. A strictly defined investigatory power would be conferred upon the Secretary of Labor, including appropriate subpena power, as well as the authority to institute injunctions restraining violations of the act. It is virtually certain that without this sort of authority the disclosure concept cannot be made effective. Under the present law, the good administrators tend to file good reports while those with something to hide either do not file or file in a form that reveals very little or in fact hides important facts.

These powers are set up in such a way that the Secretary is precluded from regulating the operations of benefits plans. I should like to emphasize this point because there has been a great deal of loose talk about this bill being an attempt to regulate these funds and the insurance industry. I want to assure this Committee that anyone who reads these proposals will see immediately that this is not the case and that any talk about this bill attempting to regulate benefit plans is simply not true.

The bill also makes embezzlement, kickbacks, bribery, and looting from these funds Federal felonies. These were the very abuses which initiated legislative action in this field and yet, as the law stands now, none of these flagrant abuses are Federal crimes. These provisions were drafted with the aid of the Department of Justice and they reflect that Department's long experience in dealing with criminal activities. Most State authorities just do not have the resources to carry on investigations and other criminal enforcement activities which are necessary to protect beneficiaries from being victimized.

Also, I should like to point out that many State laws were not drafted to deal with the type of plans covered by the Federal law. They were based on common law concepts and experience and were not specifically geared to the new and dynamic developments that have taken place in the welfare and pension fund area.

Consistent with the idea of protecting the financial integrity of these funds, the bill provides for the bonding of administrators, officers, and employees who handle the funds or the property of the funds. You have heard this bonding provision described in great detail, and I do not intend to repeat what has been previously said. Suffice it to say, however, that this bonding provision is fair and moderate, and that it is based upon the best experience that could be mustered in this area.

These then are the principal improvements recommended by the Labor Committee and embodied in H.R. 8723. They are concrete proposals with no frills attached and are based upon specific experience under the law.

I urge passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in opposition to this bill for numerous reasons. In these few moments I want to pinpoint two specific areas where I think we should look a little closer. It has been referred to time and time again that the so-called Landrum-Griffin bill needs teeth. I am going to point out an area where we see the proponents of this bill moving in the opposite direction.

Section 13(a) of the bill states:

> Such bond or other security or insurance shall provide protection to the plan against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on the part of any administrator, officer, or employee of such plan, directly or through connivance with others.

Section 13(d) of the same bill provides:

> Nothing in any other provision of law shall require any person, required to be bonded as provided in subsection (a) because he handles funds or other property of an employee welfare benefit plan or of an employee pension benefit plan, to be bonded insofar as the handling by such person of the funds or other property of such plan is concerned.

What we are saying in effect in section 13 is if you comply with the bonding provisions of this bill you will have relief from bonding provisions which otherwise might be imposed on you as administrator or employee under any other law. This is rather interesting.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to discuss this later, but let me say at the present time the gentleman's interpretation is quite wrong. We very carefully asked committee counsel, because the gentleman debated this issue on the air the other day and he made that statement. It disturbed me very much. So I asked the General Counsel whether he would not carefully examine and see whether the gentleman is right. I think I can make the statement that the gentleman is not right and I do not think there is any question but what after he hears the statement he will not feel as he does now.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Let me proceed with what I have to say, then the gentleman can answer it if he sees fit.

Let us ask this question as a practical matter. If this were the case, as the gentleman from California points out, Why would you be relaxing the safeguards of the Landrum-Griffin Act? Why would you in section 13 of this bill provide for bonding provisions which, when satisfied, relieve a person from those which were set up in 1959?

If the gentleman from California is correct and if you do not want to upset what is under the Landrum-Griffin Act, why not say so? Here you say if you comply with 13(d) you do not have to comply with any other section. I think if you look at the two bonding provisions, you will get some indication why.

Section 502(a) of the Landrum-Griffin Act provides:

> Every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative or employee of any labor organization (other than a labor organization whose property and annual financial receipts do not exceed $5,000 in value), or of a trust in which a labor organization is interested, who handles funds or other property thereof shall be bonded for the faithful discharge of his duties.

I think herein we see the difference. The bonding requirements of the Landrum-Griffin Act are extremely stringent compared to the bonding requirements of this act, so I think that is why we are saying in 13(d) if you comply with the bonding requirements of this act, you are relieved from the requirements of any other act. And, if the gentleman from California is correct, we should reverse it. We should say if you comply with any other act, you need not comply here, because people who might not be able to comply with the Landrum-Griffin Act would find it relatively easy to comply with section 13. Of course, it will be said that the bonding provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act are too stringent, but everything that has been said up to now is that we need more stringent laws; that we must have these immense funds directly controlled.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Landrum-Griffin Act does not begin to cover all of

the people we cover here under this bonding provision. What we are doing here is protecting all the funds, not one-fourth of them, so really this law is much more inclusive.

Mr. ASHBROOK. You are extending to more people less stringent provisions.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It goes up to $500,000. What we really want to do i to protect the corpus of the fund, and wherein in this bill do we not protect the fund?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Why do we circumvent the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act that call for the faithful discharge of their duties?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. These requirements were very carefully worked out with people in the insurance industry and people who understand this, and they say this bill covers any possibility of embezzlement or anything like that.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I raise these points because I think they should be answered. If the gentleman from California could answer, I would gladly yield to him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to point out that as far as handling pension and welfare funds only is concerned, this act does exempt persons from the duplicate obligation to be bonded insofar as the same funds are concerned under the Landrum-Griffin Act. Thus it treats the employers and the union officials alike and does not require bonding union officials only, as is required under the Landrum-Griffin Act. Insofar as union dues and any other moneys going into union hands are concerned, this does not relieve the union officials of any of their previous obligations to be bonded as required by the Landrum-Griffin Act. In other words, no racketeers who handle union money are in any way relieved from any previous obligation, but the difference is that all persons who handle pension and welfare funds, union and management alike, are under the same obligation with respect to this act in the handling of pension and welfare funds.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman is exactly correct when he states that it would require both the employee and the employer to be bonded, but why should we relax the situation with respect to the section 502(a) requirement?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We are only saying that insofar as the pension and welfare funds are concerned, in order to really get at the way in which they can be bonded. The insurance company people, the management people, and the labor people all said this was the only language which could be effective and could be written by the insurance companies.

The way it was written in the Landrum-Griffin Act, it would make it impossible to get the kind of a bond that would go to the purpose of the pension and welfare funds. Therefore we got a committee together and it was set up, and they came back with unanimous agreement. I think when we make sure that in no other way does it relieve anybody under the Landrum-Griffin Act specifically as to the handling of pension and welfare funds, I think the gentleman will find it does not have the horrible implications which the gentleman seems to think it has.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman said it would be impossible. Is he saying, therefore, that the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act are too stringent?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not for the specific purpose for which they are written; no. We do not change that. But, it was clearly obvious, and the insurance people said that it would not be writable or effective if they were applied to pension and welfare funds. They did not go into that. Therefore, if we wanted to write an effective bonding provision for pension and welfare funds we had better set up something that could be enforced. That was the reason this language was written.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman will certainly agree that a person who might not be able to meet the requirements of section 502(a) of the Landrum-Griffin Act will be able in many cases to meet the requirements of section 13 of this act?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; I would not agree with that at all, because if he could not meet those other requirements and were not bondable at all he simply is not going to meet these requirements and be bondable either. He is going to be unbondable, and he would have to be denied the right to handle these funds.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would suggest that that is the point on which I would not agree with the gentleman from California. I think the point I am making is whether section 13(d) is going to supersede the Landrum-Griffin Act. It is interesting to note that the only other provision requiring an employee to handle pension funds to be bonded is in the Landrum-Griffin Act. If this is the case, why not have it the other way around, and say if they have been covered previously it is not necessary to be covered here, rather than making it the opposite? I suggest it is done to soften the requirement of the 1959 legislation and make it easier to become bonded.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will have to say to the gentleman that everybody that had anything to do with this, including the Department of Labor, said that they had had so much trouble with that and it became so difficult to enforce with any possible respect to pension and welfare funds, if you want to be sure everybody is covered across the board, you had better write it this way or you will not reach everybody. This committee wanted to be sure that it did not leave anybody unbonded against the various things that have been enumerated, and we wrote it this way.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman on the other side [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], whether he has any more requests for time?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have one more speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was rather shocked in listening to the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], when they were discussing the aspects of the internal revenue laws as they concern these particular plans. Having reviewed the committee report and finding no reference at all to the internal revenue codes as they pertain to this, and then searching through the committee hearings to find out if they thought, maybe, it might be wise to get some information from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, I find they did not do that. Then, searching still further to see if there were not some testimony on the basic aspects of these plans, which is the Internal Revenue Code, I find indeed there is some evidence which apparently the subcommittee and the committee just completely ignored.

Mr. Chairman, on page 433, and then again on page 434, running to page 438, are two letters, both of them from the American Bankers Association, calling to the subcommittee's attention the basic facts in regard to the bulk of the pension and welfare funds.

Let me read just a little bit from it. First of all, they point out the distinction between the two types of plans. One is the welfare plan, which comes under one section of the Internal Revenue Code, 401(a). The other is, the pension plan which comes under 404. Practically none of the welfare plans are qualified tax plans. The bulk of the pension plans are qualified tax plans.

The amounts of money involved are very interesting. The great bulk in number of plans lies in the welfare field, of which only a few are tax qualified. It is the 36,600 plans which have nearly $30 billion of assets and are receiving nearly $4 billion in annual contributions that are under this, and if one will study the Internal Revenue Code and read what the bankers have told the committee about this they will find that the regulations of these tax-qualified programs are very strict, go away beyond anything this bill attempts to do.

The bankers have suggested that this big area be left out of this bill. They point out, among other things, that they had previously expressed the point that these tax-approved plans have no question of violation and then they go on to say "that our reasoning was correct"—and this was after the 1958 code—"and that our recommendations are sound is confirmed by the fact that no abuses in tax-approved plans were reported up to that time nor have any of them been reported since then. All reported abuses have occurred in welfare plans which were not qualified under the Internal Revenue Code."

I wish the Committee would read this letter and find out just what are the requirements under the Internal Revenue Code. The penalties are these. If you fail to file annually and in detail you lose your tax-exempt status. And I can assure you that that is a discipline that is very important. One reason why I am particularly interested in this, is that I am a member of the Committee on Ways

and Means; but I had called to my attention—and I am going to introduce a bill either tomorrow or the next day—that the pension plans do not permit putting health insurance, prepaid health insurance into those pension plans for their people when they retire. And the reason they cannot do it is that they will lose their tax-exempt status. I am anxious to see that amended so that they can do that, because immediately millions of Americans would be covered by health insurance in their retirement if we approve this little amendment.

But note why they have not done it. They lose their tax-exempt status if they do put their funds into such a very desirable program.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to urge seriously that this Committee either send the bill back to committee or at least accept an amendment that would eliminate these tax-exempt plans, because it is just going to add a lot of unnecessary cost, and the present regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue certainly police them away beyond anything in this bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I was going to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he would confirm the statement made by Mr. Bronston, chairman of the committee on employees trusts, which appears on page 434 which says these annual statements of these pension plans have to be filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue in such detail that they have to show receipts and disbursements.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And so much in detail that they have to be funded, so that they actually get into somewhat of the investment to the extent at any rate that if they are not funded in such a way as to bring in the revenues and are not actuarially sound, they stand to lose their tax-exempt status.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But the gentleman, I do not think, would quarrel with this statement. The Internal Revenue Service merely inspects the items of the plan to satisfy itself that all funds paid to the plan are irrevocably committed to providing the specified benefits for employees. The Service does not audit these funds and, therefore, it has no information as to whether or not there is theft or whether there are other abuses with respect to the handling of the funds which have been paid in.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do disagree with that. Who signed that? I was amazed to hear that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then may I read you the statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Who signed that letter—because here is what I am getting at.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will let me say it, I will be glad to say it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to point out this and then the gentleman can answer this question too. If you called that gentleman before your committee and interrogated him along the lines of what the requirements are, I think you would have clarified that. Now I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The statement is made by Mr. Harold Swartz, Director of the Tax Rulings Division of the Internal Revenue Service, and this is found on page 847 of the hearings before the Douglas committee on July 20, 1955. We then asked the Internal Revenue Service staff whether this was their same position. I do not have the name of the individual who replied, but he did reply that it was exactly the same.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is that in the hearings?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; this was a part of the staff research which we asked them to do. He stated:

> I would like to emphasize that the principal function of the IRS is a collection of Federal taxes. * * * The collection of these taxes involves the processing of nearly 95 million tax returns. Obviously we can neither examine nor audit all of these returns. We must channel our limited examining power to the items which are believed to be the most productive. Accordingly, only a small portion of our time can be devoted to examining into the annual information returns filed by exempt organizations.

Then they also replied to us:

> Qualification of a plan by IRS does not insure actuarial soundness. The regulations require only minimum standards.
>
> The assets of the plan may have depreciated greatly through bad investments or economic conditions without being of any concern to the IRS * * *. The IRS would disqualify a plan if the minimum indicated were not put in, but this action would actually work a hardship on the employee beneficiaries.
>
> The regulation of qualified pension plans by IRS is for income tax purposes. It does not assure against abuse nor is there any disclosure to the employee beneficiaries. On the contrary, by law the IRS cannot inform the beneficiary if it finds something wrong with the management of the plan.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I simply want to say this, that first, the statement made by the people who handle most of these plans that there have been no abuses shown either before or after, is compelling.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If my colleague will yield, may I point out that the statement to which the gentleman from Missouri refers was made by a party against the bill and not backed up by any information of any kind.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will wait just a moment, I want to say these people are the ones who handle the funds.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. That statement was made by a gentleman representing the American Bankers Association.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Exactly. The members of the Bankers Association handle a great deal of these funds. That is the point. Now if the subcommittee in the interest of finding out the truth contested that, they would have called them in and, secondly, I suggest that the subcommittee would at least have the Internal Revenue Service before them to interrogate them and possibly might try to resolve the conflict in the statements that we find in your hearings beginning on page 434, the statement of the American Bankers Association and the statement that the gentleman has just read from the Internal Revenue Service. It seems to me that when you talk about the bulk of your funds here, the subcommittee might have done that amount of work.

Mr. Chairman, I think I will suggest that this bill be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the gentleman, we felt there was no conflict. It was simply a situation where one side did not want any regulation, for obvious reasons. The American Bankers Association wants to run it their own way, and I do not blame them for that. They have their right to come before the committee and say so. However, we found no evidence that the Internal Revenue Service had changed their position, and it would have been a waste of time of the committee for them to repeat what was already in the record.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does the record disclose any evidence of abuses in the field of pension funds that do qualify for tax exemption under the Internal Revenue law?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The record and testimony by Mr. Carey would show that he pointed the finger at a plan which was and is tax exempt. I believe I better not name it; I would have to look up the name of the case.

Mr. JONAS. Which was the only incident existing?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That was the one instance he cited.

Mr. JONAS. Out of 30,000?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. At that time we went into matter supplied us by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, in which he pointed out other instances of misadministration of plans which obviously ought to be looked into, but neither the Senate committee nor our committee had sufficient staff to follow this through as it should have been.

Mr. JONAS. The reason I ask these questions is because I have not had an opportunity to attend the committee hearings or read the record. I have read the committee report. As the gentleman recalls, when I engaged in colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa I was concerned over the fact that there is a possibility here that extraordinary expense may be brought upon some of the people who operated in a field where there had been no complaint or no abuses uncovered. I would hope we might find some way to take care of the cases in which abuses do occur and not put the people to a lot of extraordinary expense

and trouble in a field where no complaints have been received and where the plans are operating satisfactorily.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman's concern is a proper one. I think he will find that we have taken care of that in the bill. He will find very careful statements directed to the Secretary. There is a provision in the bill which states that the Secretary may not go into this investigative area unless he has reasonable cause to believe that there is something wrong. Wherever that does not exist there will be no additional cost to anybody concerned. On top of that you should remember the Secretary of Labor's testimony as to the amount of money needed properly to police this area where there is something wrong. That, as I have said, would be a matter for the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee which prepared this legislation I rise in support of H.R. 8723. I think the discussion we have had in the past 2 hours, and the questions that have been raised, are most significant. I am delighted that there has been this give and take because it affords us an opportunity to establish some legislative history which will make the administration of this bill, as soon as the Congress approves it, that much easier.

I know of no piece of legislation that could be of greater importance to the House of Representatives in this session than this particular bill. This bill deals with the future of some 100 million Americans who are today relying on their health and welfare benefits, being available at the time when they will need them, in some 250,000 different health and welfare plans involving more than $50 billion.

These plans and this $50 billion fund that is now invested is growing at the rate of $4 to $5 billion a year. We are talking about the future of the older citizens of America, widows and orphans, and totally disabled workers who rely on these health, welfare, and pension plans for their future. I cannot think of anything that can be more tragic to an American than to rely on a pension fund only to discover that the money his employer has paid into the fund is no longer available and the reliance he has put in this fund has been betrayed simply because the program has been badly administered.

The Department of Labor under the present law passed in 1958 becomes a mere depository of welfare pension plans, descriptions, and annual reports. The Department possesses absolutely no rulemaking or investigative powers. I wish to emphasize this point. I wish to emphasize the testimony appearing on page 27 of the committee hearings when I asked the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, this question:

And then, if I understand the proposal correctly, what you are asking here is that the administrator, the Secretary of Labor, have the right to at least have a report, not necessarily review but have a report which I understand would become public on how these pension plans and pension funds are being administered and how they are being secured. Is this the purpose of this legislation?

Secretary GOLDBERG. The purpose of the statute is that we get the facts of what is happening. We are not asking for any authority to direct an administrator to invest in this type of security or that type of security. There is no attempt to go that far.

This is a very limited thing. All we are asking for is that we be authorized to require the administrator of the funds to tell exactly what is happening.

There has been a great deal of discussion here today as to whether or not there has been any evidence of wrongdoing. The only reason this committee has not been able to come before the House with that type of evidence is because there is no way to obtain this evidence under existing law. The Secretary of Labor has no powers to go beyond the piece of paper filed with him by an employer or an administrator of the fund. The Secretary of Labor has no right to ask any further questions. He must completely satisfy himself with the information or the report filed by administrators of pension funds and whether it is fraudulent or not he has no right to inquire. That is the guts of this bill, that is, to give the Secretary of Labor the right to pursue the matter to see how these funds are being invested. Nothing in this legislation would permit the Secretary or anyone else to interfere with the judgment of the people who administer these funds. But, certainly, the millions of Americans who rely on these funds have a right to know how their money is being invested. This is why I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there was discussion as to cost. The previous speaker has spoken on this subject, claiming it would cost administrators of pension funds additional money to comply with this law. I say that the Congress had no hesitation to adopt the Landrum-Griffin bill, even though at that time there were many protestations as to additional costs for reporting. But Congress swept these protestations aside because we felt that the workers had a right to know how their union funds were being spent.

I asked the Secretary:

For instance, do the provisions that you make here differ very greatly from the provisions in the Landrum-Griffin bill requiring disclosure of union funds?

Secretary GOLDBERG. They are substantially similar.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Do they differ very much from requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission in their dealings with securities, not necessarily funds such as this but securities? They have to make full disclosure there, do they not?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I think they are less onerous than the SEC requirements.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Then, of course, in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation you have some very rigid standards of disclosure.

Secretary GOLDBERG. Much greater than these. In that area, mandatory audits are concerned and they audit every institution subject to the provisions of that law.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I imagine you have a similar situation in the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation.

Secretary GOLDBERG. That is correct; they are supervised very, very closely.

I asked another question, regarding any possible additional costs involved in conforming with this proposed legislation.

I asked the Secretary:

Now, I have heard criticism of this plan from some of those who are involved in the administration of pension and welfare funds that this would impose a tremendous cost on the employer in trying to provide this information for you. Is there any merit to that kind of fear?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Congressman, I do not believe so. Here again I want to refer to our experience under the Landrum-Griffin Act and here I want to refer to some complaints made by unions in this area. Many unions complained that, if they had to make reports under the statute, this would result in great burdens and great financial burdens. Actually, the way we have worked out the provisions in that statute, we have eased some of the burdens that they had before under prior legislation of the Congress. We provide some simplified forms. We have tried intelligently to administer the statute to prevent this. It is not the purpose of this statute or the amendments we are proposing to impose great financial burdens on anybody.

The fact of the matter is that everybody who runs a welfare fund must have audits for their own protection and essentially we are not asking for any information here that is not present in a normal audit of a welfare fund.

We are just asking that it be made publicly available to the participants.

The gentleman from Missouri who just preceded me suggested this legislation is not necessary for those funds which already file a report with the Internal Revenue Service to qualify for a tax exemption. I should like to remind the House that income tax returns are completely confidential and not available to anyone for scrutiny. However, it would appear to me the gentleman is contradicting himself. If these administrators of certain types of pension plans already are filing detailed reports with the Revenue Service, it should be no problem for them to file a carbon copy with the Labor Department so the public and beneficiaries of the trust fund could see how and where the money is being invested in their behalf.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, while I have the highest regard for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], who said the United Mine Workers oppose this bill, I wish to remind him that this bill is not directed at the UMW. I know this union now publishes a detailed report for all of its members of how the pension fund is invested. I know that many other fine unions follow a similar practice. Many employers do the same. But the legislation is not directed at them. We know how their funds are managed. This legislation is directed at those administrators of pension funds who are not so above board. I wish to remind the House that more than 25 percent of pension and welfare funds go totally unreported under the present law.

It is for these reasons that I hope this bill will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1961".

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 22, 1962, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request granted today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1962.

PRIME MINISTER FANFANI'S BOLD MOVE A PROGRESSIVE ONE

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, while we are fostering democracy on this side of the Atlantic for all the nations of the Americas, a great champion of liberty and social justice, Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani, of Italy, is fighting for democracy in his country as an example for all of Europe to follow.

On the one hand, Italy has long been handicapped by having the largest and strongest Communist Party in all of Europe, second only to that of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, it has similarly been handicapped by the extreme rightist factions which seek to preserve or bring back antiquated feudal ways. The more they fought each other, the stronger grew Communist support because the poorer classes of the population felt that they had no other place to go and no other cause to support. The unfortunate result of this anomalous situation was that the development of a middle class, which could serve as a strong anti-Communist force, failed to materialize.

We had a similar situation in this country. In our own time, we suffered politically because we lacked a strong middle class until about the advent of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal.

Prime Minister Fanfani today represents the spirit and the ideals of Franklin D. Roosevelt in Europe perhaps more so than any other statesman on that continent. He stands for peace, for economic growth, for social development, for the expansion of education in his country, for raising the standard of living of the poor, for loyalty to the West and NATO, for vigilance against communism, and above all for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have read in the press the last few days that Prime Minister Fanfani's party, the Christian Democratic Party, has voted by a 4-to-1 majorty to form a parliamentary alliance with the Socialist Party headed by Pietro Nenni. This opens a new cycle in Italian politics.

While Fanfani's move is interpreted in some quarters as a turn to the left, it is worthwhile remembering that after many years he has succeeded in winning away from Communist ties the so-called Nenni Socialists. This will weaken the Communist influence in Italy, and as such it constitutes a gain for freedom. For the people of Italy it will constitute a step forward because it will mean greater reforms for the betterment of the nation.

Fanfani's move may also be described as a bold political gamble, and all of us sincerely hope that the gamble will succeed. It will be a remarkable achievement in itself to have the Socialist Party break completely from any Communist influence, and that democracy as we know it will be strengthened in Italy. In this spirit, we extend our greetings and best wishes to Prime Minister Fanfani and the Italian people.

There can be no question of Prime Minister Fanfani's great loyalty to Italy and of his friendship for the United States. He has demonstrated this time and time again. I have followed his career from the early days when he was secretary general of the Christian Democratic Party. DeGasperi had given vision to the party. Fanfani gave it strength by organizing it on a precinct level as we know it in this country.

I had the happy fortune to be his host the first time he came to this country in 1956 to attend the Democratic Convention in Chicago. Later, President Eisenhower was his host at the Republican Convention in San Francisco.

At the Chicago convention he met for the first time our present-day leaders, then still Senators, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, the then majority leader and now our great Speaker, John W. McCormack, and also Senators Estes Kefauver, Stuart Symington, and the Democratic presidential nominee at that time—Adlai Stevenson.

As a result of these meetings, a firm basis of understanding was established between the leaders of the United States and Italy which has proven beneficial for both countries.

Prime Minister Fanfani is fully aware of the risks he is taking in entering into an alliance with the Socialist Party, but he sees it as a real opportunity once and for all to break the hold of the Communists on the Italian electorate. In this effort we wish him success. Italy's gain in this respect will also be a gain for the West and for all freedom-loving nations.

REAFFIRMING U.S. POLICY IN PROTECTING ITS CITIZENS AND THEIR PROPERTY

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there was a time in history when the image of the United States commanded respect in all parts of the world and engendered fear in the hearts of those nations and their rulers who would debase human dignity. No citizen of this land has failed to be stirred in his heart at reading history when this fledging nation challenged the powerful barbary pirates and freed the seas for our merchant ships. There was real meaning behind the inspiring words of the Marine Hymn extolling U.S. championship of its sovereignty from "the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli."

I do not believe we were universally loved in those days or since when the power of this Nation protected its citizens and their property wherever they traveled in the world. We were not concerned with having people love us, but we did command their respect, we did engender fear in the hearts of would-be dictators and bandits. The words of our great President James Monroe, "National honor is national property of the highest value," had meaning and depth and were clearly understood by all peoples of the world.

The days of American glory under President Teddy Roosevelt saw us using whatever means necessary to demand that all nations recognize the rights and privileges of American citizens everywhere. The flag of the United States, backed up by our full military resources, stood behind every citizen of this country and he felt secure in his travels.

American business, knowing that the power of the United States would protect its property everywhere in the world, invested dollars, American initiative and know-how in many far-off places, creating wealth and opportunity, not only for our own citizens but people in underdeveloped countries around the globe.

In recent years, in our eagerness to be a popular nation, we have compromised our honor. The once mighty American image has been tarnished by inaction and even pipsqueak dictators, like Fidel Castro, thumb their noses at us, imprison and murder American citizens, and steal billions of dollars in American property. The Russians shoot down our planes over international waters and American airmen are killed and the survivors imprisoned. American citizens, civilian and military, have been allowed to languish in vile prisons in Red China and have become the victims of the most medieval forms of torture. American missionaries have been murdered in the Congo, their women brutally raped, their children actually drawn and quartered. Our planes have been hijacked over our own skies. The blood of Americans has run deep in many lands. American property, amounting to untold billions, has been illegally seized and stolen in all parts of the world. Our flag has been ripped down, burned and spat upon. High officials of our Government have been humiliated and their lives endangered. Our Embassies have been wrecked and their personnel subjected to personal danger. And we have done nothing except to protest. Protest to madmen and nations which make no pretense of abiding by civilized rules of conduct.

The result of our failure to maintain our national honor as a sacred duty has been the rise of international gangsterism until no American citizen, no official of this country, no property belonging to our Government or our people is safe. Every individual travels outside the boundaries of the United States at his own risk. Every business invests in foreign lands without the protection of its government which it has a right to expect.

Mr. Speaker, I say that honor is not dead in America. We are still a powerful people, not bent on conquest, with no imperialist designs upon the world akin to the Communist conspiracy of enslavement of mankind, but determined that our Nation will command respect. The American people, I am convinced, do not want to bow to bandits and dictators. The American people are determined that "the broad stripes and bright stars" will continue "to wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to reaffirm our dedication to those principles upon which our greatness has been founded. The time has come for the United States to rededicate itself to the fundamental principles of the Monroe Doctrine and to expand the spirit of that document to include the protection of the freedom and the rights of Americans and their property wherever they may be in the world. In that spirit, I have today introduced a resolution, which I hope will have the unanimous approval of this Congress, expressing the declaration of will of the American people and the purpose of their Government to reinstate the sovereignty of the United States and its people throughout the world and to guarantee the full protection of this Government for all its citizens and their property anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, by approving this resolution we will strike a telling blow against the Communist conspiracy with its disregard of international law. We will warn Castro and the other bandit dictators that no longer will they be free to prey upon American citizens. Once again we will proclaim the glory which was ours at Tripoli and other historic places and times when the American image was held in respect and the American Eagle soared high in the heavens as a symbol of freedom, human dignity, and the protection of the rights of all men.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current discussion on the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, I believe that a case has long been made for the establishment of such a department. I am in support of the President's proposal and hope that it can be accomplished.

It has been charged by some of the opponents of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing that this new agency would be directing local governments in the performance of local functions. There is nothing that could be further from the truth. To make this charge is to state that past Congresses have overstepped their constitutional bounds and that this and future Congresses will behave no better. To show this to be completely false, we have to do no more than to look at the present programs which the Congress has given the Housing Agency to administer, and ask to what extent they are imposed upon localities. The answer is very simple: all of these programs are purely voluntary and any State or locality may participate or not as it so desires.

In many ways the programs of community assistance which are administered by the Housing Agency are the very essence of democratic procedure. Central to each one is the concept that these are local programs, locally planned and locally administered. The role of the Federal Government is to provide financial assistance to the locality, and in some cases technical assistance. But the locality must initiate the request and make the decisions on project matters.

There are requirements that localities meet certain standards as a prerequisite to the financial assistance being provided. These are standards which the Congress has established for the purpose of assuring that the assisted localities are willing to help themselves. In giving money to localities, we are not paying out a dole. We are saying to a locality that, "We are willing to help you deal with certain of your problems, but we want an assurance that you are willing to help yourself." Is this an unreasonable position for the Congress to take? Has there been any dictation to the locality? And locality which is unwilling to meet these reasonable criteria is perfectly free to refrain from participating in the program—and some have.

Let us look at some of these programs and ask whether they are being dictated to local communities. In particular, let us look at the urban renewal program which is beginning to revitalize the face of urban America. There are over 500 cities, large and small, carrying out urban renewal projects. Were these cities forced to undertake projects? The answer is obviously "No." Of the 20 largest cities in the United States, 16 are undertaking federally assisted projects while 4 have chosen not to do so. There is no compulsion. There is no dictation.

Before Federal assistance is provided for the planning of an urban renewal project, the local city council or other local governing body must request that assistance. Before the project may be carried out, the city council must approve the plan and request further financial assistance. At this point we do have an example of Federal standards: Congress has required that there must be a public hearing on the project after due public notice. While it could be said that this is dictation, it is to my mind a prudent requirement to assure local citizens an opportunity to voice their views about the future shape of their community.

There are, of course, other requirements to be met as a prerequisite for Federal urban renewal assistance. One such is a requirement that the city council or city planning commission find that the plan for the project is in accord with the general plan for the locality. Does this mean that the Federal Government is now dictating to localities what their plans should be? Not at all. The community itself decides on its plan. The Federal Government merely insists that there be a plan so that the Federal assistance is not diluted by uncoordinated local actions.

There are many other HHFA programs which help States and localities without dictating to them. Under the urban planning assistance program, grants are made to States, cities and metropolitan planning agencies to help them develop their own plans for what they want to do. Through the public facility loan program, smaller localities are assisted in getting loans to permit them to install much needed public utilities and facilities for their increasing population. The program of advances for pub-

lic works planning permits communities to prepare their plans for public works in advance of their immediate needs. The new program of loans for mass transit will help cities meet some of their urgent transportation problems.

All of these programs are voluntary and all of them are predicated on a strong concept of local autonomy. With a record such as this, there should be no fear that the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will be attempting to usurp the functions of our local governments.

RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATION FEES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would charge realistic license fees to all radio and television broadcasting stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

I believe that most taxpayers would be shocked and surprised to learn that our Government now gives away absolutely free of charge the valuable right to use the people's airways. In many cases, these licensees obtain from the Government a monopoly out of which they make huge profits.

It is amazing to me that the Government has for so long seen fit to make free gifts to these television and radio outlets which in turn sell broadcasting time commercially at such rates as they can get.

The failure of the Federal Government to charge these broadcasting stations is the big giveaway of the 20th century. Can we imagine the outcry that would result if the Federal Government gave away free of charge timberland or other natural resources it might own, and then told the lucky donee to charge for these resources what the traffic will bear.

Most enterprises which are licensed by governmental bodies, whether State or municipal, pay fees for their privileges. Barbers and liquor sellers are thus charged. Public utilities such as electric companies, telephone companies, and transportation companies at least have their rates regulated. Only the broadcasting companies escape the payment of license fees and the regulation of their rates.

The point should be stressed that what I am proposing is not merely a fee for the cost of regulating broadcasting stations, although the stations now do not even pay such a fee. My proposal is to charge these outlets for a valuable asset now being handed over to them free by the Government.

This bill would require an annual license fee equal to 1 percent of the gross revenues of each licensee for the preceding year. It further provides that the Federal Communications Commission shall revoke or refuse to renew the license of any television or radio station which fails to pay the fee.

Broadcasters can be expected to oppose the bill. Naturally they want to enjoy the present pattern. However, I am sure that if, at the outset, legislation had provided for a fee for the award of a license to broadcast by the Federal Communications Commission, hopeful aspirants would be falling over themselves to obtain the licenses.

I have received letters from some broadcasting stations warning me that if this bill is passed they will discontinue public service programing. My answer to such stations is that if they do so, the Federal Communications Commission should either discontinue them, or else require a certain percentage of broadcast time to be devoted to public service programing.

In view of the revenues of these outlets, I believe our Government would obtain over $20 million each year in fees under my proposal. This legislation is long overdue.

TRADE POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1962, I introduced H.R. 9741, a bill to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the U.S. Government.

This bill would establish a program for the assistance of companies and workers adversely affected by increased imports resulting from the trade policy adopted by the United States.

The distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business in the other body, Senator SPARKMAN, is to be commended for his foresight in initiating this all-out effort to provide needed relief before a situation which could do great harm to the small business communities gets worse. There have been a large number of trade adjustment proposals introduced in the Congress in recent years and as we approach the reduction of tariff barriers it becomes increasingly important that we do something for those sectors of our economy which will need it.

This proposal would give the Tariff Commission and the President the right to invoke the assistance provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act even in cases in which no serious injury or threat of serious injury is established on an industrywide basis if some companies and workers in the industry suffer injury or are threatened with injury.

The bill would offer the following relief measures: First, 25-year, 4-percent trade injury loans from the Small Business Administration; second, grants of up to $25,000 to individual companies to employ private management and industrial experts to plan for adjustment to changed trade conditions requiring conversion to new lines of production; third, extended unemployment compensation to workers unemployed because of imports; fourth, retraining and relocation allowances for such workers; fifth, retirement under social security at age 60 instead of 65 for workers unemployed because of imports; sixth, accelerated amortization of plant and equipment for companies changing lines because of imports.

One of the most important aspects of this bill is the fact that the Small Business Administration is the key agency for the administration of the business loan program as well as the planning grants. The Administrator of SBA would be made chairman of a policy-forming Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustments, on which the Tariff Commission and the Departments of State, Labor, Commerce, Interior and Agriculture would be permanently represented.

As Senator SPARKMAN said when he introduced this bill in the other body, "no injured industry can be expected to bear willingly an economic burden that more properly belongs on the broader shoulders of the national economy," a sentiment with which I heartily concur. I trust that the Congress will act on this proposal early in the present session.

COUNTDOWN ON ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, it is time for some blunt talk. In the cold light of history men and governments must be judged by the consequences of their acts, not on their good intentions. It is the economic consequences of the collective acts of the Federal Government which too often are lost sight of in the planning rooms of the executive branch and in the legislative chambers of the Congress.

I do not question the patriotism or motivation of any man or woman in any branch of Government when I state that, in the total of its spending and taxing policies, the Federal Government is shortchanging the American people. This is simply to state the economic consequences of what we have wrought. What harms our Nation economically is not just a matter of lost jobs, of lower living standards, and of less human well being. It is a matter of less national strength, of lowered military security, and of diminished prestige and capacity for leadership in the world. What harms us economically aids our enemies.

For a number of years, many members of both branches of the Congress, and of our two major political parties, have been warning of the pitfalls of too

much spending. I believe it is accurate to say that a great majority of the Members of both branches are deeply concerned about this trend. I further believe that the time is here when the Congress as a whole is willing and ready to take a new look, to face squarely the issue of which legislation will best serve the public welfare and national interest.

One thing which is certain is that concern about inflation does not stop the spending. I suppose the reason is that any group favoring a particular spending program is willing to take the chance of inflation, leaving it up to other groups to control their appetites for public money. I doubt if we can expect the separate groups interested in spending on particular programs to act much differently, except by a stronger demonstration of their combined interest than is provided by the inflationary threat.

Regardless of separate group interests in spending, all Americans do have the same interest in our national strength and prestige and, hence, in the rate of economic growth. Even as members of special groups, they know that high-rate economic growth is the key to the improvement of their individual positions; that a bouyant, dynamic, fast moving economy not only would insure the best progress to them individually, but will in fact eliminate or moderate conditions on which so much of the spending is based.

Thus, every citizen of whatever group must be concerned with the fact that growth in the total of Federal spending is at the expense of growth in the private economy.

For several years, my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee, and I have been pointing out that continuation of the spending trend prevents the reform of tax rates and methods which impede capital formation and hence limit economic growth. Our bills, H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, with which I am sure every Member of this body is familiar, are designed to reflect the general public interest in permitting greater growth in the private economy as against more growth in Federal spending.

We have not proposed a rollback in the total of Federal spending. Instead, our bills would preempt the revenue gain from economic growth to remove the tax brakes on greater growth. After the necessary tax reductions were effected, and the economy had responded in a continuing trend of greater growth, Federal revenues would soon move ahead of those which can be expected under the present tax structure. The price of achieving these ends, so necessary to the public welfare at home and our national strength and prestige looking abroad, is a moratorium on further spending increases.

Only by controlling its spending can the Government achieve the results which so often, but inaccurately, are said to come from increased spending. The greatest hoax of our time is the notion that greater spending in the so-called public sector is a means for increasing economic growth. The Government lives off of the private economy, and not vice versa.

In statements in support of our legislation, we have noted that while our recent growth rate has been only about 2 to 3 percent annually, the economies of other nations have been bounding ahead. In Western Europe, the rates of growth have been double to triple our rate, and Japan has been doing even better. According to CIA estimates, the Soviet economy achieved an average growth rate of 7 percent in the 1950's.

Growth comes from capital formation. The greater the capital supply, the greater will be the growth of any economy. In the less advanced economies, most new capital will go into the creation of entirely new productive capacity thus resulting in net increase in economic output. In an economy like ours, a great deal of capital formation only replaces wornout or obsolete productive facilities. Keeping these facts in mind, it is evident that a rate of new capital formation in our country will not produce as rapid a climb in total production as will comparable rates in other countries. Nevertheless, we have one of the lowest rates of gross capital formation in the world today, or approximately 15 percent of gross national product. In Western Europe, comparable rates in 1959 were: Belgium, 17 percent; France, 18 percent; Italy, 21 percent; Austria, 23 percent; and Germany, 23 percent. According to the CIA, 30 percent of Russia's gross national product goes into capital formation.

Whatever excuses there may have been for our not heeding these facts before now, we can have none hereafter. A new and authoritative study is now available which documents in quantitative data the fact that government, in the total of its spending and taxing policies, is the culprit insofar as our inadequate capital formation and economic growth is concerned. Dr. Simon Kuznets, of the National Bureau of Economic Research, is the author of this study.

The data provided by Dr. Kuznets show that, over the past century, the total of capital formation in this country has been relatively stable though tending slightly downward as a percentage of gross national product. However, the part of this capital formation required for replacement has been rising so steeply that net capital formation has been a consistently declining percentage of gross national product. From the period 1869 to 1888, to the period 1946 to 1955, the decline was from 14.6 percent to 7 percent of gross national product, measured in constant prices. Since economic growth was on a generally adequate level between 1946 and 1955, before the poor record of recent years, we may take for granted that the percentage of net growth capital is even smaller today.

Dr. Kuznets' study leaves no room for mistake about the source of our problem. It is clear from his analysis that the principal cause of too little capital formation is the combine of public spending and tax policies which takes so much capital away from the private economy.

There obviously is no escaping the conclusion that the Federal Government, in its capital-destroying tax policies, is responsible for the inadequate rate of economic growth; that the failure to control spending so as to admit of fundamental reform of the tax structure is at the expense of our domestic well-being and national security; and that contemporary spending proposals designed to relieve problems caused by inadequate growth simply compound the total of such problems.

Herein is the truth of my statement that the Federal Government is short-changing the American people out of the natural bounty and security of their free economic system.

If the Congress should this year, now, enact the legislation which the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative BAKER, and I have sponsored, what would this mean in terms of increasing well-being for the American people, and our position of economic leadership in the world?

In answering such a question, we have to decide on a timespan first, and make certain assumptions.

Because of the great emphasis on the critical decade of the 1960's, the timespan which we have used would carry us through the year 1970.

The assumptions which we have made are as follows:

First, that unions and management will have the wisdom and courage to confine wage decisions to overall productivity, so that all citizens may enjoy the maximum fruits of progress without further creeping inflation.

Second, that upon enactment of this legislation, at this time the current recovery will not be quickly dissipated in a new recession, as has happened on four occasions in the past dozen years, but will be transformed into the beginning of a new era of high-rate, long-term growth; and the economy will achieve a growth rate of 4 percent in 1963, 4½ percent in 1964, 5 percent in 1965, and 5½ percent annually thereafter.

Third, that, however, without enactment of this legislation at this time, the economy will achieve a gross national product of no more than $560 billion in 1962, as compared with the $570 billion projected by the administration's budget message and Economic Report.

From these assumptions, we find that from 1962 to 1970, gross national product will grow from $570 billion to $851 billion; that personal income will grow from $448 billion to $669 billion; that income per capita, taking account of increasing population, will grow from $2,402 to $3,163; and that the base for the individual income tax will grow from $211 billion to $382 billion.

By contrast, if through these years the economy should grow at only a 2½-percent rate annually, starting from the base of $560 billion in 1962, gross national product would grow only from $560 billion to $682 billion; personal income would grow from $440 billion to $536 billion; income per capita would grow from $2,359 to only $2,534; and the base of the individual income tax would grow only from $207 billion to $278 billion.

Now let us contrast these figures, on a total cumulative basis:

Upon enactment of our bills, these projections would indicate by 1970, additions—above what would result from 2½ percent average annual growth—of $699 billion of gross national product; of $547 billion of personal income; of $2,681 of per capita income and of $402 billion in the tax base.

The following tables show these data year by year from 1962 through 1970:

Gross national product

[In billions of dollars]

	Calendar years								
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	570	593	620	651	689	725	765	807	851
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	560	574	588	603	618	633	649	665	682
Additional GNP	10	19	32	48	71	92	116	142	169
Cumulative additional GNP	10	29	61	109	180	272	388	530	699

Personal income per capita

[Dollars]

	Calendar years								
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	2,402	2,459	2,530	2,619	2,719	2,825	2,932	3,044	3,163
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	2,359	2,380	2,400	2,425	2,447	2,468	2,488	2,511	2,534
Additional personal income per capita	43	79	130	194	272	357	444	533	629
Cumulative additional personal income per capita	43	122	252	446	718	1,075	1,519	2,052	2,681

Personal income

[In billions of dollars]

Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	448	466	487	512	540	570	601	634	669
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	440	451	462	474	486	498	510	523	536
Additional personal income	8	15	25	38	54	72	92	111	133
Cumulative additional personal income	8	23	48	86	140	212	303	414	547

Individual income tax base

[In billions of dollars]

Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	211	224	239	257	278	301	326	353	382
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	207	215	223	231	240	249	258	268	278
Additional individual income tax base	4	9	16	26	38	52	68	85	104
Cumulative additional individual income tax base	4	13	29	55	93	145	213	298	402

Suppose our estimates of growth upon enactment of our bills are too high; suppose despite the record of recent years, our estimate of growth with nothing more than reshuffling of the present tax structure is too low; suppose the difference would be say no more than one-half of that which we have projected?

Over recent years, and currently, the Federal Government has been exposed to a barrage of demand for Federal aid to education, and to the argument that training and education themselves are means to economic progress. Dr. Kuznets notes that the development of scientific knowledge and technological skill inevitably contributes to improvement of our economic productivity. However, he adds that "one persistent bottleneck in the use of knowledge in economic production has been the scarcity of the resources for the production of capital goods needed for the application of new knowledge."

It seems to me that Dr. Kuznets is saying that we may have been getting the cart before the horse. Training and education do not displace the need for capital; instead, they increase the need for it. We are rendering a dubious service to our youth when we use Federal moneys to increase education when the total of Federal spending and taxing in themselves deprive trained people, and in fact all members of the working force, of the best and most productive job opportunities. It may be noted that greater capital formation and economic growth would greatly improve the base for State and local, and private support, of our educational institutions. If our economy had not been bound in the past by uneconomic tax rates, we could be certain that education would be in better position today without any direct Federal aid than is now the case. Looking ahead to 1970, no reasonable man could doubt that education would be a major beneficiary of the economic growth possible under a Federal tax structure which does not unduly penalize capital accumulation and use.

We have heard a good bit about sacrifice in the last couple of years. The question posed by the facts and figures which I have cited is where the sacrifice should be made.

Should we continue with an accumulation of public policies which deprive the people of our Nation of the jobs and advance in living standards, and of the pride and independence, which would come from the kind of growth permitted by fundamental reform of the Federal tax rates and methods?

Should we sacrifice the security and strength and prestige that would accrue to our Nation in this troubled world which would come from such growth?

Should we sacrifice the inherent power of our free economic system, letting the Soviet Union move up to our heels in its bid for world economic domination?

Or, should the Government itself make the sacrifice?

Mr. Speaker, we are not laying before you a soft or easy program. No family, no business, no nation has for long prospered and endured unless it demonstrated the capacity for discipline, for prudence today in order to multiply the well-being of tomorrow.

Is the Federal Government willing to make the sacrifice, or is this administration and the Congress to continue on the path of consuming the seed corn of tomorrow's strength?

Put in this light, there is not really as much sacrifice as we have indicated. Upon enactment of H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, we estimate that Federal revenues would total $88.4 billion in fiscal year 1963, slowly trending out from this figure reaching nearly $92 billion in 1967; then moving rapidly to $98 billion in 1968; $105 billion in 1969; $112 billion in 1970; and $119 billion in 1971.

In the intervening years, it is true we would get more revenue under existing tax rates, admitting whatever reshuffling of tax liabilities might take place. But in fiscal year 1971, the revenues which I projected would exceed those which would come from continuation of the existing spending and taxing policies, and thereafter would race ahead.

There is the question, Mr. Speaker, will the Federal Government sacrifice today, in order to enable the private economy to save and invest, to serve the public welfare at home and to confound the enemy which has stalked us with a capital formation rate twice our own?

We believe we know your answer—that this great representative body of the people, that the Senate, and that the President of the United States, understanding these facts, will make the right decision for America.

Our legislation was introduced 3 years ago this January. It has received the support of scholars, of commentators on the public scene, of representative bodies of American citizens.

No one, no group, has contested the validity of its basic assumptions and procedures. It is, in our opinion, Mr. Speaker, time that this legislation be exposed to the full deliberative process of the Congress.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege of hearing Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Commander Hansen addressed the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, and presented the VFW's 1962 legislative program.

I was very much impressed by his presentation and, at its conclusion, joined some of my colleagues on the committee in commending the commander for his truly outstanding testimony. I told the assemblage that it was one of the finest legislative offerings I have ever heard.

Mr. Speaker, under this permission to address the full House, I would like to convey to all of my colleagues the views I expressed at today's memorable meeting of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I repeat here my observation that the program offered by Commander Hansen is an excellent one. It is reasonable and fair—it is constructive and realistic. I agree with the objectives he outlined. I know that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will evaluate every detail of the VFW's recommendations and that the committee will act in what it believes to be in the best interests of the veteran and the Nation.

Commander Hansen is a leader of unique ability and dedication, and I want to compliment him on his inspiring stewardship of a great organization.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the VFW is a great organization. I know this from firsthand experiences with the VFW activities in the greatest borough of New York City and the greatest county in New York State—Queens. I am delighted to see that my native Queens is so well represented at this current VFW legislative conference.

I note with pleasure that among my friends here from Queens who are participating in the conference are: Former State commander and member of the national security committee, Edward I. Condren; former State commander, Raymond J. McDonald; county commander, Alick H. Herrmann; former county commander and chairman of the hospital committee of district 1, Allen O. Brown; past county commander and life membership chairman of the department of New York, Hollis Parker; and county legislative committee member, George Athens.

These men are among the finest I have ever known. They and the other wonderful members of the Queens organization are interested, naturally, in the advancement of the veteran's cause. But first and foremost is their dedication to a stronger, healthier America. I have seen this wonderful spirit effectively carried out in the VFW's many civic and patriotic activities, such as the community achievement program and the Voice of Democracy essay contest, which is an integral part of their excellent youth program. Incidentally, I know we are all pleased to welcome the 51 State winners of this contest to Washington.

This altruistic local activity reflects the philosophy of the National VFW and I want to commend this fine organization for its patriotism, its zeal, its strong sense of civic responsibility and its humanitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, America needs more groups like the VFW and more men like those who make up its membership. My hat is off to them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER (at the request of Mr. ANFUSO), for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. HERLONG, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include tables.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. DERWINSKI), for 5 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JOELSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend remarks made by him in Committee of the Whole on the bill H.R. 6360, and to include a letter.

Mr. GOODELL to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include pages 18261–18263 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 14.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DERWINSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOLE.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. BAKER.

Mr. HOEVEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. KOWALSKI.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States; and

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1649. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report by the Department of Defense relating to positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 during the calendar year 1961, and a report for the year 1961 relating to positions established in the Department of Defense to carry out research and development activities, pursuant to Public Law 85–322; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1650. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults unable to read and write English or with less than a sixth-grade level of education, through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1651. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1652. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the final report on the operations and condition of the Development Loan Fund as of November 3, 1961, the date of the abolition of the fund and transfer of its responsibilities to the newly created Agency for International Development, pursuant to section 621(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1653. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the initial report to the Congress on a review of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1654. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the wage accounting and unemployment contribution collection activities of the Railroad Retirement Board as of July 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1655. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1656. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1657. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on the St. Peters Creek, Manokin River, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Rep-

resentatives, adopted June 11, 1952. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1658. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Back River, Front Cove, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1659. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 6, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Martin Creek, Nev., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1660. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 13, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Eskoot Creek, Stinson Beach area, Marin County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on St. Joseph's Cut, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 19, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

1662. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 7, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the White Oak, Cypress, and Little Cypress Creeks, Tex., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted August 20, 1957, June 13, 1956, and July 1, 1958, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

1663. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9884. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4188. A bill for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. H.R. 2470. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1326). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 429. An act for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1348. An act for the relief of the Sulzbach Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1348. A bill for the relief of William Burnice Joyner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2839. A bill for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3696. A bill for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6075. A bill for the relief of Capt. H. A. Rowe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6464. A bill for the relief of Cecil D. Rose; with amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6740. A bill for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta; with amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7671. A bill for the relief of Louanna L. Leis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7704. A bill for the relief of Chyung Sang Bak; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7708. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver; with amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8195. A bill for the relief of Ronald L. Mutter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8368. A bill for the relief of A. Eugene Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8482. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Pericle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8515. A bill for the relief of James R. Banks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8628. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Tedesco; with amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9060. A bill for the relief of Rhea G. Burgess; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9188. A bill to relieve Theodore A. Anderson from loss of agricultural conservation program benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9596. A bill for the relief of Daniel E. Moore; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9597. A bill for the relief of James N. Tull; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9830. A bill for the relief of John B. Hogan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9831. A bill to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; with amendment (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10091. A bill to prohibit aerial acrobatic performances without the use of safety nets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 10092. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain surplus Federal lands to the State of Illinois for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 10093. A bill to reunite families in the United States by granting nonquota status to certain aliens entitled to a preference under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10094. A bill to amend section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act with respect to the determination of monthly pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 10095. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1963, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 10096. A bill to confirm to the State of Utah title to the bed of the Great Salt Lake; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 10097. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10098. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 10099. A bill to confirm title of the State of Utah to the bed of the Great Salt Lake; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10100. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 10101. A bill to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 10102. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increased exemption from income tax in the case of annuities payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 10103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for each dependent who is a full-time undergraduate student at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10104. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 10105. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39 of the United States Code to provide for adequate addresses on franked mail delivered by city carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 10106. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10107. A bill to amend certain laws applicable to the District of Columbia Tax Court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.J. Res. 621. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.J. Res. 622. Joint resolution declaring Communist arms and munitions contraband in the Western Hemisphere and making provisions to enforce the same; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 623. Joint resolution declaring that a state of conflict exists between the international Communist conspiracy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. Con. Res. 410. Concurrent resolution expressing the declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to reinstate the sovereignty of the United States and its people throughout the world and to guarantee the full protection of this Government for all its citizens and their property anywhere in the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 10108. A bill authorizing the readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 10109. A bill for the relief of Sister Machi Shigehisa, and Sister Tamiko Hitomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 10110. A bill for the relief of Rathindra N. Roychoudhury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 10111. A bill for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 10112. A bill for the relief of John Baltis (John Paul Petalas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

236. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a petition of 160 persons in South Dakota, Nebraska, California, Wisconsin, and Illinois, asking for an end to the Red mail subsidy, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1962

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

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

Eternal and ever-loving Father, in this mad and sad world, with the forces of envy and hatred rending in twain Thy human family, we look away from all the contentions of earth, knowing that nothing can separate us from the love of Thee, our God, and that we cannot drift beyond the circle of Thy care. It is in that love that a sparrow's fall is noted. It is in that law that the stars keep their courses. With that certainty as our shield, we confront the day with confidence and face the future unafraid.

Make us worthy of that love divine, which transfigures all it touches. May we not fall short of the high dignity with which Thou hast endowed us.

Protect our free land from the dire evils threatened by others who blaspheme Thy law. Deliver us also from the sinful tendencies of our own wayward natures which would lure us from the path of Thy commandments.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 5, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5393. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 5393. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

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

CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today's calendar shows that unanimous consent was granted for a call of the calendar tomorrow, beginning with Calendar No. 1077. That is an error; the request was for a calendar call beginning with Calendar No. 1142. We expect to take up the money resolutions—Calendar Nos. 1096 through 1141—tomorrow, but they will not be considered under the unanimous-consent calendar call.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader further with respect to the program for the remainder of the week, and possibly in regard to what will eventuate after the Lincoln's Birthday tour is over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question by my distinguished friend, the minority leader, let me say we have some hopes of finishing the unfinished business, Senate bill 1241, today.

Tomorrow we shall take up the resolutions which provide for the operation of the Senate's committees; and there will be a calendar call, beginning with Calendar No. 1142; and we hope to get started on the consideration of Senate bill 2520, for enforcement of the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act. We would like to get all these measures out of the way before the coming Friday.

It has already been agreed that there will be no votes from February 9 to February 13, inclusive.

After a discussion with the distinguished minority leader, it has been agreed—and I believe the Senate should take notice of this—that on February 19 the Senate will begin debate on the reorganization plan for a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The 19th falls on a Monday, as I recall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So we shall begin then with debate on the so-called reorganization plan to include the creation of the proposed new Cabinet Department. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois has stated the fact accurately.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORTS ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the District of Columbia National Guard Armory and District of Columbia Stadium, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a terminal report on the Development Loan Fund, as of November 3, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF CERTAIN MISSILE TOOLING UNDER AIR FORCE CONTRACT WITH THE BOEING CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of certain missile tooling under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)-36319 with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF WEATHER BUREAU

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal years 1959-61 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY MANAGEMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHIC SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supply management of photographic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense, dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

James J. Saxon, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

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

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2803. A bill for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2804. A bill for the relief of Sheu Chwan Shaiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2805. A bill to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KERR (for Mr. CHAVEZ) (by request):

S. 2806. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2807. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juliane C. Rockenfeller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Roumeliotis and Panagiota Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2809. A bill to amend section 927(d) of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to individuals acquitted of offenses solely by reason of their insanity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 2810. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to all lands lying below the high waterline of Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2811. A bill amending title I of the Social Security Act so as to require that, in the administration of State programs for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, a statement of a claimant for assistance under any such program with regard to his financial status shall, if made under oath, be regarded as factually correct for purposes of determining his eligibility for assistance under such programs; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 2812. A bill to amend section 216 of title 38, United States Code, relating to prosthetic research in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROGRAM OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DEVELOPMENT IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for an act entitled "The Alaska Farmland Development Act of 1962," providing for a sound, efficient development and utilization program for Alaska's agricultural land resources. I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2805) to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, much has been written about Alaska, much has been said. Some is the truth, some not, a good deal of it has been partially true. Too little is known of this

vast land, but we do know that Alaska can become very productive for it is rich not only in natural resources but in human resources. The people of Alaska have enormous faith in their country and in themselves and want to play a part in their country's development. We should acknowledge that desire and advance it, for Alaska now constitutes approximately one-fifth of the land mass of the United States. Its geographic position is strategic and its strength essential to the protection of the rest of the Nation.

President Kennedy has stated again and again that we must move forward. And the country is moving forward under his leadership. We want to continue to do so. Alaskans, as much as any other group of Americans, want to move forward, but they need direction, help, and encouragement. I believe that this bill which provides for a long-term, cost-sharing program of land improvement will accomplish those very things—give direction, help, and encouragement to at least some of Alaska's people.

I do not intend to speak of what might have been. Alaska's history is what it is. We recognize this and want to proceed from it. To say that the Federal Government has great responsibilities in the development of Alaska is indisputable, but equally does it have similar responsibilities in all of the other States. The Federal Government has an obligation to promote profitable enterprises and has fulfilled that obligation in many areas. Basic to our national strength is a profitable agricultural economy and Alaska must share in a healthy farming community.

The airplane, World War II and the Korean war, the discovery of oil and gas, statehood—all have changed Alaska. In the years between 1950 and 1960 Alaska experienced a 75-percent growth in population. Anchorage alone has grown from a small railroad camp of approximately 2,500 people in the 1920's to a city of 48,000 with approximately 50,000 more living in adjacent areas.

Very little in Alaska's economy has kept pace with this growth in population, least of all its agricultural economy. Alaska's farmers presently supply slightly over 10 percent of all foodstuffs consumed there. The remainder—almost all, that is—must be imported. The Bureau of the Census in 1960 estimated that there are 367 farms in production in Alaska, including tracts as small as 10 acres. Today reliable estimates indicate that Alaska has on hand only a 3-week supply of food. Alaska can and must support more and larger farms if the people are to have some measure of protection from serious and even tragic shortages in the event that the lines of commerce are severed from the rest of the Nation.

One of the great obstacles to more rapid agricultural development is the staggering, immediate cost—cost of clearing land and placing it in production. I have been told by farmers, bankers, and others concerned with the problem that the cost of clearing 1 acre has been as high as $250. Many judge the average to be approximately $100 per acre. Alaska's settlers cannot prosper confronted with these great costs. Yet, at the present time, we are asking people to undertake these debts to open the land for all of us. Unfortunately, we cannot look to Alaska bankers to provide assistance when investment capital is as limited as it is. Estimates of the basic requirements for a farm in Alaska run from $20,000 to $60,000, depending upon the type of farming.

The Alaska agricultural revolving loan fund, a State fund providing development capital for farmers, and the agricultural conservation program service, the Federal Government agency which assists in conservation practices, have helped to some degree but, of course, neither is sufficient to provide the long-term development program essential to orderly growth. Alaska is new in many ways and underpopulated, and those there recognize that growth must come gradually, but steadily, to be of real and lasting benefit. It is my belief that this bill will provide for much of that orderly, steady advancement which is imperative.

Our Nation will be strong so long as the whole economy is strong. If Alaska is to be strong, its economy must be strong. The United States cannot afford not to have Alaska contributing to the national welfare as fully as possible, nor can we, in these days of world tension, leave the people in Alaska relying upon grossly inadequate stockpiles of food, 90 percent of which comes from other areas. Alaska cannot provide that needed strength now. It will require time, patience, energy, and perseverance. Alaska's present agricultural weakness makes it an easy conquest in the event of aggression. This, however, must not be our first consideration. We must think first of peaceful, dynamic national growth. Alaska should contribute to that growth. This bill provides a means by which it can.

The bill (S. 2805), introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Farmland Development Act of 1962".

SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE.—In order to provide more adequately for the sound, efficient, and orderly development and utilization of agricultural land resources of the State of Alaska; to facilitate and assure the establishment of family-type farms as economic units of production and to encourage, promote, and strengthen this form of farm enterprise; to provide for Alaska's future economic growth by promoting a sound and stable agriculture, thereby insuring a more adequate and dependable food supply for the present and future population of the State; and in recognition of the strategic position of the State of Alaska in relation to national security and defense, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, and the purpose of this Act shall be, to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska which will assist agricultural producers to develop and utilize more effectively the productive capacity of the State's land resources for agricultural purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to formulate and carry out a land development program, which subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the policy and purpose expressed in section 2 of this Act, shall provide for the making of payments or grants to agricultural producers in the State of Alaska for carrying out specified farmland development or treatment measures including, but not limited to, clearing, draining, shaping and otherwise conditioning land for the production of crops or for pasture.

SEC. 4. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor to enter into agreements or other arrangements extending for a period of years with producers determined by him to have control of the farms and ranches covered thereby.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary may utilize the committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act: *Provided,* That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed $1,250,000 and for any program year payments shall not exceed $125,000. The program authorized by this Act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in the State of Alaska authorized by any other Act.

FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS, TO INCREASE AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED TO BE EXPENDED

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended. I ask unanimous consent that a comparative print showing changes in existing law made by this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2806) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended, introduced by Mr. KERR (for Mr. CHAVEZ), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The comparative print presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

COMPARATIVE PRINT SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY PROPOSED BILL

Changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets, new matter in italic):

ACT OF JUNE 26, 1930, AS AMENDED (19 U.S.C. 68)

To aid in the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws along the Canadian and Mexican borders and to provide better facilities for such enforcement at points along such borders at which no Federal or other buildings adapted or suitably located

for the purpose are available, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General are hereby authorized to expend, from the funds appropriated for the general maintenance and operation of the Customs and the Immigration and Naturalization Services, respectively, the necessary amounts for the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings, sheds, and office quarters, including living quarters for officers where none are otherwise available: *Provided,* [That the total amount which may be so expended for any one project, for the use of one department, including the cost of the site, shall not exceed $40,000, and that where quarters are so erected or facilities so provided for the joint use of the Customs and the Immigration and Naturalization Services the combined cost charged to the two appropriations concerned shall not exceed $80,000 for any one project, including the site.] *That the total amount which may be so expended for any one project, including the site, shall not exceed $100,000, and that where the project is for the joint use of the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the combined cost of the project, including the site, shall be charged to the two appropriations concerned.*

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY PEOPLE WITHOUT INVESTIGATION PRIOR TO CERTIFICATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Kerr-Mills Act which would provide that older persons seeking help under State medical assistance for the aged programs would not be subject to investigation prior to certification for care.

The bill provides that a simple statement under oath as to his financial status must be presumed to be accurate in determining an older person's eligibility for care under State medical assistance for the aged programs using funds provided through the Kerr-Mills Act. Effective date for the new provision would be October 1. States not complying after that date would be ineligible for Federal grants-in-aid under the act.

Adoption of this proposal will remove a psychological barrier for lower-income people over 65 who, while otherwise independent, may need help from the State in obtaining medical care. It will tend also to accelerate the speed with which needs of these persons are met.

The persons whom the medical assistance for the aged programs are designed to help are honest and proud people. If the Nation's senior citizens cannot be trusted to accurately report their income and assets in application for help, the country as a whole is in serious trouble.

This proposal would, in essence, apply the same presumption of honesty on the part of citizens as is employed in the Veterans' Administration medical care program and the income tax.

While there is no evidence that people requesting care under the State medical assistance for the aged programs have been subject to humiliating investigation, many senior citizens fear that it might happen and resent the idea of a caseworker embarrassing them in their own neighborhoods. It is to prevent such a possibility that this proposal has been made.

Under present law, States are encouraged to develop medical assistance programs for those normally able to provide for their own needs who would be unable, however, to meet the cost of serious illness. It was the intent of Congress that these persons should be helped, as needed, without being forced onto public assistance rolls or subjected to pauperization. From 50 to 80 percent of the funds required by a State for the program are available from the Federal Government.

Most State plans provide that persons whose income and assets fall below a specific level shall be eligible for benefits. The State now may make a comprehensive and detailed investigation to determine income and assets before providing help. This would not be possible after approval of the Dirksen amendment. Instead the applicant's word would have to be accepted as presumption of his financial qualification.

The proposal would in no way alter the States right to determine the income level or other standards necessary to make a person eligible for help. Nor would it interfere with the States right to prosecute or recover funds in case of fraud.

In Illinois, individuals with annual incomes under $1,800 and couples with incomes under $2,400 are eligible for the medical assistance for the aged program if their assets do not exceed $1,800 and $2,400 respectively. Not counted as assets for this purpose are a homestead, regardless of value; personal property; an automobile; $1,000 of life insurance; or $1,000 of tools used in earning income.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the table for 2 additional days for cosponsors.

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

The bill (S. 2811) amending title I of the Social Security Act so as to require that, in the administration of State programs for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, a statement of a claimant for assistance under any such program with regard to his financial staus shall, if made under oath, be regarded as factually correct for purposes of determining his eligibility for assistance under such programs, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL, IND.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not more than $1,000,000, of which not more than $75,000 shall be expended for the acquisition of lands or interests in land," and the Senate agree to the same.

ALAN BIBLE,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ERNEST GRUENING,
HENRY DWORSHAK,
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
J. T. RUTHERFORD,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

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

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the report is signed by each of the conferees for both the Senate and the House, and places a limitation of $75,000 on the amount of money which can be spent for the purchase of land for the national memorial. With that exception, the bill is as passed by the Senate at the close of the last session.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HARTKE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate today accepted the conference report on H.R. 2470, the bill to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana.

My Hoosier colleague, Congressman WINFIELD DENTON, and I have been working together to get this legislation passed by the Congress since early in January of 1961.

The Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial will be Indiana's first national park. It will be located in Spencer County, Ind., and will include the old Tom Lincoln farm on Pigeon Creek where Abraham Lincoln lived from the time he was 7 until he was 21 years old.

During the time that Lincoln lived in Indiana, his mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln died. Her grave is also located on the land which will become part of this new national park.

When young Abraham Lincoln moved to southern Indiana, this area was a meeting place between North and South. As Assistant Secretary of the Interior John M. Kelley stated in a letter to Chairman ASPINALL, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Had the Lincolns gone directly from Kentucky to Illinois it is probable that the boy's southern experience might have been wholly submerged, and with it his capacity, later so evident, to understand and sympathize with the southern mind and heart. These formative years in southern Indiana gave Abraham Lincoln a perspective that combined elements of both major sections of the Nation that he would one day be called upon to preserve. It is not too much to believe that only this early experience could have prepared him to meet so successfully the supreme challenge which destiny thrust upon him in 1860.

I pledged to the people of Indiana that I would work until legislation gave proper recognition to Lincoln's boyhood home. This pledge I have faithfully kept.

I wish to thank my distinguished colleagues Senator BIBLE and Senator ANDERSON and the other members of the Interior Committee for their assistance in this legislation.

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

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

By Mr. MORSE:

Address by him entitled "U.S. Role in the United Nations and Its Effect on Our Foreign Policy" before the League of Women Voters, Springfield, Oreg., October 11, 1961.

Remarks by him at the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961.

FIRST-GENERATION AMERICANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an interesting editorial, from a recent issue of the Daily Republican Times, of Ottawa, Ill., on "Vanishing Americans." It pays fitting tribute to first-generation Americans, and speaks eloquently of what the immigrants have meant to the Americans and what America has meant to the immigrants.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VANISHING AMERICANS

The disappearance of more and more first-generation Americans leaves a void in our Nation's life. These were the people who migrated to this country from many lands—Italy, France, Germany, Ireland, the Balkans. They brought with them an appreciation of this our land that we are sometimes apt to forget.

Many of them came from lands of oppression, poverty, and economic and social stagnation. They were plain, religious folks to whom home, family, and church meant everything. To them, America was a land of golden opportunity, not necessarily to pile up wealth, but to earn a living, to live their lives in freedom, to raise a family. America became the great melting pot.

The adjustments were not always easy. For many, poverty was a problem as long as they lived. But to them, life in America more than compensated for what we now would call hardships.

They worked in the mines and factories. They toiled long hours; they were often exploited and misled. But they built the America we know today. They thrived, and filled our cities and villages and farms. They raised sons who grew up to run the Nation's businesses and went off to war when their country called. From pushcarts they started the enterprises whose prosperity we enjoy today.

Now they are vanishing from the scene, and with them goes a little of the appreciation of America.

We second and third and fourth generation Americans take their place in shaping the affairs of our communities and States and the Nation.

We still need to match a little of the work and sacrifices, toil and sweat, laughter and tears, that the people invested in us.

LARAMIE WOOL PROCESSING & WAREHOUSING CORP.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the creation of an interesting new corporation in Laramie, Wyo. It is a wool processing plant. This is an innovation in the West. We call it a design to process wool and clean wool before it is shipped the long, 2,000-mile journey to the eastern textile markets. Until now, nearly half of the weight of wool shipped has been due to the grease and the dirt in the wool, and of course the resultant additional transportation charges have been to the detriment of the woolgrowers themselves.

With the commencement of this new operation in Laramie, we have hopes that it will open up a vast new development in connection with wool processing all through the West, and will make it possible for the wool industry and woolgrowing in general to return to their former days of prosperity.

My tribute goes to the president of this new Laramie corporation, Jim Burton, to his board of directors, and to the business groups and wool interests which have had the imagination to undertake this worthwhile experiment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article describing the operation of this woolgrowing plant in Laramie. The article was published on February 2 in the Laramie Daily Boomerang.

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

WOOL MILL OFFERS ADVANTAGE IN CLEAN SHIPPING

Western sheepmen won't have to send their wools to the New England processing centers any more—a new organization has sprouted at their doorstep.

Established as a service facility, the Laramie Wool Processing & Warehousing Corp. has been in operation about 4 months.

"We're not in operation to buy large clips of wools outright," said J. V. Burton, president and executive manager of the plant. "We work on a fee basis for eastern mills and woolgrowers in this part of the country. They are the customers. We work for them as the processor."

And the potential is great, according to Burton. He noted the plant is set up now to operate on a 10-million-pound basis annually, but that 54 million pounds are available each year in the area.

"We can expect to meet that potential," Burton stated. "We have the space available and other conditions are excellent."

The plant itself was purchased from Pacific Fruit Express Co., which had used it for ice storage and servicing refrigerated rail cars for cross-country runs. It contains 100,000 square feet of usable floor space, part of which is divided into 60- by 100-foot rooms for separate storage.

There's an additional 74 acres adjacent to the structure for outside storage or industrial expansion.

But its location is the key to the entire operation. It's on the main line of the east-west transcontinental Union Pacific Railroad, offering advantageous privileges on wool shipments in either direction.

Laramie is located equally well for the collection or concentration of wools by truck from the shearing pens and area warehouses desiring further processing of their stored wools. It is bisected by east-west transcontinental highway U.S. 30 and north-south U.S. 87 which extends from Montana to Texas.

The plant also boasts a strategic nontarget location for rapid defense center distribution of goods.

These transportation advantages can be used to the great benefit of the customers, Burton pointed out.

"It's the amount of clean wool that determines value and profit," he said. "We now can offer growers the advantage of shipping scoured wool in greater bulk to the eastern mills, thus filling rail cars with baled, clean wool and getting the benefit of bulk rates. The same advantages apply for the eastern mills.

"We are also in a position, with our storage facilities, of eliminating a lot of the 'guesstimates' in estimating wool shrinkage. We can supply reliable marketing, supply, demand, and price range facts. We can eliminate unacceptable grading by the growers and the lack of classification and separation of wool types.

"The intervening 2,000 miles between western wool production and the eastern mill consumption has been a barrier that has caused many of the planned corrective efforts to fail," Burton went on to say. "We are in a position to do something about this and it looks like we are being accepted."

The Laramie plant presently can process 1,500 to 1,800 pounds of grease wool per hour. The machines open up the wools and get out loose dirt before the scouring bowls take over. Hot water with detergents added clean the wool before it goes through two rinse bowls. The clean wool then is dried and baled for shipment.

The plant is operating with one such unit but space has been set aside for four additional units which can be installed as volume increases.

Burton reported the plant can do custom scouring and blending of wools to meet specifications of eastern buyers. "We already have done some of this and undoubtedly will have an increase in such requests," he said.

"There is nothing exactly like this new plant in the West," the manager stated. "It is unique because several of the services it

offers to woolgrowers are new and woolgrowers obtain the highest possible prices for their wools.

"The plant prepares wool, it scours wool, it sells wool for woolgrowers and mills both in the grease wool and the scoured wool state. It is not the policy of the plant to go out and actively buy wool for its own account.

"Each clip of wool is handled according to the specific wishes of the owner and he alone decides what we do with his product."

Advantages for the grower? Burton listed these:

The corporation can demonstrate substantial freight savings on prepared and scoured wools coming into the Laramie plant either in transit or of local origins.

Wools will be sold on their individual merits only and the better managed bands will be rewarded according to their practices.

The Laramie plant will be helping to establish a more orderly marketing system.

Smaller growers will receive the same consideration and market benefits as larger growers.

As soon as expedient the company hopes to offer at cost an efficient service for culling and grading ewe and yearling flocks for uniformity of wool and lambs. By this service defective wools, off-type wools and inefficient ewes will be eliminated from the flocks and this will increase the values of the products of the sheep enterprise.

Increased volume of scouring is not the only growth potential for the corporation, one officer said. He noted the possibility exists that expansion can be made into the other aspects of wool processing—combing and eventually the manufacturing phase.

"We're perhaps dreaming a bit here," he said, "but we can't discount the fact that the possibility exists. It would be a wonderful industry, and a very logical one, for Laramie."

TRADE WITH JAPAN

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States is now in Japan, on a very important mission, I believe. I hope that two articles recently published in the Washington Post—one on February 3, and the other on February 4—will be called to his attention. These articles call attention to a sentiment in Japan which is quite distressing.

The headline of the first article is "Feelings Are Hurt—Second Fiddle Trade Role Feared by Japanese."

The subheading of the article, which appears on the following page, is "Japanese Fear Desertion by United States Following Troth With Inner Six."

The article refers to the clouds that Japan sees on the horizon, including a "belief that with the passage of the new trade bill, the United States will enter into an exclusive dialogue with the Common Market countries, making restrictive deals that will leave Japan out in the cold.

The article states that Japan does feel left out, and that some in Japanese Cabinet circles feel that they have suffered a loss of face. The article states:

America speaks to Europe, not to its second largest trading partner.

And so forth. The headline of the second article is "Japan Mystified by U.S. Policy." The article states, in part:

Recent American actions, therefore, which seem in Japanese eyes to run counter to those principles, leave top level Japanese in business and government baffled and unhappy. They wonder if the very foundations of the relationship are being pulled down.

Finally the following is stated in the article:

But if the United States cannot meet Japanese appeals, it could conceivably comfort official and business leaders by appearing to accord Japanese problems more concern. The Japanese are worried, and would be happier if the Americans held their hand and worried along with them.

Mr. President, the trade bill now before the Congress provides for the most-favored-nation policy. If that is adopted, it will leave us in the position of agreeing to accord to all other nations besides the Common Market Six the same reductions in tariffs or other barriers as are agreed to by them; but it does not require us to make with the Common Market an agreement which would oblige them to do the same thing.

I intend to submit, in due course, an amendment which will require that any agreement we make with the Common Market shall carry the most-favored-nation policy, along with that agreement, so as to make clear to our good friends in the Common Market Six that they, too, have a world responsibility in these days of the cold war—on the brink of a hot war—and that they, too, should take into account the economic needs of Japan, inasmuch as Japan is the only great power in the Far East; and if Japan should fall, because of economic disaster, that would be a tragedy of the first order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time available to the Senator from Connecticut, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1962]

FEELINGS ARE HURT—SECOND-FIDDLE TRADE ROLE FEARED BY JAPANESE

(By Alfred Friendly)

TOKYO.—Japan's Government officials and business leaders are suffering a bad case of nerves, hurt feelings and bewilderment about American trade policy.

Their acute unhappiness, understandable even if somewhat irrational, comes from the thought that Uncle Sam's eyes are so fixed on American relationships with the Common Market that Japan risks, as the current phrase has it, "being lost in the northwest corner of the Pacific."

On the downward swing of a massive economic readjustment imposed by the Government to cool off the nation's superheated economy—the Japanese substitute for a business cycle recession—the country's leaders would be jumpy as cats in any event. The new dimension to their nervousness comes from a series of American actions which look like a resurgence of protectionism, discrimination against Japanese goods and exclusive preoccupation with commerce in the Atlantic community.

To understand the current case of the jitters it must be remembered that Japan is as obsessed by issues of its export trade as Brooklyn used to be by the Dodgers. As the saying goes, if you want to talk in Washington, you have to talk politics; in Tokyo if you want to talk, you talk about trade. For Japan's remarkable experiment, to bring 94 million people in a country the size of Montana to a decent life by peaceful means, the only solution is a system based on the vastest exchange of goods with the world.

A third of Japan's trade is with the United States and, after Canada, Japan is the United States' largest trading partner. Accordingly, when the adverse trade balance for Japan with the United States runs, as it did in 1961, to $1 billion, and when "Big Brother" begins to take measures that look like further restrictions on Japan's exports, the word for the result is consternation.

What Japan sees as storm clouds, if not typhoons, is built of these droplets:

Tariff Commission consideration of an 8½-cents-per-pound equalization fee on cotton goods imports (to adjust for world prices as against the price at which cotton is sold in the American market).

The cessation of American purchasers by the Agency for International Development (AID) of fertilizer in Japan for economic assistance to Korea, Indian and other Asian countries ($170 million worth in 1960, about $50 million last year and presumably none this year).

A belief that with the passage of the new trade bill, the United States will enter into an exclusive dialogue with the Common Market countries, making restrictive deals that will leave Japan out in the cold.

Reports of agitation in the United States for buy-American and ship-American policies, and against Japanese goods.

It does not help much to point out that even if the 8½-cent tariff is added, Japanese imports will not be grievously hurt, inasmuch as only 6 or 7 percent of Japanese cotton goods imported to the United States are crude and unfinished, the rest consisting of finished goods or clothing where the price of the cotton content is not important.

Nor does it help to explain—as it certainly has not been adequately or widely explained until President Kennedy's message of January 25 on the Trade Expansion Act—that U.S.-Common Market negotiations will follow the most-favored-nation principle, so that tariff reductions both in America and in Europe will benefit Japan as well.

SUSPICION REMAINS

The suspicion remains and grows almost to an obsession. The Japanese feel left out; in some Cabinet circles, indeed, there is even a sense of loss of face. America speaks to Europe, not to its second largest trading partner. High hopes were left by the United States-Japanese Cabinet-level conferences here last November, but favorable developments have not materialized—indeed the trend seems to run the other way.

So far, the pocketbook injuries to Japan have not been serious, but wounds to the feelings have been. In a sense, the United States has been guilty more in bad manners than bad actions. But manners, in Japan, are important.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1962]

SPOILED BY HISTORY—JAPAN MYSTIFIED BY U.S. POLICY

(By Alfred Friendly)

TOKYO.—Since the end of the American occupation of Japan, this nation's relationship with the United States has been sustained by a pair of cardinal, basic assumptions:

1. The United States applauds, welcomes, encourages the sensational economic progress of Japan, which is moving forward at a rate probably unrivaled elsewhere in the world.

2. In all matters, especially those economic, and in defense against the Communist menace of Red China, America stood as

a partner to Japan and accepted Japan as a first-class partner.

Recent American actions, therefore, which seem in Japanese eyes to run counter to those principles, leave top-level Japanese in business and government baffled and unhappy. They wonder if the very foundations of the relationship are being pulled down.

To say that the Japanese have been spoiled since the war—that everything which should have gone wrong for them went right, that they lost the war but won the occupation—may be to aid in understanding the situation but not in alleviating it.

To explain that President Kennedy also has a political problem in seeking to gain enactment of the Trade Expansion Act, and must make some compromises with American textile and other industries challenged by Japanese imports, is to appeal to the Japanese mind, when his worry is not there but in his innards.

To explain that some American moves, such as curbing purchases of AID goods in Japan, are necessitated by America's gold drain is to evoke a reaction of wonderment; how can America with $16.8 billion of gold reserves be worried when Japan has only $1.4 billion, and that a drop from last year's figures?

To recall how good Japan's trade has been with the United States, to hold out hope of how it can be expected to grow in years to come, especially under the new trade legislation, is to encounter the reply of Vice President Alben Barkley's constituent: What have you done for me recently?

In Government circles where the reasons and explanations may be well understood there is nevertheless a grave concern which extends from the economic to the political. If Japan's current economic cutback to rectify its overexpanded, supercharged economic boom lasts too long, and if further restriction of Japanese imports to the United States holds down recovery, there could be a worrisome reaction by the voters.

The elections for the upper house come next summer. There is, to be sure, no danger of the Socialists upsetting the Tory government of the Liberal-Democratic Party, but a sharp Socialist gain could not be looked on with any complaisance. For the Socialist Party is not, in the Western sense, a loyal opposition, but rather a revolutionary one. If not Moscow or Peiping controlled, it is nevertheless Marxist to the core. A conversation with one of its leaders differs only slightly from one with an editor of the Daily Worker.

And hanging over the head of Japanese politics is the emotional yearning for China, the mother country. If trade with the United States is a bootless game, the Socialists can argue, why not turn to trade with mainland China. The economics are nonsensical, for China has no wherewithal to buy what Japan can sell, but the psychological appeal is considerable. The political consequences would be ugly.

Government officials propose, privately, a number of remedial steps for the United States to take. None, however, are very realistic, in that they disregard both political pressures in America on the trade issue and the need to correct America's gold outflow.

But if the United States cannot meet Japanese appeals, it could conceivably comfort official and business leaders by appearing to accord Japanese problems more concern. The Japanese are worried, and would be happier if the Americans held their hand and worried along with them.

HOW MANY PEOPLE HAVE EVER LIVED ON EARTH?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the February 1962 issue of Population Bulletin, published by the Population Reference Bureau, is devoted to the subject: "How Many People Have Ever Lived on Earth?"

The article, written by Editor Robert C. Cook, is based on estimates prepared by Fletcher Wellemeyer, a consultant, and Frank Lorimer of American University.

Demography is a relatively new science. An answer to the question of total population must of course be based, in part, on assumptions and guesses. A reading of this article brings home the point that human arithmetic has moved from a relatively simple exercise in addition—and occasionally subtraction—to one of geometric progression.

Concludes Editor Cook:

It took all of the vast reaches of time to build today's population of slightly over 3 billion. But it will take only 40 more years for population to reach 6 billion, if the present growth rates remain unchanged. The majority of the world's people still live close to the subsistence level, in poverty and squalor reminiscent of the Middle Ages. If the demographic transition to a balance betwen low birth and death rates could be hastened in the less-developed countries, this gulf might yet be bridged in time to avert a Malthusian disaster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this article in the RECORD.

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

HOW MANY PEOPLE HAVE EVER LIVED ON EARTH?

(By Robert C. Cook)

How many people have ever been born since the beginning of the human race?

What percentage does the present world population of 3 billion represent of the total number of people who have ever lived?

These questions are frequently asked the Population Reference Bureau's Information Service. Because of the perennial interest and because of the credence sometimes given to what would seem to be unrealistic appraisals, this issue presents an estimate prepared by Fletcher Wellemeyer, manpower, education, and personnel consultant, Washington, D.C., with Frank Lorimer, of American University, Washington, D.C. acting as adviser. This estimate, based on certain statistical, historic, and demographic assumptions set forth in an appendix, should be regarded as no more than a reasonable guess. It assumes that man first appeared about 600,000 years ago, a date which has been proposed for the dawn of the prehistoric era. However, this date obviously is a compromise, anthropologically speaking, between varying extremes.

Since then, it is estimated that about 77 billion babies have been born. Thus, today's population of approximately 3 billion is about 4 percent of that number.

Absolutely no information exists as to the size and distribution of prehistoric populations. Presumably they were not large, nor very widely distributed. If the 600000 B.C. date is accepted as a sound compromise, then only about 12 billion people—less than one-sixth of the total number ever born—are estimated to have lived before 6000 B.C.

Anthropologists and paleontologists differ by hundreds of thousands of years as to when man first walked this earth. Recent discoveries strongly suggest that the lifespan of the human species might date back as much as 2 million years. However, this time scale has not yet been accepted by all anthropologists.

If the "beginning" actually extended a million years prior to 600000 B.C., the estimated number of births prior to 6000 B.C. would be 32 billion, and the estimated total number, about 96 billion.

Prior to 1650, historical population data are very scanty for every part of the world. Despite this lack of knowledge, ancillary evidence exists which reveals the general pattern of human growth. Throughout the thousands of centuries which preceded the present technological age, human survival was such a touch-and-go affair that high fertility was essential to balance brutally high mortality. The human female—a relatively slow breeder, even among mammals—had to reproduce somewhere near her physiological limit in order for the family, the clan, the tribe and the nation to survive.

As human culture developed over the ages, the chances of survival tended to improve. When the invention of agriculture provided a more stable food supply, the base was laid for the maintenance of large populations and for their spread into new areas. However, high death rates continued to check population growth.

Until recently, at least a half of all babies born died before reaching maturity. Man's quest for some formula to avert death included magic, incantations and prayers, but none of these had shown any efficacy against the major killers. Then, with the advance of modern science, the mortality pattern of a million years was broken.

Jenner's dramatic discovery of vaccination for smallpox was the first of a multitude of discoveries destined to defer death, especially in infancy and childhood. This brilliant application of the scientific method to biology and medicine, together with improved agricultural technology, better transportation and the vast and complex nexus of an emerging industrial culture, set in motion forces which drastically lowered death rates and thereby greatly increased the efficiency of reproduction. In some countries, the birth rate declined also, although more slowly than the death rate. During the 19th century, the industrial countries of the West were the first to experience the transition from high to low birth and death rates. This transition took about 150 years.

These epochal changes profoundly altered the patterns of survival and population growth. In those countries of northern Europe and North America which were the first to exploit effectively the new medical discoveries, life expectancy at birth rose rapidly from 30 years to 40, then to 50, and, by 1960, to 70 years and more. Infant mortality declined drastically: now, 95 out of every 100 babies born in Western industrial countries live to reach adulthood.

Although the power to defer death is one of the greatest advances in man's long history, it has been the principal factor in the acceleration in the rate of population growth during the past century. Now, public health programs reach even the world's most remote villages, and death rates in the less developed areas are falling rapidly. But the traditionally high birth rates—so essential to offset the high death rates of even the very recent past—remain high. Thus, population growth soars.

Therefore, over the long span of history, the rate of population growth has tended to accelerate—almost imperceptibly at first; then slowly; and recently, at a rapid clip. By the beginning of the Christian era, 200–300 million people are believed to have lived on earth. That number had grown to some 500 million by 1650. Then the growth curve took a sharp upward trend. By 1850, world population was more than 1 billion. Today, it is over 3 billion.

The quickening tempo of growth is even more dramatically expressed in doubling time. It took hundreds of thousands of years for world population to reach the quarter-billion mark, at about the begin-

ning of the Christian era. Over 16 centuries more passed before that number reached an estimated half billion. It took only 200 additional years to reach 1 billion, and only 80 more years—to about 1930—to reach 2 billion. Population growth rates are still going up. During all of the eons of time—perhaps as long as 2 million years—the human race grew to its present total of 3 billion. But it will take only 40 years to add the next 3 billion, according to United Nations estimates. In certain nations and larger areas, populations will double in 25 years or even less, if growth rates remain unchanged.

This historical review traces the proliferation of the human species through three very broad timespans: Period I extends from 600000 B.C. to 6000 B.C.; period II extends to A.D. 1650; and period III, to 1962. These time periods are chosen because the dates mark important epochs in man's cultural development.

It should be emphasized, however, that not all portions of the globe experienced simultaneously the cultural and technological advances which mark these different stages of man's history. When the first European settlement was established in Australia in 1788, the aborigines there were in the stone age. Even today, some tribes living in New Guinea and elsewhere still remain at that level.

PERIOD I: THE OLD STONE AGE

Period I extends from 600000 to 6000 B.C. It begins early in the Paleolithic or old stone age and continues to the beginning of the Neolithic or new stone age. It is estimated that during this period numbers grew to about 5 million, that man's birth rate was close to 50 per thousand, and that there was an approximate total of 12 billion births.

Little, if anything, is known about population size during this hunting and gathering stage of man's existence. The total land area of the earth is approximately 58 million square miles. It seems reasonable to assume that not more than 20 million square miles could have been used successfully by the relatively few who inhabited the earth at that time. The consensus of competent opinion indicates that, on moderately fertile soil in a temperate climate, about 2 square miles per person would be needed for a hunting and gathering economy.

It must be assumed that there were severe limitations on man's numbers during this period; and that his life cycle and average generation were much shorter than they are today. Man existed for the most part in wandering bands in order to survive. Our ancient ancestors were completely subject to all the vagaries of the weather and the ecological cycle of the game animals on which their existence depended. Food shortages were usually endemic, and the ravages of epidemics were routine, although the wide dispersal of the population tended to localize these hazards. Nevertheless, the picture that emerges is one in which births and deaths were roughly balanced, with births perhaps holding a narrow margin.

THE LONG TIMESPAN OF PREHISTORY

Anthropologists and paleontologists are gradually putting together, piece by piece, the great jigsaw puzzle that is the history of early man. Dr. T. D. Stewart, Head Curator of the Department of Anthropology, National Museum, in Washington, D.C., points out that only a few fossils of humans who lived in this period have been found. Nevertheless, man's long time-scale is known today with far greater accuracy than ever before, mainly because of the new radioactive dating techniques. According to Dr. Stewart, new discoveries demand new theories or that existing theories be adjusted.

The remains of Zinjanthropus, recently found in the Olduvai Gorge of Tanganyika by L. S. B. Leakey, curator of the Coryndon Museum, Nairobi, Kenya, which Leakey believes date back almost 2 million years, probably do not represent the beginning of the line. Zinjanthropus has been called man because he was a toolmaker in the crudest sense. Since his physical form represents a very early stage of human evolution, it is not advisable to assume so early a beginning for purposes of estimating human population growth.

However, it is generally believed that "man" had reached the point of being able to make simple tools and to talk by a half million or even a million years ago. Though he presumably emerged much earlier, Homo sapiens first appeared with great force in Europe sometime between 25,000 and 30,000 years ago. Very little is known about where he came from or about his connection with the Neanderthal people who were one of many types of man to precede him. By 20000 B.C., he had created the first great art in human history: The magnificent paintings and other artifacts found in certain caves in southern France and northern Spain. He engraved and carved bone and ivory with faithful representations of his women and of the animals he knew so well: The mammoth, the bison, and others. These were believed to have had magic significance—to bring fertility to the clan and success to the hunter.

No birth rates or death rates have ever been found on the walls of the prehistoric caves. Thus, what is the puzzle of man to the anthropologist and the paleontologist becomes the enigma of man to the demographer. A United Nations report, "The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends," published in 1953, presents a comprehensive survey of world population through the whole of man's history. Readers are referred to it for a more complete historical survey than this limited space permits. The report states:

"That men, using tools, have been living on this planet for at least one hundred thousand years, and possibly for over a million years, is proved by various types of evidence. For example, the definitely human skeletal remains found at Choukoutien, China, in association with artificial stone and bone implements and possible indications of the use of fire, were deposited during the second interglacial period, or earlier. There is evidence, also, that several divergent types of men emerged, some of whom had specialized characteristics which place them outside the ancestral line of all living races today. The Neanderthal people, who were dominant in Europe during the last (Würm) glaciation, were apparently such a divergent race."

PERIOD II: 6000 B.C. TO A.D. 1650

Starting with the beginning of the new stone age, this period extends through the bronze and iron periods, through classical antiquity and the Dark Ages, the Renaissance, and the Reformation. It is estimated that world population increased 100-fold during the period, growing from 5 million to half a billion, and that about 42 billion births occurred.

It is believed that at the beginning of the era the earth was still very sparsely settled and population was widely dispersed. Vast areas of the globe were not inhabited, partly because the last glaciations had just receded.

It was during this period that man began to produce food instead of simply consuming what nature had laid before him. In the Near East, he had already passed the stage of the most primitive village-farming communities which grew out of the earliest agriculture with its domestication of animals. Some of these ancient communities developed into the earliest known urban settlements. The development of agriculture with its settled farming community spread to other areas of the earth during this period. Eventually, it was to change drastically man's pattern of survival and his way of life.

The earliest scene of settled village-farming communities appears to have been in the Near East. Robert J. Braidwood, professor of the Oriental Institute of Chicago, and field director of the Jarmo project, a recently studied archeological site in Iraq, says: "It is probably very difficult for us now to conceptualize fully (or to exaggerate) the consequences of the first appearance of effective food production. The whole range of human existence, from the biological (including diet, demography, disease, and so on) through the cultural (social organization, politics, religion, esthetics, and so forth) bands of the spectrum took on completely new dimensions."

Braidwood described the hilly piedmont and intermontane regions surrounding the great "fertile crescent" which starts in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, sweeps around to the north to touch southern Turkey and Syria, then curves south to the shores of the Mediterranean and into Egypt. One radioactive-carbon date suggests that this development was well advanced by 4000 B.C.

Sheep, goats, pigs, cattle, and some kind of horse-like animal were used by those living in the area. Their plants were wheat and barley. Braidwood notes that some sort of hybridization or mutation, particularly in domesticated plants, must have taken place before certain species could have been moved to other areas. However, they seem to have moved into the Danube Valley by 4000 B.C., and into western Europe by 2500 B.C.

In other words, man was learning to utilize his environment more efficiently; thus it could support more people than ever before. But numbers were still regulated by the food-producing quality of the land. Population grew in times of plenty and declined when food became scarce and when disease decimated large populations, as it did in Europe during the Dark Ages.

During the bronze age, man began to use copper and bronze and to build towns, cities, and states. Kings, advanced religions, social classes, writing, and enduring monuments, such as the Nile pyramids, appeared during this period. The iron age brought iron metallurgy, the invention of the alphabet, the use of coined money, and the spread of commerce and navigation.

The early and great empires and cultures developed: those of Egypt, Rome, and Greece; of King Asoka in India; of the Han dynasty in China; and, later, the empires of the Mayas and the Incas in the New World. The Hindu, Confucian, Buddhist, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, and other great religions emerged.

THE CITY—PERIOD II

The great cities of ancient times rose in rich valleys adjacent to the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, along the Indus and the Nile, and along the Yangtze in China. The first great urban civilization arose about 3500 B.C. in Mesopotamia, along the Tigris and Euphrates. Another grew up in Egypt before 3000 B.C. and still another in Crete. A fourth arose along the banks of the Indus in western India, but whether this grew directly out of Neolithic beginnings or was a transplant of the Sumerian culture of Mesopotamia is a matter of dispute. Urban civilizations developed in China at a later date, and still later in some areas of tropical Central America and in Peru.

The urban societies of Mesopotamia, China, and Egypt maintained complex centralized control of soil and water resources in order to provide irrigation and to control floods. These "hydraulic" civilizations supported very dense populations with highly integrated social systems. The individual peasant was allowed a small land area which

produced more food than his family needed. Such civilizations have persisted in Egypt, India, China, and elsewhere to the present day, with little change in the economic basis of life but with periodic rises and declines.

The ancient Mediterranean, Asian, and American urban civilizations appear to have been isolated flowerings of human culture which culminated in "golden ages" and then declined. The archeological record abundantly reveals their wavelike nature. For additional information, readers are referred to an earlier issue of Population Bulletin, "The World's Great Cities: Evolution or Devolution?" (September 1960).

THE A.D. ERA OF PERIOD II

The United Nations study previously mentioned states that, at the beginning of the Christian era, the world's population was likely to have between 200 and 300 million people. Discussing the lack of historic demographic information, the report states:

"Various kinds of evidence indicate that man's numbers became adjusted to the food-producing capacity of the land in ancient times—increasing as it rose and declining as it fell. Unfortunately little of this evidence is of a census type, and most of the remainder does not provide a basis for estimating the number of inhabitants of an area. Large parts of the world's population were subject to some sort of census enumeration near the beginning of the Christian era, but the information available from these censuses has limited value. Roman censuses were taken for administrative purposes and were restricted to 'citizens,' an expanding category as citizenship rights were extended to outlying regions. Moreover only adult males were included in some of these censuses, while all household members except 'children' were included in others. Chinese censuses at about this time provided reports on total population but interpretation of the results involves many difficulties. Elaborate records were kept by the ancient Incas, but their meaning is obscure."

J. C. Russell, professor of history at the University of New Mexico, who has contributed much in the demographic history of the West, has traced the population changes within the Roman Empire from the second century A.D. to the year A.D. 543, a period he characterizes generally as one of imperial decline:

"However, within the general picture there are great differences in the trends. Actually most of the decrease occurred in western Mediterranean lands: Italy, Gaul, Iberia, and North Africa, together with Greece and Egypt. In Syria the population seems to have held even while in Gaul and Britain something like recovery must have occurred at the end of the period. Eastern Asia Minor and the Slavic area probably increased markedly. The German and Scandinavian spheres apparently held even in spite of emigration. The information about the central, eastern, and northern parts of Europe is so vague and uncertain that there may have been a considerable increase in population. The general rise in temperature should certainly have reduced the semiglacial conditions of the northern countries and made them attractive for grain-growing groups."

In the second and third centuries A.D., Rome suffered two devastating epidemics which have not been identified but their virulence suggests bubonic plague. According to Dr. Russell:

"The period from A.D. 543 to 950 probably marks the lowest ebb of population in Europe since the early Roman Empire. It covers the first great attack of the plague, the worst epidemic to strike the area with which we are concerned. Following it came the Mohammedan invasions from the seminomadic areas of the lands surrounding the Mediterranean. From the east in the 10th century the Hungarians scourged most of Europe and what they missed was visited by the terrible raids of the Vikings from the North. Some measure of the weakness of the European population is indicated by the feeble defense put up against these invaders by the governments of Europe."

Endemic diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis were prevalent, and the latter was particularly fatal among young people. In fact, the combination of both diseases occurred quite frequently and was highly fatal. Dr. Russell speculates that during the periods of population decline in early medieval Europe, much carefully tilled and drained acreage lapsed into breeding grounds for mosquitoes; and that a period of wet, warm weather about A.D. 800–900 greatly increased the incidence of malaria.

TABLE I.—*Area and estimates of population of the Roman Empire, A.D. 14*

	Area (thousands of square miles)	Population (thousands)	Persons per square mile
Total, Empire	1,289	54,000	41
European part	861	23,000	26
Asiatic part	257	19,500	77
African part	171	11,500	67

The span of life (extreme length of life) seems to have been around 100 years, as it is now. Those who could avoid infection were likely to live to considerable ages. According to John Durand, Assistant Director in Charge of Population, the United Nations Bureau of Social Affairs, the best basis for making mortality estimates of the Roman period is a study of tombstone inscriptions for males dying between the ages of 15 and 42. This method corrects the exaggeration of years that humans are apt to indulge in, even on tombstones, and allows for the underrepresentation of children's deaths. On this basis, Durand concludes that life expectancy at birth for the whole population of the Roman Empire was probably only about 25 or 30 years.

After the year 1000, it appears that population began to increase; and, between 1000 and 1348, that growth was phenomenal, particularly in northern Europe. The Empire of Charlemagne had already capitalized on the upward population movement, and stronger governments began to develop in Germany, Scandinavia, and even in Russia. The Crusades spread Christianity throughout the Middle East and brought contact between the Moslem and Christian worlds.

Then in 1348, the bubonic plague, which seems to have first appeared in the sixth century in Egypt, suddenly erupted in Europe in a more virulent form, taking a frightful toll of lives. Russell states that "the years 1348–50 saw a very heavy loss of life, 20 to 25 percent in most European countries. The decline continued with later epidemics until the population of about 1400 was near 60 percent of the preplague figures."

Between 1500 and 1700, far-ranging social, economic and intellectual revolutions began which formed the basis for the modern world. The era of medieval authority was first challenged in northern Italy, at the time of the Renaissance. This was followed by the age of discovery, with voyages around Africa and to the New World. At the same time, the reformation set the stage for the revival of intellectual development in northern Europe. For the first time since the Golden Age of Greece, the human intellect began to look at the world objectively. This led to the birth of the scientific method: new concepts of the nature of matter, energy and, ultimately, of life began to capture the minds of men. Out of this intellectual revolution came powerful new insights which were eventually to greatly change man's pattern of living and dying.

In Europe about the middle of the 17th century—after the end of the Thirty Years' War and the period of peace and stability which followed—agricultural methods improved, slowly at first and then rapidly. New crops were introduced and crops were rotated; manure and fertilizers were used more generally; and the soil was cultivated more extensively. Even though these more advanced methods increased food production, the margin of plenty continued to be precarious, especially for those who lived in cities. A comparable agricultural expansion seems to have occurred in China at about the same time.

Unfortunately, little is known about population growth and decline during this period for the vast continent of Asia, particularly for India and China. M. K. Bennett, director of the Food Research Institute, Stanford University, has recognized the need for a continent-by-continent or region-by-region survey. He estimates that world population in After Christ 1000, was somewhere around 275 million, or "probably less than half of the population of Europe in 1949; that there has been one century, the 14th [the century of the Black Death in Europe] in which world population did not increase at all, but declined."

TABLE II.—*Approximate population of the world and its subdivisions, 1000–1600*

[In millions]

Year	World	Europe	Asiatic Russia	Southwest Asia	India	China major [1]	Japan	Southeast Asia, Oceania	Africa	The Americas
1000	275	42	5	32	48	70	4	11	50	13
1100	306	48	6	33	50	79	6	12	55	17
1200	348	61	7	34	51	89	8	14	61	23
1300	384	73	8	33	50	99	11	15	67	28
1400	373	45	9	27	46	112	14	16	74	30
1500	446	69	11	29	54	125	16	19	82	41
1600	486	89	13	30	68	140	20	21	90	15

[1] China proper, plus Manchuria and Korea, Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Formosa.

The earlier hydraulic civilizations became subject to disorders which checked and, in some cases, reversed their population growth.

The Americas had an estimated population of 16 million at the time of their discovery by Columbus. Julian Steward, research professor of anthropology, University of Illinois, has estimated the population of the different regions of the American Hemisphere in 1492 as follows:

North America:	
North of Mexico	1,000,000
Mexico	4,500,000
West Indies	225,000
Central America	736,000

South America:

Andean area	6,131,000
Remainder	2,898,000
Total	15,490,000

PERIOD III—A.D. 1650–1962

If man's existence on earth is viewed as a day, this period is less than a minute. But a fourth or more of all human beings ever born have lived during this brief span.

The period brought a sixfold increase in human numbers: from an estimated half-billion in 1950 to over 3 billion in 1962. There were approximately 23 billion births during this period—over half as many as in the preceding 76 centuries.

World population doubled between 1650 and 1850, growing beyond the 1-billion mark. It doubled again, to reach 2 billion by 1930, in only 80 years. Since that time, the rate of growth has accelerated steadily. Now over 50 million more people are added each year. If the current rate remains unchanged, today's population will double again in less than 40 years.

A steadily falling death rate, especially during the last century, is mainly responsible for the very rapid acceleration in population growth. It is estimated that during 1650–1750, population was growing at about 0.3 percent a year; during 1750–1850, at about 0.5 perecnt; 1850–1950, at 0.8 percent. Currently, the rate is somewhere between 1.6 and 1.9 percent.

This period brings man through to the modern agricultural-industrial age with its tremendous scientific and technological discoveries which have greatly speeded up the rate of social change in the Western world and which have revolutionized agriculture, industry, communication, transportation, et cetera. These developments have made possible the support of the mammoth populations in numerous areas of the world. However, many of those technological advances are only beginning to touch the less developed areas where living levels for over half of the world's people are only a little, if any, above what they were during much of the earlier history of the race.

For the world as a whole, the mid-17th century is a benchmark in the pattern of population growth. Then, the upward surge in the numbers of people began. Just why the response to the early stirrings of the modern age was so rapid is not entirely clear, though many of the major factors which stimulated the increase in human numbers can be recognized. In Europe, the frightful famines and epidemics that marked the Dark Ages seem to have decreased, although hunger and disease were still endemic. The discovery of the New World opened the way for great transatlantic migrations to the rich, sparsely settled lands of the Americas. To some extent, this relieved the growing population pressure in Europe and provided a new source of food for the Old World. It also gave impetus to the tremendous growth of populations of European origin—at home and in European colonies—which amounted to a ninefold increase during the period.

TABLE III.—*Estimates of world population by regions, 1650–1960*

Source of estimates and date	Estimated population in millions							
	World	Africa	Northern America [1]	Latin America [2]	Asia (excluding U.S.S.R.) [3]	Europe and Asiatic U.S.S.R. [3]	Oceania	Area of European settlement [4]
Willcox's estimates:								
1650	470	100	1	7	257	103	2	113
1750	694	100	1	10	437	144	2	157
1800	919	100	6	23	595	193	2	224
1850	1,091	100	26	33	656	274	2	335
1900	1,571	141	81	63	857	423	6	573
Carr-Saunders' estimates:								
1650	545	100	1	12	327	103	2	118
1750	728	95	1	11	475	144	2	158
1800	906	90	6	19	597	192	2	219
1850	1,171	95	26	33	741	274	2	335
1900	1,608	120	81	63	915	423	6	573
United Nations estimates:								
1920	1,810	140	117	91	966	487	9	704
1930	2,013	155	135	109	1,072	532	10	786
1940	2,246	172	146	131	1,212	573	11	861
1950	2,495	200	167	163	1,376	576	13	919
1960	2,972	244	200	207	1,665	641		1,064

[1] United States, Canada, Alaska, St. Pierre, and Miquelon.
[2] Central and South America and Caribbean Islands.
[3] Estimates for Asia and Europe in Willcox's and Carr-Saunders' series have been adjusted so as to include the population of the Asiatic U.S.S.R. with that of Europe.
[4] Includes northern America, Latin America, Europe, and the Asiatic U.S.S.R. and Oceania.

The development of the scientific method and the application of this new knowledge to technology stimulated the industrial and vital revolutions which so greatly changed man's way of life throughout the Western World. The industrial revolution brought the transition from agrarian to industrial societies—a transition which is beginning only now for large areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The vital revolution brought the Western industrial nations through the demographic transition: from high birth and death rates to low birth and death rates.

More facts and learned estimates concerning world population are available for this period since census taking began during the 17th century. The first censuses were conducted in 1655 by the French and British in their Canadian colonies. Iceland took a count in 1703, Sweden in 1748, and Denmark in 1769. The United States took its first national census in 1790. Great Britain took its first in 1801.

The first estimate of world population ever to be compiled was published in the 17th century by a Jesuit priest named Riccioli who estimated that 1 billion people then inhabited the earth: 100 million in Europe, 500 million in Asia, 100 million in Africa, 200 million in America, and 100 million in Oceania. It appears that Riccioli reported the conjectures of others rather than his own. Other contemporary estimates of the 17th century all range below Riccioli's and one as low as 320 million.

G. King, a 17th-century English scholar, estimating population densities for the various continents, allocated 17 acres per head for Europe, 20 for Asia, 64 for Africa, and 129 for America. This yielded a total of 700 million for the world, or 600 million, rejecting a hypothetical southern continent. If correct land areas as now known are substituted, the estimate would be 874 million. It should be noted that this estimate is two-thirds higher than the estimate of approximately 500 million accepted by modern scholars.

Even though Asia's population continued to increase during the period, its proportion of world population declined from about 58 percent in 1650 to 53 percent in 1920 (excluding the Asiatic part of the U.S.S.R.). Africa's proportion also declined, from 20 to 8 percent. But the proportion for Europe, including all of the U.S.S.R., rose from 20 to 27 percent. Since 1920, the proportion for Asia and Africa has again increased, while that for Europe has declined.

Today, the combined population of the Americas is about 400 million. Their proportion of world population increased from approximately 2 percent in 1650 to 14 percent at the present time. As previously mentioned, the indigenous American populations were heavily decimated by diseases brought in by Europeans and by wars with early colonizers. Much of the subsequent increase was due to immigration and to the proliferation of the immigrant groups. More recently, the descendants of the indigenous Americans have been increasing rapidly.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC TRANSITION OF PERIOD III

Application of the scientific method to medical technology brought man the ability to defer death. In the Western industrial countries, this has changed his pattern of survival far more rapidly than any other major social development throughout his long history. Similarly, in the Western World, knowledge about the control of fertility is widespread. As the traditional pattern of high birth and death rates changed to one of low birth and death rates, man's reproductive process has become much more efficient.

In the heavily populated, less developed countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the application of scientific techniques to defer death is generally accepted and quite widely practiced; but the control of fertility has not begun to be practiced extensively enough to affect birth rates. As a result, rapidly falling death rates combined with traditionally high birth rates have touched off a surge in the rate of population growth.

Modern public health methods have cut death rates by one-third or more in a single year in some countries. With the drastic decline in infant and child mortality, the proportion of the population under 15 years of age tends to increase. It is now over 40 percent in many of these countries, as compared with about 20 percent in some countries of western and northern Europe.

It is expected that the growth rate will increase even further in many areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, as death rates continue to decline. This will surely happen unless effective measures can be devised which will speed up the demographic transition and the rate of social change. Simply stated, acceptable measures must be found to bring birth rates into balance with modern low death rates, thereby completing the demographic transition. Unless birth rates are reduced, population growth rates will continue upward until they are checked eventually by a rise in the death rate.

Although information about the number and distribution of the world's population and vital rates is far more extensive today than at any time in history, there are still large blank spaces in the world's demographic map. Only about half of the world's births and approximately two-thirds of the deaths are formally registered.

Discussing the present rapid rate of population growth, the latest United Nations Demographic Yearbook points out that approximately one-half of the world's population lives in only four countries—China (mainland), India, the U.S.S.R. and the United States—and that the reliability of world population estimates depends largely

on the accuracy of the information available about the population of these countries:

"Similarly the 1950–59 average rate of increase, estimated in the range of 1.5 to 2.0 percent per annum for the four largest populations and 1.6 to 1.9 percent per annum for the remainder of the world, can be placed, in view of possibly compensating errors, between 1.6 and 1.9 percent per annum for the world as a whole.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated population and vital rates for the world by region, 1950–75*

Continent and region	Midyear population, 1959 (millions)	Annual rate of increase, 1950–59 (percent)	Vital rates, 1955–59		Medium projection to 1975 (millions)
			Birth rate	Death rate	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
World total	2,907	1.7	36	19	3,830
Africa	237	1.9	46	27	303
Northern Africa	78	1.9	45	26	76
Tropical and southern Africa	159	1.9	47	28	226
America	398	2.1	34	14	543
Northern America	196	1.8	25	9	240
Middle America	65	2.7	45	18	99
South America	137	2.3	42	19	204
Asia	1,622	1.8	42	23	2,210
Southwest Asia	74	2.5	46	21	116
South Central Asia	546	1.8	44	26	737
Southeast Asia	208	2.1	44	23	280
East Asia	794	1.8	39	21	1,075
Europe	423	.8	19	10	476
Northern and Western Europe	141	.7	18	11	154
Central Europe	137	.8	19	10	156
Southern Europe	145	.9	21	10	166
Oceania	16	2.4	25	9	21
U.S.S.R.	211	1.7	25	8	275

"Actually in view of declining mortality, it is virtually certain that the rate of world population growth has now surpassed 1.5 percent per annum, and quite possible that it has attained 2 percent per annum. Because of this decline in mortality, world population certainly increased in the year 1959 by at least 45 million, and possibly by as much as 55 million. Again it is evident that much of the uncertainty is caused by the lack of precise knowledge regarding the population of China (mainland). Large margins of error must also be allowed for in the estimated annual increases in India, in other parts of Asia, and in Africa."

The Chinese census of 1953 is very difficult to appraise and might introduce an error of as much as 90 million in the present world population.

WHAT IS PAST IS PROLOG

Since man first appeared on earth, human arithmetic has moved from a relatively simple exercise in addition to a complicated one of geometric progression. It took all of the vast reaches of time to build today's population of slightly over 3 billion. But it will take only 40 more years for population to reach 6 billion, if the present growth rates remain unchanged.

Life on this earth was a precarious gamble for homo sapiens for hundreds of thousands of years. Driven by his natural reluctance to endure an early death, man ultimately discovered and then perfected the power to defer death. That he has succeeded is a notable tribute to his genius and to his humanitarian and philanthropic instincts.

It is noteworthy that the desire to control fertility has never had the emotional imperatives which brought the power over death. Only modest efforts have been made thus far to discover effective methods of fertility control which would be acceptable to the people of all cultures and religions. Less than modest efforts have been made to disseminate what knowledge is now available to all of the world's people who would benefit from that knowledge. Consequently, during the past decade of rapid death-rate decline in the less developed countries, there has been no measurable reduction in high birth rates; so population growth has increased.

Rapid population growth cannot be maintained indefinitely in any part of the world. If birth rates do not decline in overcrowded lands, death rates eventually will rise to check growth.

The gulf which exists today between the peoples of the world has widened: life is better than ever before for those who live in the Western industrial countries. But the majority of the world's people still live close to the subsistence level, in poverty and squalor reminiscent of the Middle Ages. If the demographic transition to a balance between low birth and death rates could be hastened in the less developed countries, this gulf might yet be bridged in time to avert a Malthusian disaster.

APPENDIX

The statistical and general demographic assumptions used to determine the number of people who have ever been born were provided the Population Reference Bureau by J. Fletcher Wellemeyer, an independent manpower consultant, Washington, D.C., in consultation with Frank Lorimer, American University, Washington, D.C.

The estimate was made on the basis of three time periods:

Period	Number of years in period	Number of births per year at beginning of period	Number of births per year at end of period	Number of births in period (billions)
I. 600000–6000 B.C.	594,000	"1"	250,000	12
II. 6000 B.C.–A.D. 1650	7,650	250,000	25,000,000	42
III. A.D. 1650–1962	312	25,000,000	110,000,000	23
Total				77

To obtain the number of births at the beginning and end of these periods, certain assumptions were made regarding birth rates and the size of populations. It was assumed that at the beginning of the Neolithic era the population was 5 million and that the annual birth rate was 50 per thousand. The procedure assumes a smooth increase. The growth was undoubtedly irregular, but the estimates may fairly represent the net effect of the ups and downs.

By 1650, the annual number of births was estimated at 25 million, corresponding to a population of about 500 million. The 1962 world population of 3.05 billion, the number of births and birth rate of 36 per thousand are based on United Nations estimates.

The 600,000 years' duration of the Paleolithic era is based on the assumption that manlike types were then in existence but in very small numbers. Earlier dates have been given a few species by certain authorities, but some of these dates are questionable, and the earlier species may have been considerably less than manlike. The 600,000-year period seems a reasonable compromise between extreme possibilities.

Once the number of births at the dates indicated was determined, the total number of births for each period was calculated at a constant rate of increase for the period.

The estimated rates of increase differ sharply. For the long Paleolithic period, the average annual rate of increase was only 0.02 per thousand; during 6000 B.C. to A.D. 1650, it rose to 0.6; and during 1650–1962, it reached 4.35.

For the figures derived here, the following equation was used:

$$\Sigma B_t = \frac{B_o e^{rt}}{r}$$

B_o is the number of births per year at the beginning of the period; t is the number of years in the period; e is the base of natural logarithms; and r is the annual rate of increase during the period.

The value of r is obtained by solving for r the equation:

$$\frac{B_t}{B_o} = e^{rt}$$

where B_o is the number of births the first year of the period, and B_t is the number of births the final year of the period.

GREATER INDUSTRIAL USES OF FARM SURPLUSES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on January 31 I spoke on this floor in reference to greater industrial uses of our farm surpluses. I then pointed out that there were literally hundreds of possibilities in industry for the use of these burdensome surpluses, including two important items such as building construction and highway construction.

At that time I also discussed the possibility of alcohol from grains being used as a motor fuel.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter written by Milburn Petty and published in the Oil Daily of February 5, 1962.

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

PETTY'S OIL LETTER

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 3, 1962.

DEAR SIR: Some farm-State Senators just won't quit on the idea of using surplus farm crops to make alcohol, which could then be blended into gasoline as a motor fuel.

Some of these Senators, notably CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, and CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, are engaged again in their biennial effort to stimulate legislation for more research on how an alky-gas program might be set up. (A research bill, S. 2759, is on the Senate table, awaiting more sponsors.)

Five years ago, a Presidential commission made a thorough study of the possibilities

along this line and concluded that "the Commission finds it impracticable to recommend an alcohol motor fuel program," and commented that this finding would probably not be changed by more studies in the future.

But, the prospects for alky-gas always appear good on paper and in theory—making for good politics in the farm belt—so no one should be surprised if another research program is set up to go over the ground again.

The idea of alky-gas is so attractive because an alcohol blend of under 10 percent would consume an enormous amount of grain—and such a program would probably wipe out the entire grain surplus.

The 1957 Presidential Commission, however, found that no blend of less than 10 percent would be practical, that this would require over 2 billion bushels of grain—more than was available in surplus then—and that plants to process such an amount would cost about $2 billion—and would probably have to be built by the Government—and that total cost to the public, in higher prices for gasoline alone, would be over $1 billion a year.

Major problem involved in making cheap alcohol from grain is to remove the protein before fermentation of starch for alcohol (or before starch is taken out for other industrial uses) in order to upgrade the protein into a human food. If this problem could be licked, the resulting alcohol would be a byproduct, with the cost then low enough to compete with oil in making gasoline.

The Presidential Commission acknowledged that a vigorous research program might find a solution to the problem and that possibly the byproduct alcohol cost might be low enough to compete with petroleum.

On the Senate floor, Senator CURTIS pushed for a new research effort on the protein extraction problem—saying (as he has many times in the past): "It has long been my hope we could use alcohol produced from grain as a part of our motor fuel."

He said that "improved methods" of upgrading the protein for humans would make protein worth many times its value as a livestock food and that the alcohol will then "become more or less a byproduct and it can be sold at a price to compete with gasoline."

CURTIS said oil companies "have no valid ground for alarm over the inauguration of such a program"—the petroleum industry should be interested in solving the farm problem (which is a big item in the Government's budget)—and farmers are oil's best customers. CURTIS also asserted that alky-gas would still be distributed by the petroleum industry and that "they (oil companies) will not lose—rather they will gain."

Very truly yours,

MILBURN PETTY.
JAMES M. COLLINS.

Mr. CURTIS. We welcome the comment and interest of these spokesmen for the petroleum industry. There is no conflict of interest between the farmers who want an outlet for their surpluses and the petroleum industry when all the facts are in.

THE CASE OF WILLIAM A. WIELAND

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I want to say for the record that I am glad the Internal Security Subcommittee is pursuing an inquiry into the State Department security risk cases identified by Reporter Sarah McClendon at the President's news conference January 24, 1962.

The case of William A. Wieland especially deserves the closest possible investigation. Here is a man, a State Department official, who has been denounced by four former U.S. Ambassadors in public testimony as untrustworthy, incompetent, a supporter of leftist elements in Latin America, and as instrumental in the fall of Cuba to communism.

I regret that the President saw fit to leap to the defense of accused security risks in such an impetuous fashion. I am sorry that he turned aside Mrs. McClendon's question in such a manner as to cause it to be interpreted as a rebuke.

As the Kilgore (Tex.) News-Herald commented:

Press conferences are for asking questions, not sweeping them under the rug. If there are any more questions about security risks, let them be asked, even at the risk of rebukes. The Nation needs to know about such things.

I believe that the majority of Americans share my concern regarding this incident. I believe they share my concern about accused and known security risks occupying important positions in the State Department.

My mail has been heavy in quantity and 100 percent in support of Mrs. McClendon's inquiry into these State Department security cases. I have heard that White House mail has predominately supported Mrs. McClendon. I have been advised that the various press headquarters in Washington have received mail addressed to Mrs. McClendon, supporting her.

I quote the following excerpts from mail received in my office:

Long Beach, Calif.:

Mrs. Sarah McClendon, by her courageous action, has opened the door for a long overdue probe of the State Department.

Midland, Tex.:

Your fellow Texan, Sarah McClendon, asked President Kennedy the $64,000 question that has been a matter of concern for years to those of us who are fearful of our State Department in these perilous times.

Venice, Calif.:

Heartiest congratulations plus to Sarah McClendon.

San Diego, Calif.:

Sarah McClendon's questions should be the wedge to open all doors. Offer a bill to give her the DSC or DSM.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place several articles and editorials on this subject in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan. 30, 1962]

THE WIELAND AFFAIR

One year ago this month the conservative magazine National Review charged that a man who went by the name of Arturo Guillermo Montenegro was once a terrorist in Cuba, and that with the backing of Franklin Roosevelt's Under Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, this man rose rapidly in the State Department to become head of the Caribbean desk under his real name, William Arthur Wieland.

National Review also said that two former Ambassadors to Cuba had linked Mr. Wieland to the Castro takeover. The magazine said Arthur Gardner had told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that William Wieland had supported leftist elements in Latin America and had contended that the Castro movement was not Communist. Earl T. Smith said Mr. Wieland was a Castro admirer.

Robert C. Hill, former Ambassador to Mexico, testified that Mr. Wieland was neither a competent officer nor a man who could be trusted. And William D. Pawley, former Ambassador to Brazil and Peru, said Mr. Wieland's activities in Rio de Janeiro were "of a nature that was displeasing to me although there was nothing specific I could put my hands on."

This was apparently the extent of published information which was derogatory to Mr. Wieland until Correspondent Sarah McClendon identified him at a Presidential press conference last week as one of two well-known security risks. The President denied the two men were security risks, and said he hoped Mrs. McClendon's question had not done harm to the men's reputations.

We surmise that those sharp words will not mark the end of the Wieland affair. The American people are entitled to know more about this man's background. If it is as clear and clean as the President says, Mr. Wieland will have nothing to lose and much to gain by a full revelation of his past.

[From the El Paso Times]

EVERYDAY EVENTS

(By W. J. Hooten)

Sarah McClendon, who has been Washington correspondent for the Times since 1947, found herself in the news again as the result of asking a question of President Kennedy at his press conference last week.

Which caused Associated Press Writer Arthur L. Edson to observe:

"Nobody—especially a President of the United States—has ever been able to ignore Sarah McClendon.

"This plump, reddish-haired correspondent for 14 newspapers from Texas to New England has always had a knack for irritating a Chief Executive."

Writing about Sarah at the Presidential press conferences, Edson said:

"In theory a President can answer or ignore anyone he wants to.

"In practice he usually recognizes the most persistent and the loudest.

"Here Sarah McClendon was in her element.

"She usually gets a seat up near the front, and leaps quickly to her feet. Possibly no reporter has asked as many questions as she has.

"Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower used to seem particularly nettled by her, and—or so it seemed to other reporters—he would play little games by pointing to those around her and acting as if he didn't see her at all.

"But, sooner or later, her persistence paid off, and he would nod her way."

It is difficult to decide whether AP Writer Edson was being complimentary to Sarah McClendon, or whether he was just doing some factual reporting the way he saw it.

GETS ENCOURAGEMENT

After Sarah's brush with President Kennedy last week she wrote me that telegrams and long-distance calls of congratulations and encouragement came from all parts of the country. She said several offers of "money if needed" were made. She wrote that a member of the New York Stock Exchange interrupted transactions "on the floor" to call to offer backing and to say, "If you need money let me know."

A group of women in Mesa, Ariz., called Sarah to offer their encouragement and added, "If you need any letters written, let us know."

A STANCH DEMOCRAT

I have known Sarah McClendon personally for 15 years. I admire her spunk, although at times I fear she is a little persistent at Presidential press conferences.

I'm wondering what her brush with President Kennedy will bring. Sarah is a stanch Democrat and she was for Kennedy even before he received the nomination.

MRS. MCCLENDON VERSUS J.F.K.

(By Holmes Alexander)

President Kennedy held his 21st Presidential news conference January 24, and it was a so-so performance.

Not even a cub reporter would write such a lead as that—a stale, listless, so-what sentence—but I have a reason. A whole lot of daily reporters praised Mr. Kennedy's last performance (James Reston of the New York Times said J.F.K. was "in his glory") so far beyond its merits that the bug of suspicion begins to bite.

What goes on here? A cult of the personality? A conspiracy of illusion about the Emperor's new clothes? Murray Marder of the Washington Post and Bill Knighton of the Baltimore Sun were among those who overpraised the handsome, articulate, popular world-famous young man who is often brilliant but who, last week (and the week before) was in a conspicuous slump.

His most publicized rejoinder to Reporter Sarah McClendon was not the icy, sharp, shrewd riposte which some front-page accounts made it appear. Mrs. McClendon got by far the better of the exchange. She mentioned "two well-known security risks" and instantly named them when the President challenged her. She was taloned and merciless for the kill. He was flustered and so much on the defensive that his grammar and sequence broke down, giving me a nostalgic sense of return to the Eisenhower era.

Moreover, for the first time in anybody's memory, the conference was abruptly terminated nearly 5 minutes ahead of the customary half hour. To the astonishment of all around me, there came an abrupt, "Thank you, Mr. President," almost as if Press Secretary Salinger had signaled from the stage for somebody to get his man out of the ring.

While the President quit early, Mrs. McClendon was quickly surrounded by a stellar group of reporters, led by Eddie Folliard, of the Washington Post, and Bob Donovan, of the New York Herald Tribune, who drafted her for an impromptu press conference of her own.

Mr. Kennedy's admirers in the press credited him with quick thinking in coming to the defense of William Arthur Wieland and J. Clayton Miller, who Mrs. McClendon named as "security risks." My opinion is that Mr. Kennedy made one of the big blunders of his White House career. J. Clayton Miller is a new man in town, but William Arthur Wieland, whatever his official security rating, is almost indefensible as a State Department public servant.

No less than four former ambassadors—Smith, Pawley, Gardiner, and Hill—have denounced Wieland by name as instrumental in the fall of Cuba to communism. Both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have found Wieland to be an embarrassment and have tried to hide him in the State Department's organizational maze. Wieland is an ex-newspaperman who left journalism and entered diplomacy under circumstances that the President of the United States ought not to be defending. Had Mr. Kennedy, a former member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a former newsman, really been as informed and quick-witted as ballyhooed in the press notices, he would have known enough about Wieland to play this one some other way.

When Mr. Kennedy is good in a press conference, he is very, very good, and he is never really bad except by his own high standards. He pays the penalty extracted from all champions and artists of being under pressure to deliver a masterpiece at every attempt. Perhaps it is uncharitable to hold a top national leader up to tests that are not by any means the full measurement of his powers and performance.

But the point is that his strikeouts, ought to be reported as faithfully as his home runs—for a very special reason. It is an open secret that Mr. Kennedy plays favorites, bringing writers and publishers as guests to the White House, thereby setting up a situation for reciprocal trade of favors. Already it is routine conversation at the National Press Club to speculate whether an extreme "snow job" column of flattery by a non-Kennedy columnist, or a cozy, "inside" think piece by an influential journalist, is a bread-and-butter note.

There is no harm, and a lot of good, in the President's consorting with newspaper friends. But let's not permit sweet friendship to cloy the acid of skepticism in which every political writer's pen should be dipped.

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News Herald, Jan. 28, 1962]

ASK A QUESTION

Most Presidential press conferences are pretty dull stuff so far as producing anything new for the reader. Questions are anticipated and the President, who has been briefed, has a ready answer.

It's the unexpected, and sometimes critical, question that upsets a President, as President Kennedy was upset when Reporter Sarah McClendon indicated that two well-known security risks had been put on a State Department task force to help reorganize its security office. In the flareup, much was made of Kennedy rebuking the reporter, and how irked he was over the incident. In this case, the feelings of President Kennedy are of little consequence, and even any detriment to the character of the men in question is not as important as any possible detriment to the Nation's interests. The point is that if there is any possibility of security risks being on the administration's staff, such a question as posed by the reporter is pertinent. Press conferences are for asking questions, not sweeping them under the rug. If there are any more questions about security risks, let them be asked, even at the risk of rebukes. The Nation needs to know about such things.

SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS OF FREEDOM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I had an opportunity to read some excerpts from a speech given by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., before the California Federation of Young Democrats. As usual, I found Mr. Schlesinger's remarks profound and stimulating. In his most thoughtful address, he stresses that there are no easy answers to the challenges which face us around the world today.

Mr. President, it is indeed the time to beware of false prophets and those who promise snappy or back-of-the-book solutions for the struggle for freedom. It gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.'s, brilliant address before the California Federation of Young Democrats be printed in the RECORD.

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

NO BACK-OF-THE-BOOK SOLUTIONS IN FREEDOM

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

I am glad to see that the theme of your convention is "The Cost of Freedom," for a pervading illusion of the 19th century was that freedom was free, a costless benefit guaranteed by history to all virtuous and respectable men. We know now that freedom is much more complicated than that.

Instead of being the natural condition of man and society, freedom is something that a few men in a few places have achieved through effort, dedication, self-discipline and social ingenuity. Freedom is the exception in history, not the rule; it is what men seek rather than what they have.

But they seek it nonetheless, and therein lies the hope for humanity. The instinct for self-fulfillment through free choice is obviously rooted deep in the human condition. It grows in vigor as education and economic growth and political responsibility liberate man from the chains into which most men are still born.

A FEARFUL BURDEN

Freedom is not only hard to get; it is hard to keep. The preservation of freedom requires the fashioning of institutions strong enough to preserve continuity, flexible enough to acknowledge change, resilient enough to transmit vitality and challenging enough to stimulate creativity. It requires, in short, a varied and subtle social discipline.

But it also requires self-discipline—because freedom emancipates man from external authority and thereby concentrates the obligation of responsibility on his own mind and his own conscience. "Liberty means responsibility," said Bernard Shaw. "That is why most men dread it."

Some men have found the strain of freedom intolerable. "Men will cry aloud at last," Dostoievsky's Grand Inquisitor warns us, "that the truth is not in freedom, for the fearful burden of free choice imposes too many cares, too many unanswerable anxieties."

To be free is to choose; and to choose is to make up one's mind; and to make up one's own mind in the whirling universe in which we live is to indulge in the most painful and hazardous of pastimes—that is, the taking of thought. This is perhaps the harshest cost of freedom.

Cogito, ergo sum, said Descartes; to think is to think for oneself and to define oneself by the thought. Those who let others do their thinking for them have ceased to be free.

But the act of thought imposes its own responsibility. To think effectively is to think honestly, soberly, carefully, intelligently. Thought is one thing, emotional self-indulgence is another. Responsible democracy requires that the two be not confused.

If I were asked to suggest the first cost of freedom, I would say that it is the renunciation of easy solutions. The mark of the dogmatist is that he is still in grade school and thinks he can find all the answers in the back of the book. He knows the truth, and everyone who rejects his truth is either a knave or a fool.

Every irritation in life, he believes, has a simple cause; every obstacle a simple explanation; every problem a simple solution. One remembers Mr. Dooley's definition of the fanatic as "a man who does what he thinks th' Lord wud do if He only knew th' facts in th' case."

THE FOOLISH FEW

As a people, we are dedicated to free choice, and we can therefore hardly com-

plain if some of our fellow citizens choose foolishly. Throughout our history there have been those who supposed that the Republic was in some terrible danger perpetrated by a clique of sinister conspirators.

In the 1820's, honest men tried to save us from the conspiracy of the Masons. In the 1850's, the Know-Nothings tried to save us from the immigrant conspiracy. In the 1890's, the American Protective Association tried to save us from the Catholic conspiracy. In the 1920's, the Klu Klux Klan tried to save us from a conspiracy of Catholics and Jews and Negroes. In the 1930's, the American Liberty League tried to save us from the radicals. In the 1940's, the America First Committee tried to save us from the interventionists. And today the John Birch Society tries to save us from the graduated income tax, Chief Justice Warren, the fluoridation of water and the 20th century.

I would be disappointed if, in a nation of 180 million, we did not have our quota of eccentrics and extremists. This is a cost of freedom. As Ed Howe, of Kansas, said years ago, "I express many absurd opinions. But I am not the first man to do it; American freedom consists largely in talking nonsense."

But I would be disappointed, too, if many people found solace in such views. For the conspiratorial theory of history is always wrong—and it is often the first symptom of paranoia. Devotees of this theory assume that history has reached its fulfillment in the world to which they are accustomed or, preferably, in some idyllic earlier period, such as the administration of William McKinley.

They regard change beyond this as the product of someone's malevolence—as the result of the secret machinations of a wicked inner ring. But they cannot withstand the rush of history. They are all, in the end, followers of King Canute, who, according to the old legend, went down to the beach and commanded the tide not to come in.

American conservatism, from the beginning of the Republic, has enjoyed the Canute complex—and has suffered Canute's fate. It resisted the extension of the suffrage. It resisted the admission of new States to the West. It resisted the abolition of slavery. It resisted the establishment of national control over the trusts. It resisted the construction of machinery to control the cycle of boom and bust. It resisted social security and unemployment compensation and minimum wages. And today it resists Federal aid to education and health assistance to the aged and tax reform and effective action on conservation and civil rights.

If anything were predictable about this present time, it is the recrudescence of this rightwing extremism. In conservative times, the radical right is dormant and disorganized, because it is always hopeful that a conservative administration will do something it wants. But when a liberal administration is in power, the radical right becomes agitated and vociferous.

President Kennedy faces in the 1960's precisely the same situation that President Roosevelt faced in the mid-1930's and that President Truman faced in the early 1950's. Only, the radical right of today does not have leadership remotely comparable in skill or appeal to that provided by such paladins of the past as Huey Long, Father Coughlin, or Joe McCarthy. It is hard for me to believe that America is in serious danger from a movement whose leader has dedicated himself to the thesis that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

This rightwing revival is thus the conditioned reflex of extreme conservatives in a liberal age. And the fact of the cold war, by intensifying the national anxieties, has, of course, intensified the passion for quick and comfortable conclusions.

The cold war is long, slow, and agonizing. It is an ordeal of frustration. It is unbearable for those who seek simple answers and final solutions in a complex and ambiguous world. The rightwing extremism of our day is, above all, an expression of cold-war battle fatigue.

But let us not suppose that all the extremism—all the confidence in the answers at the back of the book—all the faith in simple answers and final solutions—is the property of the radical right. There are those supposedly on the liberal side who seem equally wedded to the conspiratorial theory of history, equally obsessed with primer answers to insoluble questions, equally persuaded that they are in unique and miraculous possession of the truth.

Whenever I hear talk, for example, of "the power elite," I know that I am in the presence of a mirror image of the John Birch Society. The notion that a conspiracy of bankers and generals controls our destiny is as nutty as the notion that it is controlled by Walter Reuther and the officials of the ADA.

There are some who feel that all the world's troubles would be over if we only resigned from the arms race with the Soviet Union. Their view, as I understand it, is that our economic system requires us to invent an antagonism with the U.S.S.R. in order to maintain profits in our own economy; and that if we would only stop all this nonsense about maintaining our nuclear strength, the Communist world would relax its hostilities and peace would descend on long-suffering mankind.

Let us first consider the economic arguments. From 1945 to 1946, the total Government purchases of goods and services in the United States declined, with the end of World War II, from $82.9 billion to $30.8 billion. This was a drop of over $50 billion at a time when the total gross national product was only a little over $200 billion. The decline in Government spending then was, in short, about 25 percent of the gross national product—and our economy rose to take up the slack.

An equivalent decline today would be over $130 billion—which is almost three times the size of our defense budget and half again as large as our total Federal budget. The American economy would thus in no circumstances have to meet a decline in public spending comparable to that which is survived in 1945–46.

And if all present defense spending should cease tomorrow, the American economy, which survived a decline in public spending amounting to one-quarter of the gross national product in 1946, could certainly survive a drop in public spending amounting to one-eleventh of our gross national product today. The argument that our economy requires the cold war is, in short, a phony.

Let us look now at the second half of this case—that if we would only abandon the arms race, then all problems of world tension would vanish. The premise is, of course, that the cold war is an American initiative and that Soviet policy is purely defensive. But very little in the history of the years since the end of World War II substantiates this premise.

In 1945 we began the demobilization of the greatest military force known to history. In 1946 we offered to share our atomic monopoly with the United Nations. In 1947 we invited the Soviet Union to join with us in the Marshall plan. And through these years the Soviet Union made clear its ineradicable view—a view rooted in its theory of history—that any society based on a system of mixed ownership is inherently evil and inherently a threat to the peace.

In the years since, the Soviet Union has gone even further. It has made abundantly clear that even societies based on systems of Communist ownership are unacceptable, like Yugoslavia and Albania, unless they bow to Soviet views on questions of foreign policy.

The only lasting hope for a relaxation of tensions lies in the establishment of a system of general and complete disarmament. One great issue confronting us today is how we may best negotiate an effective disarmament agreement. Those who object to our defense budget evidently assume that, if we were to permit the Soviet Union to achieve a decisive margin of military advantage, the Soviet Union would reward us by suddenly accepting a program of effective world disarmament.

As a historian, I find it hard to understand how—in view of a sequence of international actions from the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939 to the resumption of nuclear testing in 1961—anyone can suppose that the Soviet Union is animated by anything but an aggressive conception of its own interests. There is only one way in which we can persuade the Soviet Union that it must submit to a program of international arms inspection and control—that is, by persuading the Soviet leaders that we can stay in the arms race as long as they can. If we abandon the arms race and concede the Communists' military superiority, we remove the incentive which might induce them to accept a meaningful plan of disarmament.

To persist in piling up the weapons of mass destruction is a tragic choice. But we live in a world of tragic choices, and there is no point in kidding ourselves that painful problems have painless solutions. It is an irony of our times that the arms race offers the only road to arms control and that our own resignation from the arms race is the one sure way to make certain that we will never attain the universal disarmament which must be the lasting foundation of world peace.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES V. BENNETT, DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF PRISONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, James V. Bennett, a fellow Rhode Islander, recently celebrated his 25th anniversary as Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. Since the passage of the legislation which created the Bureau—legislation which he helped to write—he has made our Federal penal system a model for all others to follow.

His creative intelligence and his perseverance have contributed to our major advances in this field. Our Federal prisons now provide vocational training and rehabilitation services; the open prison is Mr. Bennett's innovation.

He played a large part in writing subsequent legislation in this field: the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1938 and the Federal Youth Correction Act of 1950 resulted from his wholehearted efforts. Mr. Bennett has also worked with the United Nations to improve prison standards throughout the world.

All told, James V. Bennett has provided and will continue to provide valuable services to our country. He has many plans for the future, and I am sure that they will be as successful as were those in the past. It is a pleasure for me to salute this most distinguished Rhode Islander today.

THE QUESTION OF ROBERT WELCH

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, National Review magazine, a leading exponent of and spokesman for the growing strength of political conservatism in America, has detailed and documented an airtight case in its criticism of Robert Welch,

founder of the John Birch Society. The National Review editorial, to which I refer, is a courageous and responsible analysis, and I wish to associate myself with its conclusions.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, following these remarks, an editorial from the February 13 edition of National Review.

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

THE QUESTION OF ROBERT WELCH

In the past few weeks a number of conservative spokesmen whose credentials and sincerity are unassailable have made public statements about Mr. Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, calling into question his qualifications to lead a national anti-Communist and antistatist movement. Russell Kirk, replying to a letter addressed to him by an executive of the John Birch Society, writes that he knows Mr. Welch to be a likable, honest, courageous, energetic man who nevertheless by silliness and injustice of utterance has become the kiss of death for any conservative enterprise. Congressman WALTER JUDD said in Minneapolis that he considers Mr. Welch's judgment so flawed as to disqualify him from leadership of an effective anti-Communist movement. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER said he feels Mr. Welch should resign; and, should he refuse to do so, the society should disband and reorganize under different leadership. Fulton Lewis, Jr., at the Human Events Conference in Washington, criticized Mr. Welch's direction of the society. And, it is widely known, some members of the national council of the John Birch Society are at their wits' end, and one or two have quietly resigned. Their dilemma is, reduced to the simplest terms: How can the John Birch Society be an effective political instrument while it is led by a man whose views on current affairs are, at so many critical points, so critically different from their own, and, for that matter, so far removed from commonsense?

That dilemma weighs on conservatives throughout America. It is not a dilemma imposed by the pressure of liberal or Communist objections to Mr. Welch. If not a single criticism had been made of Mr. Welch by the liberal press, the dilemma would exist just the same, and conservatives sooner or later would have to face it. Months before the liberals even heard of Mr. Welch, many of his associates and enthusiasts were urging Mr. Welch to reshape his views, and they proceeded on the assumption that in due course he would. The underlying problem is whether conservatives can continue to acquiesce tacitly in a rendition of the causes of the decline of the Republic and the entire Western World which is false, and besides that, crucially different in practical emphasis from their own. It is unlikely that BARRY GOLDWATER, the political leader of the conservative and anti-Communist movement in America; that WALTER JUDD, one of anticommunism's most eloquent and unyielding spokesman; that Fulton Lewis, Jr., among the most obdurate opponents of communism abroad and statism at home; that Russell Kirk, whose books have done more to reanimate a full-bodied conservatism than anyone else's; or indeed that National Review, whose editors are lifetime students of communism and liberalism, could be stampeded by the liberal juggernaut into unnecessary collisions with a man who is engaged in furthering conservative ends. These men have not bent under public pressure before, and are not likely to. Yet their opinion—our opinion—is that Robert Welch is damaging the cause of anticommunism.

Why?

Because he persists in distorting reality and in refusing to make the crucial moral and political distinction. And unless that distinction is reckoned with, the mind freezes, and we become consumed in empty rages. The distinction is between (1) an active pro-Communist, and (2) an ineffectually anti-Communist liberal.

It is widely known that Mr. Welch wrote a tract in which he declared that, among others, Mr. Eisenhower, his brother Milton, and the Dulles brothers were Communists. It is assumed by the overwhelming majority of the membership of the John Birch Society, who implicitly reject the accusation against Eisenhower and others (just as the council of the John Birch Society explicitly rejected the accusation when, a year ago, it was publicly brought to light), that Mr. Welch's charges were merely personal political speculation, of no bearing whatever on the John Birch Society and its activities. That is a crucial misapprehension. Although the work on Mr. Eisenhower (sometimes it is called The Politician, sometimes the Black Book) was indeed written before the John Birch Society was founded, it was circulated right up until a year ago to select members of the society as, by implication, the ultimate insight of the founder and leader of the John Birch Society. Mr. Welch has never disavowed the book, and for obvious reasons: it can be demonstrated, by quotations from his current writings, that the Black Book's central thesis (that the Government of the United States has been "under operational control of the Communist Party"—words he used publicly in the summer of 1960) continues to govern his thinking even today.

A member of the John Birch Society is entitled to observe, as so many of them, men and women of high character and purpose have done: "But I don't believe in any such nonsense—what has it all to do with the John Birch Society, of which I am a member?" It has this to do with it: the premises of the Eisenhower book are identical with the premises that underlie current statements by Mr. Welch on contemporary affairs, and continue to guide his practical leadership of the society.

For instance, a few weeks ago Mr. Welch gave an interview to the Boston Herald at which he commented on the Cuban fiasco last spring. "The Cuban invasion," said Mr. Welch, "was a plot by Fidel Castro and his friends in the U.S. Government. The invasion was planned by Castro and his friends in our Government to make Castro stronger throughout Latin America [and to] reduce U.S. prestige."

But in fact, as everyone including Mr. Welch knows, the so-called invasion of Cuba was planned by the Eisenhower administration, and endorsed by Eisenhower himself, reaffirmed by the Kennedy administration and by Kennedy himself, and executed by the Kennedy administration. What went wrong is that John Kennedy's will failed him at the crucial hour, when he gave orders to deprive the invading force of the military support which alone could have brought liberation. "The responsibility I take for myself," said Mr. Kennedy after the catastrophe. But if, as Mr. Welch alleges, the invasion was, in plan and execution, a Communist plot, how can it otherwise be deduced than that Eisenhower—and for that matter Kennedy—are pro-Communist?

Mr. Welch's annual Scoreboard, published in a summer issue of American Opinion, Mr. Welch's public journal, has for several years listed the United States as "40–60 percent" Communist-controlled. And this past summer Mr. Welch raised the figure to "50–70+". That is to say, he is reaffirming his belief that, to quote again his own words, "the Government of the United States is under operational control of the Communist Party." That was the thesis of the Black Book.

What is more, Mr. Welch brooks no disagreement on his central thesis. He does not require of his members that they expressly accept it—they would leave his society in droves if he did. But in his communications and editorials he is constantly putting forward his thesis, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly, and always excluding disagreement with it as nonrational or treasonable. "We wrote in 1951," Mr. Welch says in the current (January) issue of American Opinion, "the truth concerning Tito. We said that he always had been, still was, and would remain, a faithful Communist agent of the Kremlin. That his break with Stalin was completely stage-managed and phony * * * And we outlined the facts and considerations which made such a conclusion inescapable to anybody who cared about the truth."

Now, there are others than Mr. Welch who care for the truth, who are very anti-Communist indeed, and who have followed Tito's career perhaps longer and more closely than Mr. Welch, but who would nevertheless reject these inflated sentences. National Review, for instance, has always believed that Tito is and remains a dedicated Communist and as such can never be a friend or ally of the West. But the relationship between Tito and Stalin, and between Tito and Khrushchev, has been very complex, and not conceivably to be reduced to the simple dependence of puppet on puppetmaster. Over the years men as stanchly anti-Communist and as diligent in the pursuit of truth in international affairs as John Foster Dulles, Senator Robert A. Taft, Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer, Frank Meyer, and James Burnham, have seen that there were schismatical strains in Titoism of a kind that we should try to exploit—and at times have succeeded in exploiting, as we did in bringing the Greek civil war to a conclusion that would not have been possible if Tito's break with Stalin had been a total fraud; that the rupture between Tito and Moscow was by no means illusory in the sense of being artificially stage-managed, but illusory only is we deceive ourselves into thinking that because of this rupture within the Communist camp Tito could be regarded as our ally.

But Mr. Welch will not tolerate such distinctions. He anathematizes all who disagree with him. "Terrific strong support [was] given to Tito, as [an alleged] defector to and friend of the West, by Life and Time; not being readers of either magazine, we did not then realize the part being so frequently played by the Luce publications in spreading the Communist line." In other words, Time and Life are not merely notoriously unreliable exegetes of a purposive anti-Communist position (on which proposition one might agree) but, by Mr. Welch's innuendo, they are compliant, if not intentional, purveyors of a pro-Communist line.

Mr. Welch continues his survey: "Practically by the time [American Opinion] began publication we pointed out that Nehru of India and Nasser of Egypt were every bit as completely Communist agents of the Kremlin as Mao Tse-tung. We supplied as many of the facts, and as much of the history of each man, as could be assembled in the space we had available, to show that any other conclusion in each case was absurd." "The notion that Nasser is an agent of the Kremlin," Russell Kirk recently wrote in his letter analyzing Mr. Welch's "erratic intuitions," is capricious. "One does not have to be a Communist to be a scoundrel. Anyone familiar with Arab nationalism will regard this allegation with contempt." Nasser has certainly exposed himself to Communist opportunism (so, on several occasions, did Dulles); it does not follow he (or Dulles) has been a Communist agent.

"In the fall of 1956," Mr. Welch continues, "we pointed out that both revolts in [Poland and Hungary] had been deliberately precipitated by the Kremlin for its own purpose." Thus, stunned, we are expected to believe that the Polish and Hungarian uprisings were not spontaneous and heroic revolts against Communist tyranny, the results of

an exploding human spirit, but mere Communist theater. And this we are expected to believe, notwithstanding the self-evident facts of the situation and the abundant testimony to the contrary of survivors of these uprisings against tyranny, which embarrassed Khrushchev more than any events in modern Communist history. We are, in sum, asked to believe that Khrushchev engineered his own embarrassment.

You name him, if he disagrees strongly, he's most likely on the other side. Our CIA is pro-Communist, says Welch—and he doesn't say it only in his Black Book, but in the current issue of American Opinion, and in the issue before. "You must realize," he wrote in the December issue, "the CIA is on the [Communist] side." In the current issue he refers to "Kwame Nkrumah, Sekou Touré, our CIA, and all of the other Communist and pro-Communist troublemakers." Our State Department? "One whole year before the Communist-fomented and Communist-led revolt, supported in every practicable way by our State Department, succeeded in overthrowing Syngman Rhee in South Korea," i.e., our State Department (undoubtedly the world's most maladroit) desires (for Mr. Welch implies that the character of the insurrectionary movement was translucent) to further pro-Communist ends. (Actually, Syngman Rhee was overthrown by a military junta whose principal agent was a stanch anti-Communist.) The press? "The Communist bosses themselves obviously felt that their control of the American Government and of our media of mass communication was sufficiently complete to make even this drastic move [Castro's takeover in Cuba] safe." Control, mind you. And again, no disagreement is tolerable: "This article [written about Castro by Mr. Welch], we believe we can say with honest pride and also with accuracy, was devastating in showing the idiocy of any claim by anybody—who claimed to be informed—that Castro could possibly be anything but a 100 percent Communist."

Now, National Review in 1957 suggested Castro was probably a Communist. That is one thing: to say that anyone who disagreed was idiotic, i.e., that the businessmen, priests, journalists, politicians, scholars, students (many of whom grew up with Castro and fought side by side with him, believing him to be non-Communist), who disagreed, were Communists or pro-Communists or morally and intellectually helpless, is to make categorical condemnations which miss the whole point of the human predicament; namely, that two different people, having surveyed the same datum, can re-create differently what they saw; that two anti-Communists, evaluating the same problem, can honestly advocate different approaches toward the same solution. The United States should have struck Castro down from the very beginning, but our failure to do so was at the critical level, failure of will, a failure of perspicacity, not a failure of loyalty. But Mr. Welch disagrees; for indeed, he believes the man primarily responsible for Castro, Dwight Eisenhower, is a Communist.

NATO? "With regard to that brain child of Dean Acheson, godchild of Harry Truman, and eventual ward of Dwight Eisenhower, named NATO, we have repeatedly insisted for years that it was probably the biggest—and certainly the most expensive—hoax in all human history," i.e., NATO affects to serve an anti-Communist purpose, but in fact does not, and never was intended to. Here we have, claims Mr. Welch, a hoax on anti-Communists that deceives Europe's premier anti-Communist, Konrad Adenauer. And De Gaulle. And the entire anti-Communist community of Europe. And Fulton Lewis. And WALTER JUDD. And BARRY GOLDWATER. And the editors of National Review. And the editors of Human Events—all of whom have backed NATO. Everyone is out of step.

Bolivia is controlled by Communists, says Mr. Welch. Well, let us assume for the moment that it is. But the question is, have our leaders desired that Bolivia should be pro-Communist? Certainly, says Mr. Welch. "* * * Bolivia has been made a satellite and kept one"—by the U.S. Government. Disagree? "If you believe that there is anybody of any importance in either the last administration or the present one who has not known this fact, then there is simply no reason for your reading any more of this article." Berlin? "We have seen the artificially created and completely phony Berlin crisis used as a means of building up the prestige of that hypocritical Comsymp Willy Brandt."

"In fact, the whole canvas of this compendium was designed as a background for these final brush strokes, dealing with Washington's visible will to win this cold war—for the Soviets. Perhaps the most alarming thing about current history in the making is the way Washington [has become a part] of the whole international conspiracy of which it is now another mecca second only to Moscow." And in domestic affairs? "We have seen budgetary proposals urged by the administration which are as clearly designed to debase and destroy our currency through inflation as if they had been prepared by Karl Marx himself." Note: the allegation is not that our inflationary policies will weaken us—which they most certainly will—but that our inflationary policies, which are (unfortunately) endorsed by (a) the administration, (b) the majority of both Houses of Congress, (c) the majority of the Nation's academicians, (d) many business and banking and insurance interests—are designed to weaken us; that is, that all these people in effect desire the triumph of communism, or are totally manipulable by Communist agents.

And Mr. Welch's summation: "And we have seen on every side, in a hundred different manifestations, the unceasing efforts of our Government to carry out all programs and take all steps required to bring about the merger of the United States with Soviet Russia and all of its satellites into a one-world Socialist government." Disagree? "These are all plain facts incontrovertibly clear to anybody who will use the eyes, the intelligence, and the commonsense God gave him."

Woe unto the man who disagrees with Mr. Welch. He is (1) an idiot, or (2) a Comsymp, or (3) an outright Communist.

There are members of the John Birch Society, and they include, in our judgment, some of the most morally energetic, self-sacrificing, and dedicated anti-Communists in America, who ask: But what does it matter if we and Mr. Welch disagree on a number of things? The answer—Senator Goldwater, Mr. Judd, Russell Kirk, and other critics of Mr. Welch would agree—is in two parts. The first is political: are these disagreements on trivial or on substantive matters? It is essential, if one would endorse Mr. Welch's analysis, to believe that the Government of the United States is under the operational control of men who desire to betray this Nation and cause us to become a satellite of the Soviet Union. That is a substantive premise, from which all political analysis, strategy, and tactics are derivative. Should one, disagreeing with Mr. Welch on so central a matter, nevertheless support him because he is also against Federal aid to education and fluordinated water? Adolf Hitler was against monetary inflation: should we then have been pro-Hitler? Gerald L. K. Smith will not disagree with GOLDWATER on most domestic proposals. Should GOLDWATER then be pro-Gerald Smith? Nikita Khrushchev favors medical care for the aged. Should the Liberals be pro-Khrushchev? Robert Welch cannot be compared to these men, but the point is valid that there are bounds to the dictum: Anyone on my right is my ally, just as there are bounds (often unrecognized by the liberals) to the complementary dictum. Anyone on my left is my ally.

And secondly, there is the moral consideration: Can one endorse the efforts of a man who, in one's judgment, goes about bearing false witness? (Was Jehovah, who answered the question on Mount Sinai with the Eighth Commandment, a Comsymp?) We have no doubt Mr. Welch himself honestly believes that all those people are Communists—that mitigates his moral culpability. But those of us who disagree are not excused if, by our silence, we egg him on.

The fact of the matter is that Mr. Welch, by what Russell Kirk has called "an excess of zeal, intemperance, and imprudence," promotes a split in the conservative movement—by asking for the tacit support of men who cannot in good conscience give it, who, moreover, feel that to give it is to damage our chances of success. "Cry wolf often enough," Mr. Kirk wrote to Mr. Welch, "and everyone takes you for an imbecile or a knave, when after all there are wolves in this world." If we are to win the war against communism, we have no less a task before us than to change national policy. Nothing is clearer than that Mr. Welch is not succeeding in doing anything of the sort, precisely because, by the extravagance of his remarks, he repels, rather than attracts a great following. The John Birch Society required for effective leverage, according to Mr. Welch's own estimates, 1 million members (it might have had many millions, if properly led); it has, even after great national publicity, and largely because of Mr. Welch's "intemperance of utterance," less than one-tenth that many members, and is growing no faster than the movement to impeach Earl Warren, who remains as unimpeached today as when Mr. Welch first launched that ill-conceived campaign. Mr. Welch, for all his good intentions, threatens to divert militant conservative action to irrelevance and ineffectuality. There are, as we say, great things that need doing, the winning of a national election, the reeducation of the governing class. John Birch chapters can do much to forward those aims, but only as they dissipate the fog of confusion that issues from Mr. Welch's smoking typewriter. Mr. Welch has revived in many men the spirit of patriotism, and that same spirit calls now for rejecting, out of a love of truth and country, his false counsels.

THEN—

"For the sake of honesty, however, I want to confess here my own conviction that Eisenhower's motivation is more ideological than opportunistic. Or, to put it bluntly, I personally think that he has been sympathetic to ultimate Communist aims, realistically willing to use Communist means to help them achieve their goals, knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life. But my firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy is based on an accumulation of detailed evidence so extensive and so palpable that it seems to me to put this conviction beyond any reasonable doubt."—From The Politician, by Robert Welch, 1958

AND NOW

"The whole canvas [deals] with Washington's visible will to win this cold war—for the Soviets. Perhaps the most alarming thing about current history in the making is the way Washington [has become a part] of the whole international conspiracy of which it is now another mecca second only

to Moscow. And we have seen on every side, in a hundred different manifestations, the unceasing efforts of our Government to carry out all programs and take all steps required to bring about the merger of the United States with Soviet Russia and all of its satellites into a one-world Socialist government. These are all plain facts incontrovertibly clear to anybody who will use the eyes, the intelligence, and the commonsense God gave him"—From American Opinion, by Robert Welch, January 1962.

TOASTS OF THE PRESIDENT AND CYRILLE ADOULA, PRIME MINISTER, REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO, AT WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, a distinguished African statesman, the Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo, Mr. Cyrille Adoula, was the guest of the President at a luncheon in the White House. In connection therewith, there was an exchange of toasts between the President and the Prime Minister.

These toasts, Mr. President, contain more than the usual pleasantries which are reserved for such occasions. They reveal a deep mutual understanding between the two leaders which augurs well for the future of the Congo and our relations with that immense new African nation. These relations appear now to be on the right track after a most difficult start. In view of the attitudes reflected by the President and the Prime Minister's words, there is reason to hope that they will stay on this track.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the exchange of toasts to which I have referred be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

TOASTS OF THE PRESIDENT AND CYRILLE ADOULA, PRIME MINISTER OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO (LEOPOLDVILLE), AT THE BUSINESS LUNCHEON IN THE STATE DINING ROOM

Gentlemen, I am sure you all join me in welcoming to this country the guest of honor and the members of his Government. I don't think that any head of state of a new country has faced the difficulties and the challenges which have pressed upon him with so much force in the last few months.

The difficulties of our revolutionary experience, and the experiences of every other people coming into independence since the end of World War II, pale in comparison to the problems which the Congo has faced and which press upon the Prime Minister and his supporters.

What makes him especially welcome is the courage and the fortitude, the persistence and the judgment with which he has met these challenges—which would have overwhelmed a lesser people, a lesser country, a lesser man, a lesser government.

Prime Minister, we welcome you here for many reasons. The success of the Congo is tied up, really, we believe, with the success of the United Nations. If you fail, and the Congo should fail, it would be a serious blow for the United Nations, upon which this country has placed so many hopes for the last 17 years. And because of the intimate association between the United Nations and your Government, we are particularly glad that you are here to address them.

We are also glad to welcome you because of your own qualities, because you have set a course for your nation, of being independent, of being African, of being free, of being unalined, of governing under most adverse conditions, through parliamentary democracy, at a time when some other new nations have been forced by events to move away from democratic processes.

We welcome you because of your own extraordinary record—rising because of your own efforts to a position of preeminence, where you have won the support of people, both within and without your country—and because of your own personal qualities.

We are vitally interested in the success of the Congo because we believe the success of your country is essential to the success of a free Africa. We believe strongly in the unity of free states, able to choose their own destiny and able to decide their own fate.

So, Prime Minister, we welcome you here. Many years ago, one of our distinguished Presidents—you examined his portrait this morning in President Lincoln's bedroom—Andrew Jackson, said, "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved."

We recognize your strong conviction that the same policy should follow for your own country, that the Congo must be preserved. And as a faithful member of the United Nations, we support—through the United Nations—the implementation of that policy.

So we welcome you here, and I hope that all of you will join me in saluting the people of the Congo, the country, and to its distinguished Prime Minister.

Prime Minister ADOULA (as interpreted from the French). Mr. President, I am almost embarrassed in having to reply to your magnificient speech—a speech which was so short and yet so complete, so full.

I will also speak very briefly and I will say that it is true that the Congo has gone through a period of grave difficulties. It is true also that there are people in the Congo, also of good will, who have decided to fight to surmount and overcome those difficulties.

However, I must say, Mr. President, that there is one thing which you have left out of your speech, and this is that all those efforts of the people of the Congo, all the efforts of the Government, of Parliament, of the population itself, would not have availed very much if we had been left to ourselves.

Fortunately for us, we have found in the world people of great understanding, people of great friendship. We have found countries which have helped us, and which have helped us continuously, without ulterior motivation.

This help has enabled us to try. I must tell you perhaps something, Mr. President, which appears to be a secret. In your speech you seemed to speak of a superman somewhere in the Congo, someone who had succeeded all by himself in overcoming irresistible obstacles, and in reestablishing something that has to be reestablished: Peace in the Congo.

This, Mr. President, is not true. There is no such man. There is no man who could have done that by himself. There is only a common man who wanted to serve his country, and who accepted the difficult task of forming a government, only because he knew that there were people in the world who are ready and willing to help him.

This help, Mr. President, has come primarily from you, from your Government, from your country, through the United Nations Organization. This is a help which you have given us by helping the United Nations from its very beginnings—by helping the United Nations to carry out the directives of the Security Council and of the General Assembly's directives, which you have helped to forge.

You have done that in the past, Mr. President, and I am quite certain that your administration stands ready to continue such a policy in the present—a policy of help to others—continuous, willing help with no ulterior motivation. This is what you have done for the Congo. This is the help which is necessary.

Now there was a time when people used to say about American policy that it was a naive policy, that Americans are people who believe everybody, who can get fooled easily, who sometimes behave like a bull in a china shop.

Today, Mr. President, no one can say that about American policy. This time you have scored a bull's eye, and this time you have proven that your policy is positive, that it is realistic, and I am certain that your policy is going to reach its goal and greatly increase the prestige of the United States in the world.

Another question which is mentioned is that of neutralism. Now here is nonalinement. You have to understand nonalinement to mean simply that each country wishes to remain independent and free, free and independent to defend its own principles, free and independent to be able to reconcile various interests, to reconcile and compromise its own interests with those of its friends, and not only of its friends, also all of the people in the entire world. That is what we mean by nonalinement. That is why I believe that this must be the policy not only of the Congolese Government but also of the entire Congolese people.

I must interrupt my speech because if I did not, if I let myself be carried away, I would repeat—speaking about you, Mr. President—the kind words which you have addressed to me. There is no necessity, however, to do that, because everyone knows who you are, and there is no need to repeat something which was said so well.

So all I can say at this moment, Mr. President, is that in the name of our people first of all, in the name of our Government, in the name of our Chief of State, we say thank you to the United States.

We can thank you. We say thank you for a help which has been efficacious, spontaneous, and sincere. We thank your administration for it, Mr. President, because we are quite sure, as I repeat it, that our efforts would have been to no avail if it had not been for the moral and material help which we have received from you.

We hope that this help will continue. We say it in all frankness. We say, at the same time, that our people as a people which understands reality will never forget to say thank you to the United States. It will not be like some other peoples which are willing to receive aid only to criticize later those who are helping. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask you now to raise your glass and drink to the President of the United States, and to the prosperity of the American people.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President's message on education is an affirmation of his views on this subject as expressed to the Congress last year. He is appealing, once again, to the Congress to face up to its responsibilities as he has faced up to his in this most important and neglected segment of our national life.

The President points out once again the urgent needs of the Nation for more adequate facilities and teaching excellence at all levels of education, from primary schools on up, and in all special aspects of education, such as medicine, dentistry, and education for the handicapped. He points out, once again, the

demands of justice, that educational opportunities be made more equal for all our young people, regardless of personal financial status or the peculiar conditions which may exist in the State in which a young person happens to live.

Millions of young people will pay the price if the President's appeal continues to be ignored. The Nation will pay an enormous price in the years ahead if this appeal continues to be ignored. Each day of delay represents an irretrievable loss.

The Senate has done what it can do, up to this point, in responding to the President's appeal. Led by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee [Mr. HILL] and his able lieutenants in this matter, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], we have passed the bills the President has sought to improve educational facilities and to equalize educational opportunities in this Nation. The Senate stands ready to move forward to the completion of this legislative task whenever the other House is prepared to join with us. I can only underscore the President's appeal, at this time, and express the hope that the moment for this advance in education which is so necessary to the Nation's well-being and to the well-being of millions of our citizens will not be long delayed.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a story on the front page of the New York Times. The headline is "Long Island Fights To Save Jobs at Republic."

This news illustrates two points: First, the labor-management relations which are possible of attainment in a difficult situation; and, second, the catastrophic dislocation to employment involved in the denial of defense orders and the need for new legislation in the direction of more competition in defense procurement.

On the first subject, the union meeting which was reported in the press, at which the cooperation of union members is requested in an effort to appeal to the President on defense orders for the company for which they work, is matched by a letter from the company to its employees which frankly sets forth the facts and takes the employees into the management's confidence in the problems of the company. I think this is salutary in supporting the importance of a high type of labor-management cooperation—a cooperation which should extend to alternative courses of action and lines of production in view of the serious problem being faced. I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper story of the union meeting and the company's letter be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point. It emphasizes the grave threat to employment and to the economy of Long Island inherent in the denial of defense orders to Republic.

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

LONG ISLAND FIGHTS TO SAVE JOBS AT REPUBLIC—LETTERS TO KENNEDY URGED AS 13,000 FACE LAYOFF

(By Roy R. Silver)

LEVITTOWN, LONG ISLAND, February 5.—Employees of the Republic Aviation Corp. were urged today to write to President Kennedy in an effort to save 13,000 threatened jobs.

The workers were told by Justin Ostro, president of Republic Lodge 1987, International Association of Machinists, to ask the President to rescind Defense Department plans to cut production on the F-105D fighter-bomber plane.

Eight thousand union members, at a meeting at Levittown Arena, heard Mr. Ostro declare that "the only area we can hope to get any help at all is the White House and the President of the United States."

Mr. Ostro, whose union represents about 9,000 of Republic's 15,569 employees, told the workers at the half-hour meeting, "You must let him [Mr. Kennedy] know you are in trouble; he promised you an expanding economy and full employment."

Mr. Ostro, along with Charles J. Brown, president of the Long Island Federation of Labor, and Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson, expect to discuss the matter at the White House tomorrow morning.

The union meeting was called by Mr. Ostro to review the potential labor crisis, in which 13,000 of Republic's employees may be laid off by December 30, 1963. A loss of 1,500 jobs is expected by March 30. Union employees at the company earn between $2.03 and $3.18 an hour.

Mr. Ostro said the economy of the entire island would be affected by the Defense Department's decision to cut production of the F-105D, by its cancellation of part of a contract for a reconnaissance version of the plane, and by the elimination of Republic from competition to build the TFX, the "plane of the future."

FORESEES ECONOMIC SHOCK

"The Long Island community will face its worst economic shock in its history through the loss of a $125 million annual payroll," Mr. Ostro predicted. "In December 1962, we will be a distressed area, with more than 6 percent unemployed."

The Defense Department plans to award a contract to the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. of St. Louis for the production of the F-110, a two-place, twin-engined fighter-bomber.

"We are not looking for a handout," Mr. Ostro said. "We wouldn't sacrifice the security of our country to keep working. Our plane is superior to the McDonnell plane. McDonnell doesn't need the contract to keep people working."

Mr. Ostro said that the separation and severance provisions of the union's contract with Republic "now become of paramount importance" and that loopholes in seniority provisions "must be plugged." The contract expires in less than 2 months.

REPUBLIC AVIATION CORP.,
Long Island, N.Y., February 1, 1962.

DEAR RAC EMPLOYEE: By the time you receive this letter, you will probably have heard all sorts of rumors about supposed cutbacks, phasing out and even cancellation of the F-105. You also probably will have read or heard that the Department of Defense has awarded study contracts for the TFX—a follow-on successor to the F-105—to two other companies in the aircraft industry.

I am therefore writing to you directly in order to set the record straight and to give you complete information about the future of our F-105 business. Parts of this letter are not going to be pleasant. But it is important that we face facts and prepare ourselves for all possibilities.

At the same time, all of the news is not bad, and I want you to know that, also.

During the past year, many important changes in the method of planning our country's defense systems have been taking place. And foremost among these changes has been the strong desire of Defense officials to try to "package" the military forces so that, for example, all Army, Navy, and Air Forces concerned with conventional, or limited warfare, will become more unified in the uses of their equipment and their manpower. The same planning is true for strategic retaliatory forces and for continental air defense forces.

To carry this a step farther, the Secretary of Defense has proposed that, where possible, one weapon should be utilized by all services, instead of each service buying its own equipment for the performance of missions that may have some similarity.

The merit of this kind of programing is unquestioned. We all want to have as strong and efficient a defense force as possible—and as economically as possible. And we think that our company, Republic, can meet the Government's needs under this kind of planning as well as, or better than, any other company in the industry. Only one other has built as many fighter aircraft as we have and none has built better fighter aircraft than we have.

But we must face the fact that competition in the aerospace industry has been getting more severe as the dollars become scarcer. We believe that our design proposal for the TFX—a short takeoff and landing fighter for both Air Force and Navy—is one of the finest airplane designs we have ever produced. Yet we have just received word that the project will be awarded elsewhere. This means that we will not have a follow-on fighter airplane to the F-105, according to present Government planning. However, there is at least one more fighter competition scheduled for this year—the VAX, a fighter attack experimental type—and we are already vigorously at work on this proposal. I don't like to be blunt, but I feel you must know the bad news when it occurs, as well as good news when we're able to give it to you.

At the same time, the Defense Department has proposed to the Congress that, in future years, production of the F-105 be somewhat reduced and that a Navy plane, the McDonnell F4H be purchased, to share in the Air Force tactical mission with the F-105. This means that previous programing by the Air Force has been changed by DOD and we are now scheduled to build the F-105 through calendar year 1964 only. At this point I want to state that this does not automatically mean that we will not be building F-105's after 1964. It means that, in the present programing, we continue to build them through 1964. I certainly hope that we will be successful in our strong efforts to continue the F-105 business after that time. It remains the finest tactical fighter in the world, when all its mission capabilities are considered. We are designing new improvements which will increase the F-105's versatility and performance, and we hope will prolong its usefulness in our defense system.

Under any circumstances, however, it is apparent that we will have to look at our own situation carefully and honestly. Our research and development efforts are beginning to bear some fruit, but it is going to be a few years before projects now just beginning will really "pay off."

Over the next year, we are going to have to watch our employment situation week by week and month by month. As it stands today there will be layoffs in the immediate

future. It is apparent that we will not be able to keep all of our people employed unless we are successful in bringing in more orders. This applies not only to our production workers but throughout the organization. In our scientific and research engineering areas we will continue at full strength, in order to develop new product possibilities to help keep our factory full.

We are a sound company. We survived even more severe blows in 1945–47 and came back strong. We have the resources and the determination to overcome this temporary setback and to move on toward new goals.

It is vitally important for you to know the facts above. It is equally important that we all keep plugging away, doing the very best job possible to keep the F-105, and all of our products, coming off the line with the same high quality and efficiency as before. In this manner, we have the opportunity to sell more of our products and keep our jobs secure.

Cordially,

MUNDY I. PEALE,
President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, second, I think the spending of $26 billion for procurement of hard goods in defense is shown, by this situation and by many others throughout the country, to have such an enormous economic impact in the communities involved that it requires a review by the Congress in order to articulate a policy which will work more equitably than it seems to be doing at present. So I call renewed attention to my bill for enactment of legislation, which has been supported by the whole delegation from New York in the other body, as well as by the Members from the State of New York in this body, which seeks greater competition in procurement contracts, including negotiated contracts, and also consideration of the economic impact in particular areas, analogous in terms to the consideration we give small business with respect to Government contracts, in order that we may deal with catastrophic situations which may be created by the withdrawal of defense contracts in particular areas, of which this is a most striking example.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY AWARD TO LEWIS RUSSELL NELSON

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Senators are familiar with the contest that is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States called the voice of democracy. This is an annual broadcast scriptwriting contest. I have noticed that several Senators have had printed in the RECORD the winning speech or statement by the young person of a State who won an award from that State.

I was most pleasantly surprised to learn that the State winner in my State of Georgia happens to be a nephew of mine, Lewis Russell Nelson, the son of Rev. and Mrs. Raymond L. Nelson, of Commerce, Ga. I am exceedingly proud to ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD in order that it might be considered along with other winning speeches printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Lewis Russell "Rusty" Nelson, State winner from Georgia)

In a time when Americans take their blessings of liberty for granted, freedom is to me, more than anything else, a challenge for every conscientious American patriot. This is a challenge to carry on the American way of life in the tradition of those who sacrificed their lives and fortunes to endow their posterity with a national heritage which is the very paragon of freedom.

This great challenge is created by the forces of evil that today, as always, threaten our sacred freedom. Today as the United States is engaged in a great war for the minds of men, the pulse of patriotism in this country is at an alltime low. The United States is backpedaling in fear of our enemies because of the lack of patriotism. In answer to the explosion of 50-megaton bombs, we build fallout shelters and that's about it. We are a nation ready to hide but not ready to fight to defend the freedom of ourselves and others. Military recruiters today cannot appeal to the patriotism of young men. The pitch has to be personal advantage, free training, civilian preparation, a choice career.

All Americans today are heirs of a freedom that was made possible by the dedication and love that our Founding Fathers had for God and country. The basic desire for this kind of freedom is still to be found but true patriots and heroes are, today, few and far between. Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" has only a faint echo in today's "I'd rather be dead than Red." To me, that statement sounds more like a suicide note than a pledge to fight for freedom. Still, we say we would gladly give our lives for our country if necessary. But I contend that what we need to do now is not to die for the freedom of our country but to live for it. We must again resolve that those who died for our country shall not have died in vain. We must dedicate ourselves to the high ideals of our free Nation so that we may preserve and renew God's gift of freedom for our land.

It is through complete dedication to their atheistic concepts and unworthy ideals that the Communists have risen from a mere handful of men to domination of half the world in less than half a century. With our wonderful and meaningful foundations and ambitions, we could indeed turn the world upside down almost overnight, if we but had the dedication of these proponents of evil and injustice.

The challenge of freedom must be met. If a rebirth of patriotism and heroism is not realized in this country, our posterity will not know the blessings of liberty that we enjoy today.

CELEBRATION OF THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last July 25 it was my privilege to represent the President of the United States at the ceremonies marking the ninth anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I should like to have appear in the body of the RECORD the speech given at that time by Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, and also the message of greetings from President Kennedy on the occasion of this ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth.

I am sure it is well recognized in the Senate that Governor Muñoz-Marín is a great world statesman who has done much to strengthen the cause of freedom in Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent that the message and the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

My cordial greetings and best wishes go to Governor Muñoz-Marín and the people of Puerto Rico on this ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth.

The great social and economic accomplishments of the Commonwealth have evoked the admiration of your fellow citizens throughout the United States, and, indeed, of freedom-loving Americans throughout the hemisphere.

In achieving the transition from a stagnant, low-income society to a dynamic, prospering commonwealth, Puerto Rico has been a source of hope and inspiration to those of us deeply concerned with charting new courses of social progress for our hemisphere.

What we seek to accomplish in our Alianza para el Progreso has already been accomplished to a remarkable measure in Puerto Rico. That the people of Puerto Rico have pioneered in translating objectives of social advancement, long-range economic planning, equitable tax structures, improved land use and vigorous investment in education, into visible realities is undeniable proof to all citizens of the Americas, of the strength and creativeness of democratic ideals.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GOV. LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN ON THE OCCASION OF THE CELEBRATION OF THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, JULY 25, 1961

Honorable representative of the President of the United States, honorable representative of the President of Venezuela, honorable representative of the Government of El Salvador, distinguished visitors, honorable presidents of the House and the Senate, honorable president of the Supreme Court, friends, and fellow citizens, in a few words on this happy and solemn occasion, I wish to express my deepest thanks to the President of the United States for his message to the people of Puerto Rico sent through such a distinguished envoy as Senator MORSE, who is with us tonight. I not only wish to express appreciation for his cordial message; I also wish to comment on some of President Kennedy's words when he so generously refers to the people of Puerto Rico as a people who have faced great difficulties with courage, decision, and patience; difficulties that they have been conquering and will finally conquer. When the President of the United States so speaks of the people of Puerto Rico, I believe that all of us, knowing the President's sincerity, should feel deeply proud of those words, from one who is at present the leader of democracy against its enemies throughout the world.

Puerto Rico, within its means and in full dedication to the cause of justice, liberty, and human freedom, will cooperate, as it has cooperated, toward the happy fulfillment throughout the American hemisphere of the Alliance for Progress which is proposed by President Kennedy, not as a paternalistic gesture of the United States, but as a call to all the peoples of America to join freely

with their hearts and wills to banish poverty, injustice, from all regions of the hemisphere.

Thus, humbly but resolutely, we in Puerto Rico have been contributing our experience, with fraternal feelings toward all men in America, and now place it at the service of the Alliance for Progress as a force of hope, in the first place, and of just achievement, afterward, for all peoples in the Americas. It was, in a modest way, such a force of hope which quickly turned into tangible progress toward a good civilization in Puerto Rico.

I wish, furthermore, to thank the President of the United States for his Executive memorandum to all heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government outlining the significance of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, of its concept of free association with the United States of America.

Allow me, at this time, to make an announcement. A few moments ago, it was announced from this very rostrum, through wires from Senator ANDERSON and Senator JACKSON, that the appropriate committee of the U.S. Senate had approved an amendment to the relations between Puerto Rico and the United States proposed to Congress, first through resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico and afterward by action of the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington. The committee recommended favorably to the Senate a resolution transferring the debt-incurring limitation of the Commonwealth from the Federal Relations Act to the Constitution whenever the voters of Puerto Rico shall so determine. I have now received the news that the Senate of the United States has approved the resolution. And I feel confident that the President of the United States will give his approval. From there on, it will be up to you, the voters of Puerto Rico, to also pass judgment on and I hope give your approval to this change, which strengthens the principle of self-government.

Let me refer again to the Executive memorandum issued today by President Kennedy, instructing all heads of the Federal Government, with regard to the relations between Puerto Rico and the United States. I am now going to read a translation of the President's memorandum:

"Because of the importance and significance of Puerto Rico in the relations of the United States with Latin America and other nations, it is essential that the executive departments and agencies be completely aware of the unique position of the Commonwealth, and that policies, actions, reports on legislation, and other activities affecting the Commonwealth should be consistent with the structure and basic principles of the Commonwealth."

And it goes on to say:

"On July 25, 1952, the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under its constitution. This proclamation was the culmination of a series of legislative and electoral steps which began with the passage of Public Law 600, 81st Congress, 64 Stat. 319 (1950). Public Law 600 made provision for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. In a referendum, held on June 4, 1951, the proposals of this law received the overwhelming approval of the people of Puerto Rico.

"Following approval, a Puerto Rican constitutional convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by a referendum held on March 3, 1952. The Congress in turn approved this constitution (Public Law 447, 82d Congress, 66 Stat. 327 (1952)).

"The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution.

"On November 27, 1953, the General Assembly of the United Nations recognized that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, exercising effectively the right of self-determination in a free and democratic way, had achieved a new constitutional status; and that, in view of this new status, it was appropriate that the United States should cease the transmission of information with regard to Puerto Rico under article 73(e) of the Charter (U.N. General Assembly Res. 748 (VIII) (1953))."

I wish to explain that the said article of the United Nations Charter provides that reports be submitted on countries retaining territorial or colonial status, and that the resolution I have just mentioned (of the United Nations in 1953), stated that the United States did not have to transmit any more information on Puerto Rico, according to the United Nations Charter, because Puerto Rico had ceased to be a territory or in any other manner a colony of the United States of America.

"All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President.

"The legislative steps which have led to the achievement by Puerto Rico of Commonwealth status have made inapplicable the provisions of Executive Order No. 6726 of May 29, 1934, insofar as they pertain to or are connected with the administration of the government of Puerto Rico. This order no longer applies to Puerto Rico.

"This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register."

In closing, I wish to express once more to President Kennedy and his very distinguished representative, the thanks of the people of Puerto Rico for strengthening the recognition of what the Commonwealth is and means. That is what Puerto Rico has overwhelmingly and repeatedly approved at the polls.

MILK CONSUMPTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I invited attention to the fact that Wisconsin was first in milk production, producing some 19 billion pounds a year. I suggested, because of the situation which has already been set forth by the Secretary of Agriculture, that since our dairy production is now in excess there are several plans which could be followed to find a solution to the problem.

One suggestion I made related to consumption.

Mr. President, for the first time in some 23 years, when I was at a luncheon at the White House yesterday, which the Vice President also attended, in addition to the usual drinks each person was served a glass of milk. To me that is what Americans should be doing throughout the land, not only in the hotels but also in homes and elsewhere, to increase the consumption of milk.

A second suggestion I made was that we should set up a laboratory and provide talent in the laboratory—we have great brains available—to make it possible to utilize the constituent parts of milk for the manufacture of industrial products. In my opinion that is one of the great outlets we have not even tapped. We have learned to make sirup out of corn. We have learned to utilize other products through chemistry, but with regard to the constituent parts of milk we have sat by and said, "We will make it into ice cream, and, yes, into powdered milk."

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MUST KEEP PACE WITH THE GROWING NEEDS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a great source of our Nation's strength is the quality of our education. We have always been proud of that quality.

We can take pride in the finest system of public schools in the world. Our colleges and universities, too, have provided outstanding higher education and training for millions of our citizens.

It is essential to the future welfare of our Nation, Mr. President, that every potential source of support for our colleges and universities be put to use, for the requirements of the future will be great.

A great upsurge of demand for admission into colleges is taking place in this decade. Even with added Federal support of our colleges and universities, it is probable that demand will exceed the ability to meet it. Indeed, in many colleges it already does.

The bill which we are now considering promises a good start in meeting the urgent needs which confront our colleges and universities and the young Americans who wish to attend them.

It would authorize loans for construction of new academic facilities for public and private institutions and would aid needy young scholars in acquiring the education they deserve. Also it would give impetus to the development of so-called community colleges, 2-year schools which provide a vital service to young students who are interested in acquiring skills but feel they do not need a major degree.

Mr. President, abundant supporting statistics already have been presented in this Chamber demonstrating the need for this pending legislative proposal. Briefly put, they show that college enrollment will nearly double in the next 10 years from a present 3.6 million to more than 6 million 10 years hence.

Meanwhile, the cost of education rises alarmingly. Tuition and fee charges have increased 86 percent in the past 10 years. A student living away from home incurs a cost of approximately $1,650 a year.

Increasing costs and increasingly crowded conditions have made it impossible for thousands of deserving young Americans to further their education. Large numbers of high school students graduating in the top one-third of their class are unable to go on to college.

Mr. President, the loss is not theirs alone. It is the Nation's.

Cold statistics do not tell the extent of the loss.

In this grim period of international anarchy, when our Nation is challenged as never before, how many potential great physicists, chemists, or engineers have been denied the education that would develop their abilities to the fullest?

How many would-be doctors, and how many fine potential teachers will never be able to fill the essential role their talents point to?

We need these young people and their abilities if our Nation is to maintain the greatness which has made it the leader of the free world and the bastion of democracy.

Our system of democracy must promise that every young American be given full opportunity to develop his abilities. Only in this way can our citizens contribute fully to their Nation.

Mr. President, I assert this is the crux of the proposal we are discussing. The statistics prove a need. It is within our capacity to meet this need.

Our obligation now, as Senators of the United States, is to do what can and must be done.

DECLARATION OF PARIS—RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the Declaration of Paris and resolutions adopted by the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations which met in Paris, France, from January 8 through January 19, 1962.

As Senators know, Mr. President, this convention was the direct result of Public Law 86–719, enacted by Congress in 1960. Under terms of this law a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, composed of 20 members was appointed by the Congress of the United States. This Commission was given the job of seeking "to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary" to bring about a convention with similar commissions from the other NATO countries. The purpose of the convention, as set forth in the legislation, was "to explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means."

Many Senators were sponsors of and gave their active and untiring support to the adoption of the resolutions, and the success of the convention. To name only a few, I call attention to the work of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has been untiring in his efforts, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and many others, and call attention to the fact that the effort had the cooperation and assistance of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I wish the RECORD to show that the Senator from Tennessee has omitted mentioning the real dynamic force that carried along so successfully the whole operation about which he has spoken. That force is his own leadership. The senior Senator from Tennessee did a great deal to bring into a real living symbol what the NATO convention can actually mean by his driving energy and his foresightedness in carrying out the principles for which the group was elected. Toward that end I salute him on this occasion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the words of my colleague from Wyoming. I was only one of the group. The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was also very active, as were many others I could mention.

I was happy to be associated with that bipartisan group of Senators in the convention. I think the convention that has been held has been a very great success.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York, who has been exceedingly active in the effort.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I join the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] in commending the effort of all Senators, led by Christian Herter and Will Clayton, who represented us so admirably in the effort to establish an Atlantic Community.

I also commend the Senator from Tennessee. I join the Senator from Wyoming in the statement he has made. The leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has been indispensable. It has been a great joy to work with him as a colleague in arms.

I should like to emphasize that we have a group of distinguished Americans who consider the wisdom of an Atlantic Community concerning economic and social questions to be entirely practical, and we must pay the strictest attention to their recommendations. I am grateful to my colleague for raising the subject.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am grateful to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am grateful to my colleague the distinguished Senator from New York for his continuous support, as well as the support of many others, for their efforts related to the building up of the strength of the Atlantic Community.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I join Senators who have spoken, particularly the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] in an expression of gratification for the work of the Senator from Tennessee in taking the lead in the movement about which he has spoken.

I also join the Senator from Tennessee and my other colleagues in what they have said about the product of the Atlantic Convention. The leadership of Christian Herter and William Clayton has been outstanding in this regard. As one of the sponsors of the resolution and one who had high hopes for it, I may say that the results up to this time have more than justified our expectations. I am deeply grateful to the Senators who participated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has been a tower of strength in this effort from the very beginning.

Mr. President, I have been working for such a convention ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. It made me very happy when Congress eventually adopted the resolution to provide the means by which this new method of bringing together uninstructed citizens and allowing them to apply their best thinking to our international problems might be tried. It makes me even happier, reading the declaration, to learn that this new experiment in international affairs has worked. The declaration and the resolutions are a distinct service to the governments involved.

I think the U.S. Commission, headed by the Honorable Christian A. Herter and William L. Clayton, is due a great deal of the credit for the success of the convention. First, they had the task of explaining the U.S. legislation to the legislative bodies in all the other NATO countries. Through the initiative of the U.S. Commission a preparatory meeting was held in London last October, at which time a scale of representation, a method of sharing the costs, and rules under which the convention would operate were agreed to. Then the other nations did, indeed, set up similar commissions and agree to participate. The fact that the convention was held was in itself an achievement.

Finally, last January 8, the delegates gathered at the International Conference Center in Paris, some 90 of them. All were uninstructed by their governments and told simply to apply their best thinking to the problems of the free world. They had been studying these problems prior to their arrival at the International Conference Center in Paris, but now they were faced with the responsibility of making decisions. Some, like Paul Van Zeeland, former Premier of Belgium and one of the fathers of the European movement, were well known and at home in international conferences. Others were new to this scene.

They came as strangers, but significantly 2 weeks later they left as friends, and they left behind a legacy of constructive recommendations for the Atlantic Community. They soon found,

that no matter where they were from in the Atlantic Community—Turks, Belgians, Italians, Icelanders, British, or American—they had a common bond in freedom. They had a common determination to make the Western World strong and united enough to endure in freedom.

Mr. President, let me read a few significant excerpts from the Declaration of Paris. It begins:

We, the citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, meeting in Paris, January 8–20, 1962, are convinced that our survival as freemen, and the possibility of progress for all men, demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade.

It continues:

A true Atlantic Community must extend to the political, military, economic, moral, and cultural fields.

The convention called upon the governments of the NATO countries to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era. It proposed, as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic community, the creation at the highest political level of a department high council, whose competence would extend to political, economic, military, and cultural matters. This council would not only prepare and concert policies on current questions, but, in defined cases, decide them by a weighted, qualified majority vote. Pending the establishment of the council, the convention recommended greater powers for the North Atlantic Council.

The convention proposed the NATO Parliamentarians Conference be developed into a consultative Atlantic Assembly, and that eventually a high court of justice be established to settle disputes between members and the organizations arising from the interpretation and application of treaties.

Mr. President, I am highlighting parts of the declaration and resolutions which appeal to me, but I think that it ought to be printed in full at this point so that the Members of this body will know it in toto. I ask unanimous consent to have printed the declaration and resolutions in full in my remarks at this point.

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

ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS—DECLARATION OF PARIS

We, the citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, meeting in Paris, January 8–20, 1962, are convinced that our survival as free men, and the possibility of progress for all men, demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade, and therefore submit this declaration of our convictions:

PREAMBLE

The Atlantic peoples are heir to a magnificent civilization whose origins include the early achievements of the Near East, the classical beauty of Greece, the juridical sagacity of Rome, the spiritual power of our religious traditions and the humanism of the Renaissance. Its latest flowering, the discoveries of modern science, allow an extraordinary mastery of the forces of nature.

While our history has too many pages of tragedy and error, it has also evolved principles transcending the vicissitudes of history, such as the supremacy of law, respect for individual rights, social justice and the duty of generosity.

Thanks to that civilization and to the common characteristics with which it stamps the development of the peoples participating in it, the nations of the West do in fact constitute a powerful cultural and moral community.

But the time has now come when the Atlantic countries must close their ranks, if they wish to guarantee their security against the Communist menace and insure that their unlimited potentialities shall develop to the advantage of all men of good will.

A true Atlantic Community must extend to the political, military, economic, moral and cultural fields. The evolution we contemplate will contribute to the diversity of achievements and aspirations which constitute the cultural splendor and intellectual wealth of our peoples.

The Atlantic Convention, keeping this ideal constantly in view, recommends the following measures which, in its opinion, would foster the necessary cohesion of the West, would bring the final objective closer and should be adopted forthwith by the governments concerned.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To define the principles on which our common civilization is based and to consult about ways of insuring respect for these principles.

2. To create, as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic Community, a permanent high council at the highest political level, to concert and plan, and in agreed cases to decide policy on matters of concern to the community as a whole. Pending the establishment of the council, the convention recommends that the North Atlantic Council be strengthened through the delegation of additional responsibilities.

3. To develop the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference into a consultative assembly which would review the work of all Atlantic institutions and make recommendations to them.

4. To establish an Atlantic High Court of Justice, to decide specified legal controversies which may arise under the treaties.

5. To harmonize political, military, and economic policy on matters affecting the community as a whole.

6. That the North Atlantic Council treat the development of an agreed NATO policy with respect to nuclear weapons as a matter of urgency.

7. That it welcomes the development, progress, and prospective expansion of the European economic institutions, and the spirit of President Kennedy's statement that a trade partnership be formed between the United States and the European Economic Community, the basis of an Atlantic Economic Community, open to other nations of the free world.

8. That the Atlantic nations, acknowledging the right of every people to freedom, independence, and pursuit of happiness, cooperate on a larger scale with the developing nations in their economic programs, through direct and multilateral action; through the acceleration of investments; and especially through measures which would increase both the volume and value of their exports, including special tariff concessions for their exports.

9. That the Atlantic Community take steps to help improve all their economies, so that the proportionate economic and social potential of all will be less unequal.

10. That the Atlantic nations, noting the destruction of the national independence and the human rights of many peoples in eastern and central Europe, reaffirm their belief that the problem of these captive nations should be resolved in accordance with the principles of both individual liberty and national self-determination.

11. To create an Atlantic Council for Youth, Education, and Culture in order to draw up Atlantic plans for exchanges of young people, students, and teachers and for the purposes of scientific and cultural collaboration.

12. That the NATO governments promptly establish a special governmental commission to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of a true Atlantic Community, suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era.

RESOLUTIONS

We, the delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, in meeting assembled, taking note of the recommendations of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference of November 17, 1961, that an organized Atlantic Community be created, have adopted the following documents:

"PART I—POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

"A. Special Governmental Commission To Propose Organizational Changes

"Call upon the governments of the NATO countries to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era. To this end they should, within the earliest practicable period, appoint members to a Special Governmental Commission on Atlantic Unity. The Commission should study the organization of the Atlantic community, particularly in the light of the recommendations of this convention, and it should be instructed to propose such reforms and simplifications of existing institutions, and such new institutions, as may be required.

"B. Institutions

"1. Recommend, as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic Community, the creation at the highest political level, of a permanent High Council, whose competence would extend to political, economic, military and cultural matters. Such a Council, assisted by a Secretariat, would not only prepare and concert policies on current questions and, in defined cases, decide them by a weighted, qualified majority vote, but would also undertake long-term planning and propose initiatives on matters of concern to the Community. All members of the Community would be represented on the Council.

"Whether this High Council be a new institution or a development of the North Atlantic Council should be a matter of recommendation by the special governmental commission. In any event, however, pending the establishment of the Atlantic Community, the members of the convention urgently request their governments to reinforce and develop the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a political center. To this end, the convention recommends that the North Atlantic Council be strengthened through the delegation of additional jurisdiction. Where authority for decision is delegated to the North Atlantic Council by governments, it should employ a weighted majority vote.

"2. Propose that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference be developed into a consultative Atlantic Assembly, to meet at stated intervals, or upon the call of its president or otherwise, to receive reports regularly transmitted to it by the Secretaries General of other Atlantic bodies; to raise questions for and to consider, debate and review the work of all Atlantic institutions, and make recommendations to other Atlantic bodies and governments on questions of concern to the Atlantic Community. A permanent Secretariat and an annual budget should be provided for the Atlantic Assembly to insure continuity. In certain defined cases, recommendations should be by weighted majority vote. Members of the Atlantic Assembly would be selected by member governments in accordance with

their constitutional procedures. They need not necessarily be parliamentarians. The members thus chosen would have the power to elect a limited number of additional members of equal status.

"3. Recommend the creation of a high court of justice, reserved to the Atlantic Community, in order to settle legal differences between members and between members and the organizations arising from the interpretation and application of treaties.

"C. Policies

"The institutions of the Atlantic Community should harmonize those policies of its members affecting the interests of the Community as a whole, and contribute to the development of Community methods in planning, considering, and executing such policies.

"1. A primary objective is the continuing expression through national and international action of an overriding community of national interests in political and military policy. Closer and more effective action in this field should not await the growth of Community institutions (see par. 2, above); the development of an agreed NATO policy with respect to nuclear weapons should, among other immediate problems, be treated as a matter of urgency by the North Atlantic Council.

"2. A second cardinal policy objective is to realize the opportunities for economic progress available through the creation and development of the Atlantic Community. The expanding European Economic Community is an economic advantage not only for its members, but for North America and the free world as well. The convention welcomes the spirit of President Kennedy's recent statement that a trade partnership be formed between the United States and the European Economic Community. We hope that the negotiations envisaged by President Kennedy succeed in establishing a relationship which would constitute the nucleus of an Atlantic Economic Community, within the framework of Community institutions, and open to all other qualified countries. Such a development would be of advantage to all countries, and particularly to those which participate directly in it. Among the fruits of this expanding Community would be its stimulus to competition, investment and more rapid growth in the mass markets appropriate to the modern technological age, with progressive reductions in tariffs and other barriers to trade.

"3. Another important goal of the Atlantic nations is to cooperate with those developing nations which wish to do so in their efforts to overcome the burden of poverty, which may well be that of a falling per capita income in some countries. The convention recommends that the Atlantic Community increase its already considerable participation in development program of this kind, through direct financial and technical measures; through increased shares in United Nations programs, OECD programs, and other multilateral efforts; and above all through policies which favor commerce with and investment in the developing countries, such as the abolition of tariffs on tropical and primary products, and the reduction and, under agreed circumstances, even the eventual abolition of tariffs on their other products. The convention also recommends the development of equitable and agreed programs for the acceleration of investments, and for the protection of investors against political risks.

"4. An important goal of the Atlantic Community's economic policies should be to help raise the standard of living and the level of economic activity of the different segments of the Atlantic community, so that the proportional economic and social potential of all the members will be relatively less unequal.

"5. In view of the hundreds of millions of hungry people alive today, and the prospect that, if the present trends continue, there will be 3,000 million more people added to the population in the next generation, the Convention recommends that the Atlantic Community should address itself forthwith to the population problem.

"6. Since Soviet expansion has destroyed the effective national independence of many peoples in Eastern and Central Europe, denying to their individual members the free exercise of their religious rights and democratic liberties—with all the attendant injurious effects upon the general climate of European security and progress, the Convention affirms its recognition of the inalienable rights of all nations to assume freely the responsibilities of self-determination and self-government, and expresses its firm belief that the problem of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe should be resolved in accordance with the rights and principles of both individual liberty and national self-determination.

"7. As most governments of the Atlantic Community countries have accepted the obligatory clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice at The Hague, the Convention recommends that all members of the Atlantic Community accept this obligatory clause.

"PART II—MORAL AND CULTURAL QUESTIONS

"A. The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations declares that the basic moral and spiritual principles upon which the lives and acts of the nations forming the Atlantic Community are based are as follows:

"1. The purpose of political and economic institutions is the protection and promotion of the rights, liberties, and duties which enable every human being to fulfill his or her spiritual vocation.

"2. Liberty is inseparable from responsibility, which implies recognition of a moral law to which men, as individuals and in groups, are subject.

"3. Liberty is inseparable from the duties of men toward one another, which implies the obligation to insure that all men gradually attain physical and moral well-being.

"4. Liberty is inseparable from tolerance, which recognizes the right to free discussion of all opinions which are not in violation of the very principles of civilization.

"5. There can be no freedom without variety, the natural result of the different origins and varying achievements of different peoples in all fields. But this variety should not entail disunity. On the contrary, retaining the common factors, it should become the permanent force impelling the peoples of our Western civilization to unite.

"6. Freedom is inseparable from the spirit of objective truth, which must restore to words the exact meaning they have in the free world.

"And therefore invites member countries:

"1. To defend and promote the values and principles of civilization by means of education, publications, lectures, radio, the cinema, and television;

"2. To uphold in their conduct with all nations the ethics and values of Western civilization and by their example to impress on others that discord and disunity result when they are not observed;

"3. To defend these values and principles against intellectual and moral subversion within the Community;

"4. To try to establish an atmosphere of mutual understanding between the members of the Atlantic Community, appreciating to the full the riches of their diversity; and

"5. To demonstrate to all peoples that respect for these values and principles can alone make a technological civilization an instrument for improving the physical and moral well-being of mankind;

"Reconstruction of the Acropolis: To decide that the Acropolis shall become the symbol of our culture and the shrine of our alliance and to call upon governments to consider how this resolution might be given concrete form.

"B. The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations—

"Considering that a major obstacle to the formation of real European and Atlantic Communities is the difference in language and therefore in mentalities and ways of thinking; and

"Considering that this language barrier is particularly prejudicial to the scientific cooperation upon which the Western potential depends—

"Invites the governments of NATO nations, and such other countries as may be inspired by the same ideal, to convene an Atlantic council consisting of Ministers of Education, Ministers for Scientific Affairs, cultural and educational authorities and representatives of universities and scientific research organizations, with a view to:

"1. Determining the comprehensive aims of an education likely to promote the ideals and purposes of the Atlantic Community, studying ways and means of implementing the principles laid down, and periodically reviewing the results achieved.

"2. Organizing—

"A bold Atlantic plan for youth and education with the aim of furthering the study of languages and the widest possible exchange of students, teachers, and youth leaders and of workers in industry and agriculture;

"A program of scientific cooperation among the scientists and the scientific institutions of the countries of the Community—

"Both of the above being financed by all participating nations.

"Within the framework of the above recommendations, the Convention draws the attention of governments to the following points:

"(a) Alongside the study and use of foreign languages, it is essential that mutual understanding be developed between men with different ways of thinking from all parts of the free world, including those of the emergent nations.

"This program should in the first place benefit university students, as many as possible of whom should be enabled to spend at least 1 year of their course in a university or other advanced training establishment where teaching is in a language other than their own.

"However, in the case of the most promising citizens of the emergent nations this program should have a special priority, since their intellectual hunger must be satisfied at all costs.

"Steps will have to be taken to insure that such periods spent at foreign universities or other establishments do not prejudice the career of the student concerned but rather confer advantages upon him in the form of either a degree valid in his own country or a new type of degree specially created for the purpose of enabling him, for instance, to exercise his profession either in his own country or in that where he has completed one or more years of study, always providing that his knowledge of the two languages is sufficient.

"(b) It is to be hoped that, in the future, those who have pursued such a course of training, which would subsequently be supplemented by exchanges of civil servants between Atlantic nations, will be given priority in selection for posts as officials required to take part in international negotiations.

"(c) It should be made possible for teachers, and particularly university teachers, research workers, and curators of museums and art galleries, either to be seconded periodically to equivalent foreign organizations,

or to establish close contacts with them. Although it may not be immediately possible for all Atlantic Community countries, the introduction of the system of the sabbatical year for professors and research workers would be generally desirable.

"(d) In the field of scientific documentation and cooperation, it would be necessary to supplement existing organs by setting up a scientific documentation center responsible, among other things, for the translation and distribution of the principal articles, reports, and other publications appearing throughout the world, and which have not yet been distributed by other agencies. The committee considers this a most urgent matter.

"(e) The pairing off of universities and other advanced educational establishments of different languages within the Community should be encouraged and intensified.

"(f) The establishment and exchange of comparable statistics on education and research in the Atlantic community countries should be assured.

"C. Recommends that these proposals be studied further by the Atlantic Institute to assist in the accomplishment of these tasks in cooperation with existing agencies, such as the Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe to avoid duplication of effort."

GENERAL RESOLUTION

"The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations requests its president to forward the foregoing declaration and resolutions to the NATO Council and to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference at the earliest possible date, and that the delegates to this convention report the same to their respective governments or legislative authorities at their earliest convenience."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think that those who participated in that Conference set the course in the right direction. I commend the report to the thoughtful consideration of Senators.

The group that assembled in Paris and gave of their time and effort over a period of several weeks are the outstanding leaders of the 15 NATO nations. There were more than 90 delegates present. I pay them high honor for the work that they did, and ask unanimous consent that the names of all the delegates, together with the countries that they represented, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE CONVENTION WITH ADDRESSES

Abdesselam, Robert (Suppléant/Alternate), Assemblée Nationale, Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

Adelmann, Count Raban, Kleinbottwar, Wurttemberg, German Federal Republic.

Agger, Donald G., 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Allais, Prof. Maurise, 15 rue Gateceps, St. Cloud (Seine et Oise), France.

Andras, Kenneth B., 320 Bay Street, Toronto, Canada.

Bethouart, Général Antoine, 3, Place du Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

Billotte, Général P., 39, Boulevard du Commandant Charcot, Neuilly (Seine), France.

Blank, Dr. Martin, Am Grafenbusch 18, Oberhausen/Rhld., German Federal Republic.

Boel, Baron, 6, Square Frère Orban, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Bonaldi, Umberto, Via Vincenzo Tiberio 30, Rome, Italie.

Brandt, Prof. Dr. Leo, Leo Str. 100, Dusseldorf, German Federal Republic.

Brauer, Dr. Max, Ander Alster 65, Hamburg, German Federal Republic.

Buchan, the Honorable Alastair, the Institute for Strategic Studies, 18 Adam Street, London W.C. 2, England.

Burden, Hon. William A., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, United States of America.

Chamant, Jean, Assemblée Nationale, Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

de Chevigny, Pierre (Suppléant/Alternate), 23 Boulevard de Montmorency, Paris 16e, France.

Cifarelli, Michele, via Eutropio 24, Rome, Italy.

Clayton, Will C., Post Office Box 2538, Houston, Tex., United States of America.

Conte, Arthur, Président, L'Union de l'Europe Occidentale, 36 rue la Pérouse, Paris 16e.

Cooper, Edward (Alternate/Suppléant), 1600 I Street NW., Washington 6, D.C., United States of America.

Cory, Raymond, Mount Stuart House, Cardiff, United Kingdom.

Crathorne, the Right Honorable the Lord, House, of Lords, Westminster, London S.W. 1, England.

Dampierre, S. E. M. de (Suppléant/Alternate), 9 rue des Saints Peres, Paris 6e, France.

Danielou, Révérend Pêre, S.J., 15, rue Monsieur, Paris 7e, France.

Dundonald, the Right Honorable, the Earl of 6, St. James Place, London S.W. 1, England.

Engelhard, Charles W., 113 Astor Street, Newark, N.J., United States of America.

Ermini, Giuseppe, Camera dei Deputati, Rome, Italy.

Esmer, Prof. Ahmet Sükrü, 30 Olgunlar Sok, Ankara, Turkey.

Fandel, Romain (Suppléant/Alternate) 25, Avenue de la Gare, Esch/Alyette, Luxembourg.

Feldman, George J., 1010 Fifth Avenue, New York City, United States of America.

Fischbach, Marcel, 17, rue du Marché aux Herbes, Luxembourg.

Forgash, Morris, 711 Third Avenue, New York City, United States of America.

de Gaay Fortman, W. F., Zuidwerfplein 7, The Hague, Netherlands.

Garbo, Gunnar, Stortinget, Oslo, Norway.

Gillis, Don, RR 1, Garson, Ontario, Canada.

Gönlübol, Mehmet, Sizasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, Ankara, Turkey.

Goold-Adams, Richard, 60 Cottesmore Court, Stanford Road, London W.8, England.

de Graaff, G. J., care of Heerstelbank, Stadhoudersiaan 1, The Hague, Netherlands.

Hallgrimsson, H. F., Vesturbrun 22, Reykjavik, Iceland.

Hereil, Georges, Président-Directeur Général, Sud Aviation, 37 Boulevard de Montmorency, Paris 16e, France.

Herter, The Honorable Christian A., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Hulpiau, Raphael, Rue de la Loi 127, Bruxelles, Belgium.

Hutchins, Francis, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky, United States of America.

Huth, Dr. Eugen, Wupperthal, German Federal Republic.

Ilk, Dr. Herta, Beethovenstr. 8, Augsburg, German Federal Republic.

Johnston, Eric, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Klebes, Dr. Heinrich (Alternate/Suppléant), care of BDI, Postfach 107, Köln, German Federal Republic.

Koper, Danis, Bahgelievler, 6 Sokak 37, Ankara, Turquie.

Kraft, Ole Bjorn, Kajerodvej 36, Birkerod, Denmark.

Kraft, Waldemar, Ahornweg 31, Bonn, German Federal Republic.

Lazareff, Pierre, France-Soir, 100 rue Réaumur, Paris 2e, France.

Le Bellegou, M. (Suppléant/Alternate), Hotel Terminus, St. Lazare, Paris, France.

Lombardo, Ivan Matteo, Piazza Stefano, Jacini 5, Rome, Italie.

Magnusson, Einar, Skeggjagata 11, Reyjavik, Iceland.

Mahias, M. (Suppléant/Alternate), A.F.C.A., 185 rue de la Pompe, Paris 16, France.

Markussen, Per, 11 H.C. Bordersens, Bonbrard, Copenhagen 5, Denmark.

Martins, Armando, Délégation portugaise auprès de l'OTAN, Porte Dauphine, Paris 16e, France.

Mathon, General T.E.E.H., Ruychrocklaan 124, The Hague, Netherlands.

Melander, Johan, Den Norske Creditbank, Oslo, Norway.

Mersinli, Orhan C., Mesrutiyet Cad 4/8, Yenisehir, Ankara, Turquie.

Micara, Senateur Pietro, Senato della Repubblica, Rome, Italie.

Montanari, Prof. Mario, Via Appia 23, Imola (Bologna), Italie.

Moore, Hugh, Dixie Cup Co., Easton, Pennsylvania, United States of America.

Mulley, Fred, M. P. (Alternate/Suppléant), House of Commons, London, England.

Naessens, M., Banquo de Paris et des Pays-Bas, 30–31 rue des Colonies, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Neyzi, A. (Suppléant/Alternate) (Turquie), 16 Avenue Paul Doumer, Paris 16e, France.

Nicholson, Patrick, 420 Minto Place, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa, Canada.

Ogmore, The Rt. Hon. Lord, 34 Alexandra Court, Queens Gate, London S.W. 7, England.

Paget, John (Alternate/Suppléant), The Travellers, 25 ave. des Champs Elysées, Paris 8e, France.

Paget, R. T., M. P., House of Commons, London, England.

Palewski, J. P. Assemblée Nationale, Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

Pallett, John, House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Papi, Prof. Ugo, Rettore, Università di Roma, Roma, Italie.

Pirenne, Jacques-Henri (Suppléant/Alternate), 2 rue de la Régence, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Pittman, Ralph D., 1740 Poplar Lane NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Portmann, Professeur G., leé Vice President, Le Sénat, Palais de Luxembourg, Paris 6e, France.

Regan, Ben, Hornblower and Weeks, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York City, United States of America.

Ressano, M. (Suppléant/Alternate), Délégation portugaise auprès de l'OTAN, Porte Dauphine, Paris 16e, France.

Roman, Stephen B., Roman Corporation, 4 King Street W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Roper, Elmo, 111 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y., United States of America.

Rougier, Prof. Louis (Suppléant/Alternate), 354 rue St.-Honoré, Paris ler, France.

Sala, Amiral (Suppléant/Alternate), 22, rue Barbet de Jouy, Paris 7e, France.

Samkalden, Ivo, Prins Hendriklaan 22, Oegstgeest, Netherlands.

Sampson, Mrs. Edith S., 1236 Madison Park, Chicago, Ill., United States of America.

Sanness, John, Parkvn 12, Oslo, Norway.

Sarow, Friedrich, Telegraf, Bismarck Platz, Berlin/Gruenwald, German Federal Republic.

Schmidt, Adolph, 1060 Highmont Road, Pittsburgh, Pa., United States of America.

Schroeder, Prof. Oliver, Jr., Western Reserve Law School, Cleveland, Ohio, United States of America.

Sermon, Lucien (Suppléant/Alternate), 2, rue de la Régence, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Slessor, Sir John, Marshal of the Royal Air Force, Rimpton Manor, Yeovil, Somerset, England.

Stewart, Alistair, 459 McAdam Avenue, Winnipeg, Canada.

Swezey, Burr S., Lafayette, Ind., United States of America.

Tsakalotos, Général Thrasyvoulos, Dim, Soutsou 15, Place Marilli, Athens, Greece.

Tsaldaris, Mrs. Lina, Neofytou Vamva 10, Athens, Greece.

Valsecchi, Athos, Camera dei Deputati, Rome, Italie.

Vedovato, Giuseppe, Camera dei Deputati, Rome, Italie.

Vissing, Poul, 2, Fredheimsvej, Vedbaek, Denmark.

Wall, Senator William M., the Senate, Ottawa, Canada.

Walther, Dr. Gerhard, Paulsborner Strasse 8, Berlin/Halensee, German Federal Republic.

Warden, Alexander Tribune-Leader, Great Falls, Mont., United States of America.

Williamson, Sir Thomas, 17, Kingsdowne Road, Surbiton, Surrey, England.

Winter, Dr. Friedrich, Fuerth i. Bay, Koenigswarterster, 66/11, German Federal Republic.

Wynn, Douglas, 1130 Arnold Avenue, Greenville, Miss., United States of America.

Yalman, Ahmed Emin, Hür Vatan Gazetesi, Istanbul, Turquie.

Yazici, Bulent, Umum Müdür, Türkiye Is. Bankasi A.S., Ankara, Turquie.

Zaccari, Senateur Raul, Senato della Repubblica, Rome, Italie.

van Zeeland, Paul, 2, rue de la Régence, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in closing let me say that the citizen delegates in whom we entrusted confidence acted in a statesmanlike manner. They saw clearly the goal ahead—the necessity to be united economically and politically, and to build the institutions that are necessary for such unity. They did not go as far as some would have liked—three delegates, two Italians and a Canadian withheld their votes because they thought the convention should have made more far-reaching recommendations. But I commend them for realizing that institutions grow by an evolutionary process. I think they have set the course in the right direction. I commend their report to the thoughtful consideration of governments.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Madam President, earlier today a discussion took place on the floor relating to the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO, which recently met in Paris. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make be printed in the RECORD immediately following that discussion.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO, which has recently participated in the Atlantic Convention, will in due course file its report to the Congress. The results of the convention have already been published, however, in the form of a Declaration of Paris and resolutions adopted by nearly unanimous vote of the delegates from all of the NATO countries. I wish to comment briefly on the work of the U.S. Citizens' Commission at this convention.

The authorizing resolution, which I had the honor of reporting to the Senate, instructed our Citizens Commission to consult with other, similar, commissions from the NATO countries on means of strengthening the unity of the Atlantic Community. I think they deserve great credit for accomplishing this task with imagination, constructive zeal, and prudence.

Perhaps the most significant of the convention's recommendations is contained in the first resolution, which calls upon the governments of the NATO countries to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era. I hope our own Government will take the lead in the implementation of this resolution, to the end that the acorn of Atlantic unity, now firmly rooted, will be nurtured to furnish a mighty shelter for Western civilization in the stormy years ahead.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 330)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the expansion and improvement of educational opportunities.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message on education be considered as having been read, and that the message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

No task before our Nation is more important than expanding and improving the educational opportunities of all our people. The concept that every American deserves the opportunity to attain the highest level of education of which he is capable is not new to this administration—it is a traditional ideal of democracy. But it is time that we moved toward the fulfillment of this ideal with more vigor and less delay.

For education is both the foundation and the unifying force of our democratic way of life—it is the mainspring of our economic and social progress—it is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life. In short, it is at the same time the most profitable investment society can make and the richest reward it can confer.

Today, more than at any other time in our history, we need to develop our intellectual resources to the fullest. But the facts of the matter are that many thousands of our young people are not educated to their maximum capacity—and they are not, therefore, making the maximum contribution of which they are capable to themselves, their families, their communities, and the Nation. Their talents lie wasted—their lives are frequently pale and blighted—and their contribution to our economy and culture are lamentably below the levels of their potential skills, knowledge, and creative ability. Educational failures breed delinquency, despair, and dependence. They increase the costs of unemployment and public welfare. They cut our potential national economic output by billions. They deny the benefits of our society to large segments of our people. They undermine our capability as a Nation to discharge world obligations. All this we cannot afford—better schools we can afford.

To be sure, Americans are still the best educated and best trained people in the world. But our educational system has failed to keep pace with the problems and needs of our complex technological society. Too many are illiterate or untrained, and thus either unemployed or underemployed. Too many receive an education diminished in quality in thousands of districts which cannot or do not support modern and adequate facilities, well-paid and well-trained teachers, or even a sufficiently long school year.

Too many—an estimated 1 million a year—leave school before completing high school—the bare minimum for a fair start in modern-day life. Too many high school graduates with talent—numbering in the hundreds of thousands—fail to go on to college; and 40 percent of those who enter college drop out before graduation. And too few, finally, are going on to the graduate studies that modern society requires in increasing number. The total number of graduates receiving doctorate degrees has increased only about one-third in 10 years; in 1960 they numbered less than 10,000, including only 3,000 in mathematics, physical sciences, and engineering.

An educational system which is inadequate today will be worse tomorrow, unless we act now to improve it. We must provide facilities for 14 million more elementary, secondary school, and college students by 1970, an increase of 30 percent. College enrollments alone will nearly double, requiring approximately twice as many facilities to serve nearly 7 million students by 1970. We must find the means of financing a 75-percent increase in the total cost of education—another $20 billion a year for expansion and improvement—particularly in facilities and instruction which must be of the highest quality if our Nation is to achieve its highest goals.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The control and operation of education in America must remain the responsibility of State and local governments and private institutions. This tradition assures our educational system of the freedom, the diversity, and the vitality necessary to serve our free society fully. But the Congress has long recognized the responsibility of the Nation as a whole—that additional resources, meaningful encouragement, and vigorous leadership must be added to the total effort by the Federal Government if we are to meet the task before us. For education in this country is the right—the necessity—and the responsibility—of all. Its advancement is essential to national objectives and dependent on the greater financial resources available at the national level.

Let us put to rest the unfounded fears that "Federal money means Federal con-

trol." From the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, originally conceived by Thomas Jefferson, through the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the still-important and still-independent land-grant college system, to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Congress has repeatedly recognized its responsibility to strengthen our educational system without weakening local responsibility. Since the end of the Korean war, Federal funds for constructing and operating schools in districts affected by Federal installations have gone directly to over 5,500 districts without any sign or complaint of interference or dictation from Washington. In the last decade, over $5 billion of Federal funds have been channeled to aid higher education without in any way undermining local administration.

While the coordination of existing Federal programs must be improved, we cannot meanwhile defer action on meeting our current pressing needs. Every year of further delay means a further loss of the opportunity for quality instruction to students who will never get that opportunity back. I therefore renew my urgent request of last year to the Congress for early action on those measures necessary to help this Nation achieve the twin goals of education: A new standard of educational excellence and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our educational system. There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education, or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering, without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education. With our mobile population and demanding needs, this is not a matter of local or State action alone—this is a national concern.

Since my message on education of last year, our crucial needs at this level have intensified and our deficiencies have grown more critical. We cannot afford to lose another year in mounting a national effort to eliminate the shortage of classrooms, to make teachers' salaries competitive, and to lift the quality of instruction.

CLASSROOMS

To meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments—increasing by nearly 1 million elementary and secondary pupils a year in the 1960's—and to provide every child with the opportunity to receive a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during this decade. The States report an immediate shortage today of more than 127,000 classrooms and a rate of construction which, combined with heavily increasing enrollments, is not likely to fill their needs for 10 years. Already over half a million pupils are in curtailed or half-day sessions. Unless the present rate of construction is accelerated and Federal resources made available to supplement State and local resources that are already strained in many areas few families and communities in the Nation will be free from the ill effects of overcrowded or inadequate facilities in our public schools.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Teachers' salaries, though improving, are still not high enough to attract and retain in this demanding profession all the capable teachers we need. We entrust to our teachers our most valuable possession—our children—for a very large share of their waking hours during the most formative years of their life. We make certain that those to whom we entrust our financial assets are individuals of the highest competence and character—we dare not do less for the trustees of our children's minds.

Yet in no other sector of our national economy do we find such a glaring discrepancy between the importance of one's work to society and the financial reward society offers. Can any able and industrious student, unless unusually motivated, be expected to elect a career that pays more poorly than almost any other craft, trade, or profession? Until this situation can be dramatically improved—unless the States and localities can be assisted and stimulated in bringing about salary levels which will make the teaching profession competitive with other professions which require the same length of training and ability—we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers.

These are problems of national proportion. Last year I sent to the Congress a proposal to meet the urgent needs of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. A bill (S. 1021) embodying this proposal passed the Senate last year; and similar legislation (H.R. 7300) was favorably reported to the House by its Committee on Education and Labor. It offered the minimum amount required by our needs and—in terms of across-the-board aid—the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. It is imperative that such a proposal carrying out these objectives be enacted this session. I again urge the Congress to enact legislation providing Federal aid for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

As noted earlier, Federal aid for construction and operation of many public schools has been provided since 1950 to those local school districts in which enrollments are affected by Federal installations. Such burdens which may remain from the impact of Federal activities on local school districts will be eased by my proposal for assistance to all school districts for construction and teachers' salaries, thus permitting modification and continuation of this special assistance program as proposed in last year's bill.

A fundamental overhauling and modernization of our traditional vocational education programs is also increasingly needed. Pursuant to my message on education last February, a panel of consultants to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is studying national needs in this area. They have been asked to develop recommendations by the close of this year for improving and redirecting the Federal Government's role in this program.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

Strengthening financial support for education by general Federal aid will not, however, be sufficient. Specific measures directed at selected problems are also needed to improve the quality of education. And the key to educational quality is the teaching profession. About 1 of every 5 of the nearly 1,600,000 teachers in our elementary and secondary schools fails to meet full certification standards for teaching or has not completed 4 years of college work. Our immediate concern should be to afford them every possible opportunity to improve their professional skills and their command of the subjects they teach.

In all of the principal areas of academic instruction—English, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, foreign languages, history, geography, and the social sciences—significant advances are being made, both in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge and in the methods of transmitting that knowledge. To keep our teachers up to date on such advances, special institutes are offered in some of these areas by many colleges and universities, financed in part by the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education. Many elementary and secondary school teachers would profit from a full year of full-time study in their subject-matter fields. Very few can afford to do so. Yet the benefits of such a year could be shared by outstanding teachers with others in their schools and school systems as well as with countless students. We should begin to make such opportunities available to the elementary and secondary school teachers of this country and thereby accord to this profession the support, prestige, and recognition it deserves.

Another need is for higher standards of teacher education, course content, and instructional methods. The colleges and universities that train our teachers need financial help to examine and further strengthen their programs. Increased research and demonstration efforts must be directed toward improving the learning and teaching of subject matter and developing new and improved learning aids. Excellent but limited work in educational research and development has been undertaken by projects supported by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and private groups. This must be increased—introducing and demonstrating to far more schools than at present up-to-date educational methods using the newest instructional materials and equipment, and providing the most effective inservice training and staff utilization.

Finally, in many urban as well as rural areas of the country, our school systems are confronted with unusually severe educational problems which require the development of new approaches—the problems of gifted children, deprived children, children with language problems, and children with problems that contribute to the high dropout rate, to name but a few.

To help meet all of these needs for better educational quality and development, and to provide a proper Federal role of assistance and leadership, I recommend that the Congress enact a program designed to help improve the excellence of American education by authorizing (1) the award each year of up to 2,500 scholarships to outstanding elementary and secondary school teachers for a year of full-time study; (2) the establishment of institutes at colleges and universities for elementary and secondary school teachers of those subjects in which improved instruction is needed; (3) grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of special projects designed to strengthen teacher preparation programs through better curriculums and teaching methods; (4) amendment of the Cooperative Research Act to permit support of extensive, multipurpose educational research, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects; and (5) grants for local public school systems to conduct demonstration or experimental projects of limited duration to improve the quality of instruction or meet special educational problems in elementary and secondary schools.

II. ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

In the last 10 days, both Houses of Congress have recognized the importance of higher education to the fulfillment of our national and international responsibilities. Increasing student enrollments in this decade will place a still greater burden on our institutions of higher education than that imposed on our elementary and secondary schools where the cost of education per student is only a fraction as much. Between 1960 and 1970 it is expected that college enrollments will double, and that our total annual operating expenditures for expanding and improving higher education must increase 2½ times or by nearly $10 billion.

In order to accommodate this increase in enrollments, the Office of Education estimates that nearly $22 billion of college facilities will have to be built during the 1960's—three times the construction achieved in the last 10 years. The extension of the college housing loan program—with a $1.5 billion loan authorization for 5 years, enacted as part of the Housing Act of 1961—assures Federal support for our colleges' urgent residential needs. I am hopeful that the Congress will this month complete its action on legislation to assist in the building of the even more important and urgently needed academic facilities.

But I want to take this opportunity to stress that buildings alone are not enough. In our democracy every young person should have an equal opportunity to obtain a higher education, regardless of his station in life or financial means. Yet more than 400,000 high school seniors who graduated in the upper half of their classes last June failed to enter college this fall. In this group were 200,000 who ranked in the upper 30 percent of their class, of whom one-third to one-half failed to go on to college principally because of a lack of finances. Others lack the necessary guidance, incentive, or the opportunity to attend the college of their choice. But whatever the reason, each of these 400,000 students represents an irreplaceable loss to the Nation.

Student loans have been helpful to many. But they offer neither incentive nor assistance to those students who, by reason of family or other obligations, are unable or unwilling to go deeper into debt. The average cost of higher education today—up nearly 90 percent since 1950 and still rising—is in excess of $1,750 per year per student, or $7,000 for a 4-year course. Industrious students can earn a part of this—they or their families can borrow a part of it—but one-half of all American families had incomes below $5,600 in 1960—and they cannot be expected to borrow, for example, $4,000 for each talented son or daughter that deserves to go to college. Federal scholarships providing up to $1,000 a year can fill part of this gap. It is, moreover, only prudent economic and social policy for the public to share part of the costs of the long period of higher education for those whose development is essential to our national economic and social well-being. All of us share in the benefits—all should share in the costs.

I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges be enacted without delay.

III. SPECIAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. MEDICAL AND DENTAL EDUCATION

The health needs of our Nation require a sharp expansion of medical and dental education in the United States. We do not have an adequate supply of physicians and dentists today—we are in fact importing many from abroad where they are urgently needed—and the shortage is growing more acute, as the demand for medical services mounts and our population grows. Even to maintain the present ratio of physicians and dentists to population we must graduate 50 percent more physicians and 90 percent more dentists per year by 1970, requiring not only the expansion of existing schools but the construction of at least 20 new medical schools and 20 new dental schools.

But here again more buildings are not enough. It is an unfortunate and disturbing fact that the high costs of the prolonged education necessary to enter these professions deprives many highly competent young people of an opportunity to serve in these capacities. Over 40 percent of all medical students now come from the 12 percent of our families with incomes of $10,000 or more a year, while only 14 percent of the students come from the 50 percent of the Nation's families with incomes under $5,000. This is unfair and unreasonable. A student's ability—not his parents' income—should determine whether he has the opportunity to enter medicine or dentistry.

I recommend that Congress enact the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which I proposed last year to (a) authorize a 10-year program of matching grants for the construction of new medical and dental schools and (b) provide 4-year scholarships and cost-of-education grants for one-fourth of the entering students in each medical and dental school in the United States.

2. SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Our economic, scientific, and military strength increasingly requires that we have sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers to cope with the fast-changing needs of our time—and the agency with general responsibility for increasing this supply today is the National Science Foundation. At the elementary and secondary school level, I have recommended in the 1963 budget an expansion of the Science Foundation program to develop new instructional materials and laboratory apparatus for use in a larger number of secondary schools and to include additional subjects and age groups; an expansion of the experimental summer program permitting gifted high school students to work with university research scientists; and an expansion in the number of National Science Foundation supported institutes offering special training in science and mathematics for high school teachers throughout the country. The budget increase requested for this latter program would permit approximately 36,000 high school teachers, representing about 30 percent of the secondary school teachers of science and mathematics in this country, to participate in the program.

At the higher education level, I am recommending similar budget increases for institute programs for college teachers; improvement in the content of college science, mathematics and engineering courses; funds for laboratory demonstration apparatus; student research programs; additional top level graduate fellowships in science, mathematics and engineering; and $61.5 million in grants to our colleges and universities for basic research facilities.

3. REDUCTION OF ADULT ILLITERACY

Adult education must be pursued aggressively. Over 8 million American citizens aged 25 or above have attended school for less than 5 years, and more than a third of these completely lack the ability to read and write. The economic result of this lack of schooling is often chronic unemployment, dependency or delinquency, with all the consequences this entails for these individuals, their families, their communities and the Nation. The twin tragedies of illiteracy and dependency are often passed on from generation to generation.

There is no need for this. Many nations—including our own—have shown that this problem can be attacked and virtually wiped out. Unfortunately, our State school systems—overburdened in recent years by the increasing demands of growing populations and the increasing handicaps of insufficient revenues—have been unable to give adequate attention to this problem. I recommend the authorization of a 5-year program of grants to institutions of higher learning and to the States, to be coordinated in the development of programs which will

offer every adult who is willing and able the opportunity to become literate.

4. EDUCATION OF MIGRANT WORKERS

The neglected educational needs of America's 1 million migrant agricultural workers and their families constitute one of the gravest reproaches to our Nation. The interstate and seasonal movement of migrants imposes severe burdens on those school districts which have the responsibility for providing education to those who live there temporarily. I recommend authorization of a 5-year Federal-State program to aid States and school districts in improving the educational opportunities of migrant workers and their children.

5. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

The use of television for educational purposes—particularly for adult education—offers great potentialities. The Federal Government has sought to further this through the reservation of 270 television channels for education by the Federal Communications Commission and through the provision of research and advisory services by the Office of Education. Unfortunately, the rate of construction of new broadcasting facilities has been discouraging. Only 80 educational TV channels have been assigned in the last decade. It is apparent that further Federal stimulus and leadership are essential if the vast educational potential of this medium is to be realized. Last year an educational television bill passed the Senate, and a similar proposal was favorably reported to the House. I urge the Congress to take prompt and final action to provide matching financial grants to the States to aid in the construction of State or other nonprofit educational television stations.

6. AID TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Another longstanding national concern has been the provision of specially trained teachers to meet the educational needs of children afflicted with physical and mental disabilities. The existing program providing Federal assistance to higher education institutions and to State education agencies for training teachers and supervisory personnel for mentally retarded children was supplemented last year to provide temporarily for training teachers of the deaf. I recommend broadening the basic program to include assistance for the special training needed to help all our children afflicted with the entire range of physical and mental handicaps.

7. FEDERAL AID TO THE ARTS

Our Nation has a rich and diverse cultural heritage. We are justly proud of the vitality, the creativity, and the variety of the contemporary contributions our citizens can offer to the world of the arts. If we are to be among the leaders of the world in every sense of the word, this sector of our national life cannot be neglected or treated with indifference. Yet, almost alone among the governments of the world, our Government has displayed little interest in fostering cultural development. Just as the Federal Government has not, should not, and will not undertake to control the subject matter taught in local schools, so its efforts should be confined to broad encouragement of the arts. While this area is too new for hasty action, the proper contributions that should and can be made to the advancement of the arts by the Federal Government—many of them outlined by the Secretary of Labor in his decision settling the Metropolitan Opera labor dispute—deserve thorough and sympathetic consideration. A bill (H.R. 4172) already reported out to the House would make this possible and I urge approval of such a measure establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to undertake these studies.

IV. CONCLUSION

The problems to which these proposals are addressed would require solution whether or not we were confronted with a massive threat to freedom. The existence of that threat lends urgency to their solution—to the accomplishment of those objectives which, in any case, would be necessary for the realization of our highest hopes and those of our children.

If a nation—

Wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1816—

expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects that never was and never will be.

That statement is even truer today than it was 146 years ago.

The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1962.*

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we continue this afternoon to debate and vote on the issue of Federal funds for college classroom construction and higher education programs, I merely wish to state that I expect to support the committee and the bill and vote against amendments that in my opinion might delay final action on the proposed legislation. It is my hope that when the bill is finally approved in conference that it will be largely the House approved bill.

I have before me an interesting article which appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor, which I think will serve to call our attention to the cost of Federal participation in education. The article was written by Josephine Ripley, I wish to read only a short excerpt:

The Government is up to its ears in education programs. A recent preliminary survey showed some 40 Federal agencies spending about $2 billion a year on educational programs.

I think the article contains information that we all should have. We doubtless at times fail to realize how many programs of education the various agencies of Government are engaged in.

In order to make the article available to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

EDUCATION COSTS, FOR WHOM?

(By Josephine Ripley)

The Government is up to its ears in education programs. A recent preliminary survey showed some 40 Federal agencies spending about $2 billion a year on educational programs.

This fact so shocked legislators that most of the education bills now pending in the House are being held back while a thorough study is conducted to see how much overlapping is involved in these many and varied projects.

Chairman POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee describes this multitude of educational programs throughout the government as "unbelievable."

Representative EDITH GREEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, has been urging a survey of these activities for the past 3 years.

Oddly, she finds more money is being spent for education by other departments of Government taken together than by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"I don't know of any single official in government, or anywhere else, who knows what the educational program really is," she has stated.

The preliminary study shows educational funds expended for agricultural extension programs, for census training, maritime administration schools, meteorological education and training, and training in the National Bureau of Standards under the Department of Commerce.

For military service academies, education for civilian and military personnel, for children of servicemen overseas; for the native population on the Pacific islands, medical education for national defense; and research assistantships under the Department of Defense.

Under the Department of the Interior, for Bureau of Mines safety program, the education of children of National Park Service employees, education in American Samoa, the Pribilof Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Carolinas, Marshalls, and Marianas), and for Indians.

Under the Department of Justice, for Bureau of Prisons general and social education, Bureau of Prisons correspondence courses; vocational training, the FBI National Academy and police training schools.

The Department of Labor has educational programs for testing, counseling, and placement services, for the foreign visitors' program, and for apprenticeship and training.

The Department of State has its educational exchange programs, country missions, and interuniversity contracts.

The Treasury has programs for Coast Guard training, education of dependent children overseas, Internal Revenue Service training for enforcement personnel.

The Atomic Energy Commission has programs of contract research, fellowships, expenditures for public schools and other training.

Under the District of Columbia there is the Capitol Page School (the pages for Members of Congress), education in public welfare institutions, and public education, since the District is a Federal city.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation conducts employee education programs; the Library of Congress supplies reading material for the blind; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has training and research centers; so has the National Science Foundation.

The Office of Civil Defense, the Small Business Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Veterans' Administration all have certain educational projects.

Mrs. GREEN has raised numerous questions with respect to these projects. She observes: "We keep increasing funds for agricultural extension work at a time when the census shows that the rural population is declining while the urban population increases."

Even while Congress launched upon its investigation of education costs, the House by an overwhelming majority approvel a $1,500 million Federal aid program to help American colleges build classrooms. The Senate is expected to start action immediately on an even broader college-aid bill.

Pending also are: the educational television bill for purchase of educational TV equipment; Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961; Veterans Adjustment Assistance Act of 1961; Manpower Development and Training Act.

The administration has proposed a bill to reduce adult illiteracy, due to be introduced formally in Congress. And there is the President's controversial program for aid to public schools which has been blocked and on which no action is expected.

But even without this proposed $2,500 million for public school aid, the cost of education to the Government—the taxpayer, that is—is bound to be on the rise substantially over the next decade.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I rise to express my appreciation to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to its chairman, Senator LISTER HILL, and to all its members, who have brought S. 1241—this bill for higher education—to its present point of perfection.

It is the nature of the Senate process, with its division of labor, that many of us, not members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, are permitted to bide our time. We profit by the long hours of hearings, reviews, and reconciliations that produce a bill in its final form.

Then we speak our minds by means of our vote. But I feel impelled to add my voice of appreciation to my vote of approval. In this area of education, especially higher education, every one of us in the Senate is keenly aware of our needs. In comparison with and in competition with the Soviet intellectual ideology we are aware of our shortcomings. We are alive to the urgency of effective, practical, and adequate steps to combat deficiencies and to match and surpass the pace of those who would deny our ideals and destroy our destiny.

If any Senator were dilatory in recognizing the necessity for action in this field, he would certainly be alerted by responsible persons within his State. These are the responsible persons dedicated to education—persons whose whole lives are immersed in the problems to which we can give so limited a time.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given sufficient time to complete my statement, not to exceed 3 minutes.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the panorama of programs and policies which give our country character in the era for which we of the Senate bear responsibility, it is unfortunate that our legislative time has to be so rationed. But when I say "limited time" I do not mean to imply that this deliberative body has not thoroughly studied the subject and intelligently reached the conclusions embodied in this measure S. 1241.

I compliment the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his scholarly, statesmanlike and exhaustive presentation of last Friday, February 2. The issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day and date is a volume to be treasured for its logic and illumination of what must be done in this field of higher education and how to do it. S. 1241 in its finished form is a masterminding of a peril that perplexes us in a country of our native riches and world responsibility.

Some of us see the problem in the simple fact that 68,000 of the top 30 percent of our high school graduates are not going to college this year. Finance and facilities are the roadblocks. This bill, I believe, removes some of these roadblocks and give us a genuine impetus along the path to more adequate higher education.

I have said that responsible leaders in education would alert us to the need for S. 1241. Senator MORSE in his Friday presentation recorded the support of college authorities in his own State of Oregon.

I would like to supplement this with support from my own State of Rhode Island, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., president of Providence College, and a telegram from President Barnaby C. Keeney, of Brown University, be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

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

PROVIDENCE COLLEGE,
Providence, R.I., January 29, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Providence College requests your support for the passage of S. 1241 which provides matching grants at low interest rates to public and private colleges for the construction of classrooms, dormitories, libraries, and laboratories. We believe the need for such assistance is urgent to provide for ever-increasing requests for admission to our colleges and universities.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
VINCENT C. DORE, O. P.,
President.

PROVIDENCE, R.I., *January 29, 1962.*

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Hope you will support S. 1241 establishing program of loans and grants for construction of academic facilities program is urgently needed although amount provided for Rhode Island in present bill is too small to meet needs in this State.

BARNABY C. KEENEY.

Mr. PASTORE. The president of Brown University suggests that the amount allotted to Rhode Island is too small to meet the needs in our State.

This indicates that we are not extravagant in our allocations of moneys. It also gives rise to this thought: the benefits of a State's educational opportunities are not limited to students from that State. The major part of students in our colleges come from outside the State of Rhode Island. But I also realize that many Rhode Island students profit from educational facilities outside our State.

This emphasizes the universality of American education—it is not limited by the boundaries of individual States. We are also emphasizing the universality of education in that its benefits cannot and should not be limited to the phenomenal student. There is with us the challenge of equal opportunity. This is the opportunity for each American boy and girl to make the most out of their lives and to benefit human society from the perfection of their God-given talents.

This opportunity for education is the obligation of human society and it is the source of society's strength. This is the philosophy of educational leaders who support this measure for educational aid, S. 1241.

I would like to quote briefly from one of these leaders. At the same time I would ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete article by Rev. Joseph L. Lennon, dean of Providence College. The article is from the Providence Bulletin of January 24, 1962.

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

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Father Lennon says:

Society then is human society, erected by the free consent of human persons and having as its aim the common good of its members, the providing of the conditions of the good life through which they can most completely develop their human potentialities.

"Unselfish love of the common good"—

Father Lennon quotes Thomas Aquinas—

"makes a good citizen."

This love of the citizen must, of course, like all love, be preceded by knowledge. It is here that our schools can be most helpful. The citizen has to be profoundly conscious of his dependence on society; he has to recognize himself as incomplete, as insufficient unto himself. He has to see civil society as it is, a unity of men like himself who desire to live the good life and who for the purpose of offering mutual help toward the realization of a common social and cultural well-being in which all may participate.

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

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

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 1 more minute.

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

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for the very fine contribution he has made to the debate on the higher education bill. His premises are unanswerable, and I commend

him for them. I thank him very much for the gracious comments he has made about the senior Senator from Oregon.

OUR CONGO POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many reasons the presence in Washington of Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula of the Congo is an occasion for congratulations on the so far good results of our Congo policy. We certainly wish Prime Minister Adoula good success in his efforts to establish peace and progress in his country. The new Republic has a long way to go before it can solve its major problems, but the situation has shown a decided trend toward improvement.

United States policy toward the Congo was formulated by President Eisenhower and continued under the present administration. It calls for support of the actions taken by the United Nations in fulfilling the mandate of the General Assembly, and the success of that policy so far, notwithstanding trials and doubts, is confirmed by the clear progress that has been made. Five out of the six Provinces of the Congo are clearly under the control of the Central Government, and the process of reintegrating Katanga is proceeding under the direction of the United Nations.

An advertisement in the New York Times of Thursday, January 25, 1962, by a group of civic and educational leaders, many of whom are actively engaged in teaching and research in African affairs, commended our Government for its Congo policy, quoting President Eisenhower's statement of policy on September 22, 1960, and concluding with the following statement:

> The United Nations is in the Congo with objectives that by and large parallel our own—to help the Adoula government create a stable and unified Congo and to ward off the dangers of civil war and great-power intervention. So far, the United Nations has been remarkably successful in its efforts toward this end; had it not been available for this purpose, we should have had to invent it, or the situation would already be lost. The United Nations effort deserves our support. We have given it. We should continue to do so.
>
> The Adoula government, the only legitimate government of the Congo, is a broadly based coalition under the leadership of an outstanding non-Communist African nationalist. This government's objectives are fully consistent with ours. It, too, deserves our support and will have it.

THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an article in the current issue of Aerospace, official publication of the Aerospace Industries Association, which summarizes quite well the current condition of our airline industry.

This article by Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, shows the remarkable progress made by our airlines in the field of safety, equipment, and service. The author, at the same time, points to certain immediate problems because of the earnings record of the past few years, particularly of our domestic trunk carriers.

In calling attention to this review of the air transport industry, I should like, at the same time, to point out that the scheduled airlines' national trade and service organization, the Air Transport Association, has now completed more than a quarter-century of service to the general public. By the key role which it plays in assisting the airlines in cooperative ways, it has helped carry out the mandate of Congress expressed in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and reaffirmed in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

The association began in 1936 when it became clear that only through a thoroughly integrated national air transport system would the maximum benefits of air travel be brought to the public.

While adhering to the philosophy of regulated competition so clearly expressed in the Civil Aeronautics Act, it was also obvious that some organization such as the ATA would be required so that the airlines could draw on each other's knowledge and experience for ways and means of improving safety, for pooling ideas to increase efficiency in maintenance, flight operations and other areas of air transport. ATA is the forum for the cooperation which is so necessary to work out uniform procedures in the areas of reservations, ticketing, accounting, and luggage, mail and cargo handling, to facilitate interline transportation.

On this 26th anniversary of the ATA, I am gratified to commend to your attention the contributions which the airlines, through their association, have made. These contributions have allowed the U.S. scheduled airline system to lead the world in air transportation.

I have known Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, since the midthirties, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives and was one of the sponsors of the measure which became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Mr. Tipton, at that time, was an attorney in the Treasury Department and performed a material part in perfecting this legislation. He is conscientious, knowledgeable, and fair in his application to public issues. I am certain that these attributes have contributed a vital part in the high standing which he and his association have in the aviation world today.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel it my duty vigorously to protest the action of the Air Force and the Defense Department which unless halted or modified, will result in throwing from 12,000 to 14,000 employees of Republic Aviation out of work. It is the most devastating blow that has yet been struck at the economy of New York State. In the last year, defense contracts awarded in New York State have dropped from 12 percent to 8 percent.

It must not be forgotten that New York State was already getting the short end of the stick before this recent drop. New York State contributes almost 20 percent of the taxes paid to run the Federal Government. There need not necessarily be a correlation between that figure and the amount of defense work the State of New York receives, but there should be a much closer connection than is indicated in the figures I have cited.

I have already lodged a vigorous protest with the Air Force. The congressional steering committee from New York and all the Members of the New York delegation, of both parties, are greatly disturbed over this development. I sincerely trust that the Air Force will have a second look.

This action comes about through a rejection of certain planes and proposed planes developed by this company. It is not my contention that we should try to dictate to the Department of Defense exactly what planes they should purchase; but it is my belief that it does not make sense to eliminate completely from their thinking the contribution which this fine firm has made in the past to our defense strength and the overall contribution which the State of New York makes to the national economy. To deal such a sudden and devastating blow to this important area of the State of New York is not and cannot, under any possible circumstances, be in the national interest.

DEATH OF WALTER J. LYON OF THE BINGHAMTON, N.Y., SUN-BULLETIN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished and colorful member of the Fourth Estate in upstate New York.

Walter J. Lyon, managing editor of the Binghamton Sun-Bulletin, died of a heart attack on the morning of February 5. Although more than 80 years old, "Bud" Lyon remained an active and vigorous newspaperman to the time of his death. He was beloved not only by his fellow journalists, but also by all persons in public life in New York State who had the privilege to make his acquaintance.

With his passing, one of the last remaining links is broken with the enterprising generation of America journalists who flourished during the years preceding World War I. Walter Lyon came out of that era and kept steady pace with developments that have since occurred in the newspaper trade. He will be missed by a wide circle of friends and admirers in upstate New York.

THE PERILS OF HATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, for his statement recently given before the Senate Special Preparedness Subcommittee.

I share the general's position that a positive, rather than a negative approach, is the best way to train our men

for combat. General Shoup frowns upon the idea, expressed by some, that we should be putting ever greater emphasis on a "hate communism" campaign. Rather, he said:

We teach them what there is in this country that is worth living for, worth fighting for, worth giving your life for.

Now we all hate communism, Mr. President, but the answer to the admitted Communist menace does not lie in seeing who can shout the loudest and the most often that he hates communism. The way to lick communism is with positive programs and positive approaches. It is not enough to be anti-Communist. No, we must do much more than that if our free society is to survive.

General Shoup in his statement shows a clear understanding of the proper role of the professional fighting man and his position in relation to the duly elected civilian leaders of the Nation. His testimony is a credit to the Marine Corps which he so proudly heads. I salute him for it.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent editorial from the Washington Post on this subject be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PERILS OF HATE

A special cheer is in order for Gen. David M. Shoup's broad measure of commonsense on the training of men for combat. One might expect General Shoup, as Commandant of the Marine Corps, to be foremost among those who are crying for a hate-communism campaign. Instead, he coolly explained to the Special Senate Preparedness Subcommittee that the marines, under his leadership, avoid hate and concentrate on ability to tangle with an enemy.

The general's thesis is that hate is a poison which is associated with fear and that fear breeds defeatism. Instead of trying to galvanize the marines with prejudices and passion, General Shoup said, "We teach them what there is in this country that is worth living for, worth fighting for, worth giving your life for." It was not hate that sustained the American fighting men who were captured in Korea, he added, but "faith and confidence, faith in the Nation and confidence in their way of life in America."

Some military men may challenge General Shoup's belief that emphasis on the positive values of our civilization is the best psychological conditioning for fighting men, but it is certainly better than hate mongering as training for citizenship. And when a nation is dependent upon citizen soldiers, it cannot afford to infect them with a hate virus that may deeply influence many of them during the remainder of their lives. For the same reason it is not a sound policy to rely primarily upon the military to inform the general public about the dangers of a potential enemy. The best interests of the country can be served if men who understand the value of freedom help soldiers and citizens alike to meet their responsibilities without resorting to the tools (hate and fear) that have made communism itself so odious and so fraught with peril.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been a great organized effort to block the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs. From the opposition mail I have been receiving on this subject, it is clear that many well-intentioned citizens are being sadly misled as to what this proposal really is.

Walter Lippmann in a recent column described the true purpose of this Department and why it is necessary and in the best interest of the country as a whole. As Mr. Lippmann notes, the proposed Department of Urban Affairs would not take away from the cities or the States any of their present powers. It does not grant a single new power to the Federal Government. It does not create any new bureaucracy. No, all that it does is to put the various Federal programs dealing with urban affairs all under one roof, so to speak. And it would mean that for the first time there would be a spokesman for urban dwellers sitting in the Cabinet just as we have men in the Cabinet to speak on behalf of working people, the business community, and the farm community.

As I said, there has been a good deal of deliberate misinformation spread in recent weeks on this matter. Mr. Lippmann's article sets the record straight. I ask unanimous consent that his article appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

MUCH ADO

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the political hullabaloo about the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, it is useful to remember that the Department will possess no new Federal powers and will possess no new money to spend. All the powers which are to be in the new Department have long since been voted by Congress. These powers will come from four existing agencies and all the Department will be able to spend is what Congress has authorized these agencies to spend. For this is a reorganization and not a new grant of power.

What ground, then, is there for thinking that the new Department creates anything new? Can it do anything which cannot already be done by one of the four constituent agencies? The answer is, it seems to me, that it can focus attention on the mounting problems of the cities and of the metropolitan areas. It can bring together and encourage those who know and care about these problems, and it can do much to get them a hearing.

The new Department will have no power and no money to replan the old cities and to plan the development of the new metropolitan areas. But it can promote the studies which must precede the replanning and the development. This will have to be done in order to make life decent and convenient for the three-quarters of the American people who live in urban areas. Over and above the work of the old agencies which would be grouped in the new Department, it would be essentially a department of research and education in urban affairs.

Why, it will be asked, is this a good thing to have done from Washington? The answer is that it cannot be done adequately and as a matter of fact is not being done adequately, by the States and municipalities. There are several reasons for that. One reason is that in the State legislatures the urban voters are grossly underrepresented as against the rural voters. Another reason is that the expanding metropolitan areas overlap State, county, and municipal lines, and if they are to be governed properly, development must be planned on a metropolitan scale. The planning and development cannot be done merely by the localities of the past which are now being swallowed up by the metropolis.

As for the politics which now swirl about the proposal, the fact is that there would have been little of it had the Republican leaders not made so much ado about nothing. It was wrong and it was foolish of them to gang up with a few southern Democrats in the House Rules Committee in order to refuse to let the House vote on the proposal. On what principle—constitutional, moral, or political—can it be argued that the House of Representatives should not be allowed to vote on a proposal made by the President of the United States?

This wrong was a silly one to commit because the Republican leaders seem to have forgotten that the President could force the House to have a chance to vote by doing with the Department of Urban Affairs what President Eisenhower did with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to send it to Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949. If there was a political trap in all this, the Republican leaders laid the trap into which they have fallen. They should not have forgotten the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I do not know what part the proposed appointment of Mr. Weaver has played in promoting the coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans. Mr. Weaver is already the head of the Housing Administration, which will be the largest component of the Department, and a refusal to promote him when he is so preeminently qualified could have been explained only as racial discrimination.

Nevertheless, he is no doubt the main reason for the opposition of the southern Democrats. But he cannot be the reason for the opposition of the Republican leaders who are making all sorts of gestures, no doubt sincerely, to prove themselves to be friends of the Negro voters.

I cannot help thinking that the Republicans did not stop to consider what they were doing, and that they acted on their reflexes, which take it for granted that any new proposal to deal with the changing world is automatically undesirable.

CENSORSHIP OF ANTI-COMMUNIST STATEMENTS OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN LEADERS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD several articles and editorials from various newspapers and magazines across the country on the subject of censorship of anti-Communist statements of military and civilian leaders in our Government. These censored items and the comments of the censors are very interesting and merit the study and attention of all Americans.

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

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 5, 1962]

THE WAY MILITARY SPEECHES ARE CENSORED: SOME EXAMPLES

Senate investigators found 154 instances of censorship of speeches by military officers in the last 3 years. Most of the deletions or changes of wording had been ordered by the Department of State.

In 26 of the speeches cited by the Senate investigators, the man whose words were censored was Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, the

Army's Chief of Research and Development, former head of Army Intelligence.

Testifying before the Senate investigating subcommittee on January 23, 1962, General Trudeau said some of the changes "caused me to wonder."

Following is from his testimony:

"On November 19, 1959, when I addressed the American Ordnance Association here in Washington, it was suggested by the Department of State that I not say, and I quote:

" 'The tenets of Marx and Engels and Lenin are as firm a part of the Communist doctrine as when they were announced.'

"The Department of State's comment to this suggested change was, and again I quote:

" 'They (the Communists) have jettisoned many of these tenets, unfortunately, because tenets were retarding industrial expansion.'

"Again, in the same American Ordnance Association speech, I was not permitted to say:

" 'The three Sputnik satellites lend substance to * * * (Communist) claims (of an intercontinental ballistic missile) and their lunar probes should clinch them.'

"The Department of State's comment on this mandatory change was, and I quote:

" 'Policy is to separate military from scientific achievement of U.S.S.R. It is much easier for Soviets to hit the moon than to hit the Pentagon. Such remarks tend to frighten our friends.' "

Following are some other changes cited in General Trudeau's speeches:

Statement: "Coexistence is not a choice. It is a fatal disease."

Change: Deleted. No reason given.

Statement: "On such theories socialism thrives."

Change: Deleted. State Department's comment. "Some of our best friends are Socialists."

Statement: "The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without."

Change: Deletion suggested. State Department's comment: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian—not likely to impress this audience."

Adm. Arleigh Burke, retired, testified on January 25 that some of the censorship applied to his speeches appeared to be capricious. He said: "I didn't see any pattern to the thing except that statements against communism—statements against the dangers of communism—were frequently removed."

Nikita Khrushchev was a touchy subject for military speakers.

Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, of the Army, in one prepared address, made a reference to Khrushchev's "smiling face and outstretched hand." This was eliminated with the comment:

"Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being."

Several attempts by military speakers to quote Khrushchev's statement that "We will bury you" were blocked by censors, who deleted the quotation. One censor explained his action with this comment: "He has denied that he meant this literally."

Attitudes of censors appeared to change, from time to time.

Early in 1961, references to "the Communists" were changed frequently to read "the Sino-Soviet bloc."

But later in 1961, references to the Sino-Soviet bloc were changed to read "the Communists."

Two examples were shown where the word "Christian" was deleted. In one instance, the censor changed "Christian people" to "peace-loving people." In another, the sentence, "We are a Christian nation," was cut out.

Expressions that impressed the censor as warlike were struck out repeatedly from speeches. Examples:

The word "conflict" changed to "struggle." "Massive retaliation" changed to "intercontinental nuclear capabilities." "Show of force" deleted.

In one speech, a military officer said:

"A missile firing from Alaska to China has a significant range advantage over a missile located on the west coast of the United States."

A State Department censor said: "No. This could be interpreted as aggressive intent."

Even a race horse is not safe from the censor's blue pencil. An Air Force officer referred to the X-15 plane as "the Man o' War of the stable of research aircraft."

Censor's comment: "Let's use another steed—Zev, Gallant Fox, etc., but not this one."

An Air Force general once proposed to say:

"And if it came to a mutual suicide type of fight, our Air Force figures that our highly urbanized United States would suffer many times the losses of ruralized Russia."

This was deleted by the State Department with the comment:

"State feels Khrushchev does not want general war and is unwilling to bear the losses such a war would entail, even though he could win it. This passage also discusses war in specific U.S.-U.S.S.R. terms, which we wish to avoid."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 26, 1962]

AUTOCRATS AT THE COPY TABLE

In a long life of putting one little word after another we've had our share of horrendous experiences with capricious copyeditors. Even today we can hardly write anything and escape arguments from our colleagues about our logic, rhetoric or punctuation.

But the experiences of Lieutenant General Trudeau with the curious minds of bureaucratic copyreaders make us realize how placid our life has been. Also makes us wonder how a general ever gets a speech written that says anything at all.

Under the current rules, any general who is making a speech must submit an advance text to a whole "slew" of civilian supervisors in the Pentagon and State Department; you never can tell when a general might get confused about what the latest policy is or, what is worse, have an idea of his own. Military minds, you understand, mustn't be allowed to think.

Well, General Trudeau has been called upon to make a lot of speeches lately, for civic gatherings and all that sort of thing, and he preserved for posterity copies of his speeches as originally written and as they finally got through the labyrinthian copydesk. What was done to them would make a Madison Avenue TV writer, even accustomed as he is to the whims of advertisers, quiver in sympathy.

A good many of the blue-penciled changes are just the whimsies of small minds, and if General Trudeau should ask us, as one writing man to another we'd say that sometimes the original was better than the revised writ.

For example, the general once wrote, on the subject of courage in the face of world troubles: "We must resolutely resist those disciples of despair who crawl around the campus clubs, cocktail lounges, corner drug stores and country clubs. * * *" General Trudeau was told that he would undermine the Republic if he didn't delete the two words "campus clubs."

The official explanation for this was a derogatory remark about one segment of our society. This won't hold water because "country clubs" was left in, and we cannot believe it's official U.S. Government policy to be derogatory of country clubs either, especially since President Kennedy belongs to several of them himself. The true explanation, we're sure, is that the copy editor didn't like all this piling up of alliterations. We've suffered the same fate many a time.

But some of the deletions are hardly explainable by this holier-than-thou attitude about rhetoric. For instance, General Trudeau wanted to say:

"There can be no doubt in any of our minds today as to why we must have the best possible weapons and equipment in all of the Armed Forces—locked as we are in vital competition with the Communists."

Now none of the civilian overseers caught the awkwardness of the phrase "as to why." No; what the State Department demanded to be deleted was the phrase "locked as we are in vital competition with the Communists." Whether General Trudeau's ideological slip was to admit we are in "competition with the Communists" or whether the fault was to consider it "vital," we didn't know because the State Department never bothered to explain.

But whatever word it was that tripped the general, the impression is plainly left that the civilian brains in the State Department either do not believe that we are locked in competition with the Communist world or that the outcome of that struggle is vital to this country's future. Or at least that it's something nobody ought to say right out loud.

The expurgated and unexpurgated versions of General Trudeau's speeches are full of many more such silly examples. And if nothing else they show why this argument about "muzzling the military" is not so simple as President Kennedy would have it appear. The military mind, as it's fashionable to call it, may sometimes act in strange ways but never so strange a way as the minds of petty bureaucrats made autocrats over what ideas the people shall hear.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune, Feb. 1, 1962]

CENSORS TOUCHY ABOUT K., CUBA

WASHINGTON.—Censors, many of them unidentified, who have blue-penciled speeches by military leaders, are under investigation by a congressional subcommittee.

Charges have been made that military men have been muzzled by the censors from making anti-Communist remarks.

The subcommittee wants to know why, if this is true, and under who's authority the muzzling is being executed.

A 2-inch-thick report, prepared for the subcommittee cites specific examples of censoring together with the explanations—or lack of explanations—from the censors.

The report said that when Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, wanted to talk about politics in Cuba, he wrote:

"Other parts of the world are now feeling the pressure of Communist aims and are being actively wooed with enticing offers of help. What is hard for us to grasp is that many unwary nations are responding like puppets on a string—some right in our own backyard."

A State Department censor penciled out the last sentence. This censor justified the deletion with: "Cuba is not in the U.S. backyard and resents being told so."

On another occasion, Pirie attempted to tell his audience of Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev's threat, "We will bury you." A nameless censor offered no explanation for dropping the line from the speech.

Maj. Gen. N. W. Grant also referred to Khrushchev's remark. He wrote, but never read:

"Nevertheless, in his written statements and in other talks, he has indicated that the

Soviet Union intends to bury us literally, rather than figuratively."

Public speeches recalling the Soviet leader's threat to "bury" us are "against policy," a censor scolded the general.

Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, Deputy Army Chief of Staff, had the same trouble with a Khrushchev reference. The paragraph he wrote but was not allowed to read was:

"That is why we have been eager to believe that Khrushchev's smiling face and outstretched hand were indications of a new attitude on the part of the Soviets. We have wanted to believe that he was coming to us in friendship and to establish peaceful relationships."

A State Department censor killed out this part of the speech and told Darcy, "Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being."

When Air Force Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Research and Development Command, prepared a speech to give before Purdue University Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets, he made reference to Khrushchev's shoe-banging antics at the United Nations.

A military speeches censor edited out mention of the tantrum from the text. Schriever made his point without it.

The term "world communism," has also triggered the blue pencils into action. A State Department censor wrote to Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development:

"We want to discourage the term 'world communism.' It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the United Nations." This censor offered "Sino-Soviet communism" as a substitute term.

Trudeau had planned to tell his audience:

"They (human liberties) must be fought for and won, again and again—through continuous, dedicated struggle. They can never be taken for granted. Already one-third of the world's peoples are enslaved in the chains of world communism."

Lt. Gen. Paul L. Freeman, Jr., Deputy Commanding General for Reserve Forces, received a lesson in word usage from an anonymous censor. Freeman had written "Then came the Korean fiasco."

"Fiasco" was stricken and "war" penciled in its place. The censor added, "See Webster—fiasco—action that comes to a ridiculous end."

Army Secretary Elvis J. Stahr, Jr. was told by a State Department censor that "extended freedom" would surely be misinterpreted as "military liberation." What Stahr was banned from saying was:

"Although I am convinced of the necessity for massive retaliation if the true occasion for it should develop—and we must always be ready in every way for that unhappy possibility—I am equally certain that a capability for retaliation is only one element of the power we need to defend and extend freedom and cope with the complex perils of our time."

General Trudeau tried to name British historian Arnold Toynbee in one of his speeches. The paragraph that went out said:

"History fairly brims over with examples of proud nations which have slowly sunk into oblivion because they sowed the seeds of their own decay. Nations who will learn nothing from these examples are doomed to repeat them. The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. Ours must not be number 22."

The State Department censor commented: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian—not likely to impress this audience."

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 1, 1962]

OFFICER SPEECH CENSORS DELETE VARIED REMARKS

WASHINGTON, January 31.—When Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev banged his shoe at the United Nations it was news, but a censor wants to forget it.

Someone having control over military speeches struck the words wholly from a talk Air Force Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Research and Development Command, wanted to give the Purdue University Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets.

There was no reason given to delete the reference to the Russian-style tantrum and Schriever had to make his point without it.

This and other types of censoring—some serious and some amusing—are included in a 2-inch thick volume prepared for a congressional subcommittee in session here.

The subcommittee is looking into charges that anti-Communist remarks by military leaders have been muzzled.

KHRUSHCHEV REFERENCES DELETED

In many cases the censors were from the State Department—and most of their deletions were references to Khrushchev as in the case of Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, Deputy Army Chief of Staff.

Darcey was told by the State Department: "Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being."

The paragraph he wasn't allowed to read was:

"That is why we have been eager to believe that Khrushchev's smiling face and outstretched hand were indications of a new attitude on the part of the Soviets. We have wanted to believe that he was coming to us in friendship and to establish peaceful relations."

Another general was told that speeches recalling the Soviet leader's threat to bury us are against policy.

That explanation was given by an unknown censor to Maj. Gen. N. W. Grant as a blue pencil was applied to this Khrushchev reference:

"Nevertheless, in his written statements and in other talks, he has indicated that the Soviet Union intends to bury us literally, rather than figuratively."

The paragraph never was read by Grant.

Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, tried to use the same "We will bury you" line and lost out, also. But the censor wasn't identified and didn't explain his action this time.

"WORLD COMMUNISM" FOUND TOUCHY

Another censor found the term "world communism" touchy.

A State Department speech reviewer wrote Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development:

"We want to discourage the term 'world communism.' It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the United Nations." They suggested substituting the term "Sino-Soviet communism."

Trudeau used it as he tried to put across the need to protect human liberties. But this reference never was heard by his audience:

"They must be fought for and won, again and again—through continuous, dedicated struggle. They can never be taken for granted. Already one-third of the world's peoples are enslaved in the chains of world communism."

Lt. Gen. Paul L. Freeman Jr., deputy commanding general for Reserve Forces, wrote a speech which used the phrase "Then came the Korean fiasco."

GENERAL TOLD TO SEE WEBSTER

"Fiasco" was stricken and "war" substituted in its place and the anonymous censor told the general: "See Webster—fiasco—action that comes to a ridiculous end."

Admiral Pirie got a so-called lesson in geography from a State Department censor when he spoke about politics in Cuba.

Pirie wanted to tell his audience:

"Other parts of the world are now feeling the pressure of Communist aims and are being actively wooed with enticing offers of help. What is hard for us to grasp is that many unwary nations are responding like puppets on a string—some right in our own backyard."

The last sentence was blue-penciled out with this explanation:

"Cuba is not in the U.S. 'backyard' and resents being told so."

Army Secretary Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., learned from a State Department censor that the phrase "extend freedom" could be misinterpreted as implying "military liberation." What Stahr could not say was:

"Although I am convinced of the necessity for massive retaliation if the true occasion for it should develop—and we must always be ready in every way for that unhappy possibility—I am equally certain that a capability for retaliation is only one element of the power we need to defend and extend freedom and to cope with the complex perils of our time."

RUSSIAN POVERTY STATEMENT HIT

Stahr also learned from the State Department that it was "inaccurate" to say Russians have a poor life. These "people are not denied necessities," said the censor. His deleted statement read:

"The Soviet Union has for years applied the major portion of its industrial capacity to the creation of military might, depriving its citizens not only of most of the comforts but many of the virtual necessities of life. We have no reason to emulate the Soviet."

Trudeau also tried to name British historian Arnold Toynbee in this light:

"History fairly brims over with examples of proud nations which have slowly sunk into oblivion because they sowed the seeds of their own decay. Nations who will learn nothing from these examples are doomed to repeat them. The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. Ours must not be number 22."

The State Department censor's comment was: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian—not likely to impress this audience."

And out went the paragraph.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 5, 1962]

BEFORE THE BRASS MAY SOUND OFF

Exactly what is censored?

Each year, hundreds of speeches by Pentagon officials, military, and civilian alike, are carefully screened before they receive the censor's imprimateur. First, the public information office of the armed service involved checks the speech for accuracy and conformity with service policy. If necessary, the speech goes to the Department of Defense to be cleared for security. If the speech touches on foreign affairs, it is sent to the State Department, which determines if it is in accord with the official policy of the U.S. Government.

Changes may be made for a variety of reasons: Some trivial, unimportant—even capricious, some due to the censor's ineptness, some for reasons of the very highest Government policy. One of Adm. Arleigh A. Burke's speeches was toned down last year, for example, because negotiations were then underway to secure the release of the RB-47 fliers who were forced down and held captive in Russia.

Here are some examples of material, in brackets, deleted by either State or Defense

Department censors from speeches of high Pentagon brass in the past 2 years:

"A capability for retaliation is only one element of the power we need to defend [and extend] freedom." Censor's comment: "Suggest omitting since implies military liberation."

"A negative philosophy won't sustain us [in this conflict]." Censor's comment: "Use softer term."

"If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to [seize] space, we must equal and surpass this effort. "Comment": It is not our policy to state that either Russia or the United States is going to seize space."

"Here is a demonstration from our tropical testing to prepare us for the kind of terrain we face in [Laos—in Central America—and in Cuba]." Changed, to: "in possible brush-fire areas of the world," without comment.

"On such theories socialism thrives." State Department comment: "Some of our best friends are Socialists."

"Their personal property is less than the clothes you have on your back [and under the rules of communism this would be all they could ever hope to acquire]." State Department comment: "They could hope for a lot more. That's why the Commies make hay."

Some censors appeared to be allergic to the words "victory" and "war," and often suggested changing "enemy" to "potential aggressor." At times, they also excised such phrases as: "The Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute domination of the world"; "Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation"; "the steady advance of communism"; "insidious ideology of world communism."

Government censors, by and large, are middle-income career employees assigned to speech reviewing; many have served as speech writers themselves. This irony was not lost on Gen. Thomas D. White, retired Air Force Chief of Staff, who observed: "I have heard there were low-level personnel who reviewed the speeches, but the truth is they were relatively low-level persons who wrote the speeches in the first place."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1962]

IF LINCOLN, LIKE KENNEDY, HAD INVITED "GUIDANCE"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—President Kennedy's statement at last week's news conference that even the highest civilian officials and military officers should circulate their proposed speeches through the Government for guidance, as he did his state of the Union message, has happily brought to light an anonymous paper on this subject, worthy of having been inspired by Bob Newhart's idea of how Madison Avenue would have edited the Gettysburg Address. The anonymity is attributed to the continued presence of the author in the State Department's speech-guidance group.

The work is a speculation of interdepartmental comments Lincoln could have received on the address if he and it were contemporary with present times and the guidance system. There is room here for only the subjoined few of these might-have-been guidelines, which seem less imaginative than they would have before the Stennis subcommittee assembled:

Comments by the State Department. 1. The phrase "brought forth on this continent," while technically correct, implies that the United States feels it owns the entire territory. This conflicts with our hemisphere policy and should be changed to "an area bounded on the north by 49° N. latitude," etc., etc.

2. The use of "dedicate" five times is tautological, which should be corrected by the alternate use of "apotheosize." Since "nation" is a popular term without basis in international law "member state" should be substituted. On the other hand, "our poor power" implies self-admission that the United States is not a major power, and the Secretary has directed the staff to work on a substitution. "The world will little note" invades the Department's statutory assignment to make such evaluations; substitute "There probably will be only a few people who will note," etc.

3. The requirements of international harmony call for the elimination or modification of phrases such as "conceived in liberty," "created equal," "birth of freedom," "Government of * * * for * * * and by the people," etc., because a number of our member states do not believe in liberty, freedom or equality and would properly take offense. The same objection applies to the words "under God." Also, "conceived," "brought forth" and "new birth" are open to interpretation among some of our NATO allies as offensive references to some recent irregular goings-on in their high official and motion-picture circles.

MORE GUIDANCE

Other departmental comment: 1. The Department of Defense urged the elimination of "We are now engaged in a great civil war." The passage recalls to the people the cost of our Military Establishment, particularly undesirable in this budget-making period. The words should be changed to "We have entered upon a period of civil uncertainty involving fairly high mobilization." For the same reason "brave men, living and dead," "honored dead" and so on are ill-chosen; they unnecessarily call popular attention to a byproduct of war the people don't like. And "all men are created equal" must be excised because it is highly objectionable to the Air Force.

2. The Navy Department deplored the misleading impression, created by stress on land operations, that there were no engagements at sea. It proposed mention of air-sea rescue. The Department of Commerce reported it would take years to coordinate the interests of all its units so that they could be safeguarded in the Address, but meanwhile had compiled 253 suggested editorial changes. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (joined by State) asked that the speech be postponed until it could locate all its officials with titles conveying supreme authority.

3. The Budget Bureau proposed the Address be turned over for complete revision to a working group from State, Defense, Treasury, Post Office, Labor and Commerce, explaining the Bureau did not seek membership on the group because it could make whatever changes it chose later. Meanwhile, however, Budget counseled against figures of specific commitment such as "Fourscore and seven years ago"—advising "A number of years" instead—against "we cannot hallow this ground" as in conflict with Secretary Freeman's plan, and reminded the President that only Congress can "highly resolve"—or "resolve" at all.

If the luck of the United States is holding, the anonymous author of this paper is still in the State Department.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 22, 1961]

MUM MILITARY?—HOBGOBLIN OF "MAN ON HORSEBACK" SHOULD NOT BAR ANTI-RED BRIEFINGS BY OFFICERS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The controversy over how far military men should involve themselves in politics shows no signs of abating.

The case of Gen. Edwin A. Walker, who resigned from the Army after being censured for urging his own rightwing views upon his troops, was followed by a Pentagon order seemingly designed to discourage open discussion of international affairs by military officers.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, has criticized the holding of seminars on communism under military auspices. Clearly this subject of the legitimate political concerns of members of the Armed Forces has a number of aspects which should be considered separately.

Practically no one would deny that American constitutional theory and practice call for civilian control of the military forces, exercised at the top level by the President and delegated by him to the Secretary of Defense, who by custom is a civilian.

By the same token an Army officer would be clearly stepping out of line if he should identify himself publicly with a political party or try to influence the votes of soldiers under his command. The United States has been happily free throughout its history of "men on horseback," of military chieftains turning themselves into dictators. And most rational Americans want to keep it that way.

KOREAN EXPERIENCE

But this does not mean that an American general or admiral should be a narrow specialist in his profession, aseptically segregated from knowledge and consideration of the world's political problems. It is, or should be, of high concern to any American officer who may have to lead men into battle to be sure that his troops know the true history of the cold war and understand the nature, methods and tactics of the Communist enemy.

Had more attention been paid to briefing GI's along these lines before the invasion of South Korea in 1950, the record of the Americans who fell into enemy hands would have been appreciably better. It is just as important for a soldier to know how to protect himself against Communist propaganda, to which he will be subjected as a prisoner, as it for him to be instructed in defending himself in the field.

Nor should the political training and education of our military leaders be neglected. It is indeed surprising that there should even be a suggestion that military science can or should be insulated from familiarity with international politics when the world's chief trouble spot, Berlin, is a most vivid example of the high price we are paying for the old idea that a war was something like a football game, that we should all go home and live happily ever after as soon as our team won.

In his "Crusade in Europe," General Eisenhower, whose decision was doubtless approved, if not dictated, by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff in Washington, records his decision that Berlin was not the logical or the most desirable objective for the forces of the Western Allies. Noting that Winston Churchill was greatly disappointed and disturbed by the failure to make Berlin the primary objective, Eisenhower writes rather innocently:

"The Prime Minister knew, of course, that, regardless of the distance the Allies might advance to the eastward, he and the President had already agreed that the British and American occupation zones would be limited on the east by a line 200 miles west of Berlin."

BAD FAITH

What never seems to have occurred either to Marshall or to Eisenhower was that the Soviet Government had already displayed bad faith in imposing a minority unpopular Communist government on Poland and thus

gave ample reason for revising the occupation lines in Germany. Had American and British troops advanced, as they were well able to do, beyond these lines Stalin might well have been told: "We will talk about the demarcation lines in Germany if and when you permit free and honest elections in Poland."

Contrast this politically innocent comment of Eisenhower with this most significant passage in the last volume of Winston Churchill's war memoirs, "Triumph and Tragedy," referring to the same period.

"The destruction of German military power had brought with it a fundamental change in the relations between Communist Russia and the Western democracies. They had lost their common enemy, which was almost their sole bond of union. Henceforward Russian imperialism and the Communist creed saw and set no bounds to their progress and ultimate dominion * * *."

Churchill then proceeds to list in sad retrospect the ideas and military-political objectives which should have governed Western policy in the critically important last weeks of the war. A new front should have been created against the Soviet onward sweep. This front should have been as far to the east as possible. "Berlin was the prime and true objective of the Anglo-American armies." American troops, not Russian, should have entered Prague and sponsored the liberation of Czechoslovakia.

WASTED OPPORTUNITIES

None but a warped fanatic would impugn the patriotism of General Eisenhower and General Marshall. It was their political innocence, an old American Army tradition that, along with the failing of Roosevelt's powers and the inevitable vacuum between Roosevelt's death and Truman's ability to grasp the whole situation, that account for the wasted opportunities at the end of the war—wasted opportunities that have come back to plague us.

Imagine how much brighter the international picture would be if all Germany, including Berlin, had evolved from an occupied enemy power into a friendly Allied power under American and British sponsorship.

We should make very certain that in the future our generals will not miss political opportunities that lie before them. This is why any proposal to suspend, curb, or curtail seminars, lectures, and other means of promoting systematic study of Communist aims and strategy by the Armed Forces should be rejected.

Americans, military and civilians alike, suffer from too little, not too much, knowledge of the international Communist conspiracy.

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 28, 1962]

MILITARY EXPERTS TESTIFY—CENSORS LACK SENSE

(By Lyn Nofziger)

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, is an unobtrusive man who speaks quietly and lifts weights for exercise.

His politics are best explained by pointing out that he ran once for President on the States Rights ticket. He is a Reserve major general and former district attorney.

And he is the man largely responsible for the current Senate hearings into charges that military men are not being allowed to speak on communism to their troops or in seminars. The hearings stemmed from the controversy surrounding former Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker and his methods of indoctrinating his troops.

At present the investigation is pretty much going STROM THURMOND'S way, probably because he is the man behind the men who have been digging up the facts.

A month ago Senator THURMOND assured a group of reporters that "we won't let you down. We have the proof to back up our charges."

The hearings, which began Tuesday, are just nicely underway, but already they have produced evidence that at least somewhat sustain the Senator's beliefs.

They have produced statements from some important persons who believe that review of speeches by high military men should be for security purposes only.

They have produced a statement by one outspoken general that the Communist menace is a fact and therefore statements regarding it should not be subject to policy review.

They have also produced one top official, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who says he likes things just as they now are.

And they have produced facts which THURMOND says are evidence of what he calls the State Department's "can't win" attitude toward communism.

Testimony through the first days was presented either orally or by written statement from former President Eisenhower; Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations; from Defense Secretary Robert Lovett, who served under President Truman; Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, who is head of Army Research and Development; Lemnitzer and Gen. Thomas White, ex-Air Force Chief of Staff.

All so far have agreed on two salient points: one, high military men respect and approve the principle of civilian control and, two, there has been no change in censorship policies since the change in administrations.

Lovett, a civilian who should know, calls any insinuations to the contrary regarding civilian control, false and damaging.

Mr. Eisenhower, Admiral Burke, and General Trudeau are agreed that speeches of high officers should be censored for security only and not for policy.

Mr. Eisenhower, who admittedly has changed his mind since he was President, goes so far as to suggest that top officers should not have their speeches cleared at all. All three men would rely on an officer's good judgment and hold him responsible for his mistakes on policy errors.

With the exception of General Lemnitzer, there have been complaints that subordinates without sufficient knowledge and perhaps without guidelines censor speeches. Trudeau remarked that there doesn't even seem to be a pattern to the censorship.

There is a pattern, of course, although the censors are not entirely consistent.

The pattern is one of weakening strong anti-Communist statements. It is not consistent in that words or phrases deleted one time may not be deleted another.

It is consistent, however, in that phrases attacking communism are never strengthened.

It is this censorship policy which Senator THURMOND calls the "can't win" policy.

Whether it is deliberate, whether it is a policy arising on a subordinate level, whether it is merely accidental and not true policy or whether it really doesn't exist to any particular extent has yet to be determined.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the investigating subcommittee, appears determined to find out just what situation does exist, if it takes all session.

Meanwhile THURMOND, added to the subcommittee especially for the investigation, sits at one end of the long hearing table, with the air of a man who knows the answers, but doesn't necessarily like them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 28, 1962]

THE EXACT WORDS IN CENSORSHIP

(By Cecil Holland)

(Censorship as practiced in the Pentagon and in the State Department has come under fire. At hearings last week on charges that military leaders have been "muzzled," the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee was told that references in speeches to communism often were toned down. Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, testified he thought changes made in many of his speeches were "capricious." Gen. Thomas D. White, former Air Force Chief, described them as "unnecessary." Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development, said some of the changes made in his speeches gave him "cause for wonder about the motivation" involved. These are some examples of the actual blue pencil of the censors at work on the speeches of the three officers as presented at the hearings:)

From drafts of Admiral Burke's speeches from January 1, 1961, to August 6, 1961:

ORIGINAL

"The Communists, however, are not going to abandon their relentless drive toward world empire—even though they dare not risk the inevitable retaliation that a nuclear war would bring."

REVISED

"Potential aggressors, however, cannot be expected to surrender their objectives without a struggle."

ORIGINAL

"Today the United States is engaged in a grim competition with an alien philosophy that has taken over whole countries—without firing a shot. That is why the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual."

REVISED

"Today, as in the past, the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual."

ORIGINAL

"Challenge of communism—Communist challenge—the Communist threat."

REVISED

"Challenge of competing ideologies—challenge—the threat."

From General White's speeches from September 21, 1960, to April 25, 1961:

ORIGINAL

"Since the Air Force's future offensive and defensive missions, as we reach farther out into aerospace."

REVISED

"Since the Air Force's future missions, as we reach farther out into aerospace."

ORIGINAL

"Approximately 90 percent of the general war striking power."

REVISED

"A very large percentage of the deterrent power."

ORIGINAL

"These same forces could also contribute substantially to a general war effort."

REVISED

"These same forces could also contribute substantially to a major aggression."

ORIGINAL

"The Soviet economic-military potential is guided by a regime which can count on the backing—however unenthusiastic—of the Russian people. In addition, the Soviets have another great intangible resource which can best be described as gall. They are showing ever increasing confidence—even arrogance—in their military and scientific strength and growth of their influence, spawned and perpetuated in brutal wars, dedicated to the mission of world revolution—their fervor for subversion and

force makes them believe that Communist domination of the world is inevitable. They are further strengthened in this belief by their close partnership with Communist China."

REVISED

"Furthermore in any revolution of the Communist threat we cannot disregard the close partnership between Soviet Russia and Communist China."

ORIGINAL

"The unquestionable capacity to repel and decisively counter any attack."

REVISED

"The unquestionable capacity to decisively counter any attack."

ORIGINAL

Weapon systems have been developed to overpower either."

REVISED

"Weapon systems have been developed to overcome either."

From General Trudeau's speeches covering the period from August 1, 1961, to December 8, 1961:

ORIGINAL

"On toward the turn of the century—world communism."

REVISED

"On toward the turn of the century—Sino-Soviet communism."

ORIGINAL

"There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous and false doctrine of "peaceful coexistence" and expediency."

REVISED

"There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous and false doctrine of aggression masquerading as peaceful coexistence and expediency."

ORIGINAL

"If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to (seize) space, we must equal and surpass this effort or lose space."

REVISED

"If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to try to dominate space, we must equal and surpass this effort or give them a free hand."

Some passages were deleted entirely and not revised or deletion was suggested. Some examples from the speeches of the three officers follow.

ADMIRAL BURKE'S SPEECHES

One speech dealing with the destructive forces of communism at work in southeast Asia, Africa, and Cuba was censored in its entirety.

For—just this sort of free, unrestricted thinking had produced most of the remarkable accomplishments throughout out Nation's history. And—it is precisely this kind of free discussion of alternative solutions to our problems—that we must rely on for our future progress.

GENERAL WHITE'S SPEECHES

Current Communist propaganda to the world concentrates on the same central theme which it has always emphasized—the destruction of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. But, under this guise, they really intend the destruction of everything which does not bend to their will.

If our cold war efforts fail, armed conflict could occur * * * as has happened in the past. The Korean and Taiwan actions are examples.

Furthermore, the Soviets have demonstrated by their intensive research and development programs that they unquestionably seek a clear military advantage over the free world alliance at the earliest possible date.

GENERAL TRUDEAU'S SPEECHES

The three sputnik satellites lend substance to (Communist) claims (of an intercontinental ballistic missile) and their lunar probes should clinch them.

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 25, 1962]

CENSORSHIP EXAMPLES—TRUDEAU SPEECH CHANGES LISTED

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Here are some of the examples of Defense and State Department censorship revealed today by Senate investigators in questioning Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Chief of Research and Development.

The date of the delivered speech, its original wording by Trudeau, and revised wording or deletions are shown.

January 21, 1961: "We will be blocked and harassed by the Fabian Socialists and Communists." The phrase "Fabian Socialists" was deleted.

January 31 (to a Canadian audience): "Your country and mine are the targets of worldwide communism * * *. This is why we and our allies arm—to counter the Communist threat." Entire section was deleted.

"As we engage the Communist * * *." changed to "as we strive for a real peace."

"Yet, if our technology is to continue to accelerate—and it must to outperform the Reds * * *." Last phrase deleted.

February 1: "Locked as we are in vital competition with the Communist * * *." Delete and substitute: "In order to negotiate from a position of strength for peace."

"The Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute, universal domination of the world * * *." Deleted.

"Today, in the face of the worldwide threat of international communism * * *." Deleted.

"The vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us * * *." Delete and substitute: "Our lives and future."

February 17: "Faced as we are by the implacable mask of communism * * *." "Implacable" deleted.

"With Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation * * *." Deleted.

March 3: "Last year, in the United Nations we witnessed the growth of a new world power group—the so-called neutralist or Afro-Asian nations * * *." "Afro-Asian" deleted.

"The record in the Congo." "In the Congo" deleted.

"And beat the Communist challenge * * *." Deleted with instructions to substitute: "The threat of foreign aggressors."

April 26: "Nothing less will permit us to emerge victorious * * *." "Emerge victorious" deleted and changed to "achieve our goals."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 631. An act for the relief of Elwood Brunken;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz; and

S. 1456. An act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 1241 is the bill before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the Miller amendment to the McNamara amendment. On this amendment there is a unanimous-consent agreement.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, we approach a critical vote in the Senate. Looking at it realistically, this probably is the last opportunity we will have in the 87th Congress to act on the vital question of Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools.

If my amendment is defeated, then the education record of this Congress undoubtedly will be confined to this relatively minor legislation which masquerades bravely as the higher education bill.

On the other hand, if my amendment is adopted, we will be serving notice on our colleagues in the other body and on the strategists of the administration that we recognize the major needs of education.

We have been given many arguments why my amendment should not be adopted. Some of them do not seem to me to have that sharp ring of sincerity—at least, when spoken by some of the opponents of my amendment.

Basically, we are told that the adoption of my amendment would jeopardize, if not actually kill, the higher education bill in the House. We are told that the House would not pass the bill if amended. Of course, we have no assurance at all that the House would pass even this minor higher education bill if it does go to that body unamended. It can, and may well be, stripped down even further than the shadow bill now before the Senate.

In any event, I think it is time the Senate reasserted itself and stopped making its moves in frightful anticipation of what the House might do.

I can vividly recall the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in charge of the higher education bill, arguing last year in favor of my similar amendment then to the extension of the impacted areas and National Defense Education Acts.

In fact, he was very vehement about the rights of the Senate and implied

very strongly that it was better to have no bill at all than to give in to the will of the House.

Mr. President, if consistency is indeed the hobgoblin of small minds, then we can be assured that the Senator from Oregon must have one of the largest minds about.

I am sorry he is not on the floor at the moment. I have looked for the floor manager of the bill, but he is not in the Chamber at this time. I can sympathize with the position in which he finds himself as manager of this legislation. However, this sympathy does not prevent my feeling that he and the administration strategists are very shortsighted in opposing my amendment.

What we need is a showdown on the question of whether the Federal Government is willing to meet its responsibilities to the States, the parents, and the schoolchildren.

Acquiescence in adopting the higher education bill without any meaningful amendment such as the one I have offered, simply postpones the day when that showdown will come. The Senator from Oregon knows that. He has used that argument himself. And the President knows that.

I call attention to the President's education message which has reached the Senate just today. In leading off his requests in the field of education legislation, the President said:

> Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our educational system.
>
> There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education—or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering—without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education.
>
> With our mobile population and demanding needs—this is not a matter of local or State action alone—this is a national concern.

Let me repeat one sentence of the President's message—something I have been trying to say in this body for several days. President Kennedy said:

> There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education—or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering—without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education.

If the President means that—and I certainly think that he does—then I can only assume he would vote for my amendment if he still were a Member of the Senate today.

For there is, indeed, little value in the proposed legislation we have before us unless we can reinforce the foundations of education at the elementary and secondary schools level.

But this bill of "little value"—to use the President's words—apparently is all we are destined to get in the field of education this year, if my amendment is not adopted.

And when the Senate goes hat in hand to its colleagues in the other wing of our Capitol, the chances are quite good that this bill will become of even less value.

All this leads me to the conclusion that today the Senate is involved in an exercise in futility.

The Senator from Oregon—and I am glad to see that at this time he is here on the floor of the Senate—asks me to respect his honest judgment that, the best way to pass the pending legislation is to defeat my amendment. I do respect his judgment in this regard, and I agree with him. That is the best way to pass the higher education bill. But it is not the best way to serve American education.

That is where we disagree. I maintain that enactment of this legislation will contribute little to the cause of education, and probably even less when the House gets finished with it. I maintain that enactment of this legislation will give a false front of respectability to a shabby, undernourished national education system.

I maintain that the only way we are going to move forward in this area is to force this issue once and for all. We shall not move forward if we simply pass this bill, which has been called a quarter of a loaf, but, in fact, Mr. President, is not even a crust.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to invite the attention of the able Senator from Michigan to another portion of the President's message on education, which I, too, received this morning.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is the Senator from Iowa referring to the section on higher education?

Mr. MILLER. No; I am referring to the section on teachers' salaries; and for the sake of the record, I should like to quote from that part of the President's message as follows:

> TEACHERS' SALARIES
>
> Teachers' salaries, though improving, are still not high enough to attract and retain in this demanding profession all the capable teachers we need. We entrust to our teachers our most valuable possession—our children—for a very large share of their waking hours during the most formative years of their life. We make certain that those to whom we entrust our financial assets are individuals of the highest competence and character—we dare not do less for the trustees of our children's minds.
>
> Yet in no other sector of our national economy do we find such a glaring discrepancy between the importance of one's work to society and the financial reward society offers. Can any able and industrious student, unless unusually motivated, be expected to elect a career that pays more poorly than almost any other craft, trade, or profession? Until this situation can be dramatically improved—unless the States and localities can be assisted and stimulated in bringing about salary levels which will make the teaching profession competitive with other professions which require the same length of training and ability—we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers.

I ask the Senator from Michigan, wherein does the McNamara amendment take care of this problem, which is so well presented by the President of the United States?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator from Iowa for his fine quotation of the President's message. I take it he agrees with the President that there is a great need to improve the quality of our teachers.

Mr. MILLER. Indeed I do.

Mr. McNAMARA. So I would be happy to join the Senator from Iowa in trying to have such proposed legislation passed by the Senate, either now or at any other time when he may wish to take the initiative, because both of us agree with the President that this is vital.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Michigan can do so; all he has to do is vote for the Miller-Cotton amendment to his amendment, and then we shall have done so. Therefore, I encourage the Senator from Michigan to do it, because I suggest that the reason why the President's particular approach to this problem in the last session is lying in the House Rules Committee, dead as a doornail, is that it contains elements of controversy which relate to religion, segregation, Federal control, and Federal bureaucracy. But those elements are completely absent from the McNamara amendment if it is amended by the Miller-Cotton amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree with the Senator from Iowa. I say further that the Senate previously passed such a bill, one which did not contain controversial provisions. The Senate did that last year; and the Senate also did it the year before, when it passed Senate bill 8. We have gone through this procedure over and over again. We passed such proposed legislation, and sent it to the House, last year; and the year before last, the Senate passed such proposed legislation and sent it to the House of Representatives. Those measures did not contain such controversial provisions at all.

Mr. MILLER. But Senate bill 1021 contained those elements; and that is why it is dead, and will not get out of the House Rules Committee.

So I suggest to the Senator from Michigan—as was suggested yesterday by the Senator from Oregon—that if the Miller-Cotton amendment had been adopted by the Senate during the last session, all this money would right now be in the process of being used for the very objectives for which the President has requested funds, in his message on education which we received today.

So I would welcome—and I am sure I speak for the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] when I say that we would welcome having the Senator from Michigan join us in our amendment to his amendment. I believe that under those circumstances we could wholeheartedly support the McNamara amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to supplement briefly the words of my friend, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who has with me, both last year, and now this year, been championing the method of aiding the States by returning to them, for use for education, a portion of the taxes on cigarettes collected in those States. In this instance, I think the money is earmarked for use for secondary and elementary school education.

Last night the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whose grasp of these matters I greatly respect and admire, indulged in a rather dramatic speech in which he said the Miller-Cotton amendment, or a bill which carried in it that amendment and was drafted on its principles, would receive the same opposition in the Rules Committee of the other body that Senate bill 1021 would, and that the Miller-Cotton amendment or a bill similar to it would not change that situation at all.

I just want to correct the RECORD this morning, because I think the distinguished Senator was overlooking the point of the approach that the Senator from Iowa and I feel so strongly is the right approach to get real money, instead of vague hopes, for the States for their educational activities. The things that are said in the cloakroom should be said on this floor. Probably what the Senator from Oregon meant in referring to the Rules Committee of the other body was that, because S. 1021 carries no aid to private and parochial schools, a firm stand has been taken that, unless it does, nobody will get anything. That was what he said. I think that is absolutely correct.

Of course, the Supreme Court has, in interpreting the Constitution, made it quite clear that any form of Federal aid for schools must be for public schools only. The President of the United States, advised by the Department of Justice, has said repeatedly that any bill which carried aid in any way for private schools established by any religion, whatever religion it might be, would be in violation of the Constitution.

That is the reason why S. 1021 carries no possibility of aid for private and religious schools, in spite of the fact that it very unjustly—and I was one who supported the amendment to correct it—in selecting the amount to be distributed to the States, counts the children in private schools, even though no aid is given them. This militates against their benefit.

Although, of course, some limitations will be placed on the activities of the States, and some limitations have been placed upon them by the courts in terms of the Constitution, the States are able, if they have aid given them without strings attached, to do things with that money that are right, proper, and fair, and which the Federal Government cannot do, and which cannot be done with Federal money as such.

In my State long ago we established the custom of furnishing transportation, for instance, to schoolchildren attending private schools. They are taken to those schools, along with children going to public schools, in schoolbuses. We furnish that transportation. Some other States furnish textbooks. The situation as between private schools and public schools varies in the different States. A State that has a very large Catholic population, for instance, and a great many parochial schools, is in a different situation from one that has a small Catholic population and where most of the schools are public schools.

The States have faced these problems each with its own situation in mind, and consequently, in many States where it is necessary to be fair to help the children of the State to get their education—and that is what we all want—have established various customs in dealing with the problems.

The Miller-Cotton amendment if adopted, as you know, Mr. President, will simply return to each State a portion of the money collected from it to be used for secondary and elementary schools in any way that State deems proper, in any way its legislature and its school authorities determine, with no strings attached to it.

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

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has just said "with no strings attached to it." It might be suggested that strings could be attached to it or Federal controls attached to it. Would the Senator think that would be a valid objection?

Mr. COTTON. I object to having Federal controls attached to it, yes.

Mr. MILLER. I know the Senator from New Hampshire objects, just as I object, to having Federal controls attached to it; but I suggest that, in view of the objections made by the Senator from Oregon last evening that this amendment would encounter the same problems that S. 1021 encountered in the Rules Committee——

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is referring to the McNamara amendment?

Mr. MILLER. I am referring to the McNamara amendment as amended by the Miller-Cotton amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Oregon said last evening that if the McNamara amendment as amended by the Miller-Cotton amendment were adopted, this bill would encounter the same problem over in the House as S. 1021 did in the last session and is now encountering in the House Rules Committee. The Senator from New Hampshire, at the beginning of his remarks, I thought made a very good point, and that is that the objection on those grounds by the Senator from Oregon is not valid.

Mr. COTTON. That is what I am about to again reemphasize. I thank the Senator from Iowa, because I intend to lead up to it. It is the point of what I am now saying.

Mr. MILLER. What I wanted to ask the Senator from New Hampshire was whether or not it can be suggested that the Miller-Cotton amendment contains a basis for Federal controls.

Mr. COTTON. No, it cannot. The Miller-Cotton amendment is the answer to those who want the amendment but without Federal controls. I want to finish my statement because the Senator from Oregon is entitled to time before we vote on the amendment.

This is what I want to set the record clear on. The States are able with their own money to deal with this problem, to deal fairly with it, and by various methods which are not artifices, but which are perfectly plain and open expedients, are able to help private and religious schools who are educating pupils in the State.

If the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa and myself is adopted, in my opinion—and here is where I sharply differ with the Senator from Oregon—we send over to the other body a bill which will not have the objections in the Rules Committee that S. 1021 has, because S. 1021 provides every cent for the public schools. If our amendment to the McNamara amendment is adopted, we shall send to the House a bill which guarantees money to the States. It is not just a vague promise or fond hope. It guarantees money to every State in the Union and its territories, and that money goes back to the States from which it was received. They can use the money for teachers' salaries. They can use it in the form and manner that a particular State has found satisfactory and in accord with the opinion of the people of that State. They can use it for transportation or textbooks. They can use it for a use which in the opinion of the people of that State is justified. It is not true of S. 1021 or the McNamara amendment. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall put most of my argument in the RECORD, but I want to make this point before I make a motion to lay on the table the Miller-Cotton amendment.

The committee's hearings on S. 1021 produced a consensus that increased financial support of American public elementary and secondary education is necessary. Not all who testified, however, agreed on how this goal should be achieved.

The major areas of disagreement focused on the nature of the Federal role and the method of allocating funds among States in the Federal grant program provided in that bill.

Some, such as the Senator from New Hampshire, urged that the Federal role should be by way of Federal excise tax, remission, or relief. The proposals in this vein were advocated as a means, preferable to Federal grants, for strengthening the fiscal capacity of States and local communities for support of public education. The committee declined to adopt such an approach for three principal reasons.

The Senator from New Hampshire appeared before our committee. He testified very ably before us. He was kind enough to say to me, in effect, after the hearing that he appreciated very much the very thorough way in which the committee went into his proposals. We did so, and we rejected them. We rejected them for these three principal reasons:

First, the Federal tax credit or remission proposals do not achieve equalization as between low- and high-income States in their relative fiscal capacities for support of education. These proposals tend to aid States in direct relation to their income levels, rather than in inverse relation as S. 1021 provides. The committee believes that the Federal role should equalize educational opportunity for young people throughout the Nation by grant assistance to States designed to equalize fiscal capacity among States. Federal tax remission and credit

proposals made to the committee would not achieve this objective.

Second, such proposals would not assure that there would be any increase in the level of support for public education by States and local communities corresponding with the Federal tax remissions or credits. Such resources could be used for any purpose and might not be devoted to education. Furthermore, even in States and local districts which decided to apply such resources to education, substantially more time would be required to enact at State or local community levels of government the programs of taxation and expenditure which would be necessary to apply Federal tax credit resources to public elementary and secondary schools.

Third, such proposals would necessarily entail reductions in Federal revenues. It is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee to recommend legislation providing for substitute sources of revenue to avert such reduction.

The Cotton-Miller amendment, if adopted, might cause the House of Representatives to feel that the Senate would be verging upon a trespass of the constitutional prerogative of the House in appropriations matters, since the effect of the amendment would be to bypass the appropriations process by a ministerial act on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such continuing appropriation or back-door financing language might unnecessarily create opposition in the other body to the worthwhile objectives of this bill.

I close by saying again that I am not at all moved by the argument of the Senator from New Hampshire, which has been repeated many times, to the effect that there is any danger of Federal control of education under S. 1021. As I have said many times, we have had a record of Federal aid to education in this country for decades. We have had a very high program of such aid for the last 10 years, when approximately $2 billion was poured into the schools of this country under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, without a scintilla of proof that the Federal Government has in any way interfered with the local administration of schools which have been the beneficiaries of such funds.

I repeat that the Cotton-Miller amendment cannot be justified on the ground that there is any danger of Federal interference in education under the bill which I had the privilege of conducting through the Senate. For the reasons I have set forth, it is my recommendation to the Senate that the Cotton-Miller amendment be defeated.

Mr. President, to substantiate my view that in legislation designed to assist our elementary and secondary public schools there be an equalization factor, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared for me by the Office of Education on January 11, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Additional percent of personal income necessary to achieve national average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance

State	Per capita personal income: 1960	Expenditure		Additional percent of personal income necessary to achieve national average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance [2]	State ranking by percentage
		Per pupil in average daily attendance [1]	As percent of personal income [2]		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
50 States and District of Columbia	2,223	$483.56	3.9		
Alabama	1,462	269.19	4.0	3.2	4
Alaska	2,735	639.59	3.8		
Arizona	2,011	542.03	5.3		
Arkansas	1,341	269.20	4.2	3.3	3
California	2,741	640.46	4.7		
Colorado	2,320	534.77	4.6		
Connecticut	2,863	541.42	3.2		
Delaware	3,013	757.48	4.1		
Florida	1,988	416.54	3.6	.6	18
Georgia	1,608	296.59	3.8	2.4	9
Hawaii	2,274	368.42	3.3	1.0	14
Idaho	1,796	356.21	4.4	1.6	10
Illinois	2,613	557.83	3.2		
Indiana	2,179	495.70	4.2		
Iowa	2,003	435.09	4.2	.5	20
Kansas	2,068	509.91	4.6		
Kentucky	1,543	281.71	3.4	2.4	8
Louisiana	1,604	477.59	5.6	.1	28
Maine	1,900	329.57	3.2	1.5	11
Maryland	2,394	530.99	3.8		
Massachusetts	2,519	462.95	2.8	.1	26
Michigan	2,322	555.58	4.4		
Minnesota	2,054	555.54	5.0		
Mississippi	1,173	297.85	5.7	3.5	2
Missouri	2,199	$423.08	3.1	0.4	23
Montana	2,018	484.89	4.7		
Nebraska	2,113	430.22	3.7	.5	21
Nevada	2,844	588.60	4.0		
New Hampshire	2,074	430.03	3.3	.4	24
New Jersey	2,665	632.32	3.7		
New Mexico	1,806	437.73	5.1	.5	19
New York	2,789	699.39	3.7		
North Carolina	1,574	295.10	4.1	2.6	5
North Dakota	1,741	476.32	5.4	.1	27
Ohio	2,339	485.86	3.7		
Oklahoma	1,848	381.70	4.3	1.1	13
Oregon	2,259	536.83	4.6		
Pennsylvania	2,266	495.99	3.5		
Rhode Island	2,228	448.93	2.8	.2	25
South Carolina	1,397	255.10	4.1	3.6	1
South Dakota	1,842	389.61	4.3	1.0	15
Tennessee	1,545	291.08	3.9	2.6	7
Texas	1,924	406.03	4.0	.8	17
Utah	1,910	447.07	5.7	.5	22
Vermont	1,859	400.32	3.9	.8	16
Virginia	1,848	350.61	3.6	1.4	12
Washington	2,317	550.65	4.7		
West Virginia	1,674	289.59	3.9	2.6	6
Wisconsin	2,171	517.74	3.9		
Wyoming	2,334	655.72	6.0		
District of Columbia	3,008	486.15	2.2		

[1] Total expenditures within each State for public elementary and secondary education are assumed to be the total expenditures reported for public elementary and secondary day schools. They are for current expense interest, and capital outlay including expenditures of public school building authorities. Expenditure data were obtained from preliminary statistics for 1959–60, and are from total revenue from all sources.

[2] On basis of total personal income by States for 1960, as reported by U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1961.

Source: Col. 2, Survey of Current Business, August 1961, U.S. Department of Commerce, table 2.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the table shows, in my judgment, most graphically the magnitude of the effort which must be made if we are to achieve an equality of educational opportunity for all our boys and girls. It shows, further, I believe, the tremendous difficulties faced by many States which have low per capita personal incomes. The effort that such States are making to allocate funds for educational purposes can best be measured by the percentage of personal income from all sources in the State which, through the State taxing mechanisms, is apportioned to educational purposes at the elementary and secondary levels. For a State having a low per capita personal income to increase its educational efforts from State resources in the degree needed to bring that State up to the national average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance is demonstrated to be so difficult by the chart as to suggest most strongly that Federal assistance without Federal control is urgently needed.

Since the pending amendment to the McNamara amendment does not, in my judgment, provide adequate equalization factors, I must regard it as being less desirable than legislation which incorporates the allocation formulas contained in S. 1021, and therefore, for this reason among others, I urge that the Senate defeat the amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to take the remaining few moments to have a little visit with my friend from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. As he indicated in his statement today, he is very much concerned about my consistency, or lack thereof. I always appreciate it when

the Senator from Michigan takes a personal interest in my well-being, but I wish to say to my good friend from Michigan that one could be no more consistent than I have been in this whole educational fight.

My position today, my good friend from Michigan to the contrary notwithstanding, is a consistent position. It is consistent with respect to the motivating objective which moves me in all these educational debates. What is that? It is to do everything I can, within my parliamentary power in the Senate as the floor leader of these education bills, to bring a maximum benefit and aid to the boys and girls in America.

I had to reach the decision as to what was the best course of action to follow in the Senate procedurally and parliamentarily to protect the educational interests of these boys and girls for whom we have been fighting so hard. My friend from Michigan has been standing shoulder to shoulder with me in that fight in the Senate for some time. Our difference is solely a difference as to what is the best procedure parliamentarily to follow in the Senate to bring help to the boys and girls that he and I join in wishing to help. There is but an honest difference of opinion between us.

I am satisfied that to follow the approach of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] by adding his amendment to the higher education bill would not advance by one iota the educational interests of those little boys and girls. Rather, to adopt his course would be to do additional damage to tens upon thousands of college students in America today who need the higher education bill passed.

We have a very good opportunity, if we can get a rule for a conference from the House, to have a conference on the higher education bills. It happens to be my judgment—and this is one of the places my friend seems to think I am following an inconsistent course of action—that the probabilities are very great that if we add a secondary and elementary school amendment such as the McNamara amendment to the higher education bill, we will in all probability not get even a rule for a conference on the bill from the House.

That does not mean I like the situation. I never like it when I think a wrong is being done. I shall take a realistic course of action about this, because I am satisfied that the present responsibility of the Senate is to pass a higher education bill. We should then use whatever influence we have on the House in other ways to try to get the House to measure up to its responsibilities in regard to an elementary and secondary school assistance bill.

Furthermore, I do not think my friend from Michigan has given due and adequate consideration to the procedural differences between the House and the Senate. In the Senate he and I serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over all education bills. Such is not the case in the House. We have a subcommittee, of which the Senator from Michigan is a member, and a very able member. It is my Subcommittee on Education. The subcommittee has jurisdiction over all education bills. On the House side, there is a subcommittee concerned with elementary and secondary school education. There is a different subcommittee for higher education legislation. There are other subcommittees for other educational subject matters.

My friend from Michigan knows that last year the able Representative from New Jersey, Mr. Thompson, was chairman of the House subcommittee dealing with elementary and secondary school education. My friend knows that Representative Thompson stood shoulder to shoulder with us in support of the major objectives of S. 1021. The chairman of the House subcommittee which deals with higher education, however, is not Representative Thompson. There is a different subcommittee which deals with higher education, and the chairman of that subcommittee is my very able colleague on the House side, Representative Edith Green, of Oregon's Third Congressional District.

I need not tell those in the Senate—I am not among them, but they have told me of their experiences—who have served in the House that there are some very strong feelings about jurisdictional lines in the House. If we add the McNamara amendment to the bill, I think the prospects are very great that we shall get into a jurisdictional difficulty with regard to the subcommittee dealing with higher education and the subcommittee dealing with elementary and secondary school education. Furthermore, I think we shall get into difficulties in gaining a rule for a conference as a result of adding, what I say most respectfully, amounts in fact, to a rider on a higher education bill. The secondary and elementary school amendment of the Senator from Michigan in my judgment, is in fact, a rider to a higher education bill.

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

Mr. MORSE. I think that will create difficulties on the House side.

I came to the conclusion, in the interest of consistency on my part—a consistent determination to do everything I can to help the little boys and girls in the grade schools, the young men and women in the high schools, and our youth in the colleges—to follow a parliamentary course of action of getting the best bill on higher education that I can, without it being encumbered by the McNamara secondary and elementary school amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think the Senator makes a very convincing argument for accepting the bill as passed by the House and nothing else. I do not know why the Senator does not wish to do that, and to avoid all the frustration.

Mr. MORSE. It does not follow that because we cannot accept amendments relating to elementary and secondary school education that we should not add amendments on higher education to the Senate bill, for on these we can go to conference with the House. We will automatically go to the House for a conference on the higher education bill, but we might not if the McNamara amendment were to be added to it.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that the Miller-Cotton amendment is not based upon the income of States. The Blakley amendment, which was offered to the bill passed at the previous session of Congress, was, because it was based upon income tax. Our approach is on the basis of a proposed cigarette tax, which has no relevancy to the income of the States.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, but I think the Senator is quite mistaken so far as a physical fact is concerned. The amendment does have to do with the income from the State, because the total amount of the money received from the purchase of cigarettes would depend upon the purchasing power of the population of the State. Certainly Arkansas does not have the same purchasing power as would New York when it comes to the purchase of cigarettes. The income would be from the sale of cigarettes. So very directly the income of a State, from the standpoint of the purchasing power of the consumers, would determine the amount of tax remission that would go to a given State for its educational needs. The situation varies from State to State, and some of our States with a smaller population have a much greater proportionate need for Federal aid to education than do some of our larger States. When I speak about personal income in relation to a State, that is the sense in which I talk about it.

Mr. President, I have discussed the subject with many members of my committee. I now move to table the Miller-Cotton amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to table the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. May I inquire of the Chair what a vote on the motion would mean? Do I understand that a vote of "nay" on the Morse motion to table is a vote in favor of the Miller-Cotton amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is a motion to lay the Miller-Cotton amendment on the table.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Chair again if a vote of "nay" on that motion is in effect a vote for the Miller-Cotton amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will not construe the meaning of a vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator form Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Aiken	Douglas	Jordan
Anderson	Engle	Keating
Bartlett	Ervin	Kefauver
Beall	Fong	Kerr
Bible	Gore	Lausche
Burdick	Gruening	Long, La.
Bush	Hartke	Magnuson
Byrd, Va.	Hayden	Mansfield
Byrd, W. Va.	Hickey	McCarthy
Cannon	Hill	McGee
Carlson	Holland	McNamara
Carroll	Humphrey	Metcalf
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Monroney
Church	Javits	Morse
Clark	Johnston	Moss
Muskie	Proxmire	Sparkman
Neuberger	Randolph	Symington
Pastore	Robertson	Williams, N.J.
Pearson	Saltonstall	Young, Ohio
Pell	Smathers	
Prouty	Smith, Mass.	

NAYS—28

Allott	Goldwater	Smith, Maine
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Boggs	Hruska	Talmadge
Butler	McClellan	Thurmond
Capehart	Miller	Tower
Case, S. Dak.	Morton	Wiley
Cotton	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Dworshak	Russell	
Eastland	Scott	

NOT VOTING—11

Chavez	Ellender	Long, Mo.
Cooper	Fulbright	Long, Hawaii
Dirksen	Hart	Yarborough
Dodd	Kuchel	

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I voted "no" on the motion to table the Miller-Cotton amendment. My opposition to general Federal aid to education is well known; therefore I am opposed to the principle as contained in the McNamara amendment. However, I feel that if an amendment to aid elementary and secondary schools is to be incorporated in the pending legislation, the proposal contained in the Miller-Cotton amendment would have been less objectionable than that contained in the McNamara amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while Senators are on the floor and we can have their attention, assuming we finish action on the pending bill this afternoon, can the distinguished majority leader tell us whether he proposes to have this measure followed by the pension and welfare disclosure bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator's assumption is correct. If the Senate completes action on the pending business this afternoon, we shall take up S. 2520, the bill for the Enforcement of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Tomorrow we shall take up the resolutions which affect the various committees of the Senate.

I hope we may complete this business by Thursday, so that when the Senate adjourns over the Lincoln Day period, the calendar, generally speaking, will be relatively clean. If that can be done, it may well mean that an extra day or so could be added to the period of recess, because no further important business calling for a vote will come before the Senate until February 20, or thereabout, at which time it is hoped to bring to a conclusion the debate and the consideration of the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs.

So if the Senate will cooperate, it is my hope that the consideration of all these measures can be concluded on Thursday, and as early on Thursday as possible for the convenience of Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire, further, of the Senator from Alabama, whether he anticipates a long discussion of the pension and welfare bill.

Mr. HILL. I do not think there will be. Of course, I would have no way of knowing for certain, as the Senator from Illinois realizes. However, I think there should not be too much discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, who I believe intends to offer amendments, if he expects to speak at length on them.

Mr. TOWER. I have two amendments. I am willing to agree to a limitation of debate of, say, an hour on each one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois advise the Chair on whose time he is speaking?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have not the slightest idea; but I ask that the time for this discussion be taken from the time on the bill.

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

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the distinguished majority leader to say something about the reorganization plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. It is hoped to bring that proposal to the floor for debate on February 19, a week from next Monday.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Would that be irrespective of whether the committee had been able to complete its hearings and make a report by that time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that under the law if a motion of disapproval is entered—and one has been entered in this instance by the Senator from Wyoming—following a 10-day period the proposal could be brought up. I hope the Senator from Arkansas, who is chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, which will hold the hearings on the bill, will agree to that process.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I am not in a position to make a commitment as to what the committee might or might not do. I do not understand why it is desired to take such early action. I do not know why there is such a rush about it. Sixty days are provided from the time the plan is submitted for the committee to study it, hold hearings, and make a report. Hearings have been scheduled to start next Tuesday, one week from today. I do not know whether it will be possible to complete them in a day or two, or whether a longer time will be necessary. I have no desire, and it is not my purpose, unduly to prolong the hearings or deliberately to delay action on the plan. But so far as I know, there is no reason, right after the resolution has been introduced, and right after the plan has been referred to the committee, to take such action with regard to discharging the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are going beyond the 10 days which are allowed. It is my understanding that extensive hearings have been held on this proposal, that a bill has been reported by the committee and placed on the calendar, and that it has been approved by

the policy committee for consideration. So it was with those factors in mind that I discussed the question with the distinguished minority leader. I shall be prepared to discuss it still further with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I think it would be quite proper to bring up the bill which has been reported by the committee and also approved for action by the policy committee. I believe that would be quite proper.

I have serious doubts about the procedure here contemplated and the precedent which it would establish. If this becomes the practice of the Senate, I doubt whether it would be advisable hereafter for the committee to whom the reorganization plans are referred to make any effort to hold hearings and develop the merits or demerits of the plans, as the case may be. I simply feel that the proposal ought to take its normal course, just as other reorganization plans have taken their course in the past. I do not recall any instance when such speed has been demanded heretofore with respect to any reorganization plan.

Bear in mind that this is an unusual legislative procedure. Safeguards were attempted to be incorporated in the law. A resolution could be introduced and the committee might not act on it; therefore, the resolution would never get before the Senate. So there had to be some procedural safeguard. However, I think it would be a mistake to take the position that after 10 days after a resolution has been introduced, and introduced the next day after the plan has been submitted, the Senate should take it up for action irrespective of having affording the committee an opportunity to hear the matter and duly process it, deliberate on it, and report its considered judgment to this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is the first time that a precedent of this sort has been set, because while a bill was reported by the Committee on Government Operations and approved by the policy committee for consideration by the Senate, action was foreclosed by the procedure adopted in the other body. It is to be hoped that we might consider this proposal. I point out that if the Senate is not prepared to move—if my information is correct, and I think it is—the House is prepared to move.

Furthermore, on the same day the President's proposal was sent to the House, a motion of disapproval was entered by, I believe, three Republican Members of that body.

So one House or the other would bring it up within a short period; and I would say that in view of the fact that hearings have previously been held—in effect—on this proposal, the Senator from Arkansas would give that due consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to say that in its procedures and deliberations the Senate should not penalize this committee because of a considered, appropriate legislative action taken by the other body. In its wisdom, it took the action it did. The action the committee of the other body took does not in itself preclude the taking of further action over there. There is a prescribed procedure whereby if that committee blocked consideration of the bill, the committee could be discharged from the further consideration of the measure, and the measure could then be brought before that body for action—for final passage or disposition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. But as a former Member of that body, the Senator is aware of the difficulties which that procedure would impose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, would the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not say whether the committee which has jurisdiction of Reorganization Plan No. 1 should be discharged after 10 days from the further consideration of the plan; but I wish to say that this reorganization plan deals with proposals which for a number of years have been before the Banking and Currency Committee—proposals with which I am quite familiar. I am very much opposed to the reorganization plan; and I propose in an extended speech next Monday, when I can be recognized, to state my objections, for the record.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the contention of the majority leader that the reorganization plan referred to is at all identical with the Senate bill which was reported by the Senate committee and was approved, for action, by the policy committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not exactly, but generally so.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that the legislative proposal went a great deal further than the reorganization plan now before the Senate; and it seems to me that consideration of the reorganization plan by no means involves duplication of the action which has been taken by the committee in passing on the legislative measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Florida has a point there. Again I wish to emphasize the word "generally," because both were in the same direction.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield briefly—but only briefly, because the time now being taken by us is being charged to the time available on the education bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations, I simply wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by our chairman. It seems to me the proposed procedure gives rather short shrift to the responsibility of our committee, which I do not think has been at all guilty of wasting time or at all obviously deliberate in acting. We have set the hearings for next Tuesday, in trying to find out how much concern there is.

What the Senator from Florida has said is precisely correct, namely, that the proposal we shall have to consider, whether on the 20th or at some later time, is certainly not foursquare with the legislative proposal approved earlier by our committee and approved by the policy committee. I am sure the majority leader realizes that that bill, as approved, contains provision for certain safeguards for smaller communities, rural areas, and many other desiderata, safeguards which, under the proposal, obviously could not be considered in connection with the reorganization plan received from the White House.

Therefore, under those circumstances I hope the majority leader will not ask that we take action with a shotgun pointed at our heads—unless we exhibit some tendencies for dilatory action, which we have not done yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize my statement that generally they are alike.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself, I call up my amendments identified as "2-2-62—C," and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

On the first page, line 4, strike out "and Scholarship".

On page 2, line 11, beginning with "holding out", strike out all through "promise and the" in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "giving them additional".

On page 2, beginning with line 18, strike out all through "college" in line 21 and insert in lieu thereof "through authorizing additional funds for loans to students under the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

On page 18, beginning with line 14, strike out all through line 22 on page 28 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR LOANS TO STUDENTS AND BROADENING OF CANCELLATION PROVISIONS UNDER TITLE II OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

"Authorization amendment

"SEC. 201. Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu

thereof '$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, $107,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $133,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964'.

"Cancellation amendment

"SEC. 202. Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for (A) maintaining an academic standing in the top 25 per centum of the borrower's class, at the rate of 50 per centum of the amount of the loan obtained during each complete academic year in which such standing was maintained, and (B) service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school, or an institution of higher education, in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the total of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon which was unpaid on the first day of such service plus any amounts canceled under clause (A) above, for each complete academic year of such service;'."

On page 38, line 5, beginning after the period, strike out all through the period in line 8.

On page 40, line 12, strike out "II or".

On page 40, line 13, strike out "206(c) or".

On page 42, lines 16 and 17, strike out "to any individual or".

On page 42, line 19, strike out "or pursuant to a scholarship,".

On page 42, line 21, strike out "respect to grants or loans".

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to increase the amount of funds authorized for loans to students under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Vermont yield to himself?

Mr. PROUTY. Thirty minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, each year between 160,000 and 200,000 young people with high ability fail to attend college. Of these, 60,000 to 100,000 might be reached if financial assistance were made available to them.

I have proposed, along with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], an amendment to the higher education bill which would provide additional funds for loans to needy and deserving students in colleges and universities. This amendment would not only aid superior high school graduates who are unable to obtain a higher education because of a lack of funds; it would, also, help the hard-pressed boy or girl already in college who might be forced to drop out if not given some form of financial assistance.

The proposal we present would strengthen the National Defense Education Act by making available additional funds for student loans. The amendment would raise the loan ceiling for the fiscal year 1963 from $90 million to $107.5 million, or a net jump of $17.5 million.

For the fiscal year 1963, the amendment would raise the National Defense Education Act loan fund authorization from $90 million to $133.75 million, or a net jump of $43.75 million.

Thus, over a 2-year period, the Prouty-Keating proposal would make possible nearly 120,000 additional student loans in the neighborhood of $500 each.

The junior Senator from New York and I feel that the program of student assistance should be designed to reward those who demonstrate academic excellence or enter the teaching field. This our amendment does by permitting partial cancellation of national defense student loans.

Forgiveness of 50 percent of their loans would be allowed to students who rank in the top 25 percent of their class academically. Students who decide to teach in an elementary or secondary school or institution of higher learning would be permitted loan forgiveness at the rate of 10 percent for each year they are engaged in the teaching profession.

The maximum loan cancellation possible would be 50 percent.

I believe that our amendment shows the confidence we have in the national defense student loan program. This program has produced excellent results and is carried out by the institutions of higher learning themselves.

The Prouty-Keating amendment will be of particular help to the most needy students.

A recent survey covering 86,000 student borrowers under the National Defense Education Act during the period of July 1 to November 1, 1960, reveals that 72 percent of the borrowers come from families with annual incomes of $6,000 or less, and that 45 percent come from families having two or more children. Ninety-four percent of the borrowers report personal savings of $500 or less. The combined elements of meager personal savings, relatively low family income, and number of dependents bring sharply to focus the youths most in need of assistance to pursue higher education.

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 83 percent of the freshman borrowers depended on the loan program to enable them to enter college, and 58 percent of other undergraduates indicated that the National Defense Education Act loan would determine their ability to remain in college. In addition, 30 percent of them had to pay their entire college expenses by means of scholarships, fellowships, and loans, and 29 percent of them had to finance three-fourths of their college expenses in this way.

These figures demonstrate beyond question that the National Defense Education Act should be strengthened because it aids the genuinely needy student.

I think all Senators ought to take note of the fact that the House-passed college aid bill has no scholarship provisions and that the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has announced his committee will consider the question of helping needy students only in conjunction with a review of the operation of the National Defense Education Act. This attitude was not assumed without good reason. The Advisory Group on Higher Education, which submitted a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress, unanimously agreed that the national defense student loan program is highly successful and the group urged that it continue to be the primary vehicle of direct Federal assistance to students.

According to the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association, no Federal program of scholarships has been offered which they consider soundly conceived or practical of administration in terms of achieving its professed objectives, or as deserving at this time a priority in Federal expenditures on higher education.

These associations went on to say:

> Poorly conceived action could prove to be only a deluding of the public into thinking it had met its challenge to provide educational opportunity.

There are a number of definite advantages which the Prouty-Keating amendment has over the scholarship title in the committee bill. There are, also, countless valid objections to the scholarship title. I would like to proceed at this time to compare our amendment with the provisions of the committee bill.

First, the Prouty-Keating amendment is tied to the administrative machinery we already have on the statute books. It requires the establishment of no new agency, bureau, or commission.

The committee bill would make it necessary to have the States set up 50 brand new commissions, and the administrative costs of such an effort would run between 12 and 15 percent of the total amount of funds authorized for scholarships.

Second, our amendment would encourage academic excellence by permitting partial cancellation of student loans for those who rank in the top 25 percent of their class academically.

It would appear from a reading of the reported bill that if a student demonstrates that he can squeak by in college and is in financial need, he will be eligible for a scholarship. The bill does not require in so many words that scholarships must go to those with the highest ability, and this would give State commissions a certain flexibility which could be utilized for political purposes.

Third, our amendment would allow the colleges and universities themselves to select the recipients of student loans, as they have been doing very successfully under the National Defense Education Act.

The committee bill would place authority to aid students in the hands of 50 yet-to-be-established State commissions.

Everett Case, president of Colgate University, speaking for the American Council on Education, had this to say about the scholarship provisions in S. 1241:

> The problem is one of evaluating individual needs, and college admissions officers have far more experience in dealing with this problem than most State boards are likely to have. This can be done effectively only on a personal basis, not solely as the result of comparing the results of standardized tests and financial questionnaires—the

only procedures available to State boards. College admissions officers do this as a routine matter.

This representative from the American Council on Education went on to say:

The financial needs of the individual student can frequently be met by a combination of scholarship aid and loans. College campuses can plan such combined programs for individuals. State scholarship boards cannot.

The sentiment expressed by the American Council on Education was strongly supported by the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, and the State Universities Association. President John D. Millette, Miami University, representing these associations, made this comment:

There is substantial sentiment among educators to the effect that Federal scholarships should be awarded through educational institutions. We doubt that the evidence exists on which to base a judgment that the proposed legislation will make a substantial contribution to accomplishing its purpose.

Frederick Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies, expressed great concern about the scholarship provisions in the administration bill. I quote now from Dr. Burkhardt:

I urge that this be put into the hands of th institutions of higher learning. They have had long experience with both scholarships and loans and can plan for the individual more effectively than can regional or State boards. The funds should be allocated essentially as they are now under the Federal Student Loan Fund provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, represented by Rt. Rev. Msgr. F. G. Hochwalt, stated:

There must be kept uppermost in the minds of those who decide the problem of evaluating the individual needs, the recognition that college admissions officers have years of accumulated experience in dealing with these problems. Some of this valuable experience moreover may be lacking on the part of State or regional boards. Another basic consideration lies in the fact that the needs of the individual student can frequently be met by a combination of scholarship aid and loans. Here again the institutions and their admissions officers may be the individuals best qualified to make decisions.

Fourth, our amendment would not have any unhealthy influence on the distribution of students among the various colleges and universities.

The committee bill would tend to pack the already overcrowded so-called prestige institutions.

The American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association are very much disturbed about the fact that the proposed Federal scholarship program will probably unduly influence the normal distribution of students among American colleges and universities. They feel that any program which combines selection of scholarship holders by State or national boards with freedom of winners to attend institutions of their choice inevitably will lead to the concentration of applications in relatively few of the better known institutions. These distinguished associations claim that the experience of the national merit scholarship program proves their point beyond any shadow of a doubt.

The American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association strongly recommend that funds be allocated in approximately the same manner as Federal student loan funds.

It would be extremely unwise to enact legislation which encourages the packing of the big colleges and deprives of their normal student potential many of the underutilized but excellent smaller institutions.

Philip H. Coombs, program director of the education program for the Ford Foundation, recently took note of the tremendous waste in current utilization of both faculties and facilities of higher education. He quoted a survey of colleges and universities which revealed that, on the basis of a 44-hour week, classrooms were used only 46 percent of the time—25 percent when used in terms of pupil stations—and their laboratories were used at only 38 percent of capacity.

It is highly important, therefore, that we do not take any action which will crowd the overcrowded colleges and take away students from the institutions which have ample facilities and faculties to receive them.

Fifth, our amendment is designed in such a way as to help many needy students, and would injure no other students.

The committee bill would cause a college to discriminate in favor of a student who has a Federal scholarship and deny enrollment to a student who has no such aid. This is true because under the committee bill the college gets a $350 bonus for each Federal scholarshipholder it admits.

Sixth, the Prouty-Keating amendment would help not only the superior high school graduate about to go to college, it would also assist the needy and deserving already in college who may be forced to drop out because they have no money.

The committee bill advances a program which says in effect "If you have not entered college, we are willing to give you some money to go. But if you are already in college and need money, we are not going to do a thing for you."

Seventh, the Prouty-Keating amendment would encourage students to prepare to teach in all of our elementary and secondary schools and in our institutions of higher learning, as well. It would do this by providing a partial cancellation of loans up to 50 percent to those students who later engage in the teaching profession. Our amendment strengthens the foregiveness provision presently in the National Defense Education Act.

The committee-reported bill offers no incentives which will aid in erasing the teacher shortage.

Eighth, under the Prouty-Keating proposal loan funds will go into areas where they are needed most. This is true because colleges and universities themselves, knowing the loan demand, are the ones who apply for Federal funds.

The committee bill could very well bring about a bad distribution of scholarship money. According to the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the U.S. Office of Education does not have adequate studies of the distribution of qualified and needy students. By this I mean, there are no State-by-State studies covering the entire country of the percentage of high school graduates who attend college and of the percentage of those in various ability groupings who do attend. On the basis of the studies they do have, the land-grant colleges conclude that the percentage of high school graduates attending college varies greatly among the States and regions and raises in their mind the question as to whether or not a high percentage of the able young people who fail to go to college for financial reasons may not be fairly heavily concentrated in a few States or regions.

Our land-grant colleges argue, and I agree, that a considerably better factual basis of information needs to be available before we can make sound judgments as to the effectiveness of a Federal scholarship program and whether it would accomplish its stated objectives.

Ninth, our amendment, calling for an extension of the National Defense Education Act loan program, will reach those who are most determined to get an education and will take ample recognition of achievement through loan forgiveness for high academic standing. The money which goes to students for loans will be repaid in whole or in part and repayments will be placed in a revolving fund so that other needy pupils can be assisted as long as the National Defense Education Act is in operation.

The committee bill does not encourage industry on the part of the student and once money goes out from the Federal Government for student aid, it does not come back. The same money cannot be used over and over to aid the deserving young men and women who want a college education.

Tenth, the Prouty-Keating amendment would add additional fund authorizations to the National Defense Education Act totaling $17.5 million for fiscal 1963 and $43.75 million for fiscal 1964.

The committee-reported bill has such defective scholarship provisions that it is impossible to estimate what their costs will be. It is important to note that the limitation on authorized appropriations in the committee bill only applies to the first year of the scholarships. The second sentence of section 201 states that funds are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of 7 succeeding fiscal years, in such sums as are necessary to make payments to persons who have been previously awarded scholarships. If the scholarships awarded to recipients during the first year were to remain constant over a 4-year period then the maximum amount of appropriations would reach $595 million.

However, the State commissions who will be handling the scholarship money could, through simple techniques, hike the fund authorization to the multibillion-dollar category. In fact, it is theoretically possible for these commissions to hike authorizations to a figure exceeding the national debt. We can illustrate the absurdity of the language now in the bill by using a hypothetical set of circumstances.

Let us suppose that during the first 5 years of direct authorized appropriations, the several State commissions award scholarships of $100 each to 1,487,500 individuals. During each of the next 3 years, the State commissions in accordance with the provisions of section 206(a)(2)(A), upgrade these scholarships to the maximum amount of $1,000, resulting in a cost of $4,462,500,000—1,487,500 scholarships of $1,000 for 3 years. Adding the first year cost of $148,750,000 to the above figure would bring the amount to $4,463,987,500.

In addition, the education allowance of $350 granted to the institutions for each scholarship recipient in attendance per year would cost $2,082,500,000—1,487,500 scholarship recipients times $1,400—$350 for each of 4 years. Thus, under our assumed circumstances, the total cost of the scholarship program would be $6,546,587,500.

Of course, the weaknesses in the committee bill will probably not be exploited to the tune of $6 billion plus, but I do think the example I have brought out shows that the cost of the proposed scholarship program could be fantastic.

The distinguished junior Senator from New York and I feel that we have developed an approach to the problems of needy students that is both practical and realistic. It is our hope that Senators will examine the amendment we advance very carefully and will conclude that it deserves their support.

Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). Twenty minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, first I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. KEATING. Except for the pending amendment, as I understand, the Senate is operating under a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. If an amendment is offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], or any other Senator, and an amendment to the amendment is offered, will any Senator offering an amendment to an amendment also have 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each amendment will have 1 hour, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. KEATING. An amendment to an amendment would have 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, the purpose of the pending amendment, on which I am happy to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has done such outstanding work in this field, is to limit the scholarship provisions contained in title II and to substitute instead, as he has explained, an expanded loan program under the National Defense Education Act.

The loan program which we are proposing has provisions for loan forgiveness up to 50 percent for two classes; students in the top quarter of their class academically, or students who enter the teaching profession.

The virtues of this approach, as opposed to the scholarship program, seem to me to be substantial. In the first place, the National Defense Education Act loan program, title II, is now in effect. It has been working well for 4 years. It has widespread support. So far it has helped some 230,000 young people to go to college who probably otherwise would not have been able to do so.

The second advantage is that a loan program can be expanded over the years at a much reduced cost when the repayments are made.

As the Senator has pointed out, it is estimated that there are from 60,000 to 100,000 high school seniors each year in the top 30 percent of their class who are prevented from going on to college because of lack of funds. To supply enough scholarships to help all those students, or a large part of them, would require astronomical sums. A loan program could help many more of these students with the same amount of money.

The third advantage of the proposal we are making is that it calls for substantial incentive provisions to encourage higher caliber students.

As I pointed out, there are provisions for forgiveness up to 50 percent of the loans for students who rank in the top 25 percent of their class and for students who enter the teaching profession. As we all know, teachers are badly needed today.

Fourth, this procedure would eliminate the creation of new and perhaps unwieldy State commissions in each of our 50 States to conduct tests and award scholarships, which is the plan under the bill before us. It would leave the program in the hands of those most directly involved—the colleges and the universities.

In setting up the proposed commissions, the administrative expenses are estimated by the House Committee on Education and Labor to be as high as 12 to 15 percent.

In the bill before us, there is no limit whatsoever, but the bill would authorize appropriations of such sums as might be necessary to meet administrative expenses.

All this money might better be spent directly on loans for needy students than on piling up another administrative structure.

Finally, the great virtue of this proposal is that it is practical and realistic. This argument has to do with the practical considerations involved in getting a bill through this Congress. There is little likelihood that the other body will accept the scholarship program in any form. If the Senate blindly goes on to pass a bill providing scholarships, the final version, if we get a bill at all, will then have to be hammered out in conference between two bills; namely, the Senate and House versions. These are as far different as night and day. As a result, the Senate will probably be asked to approve willy-nilly a compromise program that we shall never have had an opportunity to discuss adequately on the floor or to vote on directly. To my mind, that is not a desirable way to legislate. It seems to me we should take up and consider the kind of legislation we really want and not leave it to the conference committee to arrive at the final result.

For these reasons I believe that the proposed approach through the National Defense Education Act is the wisest, the most effective, the easiest to administer, and the most likely in the long run to be achieved; and I venture the prediction that if we stick to the scholarship idea, and the bill goes to a conference and we get a bill at all—if it is not tied up completely in conference—the only thing the other side will agree to is probably a loan provision. In any event, I am reliably informed that would be much more palatable to the other body than the scholarship provisions in the bill before the Senate.

Objections will be raised—and I think they are answerable—to the suggested approach. In the first place, it will be said that the bill is a higher education bill, and that we should therefore not try to bring in any provisions of another act, the National Defense Education Act, or especially that we should not here try to change the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. The National Defense Education Act benefits higher education in an effective and workable manner. Therefore, it seems to me that instead of turning our backs completely on the bill, and the machinery under it, and establishing under this bill a new form of bureaucracy to work for the very same objectives, we might better meet those objectives, since they are similar under both bills, by patterning what we do here after the National Defense Education Act.

Let me make very clear that the amendment would not affect any part of the National Defense Education Act except title II, dealing with loans; and most of title II would not be altered at all. It would be merely extended in respect to the times provided and in the sums available.

The most sizable changes are in providing forgiveness of loans, not only to those entering the teaching profession, but also to those achieving a certain academic standard. The reason why I think that should be done through the National Defense Education Act at this time, even though I realize there is another bill on the calendar dealing with the revision of the National Defense Education Act, is that it seems to me it would be a great mistake to set up 50 more State agencies, as is proposed under the bill, to handle the scholarship or any other program, when it could be handled through an existing establishment.

To my way of thinking, it is good administration to take advantage of a program now in operation so long as it is

functioning well, rather than to create a new bureaucracy for that purpose. The fact that the Senate is not now considering the National Defense Education Act, and amendments to it, is in no way a legitimate argument against the amendment, it seems to me, because I believe that in studying the question of aid to higher education, the Senate should also be coordinating with the national defense education programs in that field.

In short, we should be amending that act rather than creating entirely new machinery.

Another point may be made, and probably will be made. And all these arguments have a certain amount of validity. I in no way belittle them. They are legitimate arguments in opposition to the amendment. One such argument will be the fact that the National Defense Education Act was intended to encourage the study of mathematics, sciences, and modern languages particularly, whereas Senate bill 1241 is directed at making education in any field available to those who could not otherwise afford it. I am informed—and I am rather surprised to hear it—that only between one-quarter and one-third of the national defense education agency loans are now made to those in the fields of science, mathematics, and languages.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. There seems, therefore, to be ample scope under the National Defense Education Act program, as now drafted and executed, to assist able students in other areas of study as well. As I have said, the principal changes that we would make in the National Defense Education Act would involve the forgiveness of loans up to 50 percent for the student who remained in the top quarter of his class, and provision for an incentive so that the student would get the most out of his college year academically. At the same time, the loan feature of the program would be preserved. Students who know they must repay a loan, in part at least, are far more likely to try to benefit fully from their education than those who receive the money gratis under a Federal scholarship. Moreover, a loan program automatically singles out those who are most determined to have an education, while the forgiveness feature rewards those who are most conscientious and who take their studies most seriously. The loan feature has the virtue of providing funds and developing a sense of responsibility at the same time. The student's mind and character are strengthened. Rather than leaning on the crutch of a Government handout, the student learns to stand on his own feet.

Incidental benefits that will be derived from the fact that the Government can make these loans available to more students include the fact that it costs less, overall, to the Government, and also affects the student himself by developing his character and his dependability and his general moral fiber. That is the principal reason why I like the idea of a loan provision as opposed to an outright grant.

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

Mr. KEATING. I will be very happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio, but I would prefer to complete my statement if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. The experience of private organizations, of which there is one in the city of Washington, the Strong Foundation, which are involved in this type of loan program shows that there is a very high percentage of repayment.

The other change in the National Defense Education Act is the provision for forgiveness of up to 50 percent of the loan, at the rate of 10 percent for each year in which the recipient teaches in an elementary or secondary school or in an institution of higher learning.

Under the present terms of the National Defense Education Act forgiveness is allowed to those who teach in public elementary and secondary schools. The need is equally great for teachers in private elementary and secondary schools, as well as in institutions of higher learning, both public and private.

This provision would end what is a discriminatory provision in the present bill, and which has no possible relation to any kind of constitutionality; in fact, it is a change which was recommended by the committee in its amendments to the National Defense Education Act, S. 2345 is on the calendar.

There are other technical problems that may arise. For instance, the amendment would provide for a 2-year program rather than a 5-year program, because the National Defense Education Act as it now stands on the books is a 2-year program.

There may be other problems with respect to students who are now enjoying National Defense Education Act loans, in relation to the revised terms of the proposed legislation. That is something which can easily be worked out.

The incentive provisions in the amendment are virtually identical with those proposed by the advisory group on higher education, made up of members of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. That is one reason why I state with what I believe to be accuracy that the chances of the bill in the other body are much better if we add the amendment to the bill.

Under section 4 of the report entitled "Congressional Action For Higher Education," issued by the group to which I have referred, namely, the advisory group, recommends an extension of the national defense students' loan program, with an increase in the fund. It also recommends cancellation of a portion of a student's loan for any year or years in which his academic achievement is outstanding.

The committee has expended a great deal of time and effort on the study. I am reliably informed that a provision along these lines would be more acceptable in the other body than the scholarship provisions in the present bill.

After all, those of us who are sincerely interested in improving the standard of excellence in institutions of higher learning—and this is true also, I am sure, of those who oppose the amendment—believe this is essential to our strength and security, and do not want this program to fall between the House and Senate stools.

I urge that all those who have an interest in the incentive approach to the problems of individual assistance, which has been highly successful in the framework of the National Defense Education Act, give support to the pending amendment.

I would like to comment briefly on the President's message, which came to Congress today, but perhaps I should defer doing so until a later time. I am now happy to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New York understands that I have an amendment which is substantially like that offered by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I might say to the Senator from Ohio that I believe the intention of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York, after discussing the amendment, is to withdraw it at this time and to renew the substance of it as amendments to the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I would ask my friend from Vermont for confirmation. I understand that is what our present plan is.

Mr. PROUTY. That is true. I would like to add that, in principle, we are extremely sympathetic to the amendment which will be proposed later by the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. KEATING. We think we can improve the Senator's amendment. Perhaps we can, perhaps we cannot.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the view of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Vermont that it will be in the better interest of the country if the scholarship fund money were loaned rather than granted as a gift. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct. Also, it would be better in the interest of the student and of strengthening his moral fiber.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is of the belief that if there were made available, for example, a thousand dollars as a loan, the student receiving it, if he has moral fabric, will take the money, and in the end his character as a citizen will be improved, rather than if the money were given to him outright. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. That is the feeling of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My amendment contemplates increasing the amount under the National Defense Education Act. In the first year of 1962 the amount would be $90 million. In the second year, I contemplate increasing it by $35 million. In the third year it would be increased by $50 million.

Mr. KEATING. As the Senator knows—and he has discussed his amendment with us—it is not our intention to interfere with the figures in the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Ohio. We accept those figures. He is more generous in this regard than we are in our amendment. We accept those figures, if I may accept them for both of us. Our amendment refers to the forgiveness provisions of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the forgiveness provisions, under the existing law and under my amendment, a student who completes his course with the money borrowed, is granted a forgiveness of 50 percent if he enters the teaching profession. Do we agree on that?

Mr. KEATING. At present?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Only if he teaches in a public elementary or secondary school.

Mr. PROUTY. With this qualification, that it is only up to 10 percent a year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York contemplates granting additional forgiveness, and it is on the basis of being in the top 25 percent. What will that forgiveness be?

Mr. KEATING. Up to 50 percent. In other words, a student, if he were to get a thousand dollars, would be able to get a forgiveness of up to $500 if he remained in the top quarter of the class.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If he had a thousand dollar debt, and if he got 10 percent for 5 years, the debt would be reduced to $500. Is that correct? The 10 percent a year relates only to those going into teaching. The 50-percent forgiveness is for students then in college who remain in the top quarter of their class.

So a $1,000 debt, if the student complied fully with the provisions of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York, would be reduced to $250, would it?

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one minutes have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is my last question.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to hear the Senator's question again.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the debt of the student is $1,000, and he complied with all the forgiveness provisions, would his debt be reduced to $250?

Mr. KEATING. It would be reduced to $500.

Mr. PROUTY. Fifty percent would be the maximum amount of a loan that could be forgiven.

Mr. KEATING. If he remained in the top quarter of his class, he could get forgiveness up to 50 percent of his loan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about the forgiveness under the existing law—the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That applies only to teaching in public schools.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us consider a teacher. A teacher, then, would have two benefits: First, if he went into the teaching profession, he would get a 50-percent reduction; second, if he finished in the top 25 percent of his class, he would also get 10 percent.

Mr. KEATING. He would have had that forgiveness while he was in college. So his debt would never accumulate to more than $500 out of $1,000. But a limit of 50 percent would be put on the total allowable forgiveness.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The teacher who borrowed $1,000 could, in the maximum, if he went into the teaching profession, reduce his debt to $250.

Mr. PROUTY. The way the amendment is drafted, it would be impossible under any combination of circumstances to grant forgiveness of more than 50 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of the whole debt?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from New York and the Senator from Vermont for clearing up that point.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 45 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I am about to make appear following the vote on this amendment.

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

(The remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware relating to the Federal financing of the production of poultry appear following the vote on the Prouty-Keating amendment.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, with the understanding that the time for the quorum call shall not be charged to the time of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and I withdraw our amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

FEDERAL FINANCING OF PRODUCTION OF POULTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on many occasions during the past administration I criticized the Federal Government for pouring out the taxpayers' money to finance the construction of new poultry houses and to finance the production of broilers, layers, and turkeys, especially at a time when those agriculture products were in oversupply.

Today I want to discuss how the new administration not only has continued this absurd practice but also during the past 12 months has more than doubled the rate of these loans. Last year through six different lending agencies millions of dollars were poured out to finance the increased production of broilers, turkeys, and commercial eggs, with the result that they have brought this industry to the verge of bankruptcy.

During the past year poultry products have been selling at record low prices. The price of broilers at the farm level has ranged as low as 10 to 14 cents per pound with the price of eggs at a correspondingly low figure, and turkeys sold at the lowest price during the past 20 years, with the result that millions of dollars have been lost by the American farmers. During recent weeks broiler prices at the farm level have improved and today are at a profitable level, but the danger of renewed trouble looms unless the cause is removed.

The reason for these extremely low prices of 1961 was overproduction of turkeys, broilers, and laying hens. Normally when prices of poultry products are below the cost of production a curtailment in the output automatically follows, but this time, notwithstanding the record low prices and heavy losses being sustained, the poultry industry continued to operate at record capacity levels.

Unable to understand this failure of the law of supply and demand to function normally, studies have been made both at industrial and governmental levels. There are many in Government and some out of Government who are citing last year's plight of the poultry industry as proof that this segment of our American agriculture can no longer function under the free enterprise system but that the industry will now be forced to ask for Government supports and Government controls over its productive capacity. Several top administration officials are today gleefully referring to last year's plight of the broiler and turkey farmers as further evidence that their plan of complete Government controls over all segments of American agriculture is the only answer.

But before we abandon the free enterprise system and begin advocating further extension of Government controls I think we should first determine what was responsible for last year's plight of the industry and its failure to make its own readjustment in production. I am not overlooking the poultry industry's own responsibility when it failed to bring its production under control, but there were other contributing factors over which industry had no control.

Today I call attention to one major factor over which the farmer had no control and which accounted to a large degree for the low prices received by the American farmers for broilers, turkeys, and eggs, and that was the activities of the U.S. Government itself.

Last year while the Secretary of Agriculture was shedding his crocodile tears over the plight of the poultry farmers we find there were six different lending agencies of the U.S. Government actively soliciting loan applications from

the American farmers and urging them to build new poultry houses and thereby expand their production. During 1961 representatives of these six Government agencies were scouring the country, urging the farmers to build new poultry houses and increase their production with Government money. The result was that during the first 6 months of 1961 nearly twice as much Government money was loaned for the construction of new broiler houses, new laying hen houses, and for the production of both broilers and turkeys than was loaned during any preceding year.

These same agencies are today still pouring out taxpayers' dollars to finance the expansion of this overcapacity industry at a rate of double that of any preceding year. The agencies making these loans are as follows: Federal Land Bank, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Production Credit Associations, Cooperative Banks, Farmers Home Administration, Federal Housing Administration under title I, and the Small Business Administration.

There are only two possible explanations of this absurd situation wherein we find the U.S. Government deliberately pouring money into an already overexpanded industry at a time when the producers are already going bankrupt as a result of low prices. One explanation could be that it represents sheer bureaucratic stupidity and the other is that this is a part of a planned program of the New Frontier bureaucrat to bankrupt the American farmers if necessary to force them into a situation where they will have to accept Government controls and allotments.

Most certainly the argument advanced by some of the bureaucrats in these agencies that they are trying to assist the little farmer over the present demoralized market situation cannot be supported by the fact; for example, the overwhelming majority of the loans that were made were in the $50,000, $100,000, and sometime million-dollar class.

First, I shall describe just a few of these loans made by one of these agencies, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks:

In 1961 one loan of $65,000 was made for the construction of laying henhouses in New Jersey. In Missouri a $67,096 loan was made to finance the production of broilers, while in Ohio a loan of $59,095 was made to finance the construction of a new house for layers.

I cite four loans in Indiana: Loan No. 302 represents a Government loan of $1,300,000 that was made in 1960 to an individual to be used for the production of broilers, and in 1961 we find that the same individual borrowed another $300,000 from the same agency. Another so-called small farmer borrowed $304,900 in 1960, and in 1961 he came back for another $232,450, all to be used to expand his production of broilers. Several other loans ranging from $330,000 down to $60,000 were extended in the same area. Whether the 1960 loans were all paid back or whether part of the proceeds of the 1961 loans were used to make such payments is not answered in the Government's report. They are described as separate loans, but in any event they indicate the manner in which the Government has been pouring taxpayers' money out in an endeavor to encourage further expansion in this troubled industry.

A further list of some of the loans in excess of $50,000 that were made in Indiana to finance the increased broiler and layer capacity of that State are as follows:

1960:	1st half 1961 Jan. 1–July 1
$330,000	$60,000
$1,300,000	800,000
$304,000	232,450
$106,190	126,277
$128,144	99,542
$70,000	-------

Do not overlook the important point that each time new capacity for 1,000 broilers is constructed it means at least 3,000 additional birds per year for the market. Each house can produce at least three crops.

In California during the first half of 1961 alone approximately $3 million were furnished by the Federal Government through two of these lending agencies to build new poultry houses for layers and to finance production therein. The most of the loans by these two particular agencies were in excess of $50,000 each. As examples I list 10 of these loans:

1961

Loan No.:	Amount
----	$75,700
----	79,400
1101	56,500
1104	62,987
1105	90,620
1106	79,905
1107	56,940
1108	150,000
1109	125,865
1110	243,382

The extra eggs and broilers that were produced in these new poultry houses built with Government money certainly were a major contributing factor in the low prices for broilers, turkeys, and eggs last year.

But these were not the only States in which large loans were made. For example: There were eight loans made by this agency in Georgia during the past several months ranging between $50,000 and $150,000, all of which were for the purpose of building new broiler houses or to finance the increased production of layers. Those loans are as follows:

1960

Loan No.:	Amount
101	$106,993
102	50,800
103	60,000
104	92,000
105	100,000

January–July 1961

Loan No.:	Amount
106	$60,000
107	55,000
108	150,000

A farmer in Wisconsin borrowed $54,530 to build a new house for layers. Another farmer in Oregon borrowed $60,000, and another farmer in the State of Washington borrowed $58,000, all for the construction of new houses for layers. In Texas they list a $60,659 loan for a new broiler house, and in Arkansas during the first half of 1961 one agency made three loans, $63,000, $67,600, and $100,000 to finance increased broiler production in that area. In Alabama one farmer borrowed $70,000 in 1961, and another borrowed $419,030 in 1960 and $390,000 in 1961 to build new broiler houses and to finance expanded production.

In 1960 one farmer in Delaware borrowed $130,800, and in 1961 he borrowed another $64,000, while another farmer—loan No. 1502—borrowed $119,500 in 1960. This latter individual borrowed another $69,500 in 1961 all for production of broilers or turkeys.

In Maryland a total of $5½ million was poured out in 1960 and 1961 by two of these agencies to expand production of broilers and turkeys in that State. Maryland loans ranged from $60,000 to over a million each. To emphasize that these loans were not to finance small farmers, I cite some of these loans which were made for increasing the broiler production in Maryland:

1960

Loan No.	Amount
1401	$455,000
1402	960,000
1403	1,357,500
1404	164,000
1405	285,000
1406	460,500

January–July 1961

Loan No.	Amount
1401	$260,000
1402	540,000
1403	60,000
1404	107,400
1405	195,000
1406	208,600

Altogether this one agency, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, in one 18-month period made 63 loans throughout the country totaling $12,490,233. This total includes only those loans which were in excess of $50,000.

I was unable to obtain the complete statistics showing the total amount of all the millions which have been poured out by overly enthusiastic bureaucrats as they scoured the country urging the farmers to take the Government money and expand their production of broilers, turkeys, and laying hens. But the statistics which have been obtained clearly show that this loose Government money has been and is today still being poured out at double the rates of any previous year.

For instance, a sample check of loans made by another agency, the Federal land banks, shows that in the calendar year 1960, it made 361 loans totaling $1,712,472 for the construction of new broiler houses with a stated capacity of 3,968,210 broilers. In the first 6 months of 1961 this same agency made 499 loans totaling $2,290,984 for the construction of new broiler houses with an increased capacity of 4,621,222 broilers. There is no indication that loans made in the second half of 1961 were at any lower rate. This same agency, the Federal land banks, in 1960 made 129 loans totaling $915,607 for the construction of new laying hen houses with a stated capacity of 528,000. In the first 6 months of 1961 this agency made 133 loans totaling $1,195,109 for the construction of more new laying hen houses with the stated capacity of 693,210.

A special report designated "Loans Financing Poultry Houses" by the intermediate credit banks lists loans for the calendar year 1960 as follows: 901 loans totaling $4,437,157 for the purpose of constructing new broiler houses with a capacity of 8,819,300 broilers; then during the first 6 months of 1961 they made 961 loans totaling $4,129,036 likewise for the construction of new broiler houses, with a capacity of another 7,251,380.

During this same period, 1960, this same agency, the Federal intermediate credit banks, made 454 other loans totaling $3,557,306 for the construction of new laying hen houses with a capacity of 2,400,500; then during the first 6 months of 1961 they made 446 more loans totaling $3,672,478, again for the construction of new houses for layers, which further increased capacity by 2,375,300.

The Farmers Home Administration, a third Government agency working overtime to get rid of taxpayers' dollars in an area where the money is certainly not needed, has likewise been making its contribution toward bankrupting the American poultry farmers. In the calendar year 1960, this agency made 98 loans to build new poultry houses for expanded broiler production and another 56 loans to finance the production of broilers therein. These loans totaled $545,805 and $111,770, respectively. These building and production loans resulted in increased capacity of broilers by 2,071,700. Then in the first 6 months of 1961 this same agency, the Farmers Home Administration, made 92 other loans totaling $472,191 to build new poultry houses and buy equipment plus another 34 loans totaling $76,520 to produce broilers therein, with the result that by virtue of these loans the productive capacity of broilers in the first 6 months of this year was increased by 2,178,000.

This same agency, the Farmers Home Administration, was also active in helping to aggravate the already demoralized egg market. In 1960 they made 42 loans totaling $296,455 for building new laying hen houses along with 500 operating loans totaling $1,681,340, to produce layers therein. The result was that under these loans the Farmers Home Administration increased the total capacity of layers by 83,266. In 1961 this agency was still going strong pouring out Government money with another $1,149,288 being loaned to increase laying flocks by an additional 52,600 hens.

But this was not all; three other Government agencies were making similar efforts toward encouraging the American farmers to borrow Government money and increase the production of turkeys, broilers, and eggs, all of which were already in a state of oversupply.

For the most of 1961 broilers, turkeys, and eggs were all selling at prices resulting in substantial losses to the American farmers. During all this period the Secretary of Agriculture and other administration officials were shedding crocodile tears for their plight, yet we now find that it was the Government itself which was deliberately pouring out millions in an effort to accelerate the bankruptcy of this industry. This was not an accident, nor can it be charged off as sheer stupidity. It was for no other purpose than to force the industry to beg the Government to take it under its umbrella of price supports and controls.

In my opinion and in the opinion of most of the industry, price supports or Government controls over production are not the answer to the problems of the poultry industry. In fact, the greatest contribution that the Federal Government could make toward assisting the American poultry farmers today would be to stop pouring Government money into the industry to finance its overexpansion.

In my opinion, this contradictory policy of the Government is not an accident. It is part of a deliberate plan to bring the poultry farmers so near to the verge of bankruptcy that they will be forced to request and accept Government supervision.

Nor will this situation be corrected by establishing another Government agency to send its representatives into the same territory to control production and administer price supports.

Let us not forget that it was only last spring that an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture publicly boasted that by dumping surplus corn on the market the Government could force the price of corn down to levels where farmers producing corn would be forced to sign up under the Government support program.

These same power-mad bureaucrats on the New Frontier are now trying to force the American poultry farmers to seek shelter under the same Government umbrella of supports and controls, and unless they are stopped they will bankrupt a lot of farmers in the attempt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, reports from the agencies referred to above.

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

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Since writing you on September 29 transmitting the information you requested in your letter of August 4 pertaining to poultry loans made by institutions under our supervision, we learned that one of the banks supplying information had not correctly interpreted one of the items in the request. Due to this misinterpretation, the loans of 8 borrowers who obtained loans of more than $50,000 for production purposes only (no housing construction involved) were omitted from one of the tables furnished you.

We are enclosing a revision of the table affected.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD T. MASON,
Acting Governor.

Loans in excess of $50,000 for financing poultry housing or production by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks—Year 1960, period January–July 1961

District and State	Year 1960			January-July 1961		
	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose
2. Maryland	1401	$455,000	Broiler production	1401	$260,000	Broiler production.
	1402	960,000	do	1402	540,000	Do.
	1403	1,357,500	do	1403	60,000	Do.
	1404	164,000	do	1404	107,400	Do.
	1405	285,000	do	1405	195,000	Do.
	1406	460,500	do	1406	208,600	Do.
Delaware	1501	130,800	do	1501	64,000	Do.
	1502	119,500	do	1502	69,500	Do.
Total	8	3,932,300		8	1,504,500	
3. Georgia	101	106,993	Layer housing and production			
	102	50,800	Layer production	106	60,000	Broiler housing.
	103	60,000	Layer housing	107	55,000	Layer housing and production.
	104	92,000	Layer housing and other	108	150,000	Layer production.
	105	100,000	Layer production			
Total	5	409,793		3	265,000	
4. Ohio	201	59,095	Layer housing			
Indiana	301	330,000	Broiler and layer production	301	60,000	Broiler and layer production.
	302	1,300,000	Broiler production	302	800,000	Broiler production.
	303	304,900	do	303	232,450	Do.
	304	106,190	do			
	305	128,144	Broiler housing and production	305	126,277	Broiler housing and production.
	306	70,000	Broiler production			
				307	99,542	Layer housing and production.
Kentucky	401	57,847	Layer housing			
Total	8	2,356,176		5	1,318,269	

Loans in excess of $50,000 for financing poultry housing or production by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks—Year 1960, period January–July 1961—Continued

District and State	Year 1960			January–July 1961		
	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose
5. Alabama				501	$70,000	Broiler housing and production.
	502	$419,030	Broiler production	502	390,000	Broiler production.
Total	1	419,030		2	460,000	
6. Illinois	601	85,098	Layer production			
Missouri				701	67,096	Broiler production.
Arkansas	801	100,000	Layer production	803	100,000	Do.
	802	55,500	do	804	67,600	Do.
				805	63,000	Do.
Total	3	240,598		4	297,696	
7. Wisconsin	901	54,530	Layer housing			
Total	1	54,530				
10. Texas				1001	60,659	Broiler housing.
Total				1	60,659	
11. California	1101	52,760	Layer housing and production	1101	56,500	Layer housing and production.
	1102	79,235	do	1104	62,987	Do.
	1103	55,488	do	1105	90,620	Do.
				1106	79,905	Do.
				1107	56,940	Do.
				1108	150,000	Do.
				1109	125,865	Do.
				1110	193,352	Do.
				1110	50,030	Layer housing.
Total	3	187,483		9	866,199	
12. Washington				1,201	58,000	Layer housing.
Oregon	1301	60,000	Layer housing			
Total	1	60,000		1	58,000	
Grand total	30	7,659,910		33	4,830,323	

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It has taken us somewhat longer than we expected to obtain the information you requested in your letter of August 4, 1961, pertaining to poultry loans made by institutions under our supervision.

Figures shown on the enclosed tables were furnished by the 12 Federal land banks and the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks and represent the best available estimates on credit for the types of operations which you mention.

The Federal land banks made the following loans in excess of $50,000 for construction of laying houses, construction of broiler houses, or production therein:

State	Broiler houses		Laying hen houses	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
New Jersey			[1] 1	$65,000
Mississippi	[2] 1	$57,895		
California			[2] 1	56,800
Do			[1] 1	75,700
Do			[1] 1	79,400
Total			3	211,900
United States	1	57,895	4	276,900

[1] 1961.
[2] 1960.

A table showing information on similar loans in excess of $50,000 made by production credit associations is enclosed.

The Federal intermediate credit banks do not make loans directly to farmers, but the production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscount with the Federal intermediate credit banks.

On loans made in excess of $50,000, we have not shown the names of borrowers. As in the case of other lending agencies, we consider this borrower-lender relationship as confidential and do not divulge such names.

The banks for cooperatives are not included in the tables because these banks make a loan for overall operations of a cooperative and there is no way of determining how much of the loan might be used for any purpose relating to poultry. Mr. R. C. Mahone of our office talked with Mr. Ralph Peters of your office on this subject on August 25.

As we have assured you previously, each application for a loan is carefully considered by the loan committee of the local association and by the district bank involved. No loan is granted unless experienced credit people believe the applicant has a sound business proposition and will be able to repay the loan in an orderly manner. We believe that this is a sound procedure.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. TOOTELL,
Governor.

Loans financing poultry houses by Federal land banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January–July 1961			Year 1960			January–July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
1. Maine				1	$31,000	40,000				1	$8,300	5,200
New Hampshire												
Vermont												
Massachusetts				2	9,750	19,720	1	$4,375	4,000			
Rhode Island												
Connecticut	1	$10,000	6,000							1	4,920	2,200
New York	1	3,100	6,500	1	12,500	20,000	6	66,035	23,600	4	35,773	20,080
New Jersey										3	88,600	55,300
Total	2	13,100	12,500	4	53,250	79,720	7	70,410	27,600	9	137,593	82,780

Loans financing poultry houses by Federal land banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961—Continued

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January-July 1961			Year 1960			January-July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
2. Pennsylvania	5	$44,700	60,200	5	$88,300	117,000	7	$86,300	45,200	2	$9,600	10,000
Delaware				4	24,103	32,000				1	22,573	18,000
Maryland	20	130,321	216,500	20	197,599	283,600						
Virginia	3	12,050	17,500	4	21,780	36,000	1	5,100	3,000	6	20,484	10,500
West Virginia							4	26,792	11,100			
Total	28	187,071	294,200	33	331,782	468,600	12	118,192	59,300	9	52,657	38,500
3. North Carolina	43	174,900	439,000	28	149,100	284,000	8	46,300	35,000	2	10,900	7,000
South Carolina	3	11,700	26,000	2	10,100	16,000	4	10,500	6,500	1	2,500	4,000
Georgia	80	308,000	690,000	178	547,000	1,081,200	14	48,000	37,700	13	58,100	41,000
Florida	2	17,300	27,000				8	34,600	35,000	1	5,200	3,400
Total	128	511,900	1,182,000	208	706,200	1,381,200	34	139,400	114,200	17	76,700	55,400
4. Ohio				1	7,200	2,700	3	31,000	6,500	4	35,500	7,000
Indiana	3	22,800	13,000	3	12,600	12,300	7	43,000	13,200	6	29,700	13,100
Kentucky							1	1,700	1,600			
Tennessee	3	21,000	30,000	1	6,000	10,000	1	9,000	10,000	1	5,200	3,000
Total	6	43,800	43,000	5	25,800	25,000	12	84,700	31,300	11	70,400	23,100
5. Alabama	109	330,826	954,430	134	498,903	1,155,170	11	44,685	69,260	8	27,445	57,440
Mississippi	26	290,030	873,720	25	197,357	579,600	2	13,230	5,000	7	58,100	54,740
Louisiana												
Total	135	620,856	1,828,150	159	696,260	1,734,770	13	57,915	74,260	15	85,545	112,180
6. Illinois							3	18,300	5,300			
Missouri	15	85,533	150,800	9	35,999	79,000	2	16,000	7,000	3	14,500	7,600
Arkansas	34	147,712	341,560	59	271,275	596,932	3	13,907	19,000	5	19,630	22,000
Total	49	233,245	492,360	68	307,274	675,932	8	48,207	31,300	8	34,130	29,600
7. Michigan	2	4,400	1,000	1	5,600	2,000	6	39,200	14,000	14	97,390	49,700
Wisconsin	1	10,000	4,000				2	18,700	8,500	1	8,350	7,000
Minnesota	5	55,400	81,000	3	42,823	75,000	2	10,858	3,250	2	13,000	7,600
North Dakota				1	21,000	25,000				6	66,300	24,650
Total	8	69,800	86,000	5	69,423	102,000	10	68,758	25,750	23	185,040	88,950
8. Iowa	1	20,000	6,000				1	4,100	1,000	1	7,000	4,300
South Dakota				3	32,550	36,000	1	10,400	850	3	23,550	9,000
Nebraska												
Wyoming												
Total	1	20,000	6,000	3	32,550	36,000	2	14,500	1,850	4	30,550	13,300
9. Kansas							3	9,534	5,500			
Oklahoma				2	11,500	13,000	1	2,800	2,000	1	3,000	1,800
Colorado										2	8,000	7,500
New Mexico							1	5,000	250			
Total				2	11,500	13,000	5	17,334	7,750	3	11,000	9,300
10. Texas	4	12,700	24,000	11	51,900	91,000	5	34,300	21,000	3	5,700	4,000
11. Arizona												
Utah												
Nevada												
California							18	253,400	121,200	27	482,000	209,900
Total							18	253,400	121,200	27	482,000	209,900
12. Alaska												
Montana												
Idaho				1	5,045	14,000				1	10,290	12,000
Washington							1	3,573	6,000	1	4,600	10,000
Oregon							2	4,918	6,500	2	8,904	4,200
Total				1	5,045	14,000	3	8,491	12,500	4	23,794	26,200
United States	361	1,712,472	3,968,210	499	2,290,984	4,621,222	129	915,607	528,010	133	1,195,109	693,210

Loans financing poultry houses by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January-July 1961			Year 1960			January-July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
1. Maine	3	$16,915	66,500	2	$3,525	14,000				1	$5,000	5,200
New Hampshire												
Vermont												
Massachusetts												
Rhode Island												
Connecticut							1	$2,000	300			
New York										5	19,266	15,200
New Jersey							1	3,000	1,000			
Total	3	16,915	66,500	2	3,525	14,000	2	5,000	1,300	6	24,266	20,400

Loans financing poultry houses by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961—Continued

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January–July 1961			Year 1960			January–July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
2. Pennsylvania	18	$93,000	103,000	21	$106,100	12,000	28	$134,189	167,000	33	$149,314	200,700
Delaware	2	8,000	13,500	2	29,000	36,500						
Maryland	5	20,500	30,600	10	47,000	38,600						
Virginia	1	2,700	3,000	1	20,000	96,000	4	5,500	7,000	2	15,900	4,800
West Virginia							1	8,200	2,500	2	3,814	2,800
Total	26	124,200	150,100	34	202,100	291,100	33	147,889	176,500	37	169,028	208,300
3. North Carolina	295	1,045,622	1,850,000	359	690,044	950,000	27	102,545	78,200	35	116,659	110,500
South Carolina	6	27,802	42,000	6	41,647	28,000	28	87,740	56,700	16	60,096	31,700
Georgia	195	758,774	1,660,000	140	607,650	1,295,500	55	292,133	234,300	41	228,664	224,600
Florida	2	8,100	20,000	6	30,700	28,000	7	83,855	51,750	10	88,645	52,000
Total	498	1,840,298	3,572,000	511	1,370,041	2,301,500	117	566,273	420,950	102	494,064	418,800
4. Ohio	2	14,392	17,500	5	39,700	36,000	27	267,613	92,000	24	357,366	98,760
Indiana	10	59,305	76,000	14	98,879	113,000	37	255,664	147,150	54	463,320	221,924
Kentucky	3	16,701	25,500	4	41,723	40,000	14	224,423	104,980	9	81,282	59,600
Tennessee	46	299,447	215,900	34	159,467	260,500	32	181,145	74,400	31	134,081	71,600
Total	61	389,845	534,900	57	339,769	449,500	110	928,245	418,530	118	1,036,049	451,884
5. Alabama	87	384,157	851,800	138	683,779	1,378,780	29	102,351	164,040	34	200,389	267,400
Mississippi	68	454,810	930,000	88	624,409	1,245,500	30	278,241	160,495	33	246,915	164,950
Louisiana	10	107,898	197,500	12	105,882	190,000						
Total	165	946,865	1,979,300	238	1,414,070	2,814,280	59	380,592	324,535	67	447,304	432,350
6. Illinois	1	4,000	8,000				7	38,720	23,700	5	66,825	18,000
Missouri	2	10,200	52,500	5	28,301	16,000	7	33,140	30,000	14	94,472	41,300
Arkansas	89	534,735	1,398,500	87	523,200	909,000	28	233,961	260,050	37	284,354	205,150
Total	92	548,935	1,459,000	92	551,501	925,000	42	305,821	313,750	56	445,651	264,450
7. Michigan							24	306,692	77,150	6	92,100	31,000
Wisconsin	3	33,957	38,000				19	275,501	86,740			
Minnesota	11	107,855	140,500				7	65,025	28,700			
North Dakota	2	34,000	75,000				2	18,906	13,950			
Total	16	175,812	253,500				52	666,124	206,540	6	92,100	31,000
8. Iowa							3	12,500	3,800			
South Dakota												
Nebraska										1	1,200	1,000
Wyoming												
Total							3	12,500	3,800	1	1,200	1,000
9. Kansas												
Oklahoma				2	21,625	45,000	2	66,975	43,000	1	26,450	15,000
Colorado												
New Mexico										1	1,700	2,000
Total				2	21,625	45,000	2	66,975	43,000	2	28,150	17,000
10. Texas	33	297,025	624,000	22	177,405	329,000	1	2,590	62,500	4	24,030	8,750
11. Arizona												
Utah										1	11,084	6,000
Nevada												
California	7	97,262	180,000	2	45,000	74,000	32	454,297	419,096	44	831,022	490,369
Total	7	97,262	180,000	2	45,000	74,000	32	454,297	419,096	45	842,106	496,369
12. Montana												
Idaho												
Washington				1	4,000	8,000				2	68,530	25,000
Oregon							1	21,000	10,000			
Alaska												
Total				1	4,000	8,000	1	21,000	10,000	2	68,530	25,000
United States	901	4,437,157	8,819,300	961	4,129,036	7,251,380	454	3,557,306	2,400,501	446	3,672,478	2,375,303

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We are enclosing a schedule, requested in your letter of August 4, 1961, showing the number and amount of Farmers Home Administration loans to finance commercial broiler and egg production, and the increases in number of birds resulting from these loans. Only information for 12 States is included in this schedule because our experience in other States indicated that the amount of loans for commercial poultry production was not significant. We are, however, adding Louisiana to the list of States from which we obtain periodic reports on poultry financing by our agency.

The enclosed schedule contains the information presently available in the national office. We hope that the information as presented is satisfactory. If you have additional questions, we shall be glad to be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD F. HIGBEE,
Deputy Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Loans to finance commercial broiler and egg production, Jan. 1 through Dec. 31, 1960, and Jan. 1 through June 30, 1961

JAN. 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1960

State	Broiler production						Egg production						Number of borrowers involved in increases	
	Number of loans		Total funds loaned		Increase in number of birds per year		Number of loans		Total funds loaned		Increase in number of birds per year			
	Real estate loans for buildings and equipment	Operating loans	Real estate loans	Operating loans	Resulting from real estate loans	Resulting from operating loans	Real estate loans for buildings and equipment	Operating loans	Real estate loans	Operating loans	Resulting from real estate loans	Resulting from operating loans	For broiler production	For egg production
Alabama	13	11	$29,220	$16,380	245,000	0	1	12	$1,600	$19,440	0	134	21	1
Arkansas	51	1	210,110	2,500	1,491,000	40,000	2	4	9,360	5,350	2,400	1,100	34	4
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	26	72,865	130,470	15,700	26,200	16	14
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5,900	5,000	1,132	0	2	1
Georgia	1	0	4,075	0	0	0	0	7	0	20,210	0	0	6	0
Maine	27	32	262,600	7,550	194,000	30,800	13	198	74,250	747,760	5,800	15,300	125	9
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	25,970	0	0	3	0
New Jersey	0	1	0	6,000	0	0	8	182	63,070	506,940	0	5,000	137	2
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	52,110	100,060	5,000	1,500	10	2
North Carolina	6	0	39,800	0	70,000	0	3	34	17,300	107,640	0	4,000	16	4
Pennsylvania	0	5	0	16,340	0	0	0	6	0	12,500	0	0	5	0
Total	98	56	545,805	111,770	2,000,900	70,800	42	500	296,455	1,681,340	30,032	53,234	375	37

JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1961

Alabama	13	6	$41,600	$7,750	222,000	112,000	0	6	0	$7,690	0	0	12	0
Arkansas	34	3	160,856	5,680	1,227,000	34,000	5	2	$20,740	5,675	12,700	0	29	5
California	0	1	0	4,500	0	0	3	9	24,358	34,390	2,000	2,000	0	2
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6,000	0	0	0	0
Georgia	8	0	19,860	0	36,008	0	0	2	0	9,480	0	2,000	8	1
Maine	20	20	183,500	41,950	232,000	0	20	97	115,890	390,080	14,800	0	13	5
Mississippi	8	1	31,505	3,000	90,000	0	0	1	0	2,000	0	500	7	1
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5,800	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	1	1	4,200	2,500	0	0	8	116	73,150	294,560	0	500	0	1
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	42,300	34,850	6,100	4,000	0	3
North Carolina	8	2	30,670	11,140	224,000	0	5	14	36,500	44,800	4,500	3,500	5	5
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	965	0	0	0	0
Total	92	34	472,191	76,520	2,032,508	146,000	43	256	312,938	836,350	40,100	12,500	74	23

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "1-30-62—A." I ask that the amendment not be read, but that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the amendment will be dispensed with; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On the first page, line 4, strike out "and Scholarship".

On page 2, line 11, beginning with "holding out", strike out all through "promise and the" in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "giving them additional".

On page 2, beginning with line 18, strike out all through "college" in line 21 and insert in lieu thereof "through authorizing additional funds for loans to students under the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

On page 18, beginning with line 14, strike out all through line 22 on page 28 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR LOANS TO STUDENTS

"Amendment to title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"SEC. 201. Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964'."

On page 38, line 5, beginning after the period, strike out all through the period in line 8.

On page 40, line 12, strike out "II or".

On page 40, line 13, strike out "206(c) or".

On page 42, lines 16 and 17, strike out "to any individual or".

On page 42, line 19, strike out "or pursuant to a scholarship,".

On page 42, line 21, strike out "respect to grants or loans".

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to increase the amount of funds authorized for loans to students under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Ohio yield to himself?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Ten minutes. May I ask how much time I have on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 30 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment relates to title II of the bill. Title II of the bill as it is now written contemplates making grants as distinguished from loans to students who wish to attend public institutions of higher learning.

My amendment is tied into the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The particular amendment which I am offering has been before the Senate and House probably on three occasions, and positively on two.

When the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was considered, it contained provisions for the making of outright grants to induce students to attend institutions of higher learning. When that matter came before the Senate, it was proposed to change the language from "grants" to "loans." On that occasion the Senate determined that it would be in the greater interest of the

country and in the greater interest of the students if, instead of making outright grants, the aid were provided in the form of loans.

When the administration's bill went to the House of Representatives, it likewise contained provisions for the making of grants up to $1,000 a year, plus a payment of $350 to the educational institution chosen by the student. When that subject was considered in the House, it was moved to strike the loan provisions completely out of the bill. In the discussions had in committee and on the floor of the House, it was concluded that the grant provisions should not be adopted. One phase of the arguments made on the floor of the House was as follows: A student who refuses to attend an institution of higher learning unless he is given an outright grant, instead of a loan, in all probability does not possess the moral fabric to justify making the grant to him.

That raises a very interesting query: In our country have we reached a stage where we say, in effect, that the only way by means of which we can induce our youth to go to institutions of higher learning is by paying fully their tuition? Is that in accord with what we have known as the willingness of our youth to work their way through?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course the Senator from Ohio knows that under the National Defense Education Act a very sizable sum of money is being loaned each year to students, in order to enable them to get educations which are supposed to be helpful to the country, in giving it greater security and better defense; and it is proposed to continue that operation. How does the Senator feel the advocates of the pending bill can justify the setting up of another large sum of money for grants to students who would be expected to take any course they wished to take, regardless of whether it had any impact upon the security of our country, while at the same time that we granted them, free of charge, those sums of money, we would be asking those who want to defend our country to borrow money and to pay it back? How does the Senator from Ohio justify those two contrasting points of view?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Florida has raised a very interesting and important aspect of this issue, Mr. President. We have loaned to such students, under the National Defense Education Act, $130 million. Each one of them has pledged that he will pay back the money that has been loaned to him. But now the proponents of the pending bill would say to the other group, "We will grant you the money."

I should like to know what sort of answer we will give to those who have borrowed the $130 million, when they say: "We have pledged ourselves to take a course related to the national defense, and you require that we pay back the money." But the recipients under the provisions of the pending bill are given the money as an outright grant.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio has asked the same question that I have propounded. I judge that—as in my own case—the Senator from Ohio finds it impossible to reconcile those two approaches; namely, to lend money to be used for national defense education and to expect the repayment of the loans by the American youths who have received the loans, and at the same time with the other hand to give money freely for education to other American youths, without requiring or expecting any help to the national defense effort.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur fully in what the Senator from Florida has said. I repeat that if our youth have reached a stage where we cannot get them to go to college unless we fully or substantially pay their tuition, we ought to begin to wonder what is wrong with what we in the Congress have been doing and what has broken down the moral fabric of our youth, when a young fellow says: "I will not go to college and I will not study, even though I have an alert mind, unless you give me the money I need to have in order to go to college."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Aside from the very great difficulty of answering the questions which the Senator from Ohio says will be asked—and very properly so—by those who have secured loans under the National Defense Education Act—questions as to why they are not treated as generously as are these others—is it not now proposed, under this pending measure, to have both systems operate at the same time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is exactly the case. On three occasions an attempt was made to provide help by way of gifts. On each occasion there was a repudiation by the Congress of that plan. The National Defense Education Act is in existence, and is operating; $130 million has thus far been expended.

Now it is proposed that there be a sort of adjunct under which another special type of aid would be created. I submit that there cannot be any rational support of the proposal to have loans made to one group and to have outright grants made to another group, especially when we consider the fact that the loans are related to the national defense, whereas the proposed grants or gifts would not be related to the national defense.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would not such a two-headed program as has been suggested put Uncle Sam in the position of a storekeeper who points to certain goods on one counter, and says, "I will sell these commodities for such-and-such a price, on credit, provided you propose to pay. But if you do not want to pay, I have the same article over here on the next counter, and I will give it to you, without charging it to you and without expecting you to pay for it." Would not the pending proposal put our country in that precise rather ridiculous position?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Exactly so. I suggest that if the pending bill is enacted, next year we shall be asked, and in good conscience we shall be compelled, to forgive the debt of those who thus far have borrowed the $130 million. At that time, when that group comes before the country and asks for forgiveness or asks for treatment on a basis similar to that provided in the pending bill, how can the Congress possibly say, "We will not listen to you"?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Mr. HOLLAND. I subscribe entirely to the philosophy of the Senator from Ohio. I think we cannot follow these two roads at the same time. We are often inconsistent in this body, but I cannot imagine our being so inconsistent as to say with one voice, "We will lend you money for education provided it has relation to our common defense," and with the other voice say, "If you would not take it on that basis, we will give it to you free." I see no possibility of reconciling those two points of view, and for that reason I strongly support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have taken the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and allocated for the year of 1962 $90 million, the identical sum that is in the existing law. For the year 1963, instead of allocating the $90 million as provided in the existing law, I have increased the amount to $125 million, in other words, by the amount of $35 million. For 1964 the sum is increased from $90 million to $140 million. But all of it is made available on the basis of loans, and these loans are forgivable if the recipient goes to an educational institution and studies the subject of teaching and then enters into the teaching profession.

It is my wish to liberalize the National Defense Education Act, providing, as I have said, $85 million more than is provided in the existing law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for one more question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is not the figure of the Senator on the National Defense Education Act, although $85 million more than under the present law, substantially less than the amount provided for in the National Defense Education Act pending on the calendar?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The bill submitted by the Senator from Oregon extends into 2 further years and provides additional money.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If this section remains in the bill, can it be said that the young person who chooses to work and pay for his education will be taxed on his earnings, in part at least, to carry the burden of those who are the recipients of the grants set up by the dominant machine in each State that will select the grantees?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot see how one can escape answering that question in any way but in the affirmative. The one who is working, and who shows the true quality of the "American kid," is trying to work his way through college. The other will be given a gift of $1,000, and the one who is working will be paying a tax on what he earns, and, in addition to that, working his own way through school.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further, I think sometimes in this body we lose sight of the fact that the rank and file pay substantially all the taxes. Were we to increase the tax rate so that all individuals making more than $10,000 of ordinary income were taxed at 100 percent, we would collect only about $5 billion a year—a small fraction of the national budget.

Were we to impose a tax of 100 percent on the ordinary income of individuals making over $10,000 a year, that would bring in less than $1 billion, or only enough to run the Government a matter of days. It is the rank and file of the people, because there are so many of them, that pay the great burden of the taxes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My time is running away. I would like to raise an additional point which we ought to ponder and be alarmed about. The aircraft industry says it cannot operate without subsidies. The inland water carriers make the identical argument. The railroads state they need subsidies; otherwise they will "fold." The lead and zinc mine operators say that, unless the Government provides subsidies, they cannot operate their mines. The merchant in our country states that he cannot sell his goods throughout the world because his cost is too high. Not a week passes without the argument being heard on this floor, "My segment of business cannot survive unless the Congress pays me money."

What has produced that condition? What is wrong with our system? The student says, "I will not go to college unless you make me a gift."

I want to repeat, we had better ponder about it. If there is a difference between what is being produced in our country from what is being produced in other countries by way of scholastic attainment, the difference results from what we are doing in Congress. We are telling the young fellow, "Do not worry about working. Do not worry about the struggle. We will dig into the taxpayer's pocket and we will give you the money."

I am willing to lend money to the student, and I think the youth of the United States does not want any more than that. He would work his way through college if he could, but the hours of work and the school burdens impair him in the pursuit of his studies. All I am asking is that we lend him the money and then give him a chance to pay it back; and if he borrows money and goes into the teaching profession, we will forgive up to 50 percent of the loan.

"No; but that is not enough," the proponents of the bill say, "We will give it to you."

Well, we will keep on giving, but there will come a time when we will not be able to give, and perhaps that time is pretty close to being here now.

Two years ago there was a run on our gold. Our State Department went around the world and begged our short-term creditors not to ask for gold. The State Department was like a banker going to his depositors and saying, "Do not ask for your money. I cannot give it to you." Yet there is subsidy after subsidy. New ones are created; old ones are expanded. I think that is an error. I do not think it is in the interest of the country. I do not think it is in the interest of our youth.

That is why I ask that we convert chapter 2 of the bill from grants into loans, and increase the amount of money by $85 million. It will create a revolving fund, and the boy who gets his education now will pay back his loan, so the Government can lend it to a boy tomorrow for him to get his education, and he in turn will pay it back, and the money will be loaned again.

By that course we will build the moral character of our youth. We will contribute to the security of our country.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding me this time.

Mr. President, I rise in support of title II, S. 1241, and against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I support the provision of the bill providing a scholarship program for needy and able students who wish to continue their education beyond high school.

I support this provision of the bill for two reasons: First, it recognizes the fundamental principle of equal opportunity for all young people to secure an education according to their ability and not according to their station in life; and, second, it recognizes the importance to a free society to invest in the training of young people to qualify for the professions, and to develop other skills of importance to our country.

As Governor of the State of Maine and as a Member of this body I have said on many occasions that I am committed to equal opportunity in education for all young people, regardless of their geographic location, economic status, race, or creed. This has been the basis of my enthusiastic and continuing support for legislation providing general Federal assistance for elementary and secondary public school education.

I regard the proposed scholarship program as an extension of that principle to advanced education. It is in line with the Morrill Land Grant College Act, which has provided public institutions of higher education. It has a precedent in the GI education bill. It is a logical extension of the loan program under the National Defense Education Act.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. How does the Senator reconcile the two programs he has mentioned; the National Defense Education Act, under which loans are made for the purpose of allowing youngsters to get an education which presumably will help our country to be better defended, and the program the Senator is now supporting in the instant bill, which would give grants instead of loans to other young Americans for any type of education they may choose to obtain? How can those two approaches existing at the same time be reconciled one with the other?

Mr. MUSKIE. I shall make two points in reply to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

First, I consider the educated man, whether educated in the sciences or in any other subject, to be a bulwark of strength for a free society. Second, on the question of reconciling grants and loans, this is the thrust of the remarks I have prepared. I hope the Senator's question will be answered as my remarks unfold.

In 1900 only 7 percent of those in the age group of 14 to 17 years were enrolled in high school. By 1952 20.7 percent of those in the 18- to 19-year-old group were in college; by 1960 the figure had gone up to 32.7 percent. By 1970 the opening enrollment in colleges and universities will be from 5.2 to 7 million.

This is a reflection not only of our increasing population; it is an indication of the increasing importance of advanced education to our society and to our economy.

A modern, complex, and highly industrialized society requires greater skills and more advanced training than an agricultural society. A free society, if it is to compete with a vigorous and determined totalitarian society—and this point is responsive to the remarks of the Senator from Florida—must make maximum use of its available talent.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield. I am limited in time, but I yield again.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have only one question. What is the line of demarcation made by the Senator as between the young people who would be eligible for loans only and those who would be eligible for grants?

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not think there is any such line of demarcation. When I was a young man I was one of those who was privileged—and I use the word advisedly—to work my way through college. My parents did not have the resources to send me. I was able to go and was able to finish my education, 4 years of college and 3 years of law school, partly because I worked, partly because of scholarship aid, and partly because of loans from people who were interested in my future. I benefited from loans, from scholarships, and from my own labors. I do not think there is any line of demarcation such as that suggested by the Senator.

I continue with my prepared remarks.

The fact is that we, as a nation, cannot afford to undereducate our youth. If we do not make maximum provision for their education we will be selling them short, and we will be weakening our whole society.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon has pointed out in his remarks, the increase in population, the increase in the cost of living, and the increase in the complications of education requirements have boosted the cost of education at a far higher rate than the general cost-of-living increase. In the academic facility loan provision and the community college grant provision of this bill we recognize the impact of these costs on the institutions themselves.

The scholarship program recognizes the impact of these increased costs on the students themselves. Institutions and private groups have made a consistent effort to help alleviate these costs by increasing scholarship resources. But even the average scholarship increase in the past 4 years of $63 has fallen far behind the tuition increase of $242 in the same period, and this does not take into account the increase in the cost of room and board.

There is little value is expanding the facilities of the universities and colleges if we do not provide some assistance to able students who may be kept out of school because they do not have the funds.

The Federal scholarship program provided in this bill does not supplant the excellent and necessary private plans; it is a supplement. In Maine, for example, in 1959–60, there were 1,901 scholarships, averaging $377, granted by institutions of higher learning for a total scholarship grant of $715,825.

If enacted as presently written, the scholarship program would provide for the State of Maine, in fiscal year 1962, 141 scholarships totaling $98,700. The total for fiscal years 1963 through 1966 would be 1,058, or a total of $740,600. In addition to the payments to students, the institutions they attended would receive a grant of $350 for each scholarship awarded.

Two basic objections have been raised against the scholarship plan advocated by the committee in S. 1241. The first objection is that the National Defense Education Act loan program is as far as we should go in providing direct assistance to students. The second objection is to the $350 grant to accompany each scholarship student to the college or university of his choice.

Implicit in the argument against the scholarship grant is the assumption that a student so aided will somehow lose his sense of initiative. If this were true, then the logical conclusion would be to abolish all scholarship aid, public and private. I doubt that any of my colleagues are willing to accept that conclusion.

There can be no doubt in our minds that financial need is an effective bar to education for needy students. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon noted in his presentation yesterday, a study by the American Council on Education has revealed that approximately 60,000 to 100,000 very able high school students each year are prevented from going on to higher education by financial need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes yielded to the Senator from Maine have expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. MUSKIE. I know there are those who say that the student who really wants to go on will find a way, especially through the increasing loan programs. This is a relatively easy observation for those of us who have reached a measure of financial security, and who have realized the benefits of college and university training. For us, looking back, the investment would be worth it.

Mr. President, I came from a family of modest means. I managed to get through college by working, scholarship aid, and loans. I think I would be willing to make the same sacrifices today that I made too many years ago to want to remember—but I shudder when I look at the cost of education today compared with what I had to pay when I was an undergraduate.

Scholarship aid for education does not reduce initiative, Mr. President. The GI bill certainly did not do so for many independent businessmen who are members of the chamber of commerce and who write to me to express their views on issues involving private enterprise and the Government.

The modest scholarships we are proposing would not wipe out financial problems for needy students. They would reduce the barriers to the point where students would be able to surmount them.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The answer to the related college grant is a simple one. Here again we do not begin to meet the whole cost. We are saying to the college, in effect, "We are sending you an able student. We recognize that his fees will not cover the entire cost of his education, and we are willing to shoulder a part of that burden." That contribution is not great enough to constitute discrimination against nonscholarship students, and it will not bar worthy students without scholarship aid.

Mr. President, this is not a grandiose program. It is a very modest means of opening the doors of educational opportunity for needy students who have the desire and the capacity to advance their education, but who, through no fault of their own, would be barred from that education because they lack the funds.

I urge that the Senate support the farsighted recommendation of the Labor and Welfare Committee for a scholarship program.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his speech.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. May I have the cooperation of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would a yea and nay vote on the amendment in any way interfere with a yea and nay vote on an amendment to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ordering of the yeas and nays on the amendment does not preclude the ordering of the yeas and nays on an amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is the first time I have been heard in this debate. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Education. I hope the Senate will pass the bill on to the other body. Perhaps I shall be a conferee on the bill. I joined in drafting the bill. I am deeply convinced that it is the right prescription for American higher education. So I rise with all respect—because I have the deepest regard for my colleagues who feel the other way—to support the scholarship provision.

I like very much what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] stated regarding the tests. I am sorry that for the moment he is not in the Chamber. But he said, in a very moving speech, "What does the youth of the United States want?" I add to that statement, "What does the United States want?"

I think the youth of the United States want the best opportunity in life which the country can afford. I think what the United States wants is the greatest utilization of its greatest resource, to wit, its youth, especially in as critical an hour as this. As much as we do not like it, whether it is in production or in education, in foreign aid, or in any other field and much as it may irk us, the fact is that we are engaged in the greatest international competition mankind has ever known. This is essentially

a competition in technology. Whether it is a competition in weapons, a competition in production, or even a competition of the social order, we are faced fundamentally by a competition of technology. We know that the whole level of our human resources must be graded up in an educational sense. We know that. We are sure of it.

I have recently been in the Soviet Union, and probably the most distinguished aspect of the whole Soviet society is its drive in the field of education. Therefore, when we legislate here, instead of getting into a frame of mind that we are in a period of normalcy, I think we must get ourselves in a frame of mind that we are in an emergency. That is what we are legislating on—an emergency. So as much as I sympathize with my colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], that the program is a modest one—and it is a modest program—I say it is unnecessary to base the argument upon that point.

The argument in my opinion should be based upon the point: Are we legislating adequately to meet an emergency—the emergency in higher education—because of the great challenge to our fundamental institutions that we face, and because I think most of us are convinced that one of the prime answers to that challenge lies in the field of higher education.

By that standard, Mr. President, the proposal is an indispensable provision of the bill, and for a reason revealed in the very testimony which was referred to by my colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]: The testimony of President Case, of Colgate University, which is in my own State. It seemed to me that he stated precisely the evaluation of the situation that we must make in this field. He said that the college administrator must have in his hands all the tools available, including the tool of scholarship, the loan instrument, the scholarship tool of the school itself and its alumni, and any other tools he can obtain in order to facilitate the attendance at college of young people. They deserve, not in their interest alone, but what is even more important now—and I make the statement with all respect to the youth of our country—in the national interest to go to college. The most critical figure of this entire debate is the figure contained on page 9 of the committee's report, which states that each year between 60,000 and 100,000 high school graduates in the top 30 percent of their class failed to go to college because of a lack of funds, and about 60,000 college students leave college for the same reason.

For the 5 years of the program, we are talking about 300,000 plus 300,000, or 600,000 students a year, or a neat figure of 3 million in 5 years. That is the minimum figure. The maximum figure is 5 million in 5 years. We are talking about what? We are talking about 212,000 scholarships in 5 years, or the rate of roughly 40,000-plus a year.

Mr. President, that is the way in which to evaluate the program. On that basis the scholarship program is absolutely indispensable, if we are to have any balance in the bill at all. From the experience in my own State of New York, which in terms of per capita ability to maintain higher education is probably at the very top rank of our country, in terms of size——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 1 additional minute and I shall finish.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. In my own State of New York, we would receive about 4,000 scholarships a year out of the program at the maximum. That figure is to be compared with the 21,381 which are awarded now. It is to be compared with the 6,000 which the State of New York itself awards today.

It seems to me that the Federal Government is certainly making a very modest contribution to the aggregate educational picture in the State of New York, as an example, and that obtains throughout the country, perhaps not as advantageously.

I conclude my statement on this proposal: We are laboring on higher education under the dread gun of a challenge to freedom second to none in the world. I think most of us are convinced that higher education represents one of the keys to answer that challenge. We are making the most modest and reasonable approach to what the Federal Government ought to do in a balanced program for higher education as demonstrated by the actual figures in my own State. So I believe the amendment should be defeated. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his able speech.

Mr. President, how much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately 6 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the portion of the President's message of today dealing with assistance to higher education.

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

II. ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

In the last 10 days, both Houses of Congress have recognized the importance of higher education to the fulfillment of our national and international responsibilities. Increasing student enrollments in this decade will place a still greater burden on our institutions of higher education than that imposed on our elementary and secondary schools where the cost of education per student is only a fraction as much. Between 1960 and 1970 it is expected that college enrollments will double, and that our total annual operating expenditures for expanding and improving higher education must increase 2½ times or by nearly $10 billion.

In order to accommodate this increase in enrollments, the Office of Education estimates that nearly $22 billion of college facilities will have to be built during the 1960's—three times the construction achieved in the last 10 years. The extension of the college housing loan program—with a $1.5 billion loan authorization for 5 years, enacted as part of the Housing Act of 1961—assures Federal support for our colleges' urgent residential needs. I am hopeful that the Congress will this month complete its action on legislation to assist in the building of the even more important and urgently needed academic facilities.

But I want to take this opportunity to stress that buildings alone are not enough. In our democracy every young person should have an equal opportunity to obtain a higher education, regardless of his station in life or financial means. Yet more than 400,000 high-school seniors who graduated in the upper half of their classes last June failed to enter college this fall. In this group were 200,000 who ranked in the upper 30 percent of their class, of whom one-third to one-half failed to go on to college principally because of a lack of finances. Others lack the necessary guidance, incentive or the opportunity to attend the college of their choice. But whatever the reason, each of these 40,000 students represents an irreplaceable loss to the Nation.

Student loans have been helpful to many. But they offer neither incentive nor assistance to those students who, by reason of family or other obligations, are unable or unwilling to go deeper into debt. The average cost of higher education today—up nearly 90 percent since 1950 and still rising—is in an excess of $1,750 per year per student, or $7,000 for a 4-year course. Industrious students can earn a part of this—they or their families can borrow a part of it—but one-half of all American families had incomes below $5,600 in 1960—and they cannot be expected to borrow for example, $4,000 for each talented son or daughter that deserves to go to college. Federal scholarships providing up to $1,000 a year can fill part of this gap. It is, moreover, only prudent economic and social policy for the public to share part of the costs of the long period of higher education for those whose development is essential to our national economic and social well-being. All of us share in the benefits—all should share in the costs.

I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges, be enacted without delay.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the President very much for the great strength he has added to the debate in the Senate today in what he has to say. I read now only a portion of his statement:

I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges, be enacted without delay.

Mr. President, there is an underlined plea for action on the part of Congress, in keeping with the strengthening of the whole fabric of this Republic.

I wish to make these remarks in connection with the statements made by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that my prepared statement may be inserted in the RECORD at this time, because in the 6 minutes that I have remaining, I can only digest what I have to say.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I respect the sincerity and conviction with which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has urged upon the Senate this afternoon his amendments with respect to title II of S. 1241. I am constrained as floor leader of the bill to oppose them since, in my judgment, they would be crippling amendments in the sense that they would delete from the pend-

ing bill a major portion of the President's educational program which was so clearly restated today in the message we have just received. The President has set forth with eloquence and conviction the need for title II, the scholarship provisions of this bill. He has provided us once again with the factual basis recommendation which is in complete accord with the committee position on the bill.

I oppose the Lausche amendments on the basis that, first, they are not in accord with the President's program; second, the effect of the amendments is such that, if adopted, many of our most able young men and women who come from low-income families could not benefit, since they could not, given their economic circumstances, afford to go on to college. Once again, I wish to restate the basic conviction of the committee that the scholars selected by State commissions under title II of the bill, if they are to achieve their degrees, will need to be in receipt of the scholarship and also loan funds and that for most of them these two income sources must be supplemented by work while attending school. The testimony before the committee, much of which has been placed in the record of this debate, clearly indicates to me that these talented young people will need assistance from all three sources if they are to achieve their goal. I would again remind the Senate that the scholarship provisions of S. 1241 are intended not only to benefit the individual but in the long range will constitute a most important accession to the Nation of a most precious and vital national resource. The cost to the Nation over the period of this program will be repaid again and again in income taxes made possible by the training these talented youngsters will receive.

I urge the defeat of the Senator's amendments.

The last Lausche amendment, insofar as it strengthens the student loan program, offers considerable promise of assisting additional numbers of able but needy students to obtain a college education. However, in terms of assisting, encouraging, and inducing additional numbers of bright students from economically deprived homes to enter college, it does not measure up. For many thousands of these talented young people, the high and increasing costs of a college education, now averaging more than $1,750 per year or about $7,000 for 4 years, is an altogether too formidable barrier and the prospects of borrowing all and most of this money is not a very compelling inducement. What is needed is a program that would provide these young people with a "leg up" on these college costs.

It is, of course, reasonable to expect such young people to do all that they can to help themselves. The provisions of the scholarship bill, providing as they do stipends averaging $700 per year to talented students from low-income families, practically insure this. Scholarship recipients would in almost every instance find it necessary to borrow additional funds and to supplement their resources by taking part-time jobs. The important and ever so crucial purpose of the Federal scholarship bill is that it would make it possible for many talented young people, many coming from families earning less than $4,000 to $5,000 per year, to turn to hope in their plans for the future. Moreover, it represents an opportunity for the Nation to develop and invest in its most precious resource, with the assurance that the investment will be returned manifold, in increasing productivity and social and economic progress.

The amendment poses great problems for the talented but needy students who simply cannot afford to investigate the possibilities for attending institutions removed from their immediate vicinities. For the reasons I have given I am constrained to oppose the amendment and I urge that the Senate defeat the proposal. Should the Senator wish to sponsor an amendment increasing loan funds under title II of the National Defense Education Act, at the time S. 2345 is on the floor, as it is now on the calendar, further consideration could then be given to the proposal.

COLLEGE COSTS

In many of the State colleges and universities "fees" have gradually entered the picture so that there are, in many of them, required charges which are equally costly whether called tuition or fees. Tuition charges, are, of course, common to private universities.

At the present time, college costs in the United States are increasing at a rapid rate. One study recently analyzed fixed (i.e., required) charges in 96 colleges and universities over a 32-year period, 1928–60. The colleges were grouped as: public—large, small; private—large, medium, for men, for women. From 1928 to 1960, tuition and fees (excluding nonresident students in public universities) had increased in public institutions around 200 percent. In private institutions, the increase was much higher, ranging from roughly 275 to 350 percent. Board and room increases were much more conservative, from 80 to 125 percent. The significant thing about these increases, however, is that roughly one-third of all the dollar increase between 1928 and 1960 occurred between 1956 and 1960, or in only 4 years of the 32 years.

One of the most important considerations in relation to financial assistance is the timing. Usually it comes too late to offer the hope which might make a difference. If it were known, perhaps even in the elementary schools, that those with a good record, good motivation, and a genuine need, would not find the door to college closed to them, more of those with high ability might make the necessary preparation.

In order to achieve this, however, the number of scholarships available would have to be increased substantially, with freedom of choice as to institutions attended and programs followed. There is some evidence that students tend to take programs in which scholarships are offered. The fact that loans are accepted by students whose family income is low also suggests the need for additional scholarships or more low-cost local institutions.

I wish to point out to the Senate that the title II scholarship provisions of this bill are complementary to the fellowship provisions of title IV of the National Defense Education Act. At the present time the Federal Government is awarding scholarships at the graduate level without requiring interest and without requiring repayment to students in training beyond the bachelor's degree level. This is a most important function and one from which the Nation will reap great benefits in the future. In title II of S. 1241 by providing scholarships we are simply seeking to insure that talented boys and girls from low income families can have the opportunity to go to college.

I am quite sympathetic to the positions expressed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I would point out to him that in my judgment, given the costs of college education today we need to have scholarships as a base, full utilization of all student loans, and in addition, if these youngsters are to achieve their goal they must be amply supplied with work opportunities while they are going to college. All three of these financial resources will have to be used in the overwhelming preponderance of the cases since by definition the youngsters selected can expect no help from family resources.

I would point out, too, that under title IV of the NDEA, the fellowship provision, that cost of education allowance to the university is included over and above the fellowship.

I include the material contained in the Senate report on S. 2345, pages 17, 18, 19, and 20, relating to the title IV fellowship program at this point in my remarks:

"TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

"A. Existing law—National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Purpose: To increase the supply of well-trained college or university teachers through the award of fellowships, expansion and improvement of graduate school facilities, and wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation.

"Provisions: Under existing law, for the first year 1,000 fellowships may be awarded by the Commissioner and during each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, 1,500 additional fellowships. These fellowships are for periods of study not in excess of 3 academic years. Each fellow receives a stipend of $2,000 the first year, $2,200 the second year, and $2,400 the third year, together with an allowance of $400 for each dependent. An institution which enrolls the holders of fellowships may receive not more than $2,500 each academic year for the cost of its approved program which is reasonably attributable to each fellow pursuing a course of study in the approved program.

"The Commissioner awards fellowships to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him. A graduate program may be approved only upon application of the institution and only upon the Commissioner's finding: (1) that such program is a new program or an existing one which has been expanded; (2) that the new program or expansion of an existing one will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation; and (3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs, preference will be given to persons interested in teaching at institutions of higher education.

"Appropriations now authorized: Such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the title.

"Appraisal: At the conclusion of the next academic year, 149 graduate schools will have received about $27 million in support of the graduate programs in which these fellows are studying. The following summary shows the growth of the program by years:

1959–60: 3-year fellowships in 272 graduate programs	1,000
1960–61: 3-year fellowships and 90 1- and 2-year fellowships in 204 programs approved for the 1st time and in 200 programs approved in 1959–60 but further expanded	1,410
1961–62: 3-year fellowships and 100 1- and 2-year fellowships in 204 programs approved for the 1st time and in 322 programs approved in previous years but further expanded	1,400

"In the fall of this year nearly 4,000 national defense fellows will be studying in 680 different programs at 149 institutions, in preparation for college teaching careers. Thus far, institutions in all States but Nevada and Alaska have participated in this program.

"There has been very great interest in the graduate fellowship program. In the first year, 1,040 proposals were received for new or expanded graduate programs involving over 6,000 fellowships. This compares to the 272 proposals finally approved and the 1,000 fellowships awarded. In 1960–61, 918 proposals were received for 5,370 fellowships, of which 406 programs were approved and

1,500 fellowships awarded. For the academic year 1961–62, 948 proposals were received for 5,050 fellowships, of which 526 programs were approved and 1,500 fellowships awarded.

"Title IV is having a considerable influence on the growth of graduate education in a number of States which have produced no or very few doctoral graduates in the past few years.

"The University of Idaho, for example, produced no doctorates in 1958–59, but in 1961–62 will have 44 national defense fellows studying in 9 approved programs. Similarly, the University of Mississippi produced only 7 doctorates in 1958–59, but in 1961–62 its graduate school will have 31 graduate students studying for their doctorates with national defense graduate fellowships in 3 programs. Nationally, we find that 10 States which produce the fewest doctorates have profited relatively the most from the title IV program, while 8 of the States which produce the most doctorates were among the 10 States which have profited relatively the least.

"B. National Defense Education Act Amendment of 1961

"Amendment and extension: The bill would amend the act to place the title IV program on a continuing basis. The problem which title IV is designed to meet will continue to exist in the foreseeable future and will continue to be one of major proportions. However, support for the training of teachers at the graduate level cannot indefinitely continue on the basis of the award of fellowships only in connection with new or expanded programs in graduate schools. Modifications of the title are required in order to permit qualified graduate students to take training in existing graduate programs and thus to forward the purpose of the title as stated above.

"Graduate fellowships: Accordingly, the bill would increase the number of new fellowships authorized to be awarded each year to 5,000, with up to 2,500 of such fellowships to be awarded to individuals in connection with new or expanded graduate programs as under the present act. The remainder of the awards would be made to individuals who have been accepted for graduate study in any university.

"The amendment would require that in granting fellowships under this program preference shall be given the persons who, in writing, express their intention to teach in institutions of higher education or in elementary or secondary schools, upon completion of their graduate program.

"The effect of these amendments would be to increase further the availability of fellowships, thus contributing to our national pool of highly trained teachers. The granting of 2,500 additional fellowships in existing institutions where present facilities are adequate should further be of great assistance in meeting the current college teacher shortage. Moreover, the award of fellowships to persons who need but 1 year of assistance to complete their program of study could provide an immediate reserve of capable individuals who, with this aid, could become better qualified teachers.

"Fellowship stipends: Under a committee amendment to this title, stipends, not in excess of $3,600, would be paid to the recipient of the fellowship award under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner. An additional amount of $400 would be paid to such recipient for each dependent. Recipients of the limited number of postdoctoral fellowships which it is anticipated will be granted could be paid up to $5,000 as determined by regulations of the Commissioner, and would likewise receive $400 for each dependent.

"Payments to institutions: Another amendment would provide a uniform payment to institutions of $2,500 per year for each fellowship in a new or expanded graduate program and a payment of $2,000 for each of other fellowships. The purpose of making such payments to institutions is the same as in the National Defense Education Act of 1958; namely, to reimburse the institutions for a portion of the cost of the education of the fellow who is attending the institution with Federal assistance. Testimony presented to the committee indicated that the average cost to a graduate school for the training of an individual graduate student was above the figures set in this legislation. The larger payment for new and expanded programs is intended to meet the higher costs to the graduate schools establishing new or expanding graduate facilities.

"In this connection, the committee wished to emphasize its belief that institutions of higher education, attended by a fellow selected for the program, should provide the services of their graduate schools to such fellows without charge. An amendment inserted by the committee seeks to accomplish this objective by providing that the payment to the institution (which flows to the institution by virtue of the attendance of the fellow and is conditioned upon his attendance thereat) shall be reduced by the amount of tuition charged.

"Committee comment upon fellowship programs: The committee has noted with much concern that the Office of Education has been authorizing the approval of graduate programs and the award of fellowships under this title in almost all field of academic endeavor.

"Approval has been given in a number of cases to fellowships in subject matter fields which the committee has great difficulty in reconciling with the national defense purposes of the legislation. In the committee view, programs relating to areas for which advanced degrees such as doctorates in theology are awarded, or in disciplines such as home economics, are quite unrelated to the purposes of the act.

"It is the belief of the committee that awards under this authority should reflect a concern for the Nation's most urgent needs for highly trained manpower to meet its national defense needs. The committee has therefore taken two steps designed to give clear direction to the Commissioner of Education:

"1. It has specifically excluded from eligibility fellowships for graduate study at a school or department of divinity or religion or graduate study of a religious or theological nature.

"2. It has inserted language limiting the fellowships to study in such subjects as the Commissioner finds are important to the national defense and which are consistent with the declaration of policy in section 101.

"In thus restricting the Commissioner of Education, the committee does not intend to imply that only a very narrow selection of courses is related to the strength of the Nation. On the contrary, the committee believes that the strength of the Nation rests significantly upon overall excellence in college and university faculties in the humanities and social sciences, as well as in science, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages. Indeed, a well-educated scientist or linguist is in need of exposure to excellent instruction in fields other that his specialty. However, the committee believes that, in the light of the general objectives of this act, expenditures should be concentrated in those fields of study—sciences, engineering, humanities, and social sciences—which are closest to the defense needs of the Nation. The preparation of college teachers in history, economics, and government, for example, is more directly related to a strong system of undergraduate training to meet the Nation's defense manpower needs, than are graduate programs in folklore or church music.

"The title would also be amended to permit the appointment of new fellows to replace those who have resigned. This amendment would provide opportunity for maintaining the program at full strength and for aiding additional numbers of worthy individuals who have demonstrated competence in their graduate programs."

Mr. President, I call attention to these five points:

1. The committee bill is designed to assist students who are so in need of assistance that the loan fund is not enough. These students are not now in college and will not be able to enter college without scholarship assistance.

2. There is great disparity in present distribution of scholarship funds. Three percent of the colleges control 34 percent of all college scholarship aid. Four States (New York, Illinois, California, and New Jersey) grant 94 percent of all State scholarship assistance. The committee bill is designed to counteract this unequal distribution by establishing as a pilot model a Federal scholarship program in every State.

3. Colleges have already projected lending needs under the student loan program at levels above those recommended in the Lausche amendments. These loan funds are designed to provide partial assistance for students who have some support from other resources.

4. Today the average scholarship award is under $400 per year, while the average cost of education has increased to nearly $1,700 per student per year.

5. The average family income for 1960 was approximately $5,700, while the average cost of a year at college in 1961–62 is nearly $1,700. The cost of attending college has increased and will continue to increase at a rate faster than the annual increase in family income each year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, first of all, that we must look at this program as a package program. The Senator from Ohio, I respectfully say, is picking out an item here and an item there. We have presented a package program for support to higher education. The Senator from Ohio and some of his colleagues who are opposed to me on this issue have been talking about $1,000 scholarships. I say to the Senate that $1,000 scholarships will be as scarce as hens' teeth. The figure for scholarships will average somewhere between $400 and $700. How can we possibly get 25,000 scholarships out of the total amount authorized if we are going to give $1,000 scholarships?

That is the maximum. Most of the scholarships will not be $1,000 scholarships. They will be in the neighborhood of $400 and $700 scholarships. We are not talking about thousand-dollar scholarships.

Mr. President, we are talking about the young men and women who, we find, come from homes so poor, where the economic need is so drastic, that there is not any chance for these thousands of boys and girls to go to college.

It is all right for the Senator from Ohio to argue that if these boys and girls have the intelligence and stamina that characterized our generation, they would go to college, just as we did. The fact is that there were thousands of students in our own generation who were not able to go to college because they had economic problems to consider. The fact is, also, that today the cost of a college education has gone up by more than three times what it was when the Senator

from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon went to college.

We are dealing here with a group of students who will be encompassed in the bill and who will otherwise be denied a college education. If this should occur, America will suffer as well as these students because we will have wasted the precious brainpower of students that should have been developed to the maximum extent.

No one can argue with me in terms of economy. No one can argue with me in terms of putting a price tag on this whole proposition. The fact is that we are dealing here with young men and women who will be the beneficiaries of these scholarships and who otherwise would never see the inside of a college classroom.

I wish to take my next point. The money provided will not be enough in itself, to make it possible for them to go to college. It will be enough to help them make the decision as to whether or not they will have a chance of going to college. I say that, because in addition to the scholarship money, they will have to borrow money to go to college, and they will have to go to work. I was a teacher for 21 years, and I have seen some tragic cases of young men who had to work manually far beyond their physical ability in order to try to carry their schoolwork. Of course, I admire that kind of courage and that kind of character. However, I say it is wasteful. It is much better if we can keep them working in the library, if we can keep them working in the laboratory.

There has been some talk this afternoon about the fact that we are going to make loans to some students under National Defense Education Act, and that we are going to have grants. Well, we do that now. I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that under the fellowship program of the existing law, under National Defense Education Act, we give grants up to $2,000 in first-year fellowships. There is nothing new about this proposal. We are already granting fellowships to graduate students, but not to undergraduate students. These students, as I say, will have to borrow money in addition to the money they will receive.

I wish to talk now about scholarship grants. My friend from Ohio knows that corporations of America and foundations give grants. God bless them for it. I wish they would double them or treble them. They are grants. They are not loans. The overwhelming proportion of the scholarships donated today by business are grants, not loans.

I am strongly in favor of a loan program. However, I say to my friend, the Senator from Ohio, that when we get the National Defense Education Act bill before the Senate to increase the amount of money, I want the Senator from Ohio to support us in our attempt to increase the amount of money that we have already placed in it for loans.

Let me point out what the Senator from Ohio is proposing to do. He is proposing in his amendment to increase the present amount in the law for loans. However, it is a smaller amount than the amount that this committee by a vote of 13 to 2 has recommended to the Senate we ought to adopt. That bill, S. 2345, is pending on the calendar.

What we ought to do is increase the loan provisions for National Defense Education Act over what the committee has already recommended.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate that we must look at the totality of this great educational need. We must meet it by way of loans. We must meet it by way of fellowships. We must meet it by way of grants. We must do all of these. We cannot justify the waste that we are now guilty of in regard to the brainpower of this country.

There is no greater opportunity for us to strengthen the security of this country than we have this afternoon, by voting to add some Federal scholarships to our wholly inadequate educational effort in this country.

I now would like to put my fellow Senators in my seat as I go into conference with the House. I want to talk about the practical parliamentary problems which face anyone who is chairman of a conference committee when he goes into conference in behalf of the Senate. Each one of my colleagues has been in that position.

I will be confronted in the conference with a House bill that does not have one single cent in it for scholarships. There is no scholarship aid at all in it. The House has eliminated scholarships. The President of the United States has made a very able case today for his higher education program, and he ends his plea to Congress with a request for support for the scholarship provision in the bill as it has come to the floor of the Senate.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to come with me into the conference room. If I walk into that conference with an amendment, let us assume—God forbid—of scholarships only in the form of loans, how much of a chance do Senators really think I will have with the House in getting scholarships out of that conference at all?

I make a plea to my colleagues in the Senate to keep me in a bargaining position in support of the Senate. I make a plea that I be kept in a position where I can go into conference with at least a chance of being able to negotiate with the House. Senators have been in enough conferences to know how weakened I would be if the Senate had weakened the whole scholarship approach to the educational needs in higher education in this country.

For these reasons I urge the Senate this afternoon, in the vote which is about to take place, to defeat the Lausche amendment. In my judgment it is inadequate, because it does not go far enough, and because it represents a failure and a lack of faith on our part to invest in the brainpower in the young men and women of this country, who will be recipients of these scholarships. Let us remember that what I am really proposing is a loan when I propose a scholarship. It is only a long-term loan.

Senators ask, Who is going to pay the taxes for the scholarship program? Let me tell them who it will be. It will be the recipients of the program. There is no question about the fact that, if we give these scholarships and we get these students into college, they then can leave college and earn money far in excess of what they would have been able to obtain without a college education. They will repay to the Treasury of the United States in taxes during the next 15 or 20 years after they leave college 100 times the benefits they received under the scholarship program.

That is why I say this scholarship program is a true long-term loan program which will strengthen the security of this Republic.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the closing words uttered by the Senator from Oregon demonstrate the weakness of his position and the strength of mine. He said the scholarships will be repaid by the recipients in the future through the taxes which they will pay. I submit the repayment would be far simpler by having the students borrow the money and repay it as a debt.

The Senator from Oregon concedes that the funds ought not to be a grant, because he argues that they should be paid back not as a loan but in the form of taxes. If he concedes that the funds should be paid back, then I respectfully submit that the simplest way to do so is to pay them back in the form of discharging a loan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have only 9 minutes remaining.

Second, when he argues that boys and girls will not attend college unless the money is provided for them as a gift, I cannot agree with him. I simply cannot believe that the citizenry of the United States has reached the stage, as I stated earlier, that unless the Federal Congress gives them the money, they will allow all of their creative ability, all of their creative mentality to go to waste. I simply cannot believe that to be the fact.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] argued that the bill will open the door for students to go to college. It will open the door; but the door will be opened for an expansion of the program next year and the following year. It is a very appealing proposal. It probably will invite votes. I suppose that when election time comes around, the program will be expanded in the quest for those votes. Certainly it will open the door.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 6 years. I have seen how the wedge is placed into the door and the door is opened a bit, and how finally the train goes through.

This is only the beginning. What the program will eventually cost, no one can foretell. The Senator from Oregon argues that this is a package deal and must be viewed in its totality. I agree that it should be viewed in its totality; but it should be reviewed in the totality of the problem of the country as a whole.

We have the finest schools in the world. We have the students for whom those schools are available. Of course, the number of schools should be expanded, and I am in favor of that portion of the bill which will help to build them. We have the students to fill the schools; but when we seek to help them, the best way to help them, in my opinion, is to make the program available on the basis of loans.

Getting back to the thought of totality, we have provided $50 billion for the national defense this year. The budget is up to $93 billion. There have been deficits in 25 of the last 31 years. The purchasing dollar has fallen from 100 cents in 1941 to 46 cents in 1962. There has been a run on our gold. The request is made for the right to borrow more money.

What is the totality of the proposition? The totality is that we had better recognize that there is a limit on how much money can be ladled out by Congress.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me. I simply wish to ask him a question concerning opening the door of opportunity. Is it his statement that his program would not open the door of opportunity to young people?

Mr. LAUSCHE. If money is loaned to student A, he will pay it back. When he pays it back, that money will be available to student B. When student B pays it back, it can be loaned to student C. That is a sound basis of approach.

The argument of the Senator from Maine is: Give the money to the student. He will not have to pay it back directly, but he will pay it back in taxes because his earning capacity will be increased. I say that if he can pay it back in taxes subsequently, then, frankly, it is better to ask him to pay it back as a loan.

Mr. MUSKIE. I think it should be stated, so far as I am concerned, that I am not arguing that a student's college education should be financed totally by loans or totally by scholarships or totally by his own earnings or totally by assistance from his parents.

I recognize the merit of loans. I benefited from them myself. I found it possible to repay them. But I also benefited from grants in the form of scholarships from private sources. Perhaps I derived the greatest benefit, a benefit which the Senator described so eloquently this afternoon, from the money which I earned by my own efforts. I agree with the Senator's statement in that respect.

But I am talking about what is necessary and reasonable for the average student of average means to have as a financial program to finance his education. With the increasing cost of education, the part which scholarships have played in financing the cost of education for the poorer student has diminished. The program of the bill would simply restore the role of scholarships in financing the program of students to something approximating the part they previously played. This will not result in an overbalance on the side of scholarship aid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by Dr. John D. Millett, president of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, supporting the proposition that adequate studies have not been made to demonstrate that the Federal provision of scholarships is necessary. The testimony appears at page 298 of the hearings.

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

STATEMENT BY DR. JOHN D. MILLETT, PRESIDENT, MIAMI UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, OHIO

FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Chairman, if I can best express briefly the consensus among the two associations for which I speak on the subject of general Federal scholarships it is simply that they do not have a high priority on the agenda of needed Federal action.

We believe that scholarships as such are important means of assisting worthy students in attendance at colleges and universities.

We also believe that unless funds are provided to help meet operating costs and facilities costs for colleges and universities—other than passing them on to the student and his family through tuition charges—there will be no end to the demand for more and more scholarships. We believe that if the central problem of support is attacked first, and attacked vigorously, the need for scholarships will be minimized rather than maximized, and that otherwise no conceivable scholarship program will perform the task of keeping educational opportunity open.

We realize that the stated and central objective of most proposed Federal scholarship programs, including the administration proposal now before your committee, is to make it possible for the many students of high ability but limited financial resources to attend college. This is a most laudable objective. We doubt that the evidence exists on which to base a judgment that the proposed legislation will make a substantial contribution to accomplishing its purpose. The studies which are cited as a basis for the belief that a high percentage of high ability students do not attend college for lack of funds are "national" studies based on techniques of limited sampling. But we do not have, and the U.S. Office of Education does not have, adequate studies of the distribution of these qualified and needy students. By this I mean there are no State-by-State studies covering the entire country of the percentage of high school graduates who attend college and of the percentages of those in various ability groupings who do attend. On the basis of such studies as we do have we do know that the percentage of high school graduates attending college varies greatly among the States and regions.

This at least suggests the question as to whether or not a high percentage of the able young people who fail to go to college for financial reasons may not be fairly heavily concentrated in a few States or regions. We know that some States—including some of the most prosperous States—have made the financial barriers to higher education extremely high. I respectfully suggest that a considerably better factual basis of information needs to be available, Mr. Chairman, before we can make sound judgments as to the effectiveness of a Federal scholarship program in accomplishing its stated objectives.

Having said this, I wish to add that, if we are to have a general Federal scholarship program, the proposed legislation has certain commendable features. Its intent is that scholarships go only to students who need help to go to college and not to students who are going to college but need help to go some place else to college. It thus avoids the expenditure of Federal funds to permit west coast students to go to the east coast to college, and vice versa, as some of our present non-Federal programs do. Its provision for a flat grant to the institutions of $350—rather than paying whatever fee it decides to charge—would have the effect of helping out on institutional costs without having a tendency to force up tuition charges and thus making attendance more difficult for nonscholarship students. It will reduce the tendency shown in some existing programs to encourage the concentration of the high ability students in a relatively few institutions. So great is the concern on this score, Mr. Chairman, that there is a substantial sentiment among educators to the effect that Federal scholarships should be awarded through educational institutions in order to insure that Federal action does not greatly affect the distribution of students of high ability as among the various regions of the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has indicated he wishes to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. In case the Senator from Indiana offered and amendment in the nature of a substitute, which amendment would be considered first by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that case the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, if a perfecting amendment, would be considered first by the Senate.

Mr. HARTKE. Would the discussion of that amendment also precede the discussion of the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator having the floor could speak on either amendment he desired, but the vote on the perfecting amendment would take precedence over any substitute.

Mr. HARTKE. But it would in no way jeopardize the discussion or the vote upon the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please state his question again?

Mr. HARTKE. As I understand, the Chair has ruled that if an amendment in the nature of a substitute were offered at a later time, and the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio were proposed, that would in no way jeopardize the consideration or the discussion of the amendment which might be offered by the Senator from Indiana, although the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Vermont would take precedence so far as time and a vote are concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Vermont and I propose to offer two amendments to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Indiana has a substitute for the

amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. Do I correctly understand that the vote would first come on the amendments to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, and that after that amendment had or had not been perfected by such amendments, the vote would then come on the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. HARTKE. Debate on the amendments proposed by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Vermont would take precedence over debate on the amendments I have previously submitted, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator having the floor could debate either the amendments proposed by the Senator from New York or the Senator from Indiana, or both, if desired, but the vote would first come on the perfecting Keating-Prouty amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I call up my amendments identified as "2-2-62—A," which previously have been considered as amendments to the bill. I ask that my amendments be considered en bloc, as a substitute.

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

The amendments subcommitted by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments submitted by the Senator from Indiana will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendments submitted by Mr. HARTKE are as follows:

On page 2, line 21, strike out "and".

On page 2, line 24, before the period insert a comma and the following: "and through a program of loan insurance for students in higher education".

On page 37, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"TITLE IV—STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FOR STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

"Part I—Short title

"Short Title

"SECTION 401. This title may be cited as the 'Student Loan Insurance Act of 1961'.

"Part II—Loan insurance for student loans

"Authorization

"SEC. 411. For the purpose of facilitating loans to students in institutions of higher education, such institutions shall be insured by the Commissioner against losses on loans made by them to such students in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and the succeeding fiscal year, if made upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this part. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this part in any fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000. The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within such maximum amount, insurance quotas applicable to eligible institutions of higher education, or to States or areas, and may reassign unused portions of such quotas.

"Limitations on Individual Loans and on Insurance

"SEC. 412. No loan or loans by one or more institutions of higher education in excess of $1,000 in the aggregate to any single student in any fiscal year shall be covered by insurance under this part, nor shall the aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of loans made to any student exceed $5,000 at any time.

"Source of Funds

"SEC. 413. Loans made by institutions of higher education in accordance with this title shall be insurable whether made from the funds of the institution or from funds held by the institution in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

"Eligibility of Student Borrowers and Terms of Student Loans

"SEC. 414. A loan by an institution of higher education shall be insurable under the provisions of this part only if made to a student in such institution who devotes essentially full time to educational work in accordance at such institution, as determined by such institution, and if evidenced by a note or other written agreement which (1) provides for repayment of the principal amount of such loan in installments each quarter or lesser period beginning (except in the event of default in the payment of interest, or in the payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower) within one year following the date on which the student ceases to devote essentially full time to educational work in attendance at any institution of higher education, (2) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required, (3) requires full repayment of the principal with interest within not more than ten years after the date on which the first installment of principal becomes due, (4) provides for interest on such loan at a per annum rate not exceeding 4¾ per centum on the unpaid balance and accrued interest, but payment of interest accruing prior to the date on which the first installment of principal becomes due may be postponed until after such date, (5) entitles the student borrower at his option to accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan, and (6) contains such other terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this part and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this title as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, at their option, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the institution, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the institution to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

"Certificates of Insurance—Effective Date of Insurance—Premiums

"SEC. 415. (a) If, upon application by an institution of higher education, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the institution has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this part, he shall, upon tender by the institution of the first year's insurance premium payable pursuant to subsection (d), issue to such institution a certificate of insurance covering such loan and setting forth the amount and terms of such insurance.

"(b) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of such certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans submitted by eligible institutions, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a) by the institution, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when the loan to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon thirty days' default by the institution in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (d).

"(c) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall contain (1) an agreement by the institution of higher education to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (d), and (2) an agreement by such institution that if the loan is covered by insurance the institution will submit such reports during the effective period of the loan agreement as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe as necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

"(d) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this part a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest of such loan, payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest, or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 416.

"(e) The rights of an institution of higher education arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued under this section may not be assigned or transferred by such institution, except as provided in case of default in section 416.

"(f) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. Upon surrender of the original certificates of insurance in such cases, the Commissioner may issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with this section upon such consolidated obligation.

"Procedure on Default, Death, or Disability of Student

"SEC. 416. (a) Upon default and a reasonable effort toward collection by the institution on any loan covered by insurance pursuant to this part, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the institution that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled, determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner, before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon the loan or upon any security for such loan, the institution shall promptly notify the Commissioner who shall thereupon, if requested by such institution or on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the institution the amount of the loss sustained upon such loan as soon as such amount has been determined.

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the amount of loss pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to

the rights of the institution upon the insured loan and be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan and any security therefor.

"(c) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on such insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the institution of higher education or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the institution to have become permanently and totally disabled.

"(d) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to excuse the institution of higher education from exercising, in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this part, the same care and diligence which would reasonably be used in making and collecting loans not insured. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the institution, finds that an institution of higher education has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence, or to make the reports required under section 415(c), or to pay the required insurance premiums, he shall disqualify such institution for further insurance on loans granted pursuant to this part until he is satisfied that such failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the institution will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

"Part III—Loan insurance on loans to institutions of higher education

"Authorization

"SEC. 421. For the purpose of assisting institutions of higher education in obtaining funds to make loans insured under part II, the Commissioner, on terms and conditions prescribed by him consistent with the provisions of this part and necessary to protect the interests of the United States, may insure in whole or in part any public or private financing institution, or trustee under a trust or indenture or agreement for the benefit of the holders of any securities issued thereunder, by commitment or otherwise, against loss of principal and interest on any loan to an institution of higher education for the purpose of providing such institution with necessary funds to make loans insured under part II of this title. The total principal amount of new loans covered by insurance under this part in any fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000. The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within such maximum amounts, insurance quotas applicable to eligible institutions of higher education, or to States or areas, and may reassign unused portions of such quotas.

"Limitations

"SEC. 422. No loan shall be covered by insurance under section 421 unless—

"(1) the Commissioner finds that such loan is necessary to enable the institution of higher education to provide student loans to be insured under part II;

"(2) the rate of interest to be paid on the loan is 4½ per centum or less;

"(3) the terms of such loan require repayment in twenty years or less; and

"(4) the Commissioner finds that there is reasonable assurance that the institution of higher education has the ability to repay the loan within the time fixed therefor.

"Payment on Guarantees

"SEC. 423. Payments required to be made as the result of default on any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be made from the revolving insurance fund established under section 431.

"Part IV—Administrative matters

"Revolving Insurance Fund

"SEC. 431. (a) Premiums under part II and all other moneys derived by the Commissioner in the course of operations under this title shall be deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. All moneys in the revolving fund shall, upon requisition by the Commissioner, be available until expended, (1) for the payment of losses in connection with insurance undertaken pursuant to this title, and (2) for any fiscal year, in the amount provided for by an appropriation Act, for defraying the expenses of administration incurred under this title.

"(b) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund provided in this section—

"(1) the sum of $500,000 for the initial establishment of the revolving fund; and

"(2) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the revolving fund.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, from the revolving fund, pay annually into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, interest on any sums appropriated to the revolving fund pursuant to subsection (b) which have not been repaid into the Treasury as provided in subsection (d). The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance, such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its costs in connection with such appropriated funds, taking into consideration the current average interest rate which the Treasury pays upon its marketable obligations.

"(d) Until all advances made to the revolving fund by appropriation pursuant to subsection (b) (1) and (2) have been repaid through credits as provided in this subsection, the Commissioner shall, at least annually, determine any balance in the revolving fund in excess of an amount determined by him to be necessary for the requirements of the fund, and for reasonable reserves to maintain the solvency of the fund, and such balance shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and the amount thereof be credited against such advances.

"(e) The Commissioner may authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to invest and reinvest such portions of the revolving fund as he may determine to be in excess of current needs in any interest-bearing securities of the United States or in any securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and the income therefrom shall constitute a part of the revolving fund.

"Legal Powers and Responsibilities

"SEC. 432. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commissioner may—

"(1) sue on behalf of the United States and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"(2) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or security, of the provisions of any note, contract, mortgage, or other instrument evidencing or securing a loan which has been insured under this title;

"(3) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

"(4) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this title—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

"(2) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the financial transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"Treatment of Certain Trusts, Foundations, and Other Organizations as Institutions of Higher Education

"SEC. 433. The Commissioner may by regulation provide for the treatment of any nonprofit trusts, foundations, or other similar organizations, controlled by an institution of higher education or the officials thereof, as part of the institution of higher education for the purposes of this title, if he determines that such treatment would promote such purposes. Such regulations may establish such requirements for the purpose of this section as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"Administration

"SEC. 434. (a) This title shall be administered by the Commissioner, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Commissioner shall, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, make all regulations specifically authorized to be made under this title and such other regulations, not inconsistent with this title, as may be necessary to carry out its purposes.

"(b) At the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Commissioner shall make, through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a full report to Congress of the administration of this title, including his recommendations for needed revisions in the title.

"(c) When deemed necessary by the Commissioner for the effective administration of this title, experts or consultants may be employed as provided in section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806, 810).

"Authority Under Act Conditional Upon Amount of Appropriation for Title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"SEC. 435. The authority of the Commissioner to insure any loans in any fiscal year under the provisions of this title shall be conditional upon the appropriation under the provisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for such year of at least 75 per centum of the amount authorized for such year under the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

On page 37, beginning with line 6, redesignate title IV as title V and redesignate the section numbers in such title accordingly.

In lieu of the amendment to the title amend the title to read as follows: "A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges, and to provide a program of loan insurance for students in higher education."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I think the Senator from Indiana is entitled to know from me, as floor leader of the bill, what my approach to his amendments would be, because I always try to give due notice and to be perfectly fair in connection with the debate. I want the Senator from Indiana to know that after all debate on his amendments, from his standpoint and that of other Senators who support them, is completed, I shall move that the amendments be laid on the table; and when I make my reply to the Senator, I shall state my reasons for making the motion.

But I believe he realizes that I deeply appreciate the sincerity of his purpose, and that also, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I deeply appreciate the many instances in which the Senator from Indiana has been of help to me. It always pains me to find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Indiana. But I am in disagreement with him in regard to these amendments; and at the appropriate time I shall move that his amendments be laid on the table.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, has the Senator from Indiana finished his presentation for the time being?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in due course I wish to ask the privilege of the floor for the Senator from Vermont.

At this time I suggest that the Senator from Indiana proceed with his explanation of his amendments, if he wishes to do so at this time.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the amendments I have submitted at this time are really a supplement to Senate bill 1241. They would not in any way interfere with the scholarship program or the educational facilities now provided by that bill, and they would not interfere in any way with this educational program.

Instead, Mr. President, my amendments provide, as a supplement to the provisions of S. 1241 and the National Defense Education Act, a program of loan insurance on loans to students in higher education.

This loan insurance program is modeled after the Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance program. The Federal Government would not provide money for the loan, but it would guarantee repayment. The moneys will be provided to students by the institutions of higher education, and to colleges and universities by financial institutions.

Basically, my amendments provide:

First. Insurance on student loans of up to $1,000 a year, with an overall maximum of $5,000. Loans must be made from funds of the college or university or from funds held by such institution in a trust or similar capacity.

Second. Federal insurance on loans made by financial institutions to colleges or universities needing outside funds for student loans.

Third. Repayment of student loans to be made in installments each quarter, beginning within 1 year after the student ceases to devote essentially full time to his educational work. Full repayment must be made within 10 years after the first installment becomes due.

Fourth. The cost of student loans may be no greater than 5 percent—that is 4¾ percent for interest and one-fourth of 1 percent for insurance premium and administration.

Fifth. Repayment of loans made by colleges and universities from financial institutions must be made within 20 years. Interest on these loans may be no greater than 4½ percent. The cost of the insurance premium and administration would be an additional one-fourth of 1 percent.

Sixth. There would be a maximum yearly ceiling, on loans which the Federal Government may insure, of $100 million, for student loans; and $100 million for loans to colleges and universities.

The program of Federal scholarships provided for by S. 1241 is one which I endorse and one which I believe is very worthwhile. However, this program helps only a limited number of the capable and needy young people of our Nation. I am concerned with the great number of our young people who will not be reached by this measure.

In our complex society, there is greater and greater need for trained and well-educated people. Automation is rapidly eliminating the need for large numbers of relatively untrained and unskilled workers. For this reason, we shall be adding to our unemployment problems if we allow ambitious and able young people to enter a labor market which cannot absorb them and does not need them. We must make every reasonable effort to see to it that high school graduates of today are not the unemployed workers of tomorrow, that they are not the ones ment expense, in the future, so that they whom we shall have to train at Governcan work and earn a living.

For over 25 years, we have had an FHA program which insured housing loans. During this period, the Federal Government has insured billions of dollars' worth of housing loans, with little or no drain on the Treasury. Losses during that time, resulting from defaults on the loans, have amounted to only eighteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, for home mortgage insurance.

If such a program can be successful for insuring loans for real estate, certainly it can be successful for insuring educational loans.

Adoption of the loan insurance program for which my amendments provide will permit the utilization of our private credit resources to encourage and enable students to continue with their studies. The program will insure loans, and it will help to insure our Nation's future.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a speech which I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speech was delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on June 22, 1959, at the commencement exercises of the Bronx High School of Science, at the Paradise Theater, in New York City. In the speech the Senator from New York endorsed the principles of the program covered by my amendments, and stated fully—probably much more eloquently than could be stated by me at this time—the need for a program of this sort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PEACE PROGRAM FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

(Commencement address of Senator JAVITS at the graduation exercises of the Bronx High School of Science, June 22, 1959, at the Paradise Theater, New York City)

There are three key elements in a true "peace program for higher education" which must be launched if millions of well-trained minds are to be fully developed as our most valuable national asset in the cold war, a struggle which your generation has no choice but to inherit—

First, a Federal program for underwriting 50,000 scholarships in higher education, a minimum goal considering that an estimated 180,000 high school graduates this June—all ranked in the top 20 percent of their class scholastically—will not go on to college, a staggering loss of talent which may never develop its full potential;

Second, adoption of a Federal guarantee program for student loans, similar to the FHA guarantees for mortgages on private housing, which would stimulate an overall Federal-State $1 billion student loan program establishing a $1,000 loan maximum the first year and up to a $5,000 maximum for 5 years of study (this proposal is essential in the face of soaring college costs for students which average about $1,700 per capita each year, a leap of 33 percent from 1954 to 1958);

And third, a nationwide campaign to further increase corporate giving to higher education from the current level of $135 million to reach a national goal of $400 million by 1970 annually, with labor unions and trade organizations making contributions in recognition of their own stake in the development of skilled manpower, technicians and scientists who promote productivity and economic growth; such funds can be an invaluable aid to college construction programs trying to provide the education and living facilities required by the students a decade hence when present enrollment figures for higher education are expected to increase 100 percent.

The four-alarm warning which was sounded throughout the U.S. education system after Russia launched the first earth satellite in October 1957 has not yet been adequately answered either by Congress, our colleges and universities or by the country at large. In the wake of the orbit blazed by that first sputnik, a public awareness and enthusiasm arose which gave a tremendous boost to proposals for vitally necessary programs of Federal and private financing, particularly for higher education. Unless that support reasserts itself, a heavy penalty for our current complacency will be borne by the generation now preparing for college—in terms of sharply limited educational opportunities—and by the Nation—in terms of endangering the economic growth rate in the United States and the maintenance of U.S. peace leadership in the years ahead.

The total bill for higher education in our colleges and universities currently comes to $3,580 million a year. But if we are to do an adequate educational job for the 7 million students expected to apply to them by 1970, it will cost $9 billion, according to the Council for Financial Aid to Education. However, at the present level of financial

support—public, private, and from tuition—only $7 billion will be available. The $2 billion deficit can only be made up by a coordinated program of public and private financing. And to those who see the specter of Federal control behind the prospect of increased Federal funds for higher education, let me emphasize that the proportion of the higher education bill paid for out of the Federal Treasury has been decreasing steadily for the past 15 years. As a revenue source, the Federal Government contributed $308 million in 1943–44 compared to $535 million in 1957–58, representing a 21-percent drop in its overall share of the total bill. However, during the same period, the proportionate burden shouldered by the State governments increased 10 percent, the share of private gifts rose 5 percent, and tuition's share rose 8 percent. Actually, the impact and the importance of Federal aid has been sharply reduced, and the proposals I favor for expanding its activity would carry the least likelihood of unfavorable influence—a national scholarship and loan program to individual students to help meet college costs.

If a peace program in higher education is not launched promptly, the personal loss suffered by the qualified but rejected applicants will be even more dramatically revealed as society's loss. For, a projection of current trends combined with the opinions of education authorities indicates that by 1970, the United States will be short 200,000 engineers, 100,000 research and development personnel, 56,000 nurses, and a most shocking shortage of 346,800 teachers in higher education alone, according to the National Education Association which will feature this statistic in a study to be released in the near future.

Your generation, like my own, must face the most serious intellectual challenge ever to confront this country and its constitutional institutions. Never before have we been so tested by a totalitarian ideology as we are today by Communists, but it is also my deep conviction that a superbly trained and educated generation benefiting from equal educational opportunity will not only be fully prepared to meet such a test of survival, but will have every capability for decisive success in such a competition.

The number of qualified young men and women who are deprived of a higher education today because of financial problems is about 200,000, including as many as 100,000 who are forced to stop after high school although they are considered gifted by their teachers. We cannot afford to let a higher education become a luxury item in this country. The contribution it makes to the well-being of the individual benefiting from it (the Labor Department says that a college degree is worth an additional $100,000 in earning power during a person's working life) is also clearly reflected in the growth and prosperity of the United States in recent decades.

Last year, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act but so far the loan program provided under it has proved inadequate. This statement may seem surprising in light of the fact that by May 20 of this year, $30.5 million had been appropriated out of a total authorization of $47.5 million for 1958–59. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the funds so far made available to 1,200 institutions of higher learning in the 49 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico can assist some 115,000 students—however, that means the average loan would be about $300 per student, which is insufficient to even pay board for 1 year at the average college.

Nevertheless, the full subscription to this loan program by colleges and universities (which must make available $1 in loan funds for every $9 loaned by the Federal Government) has substantiated the fact that our emergency need for college-trained professionals, particularly in engineering and science, would bring student loan programs into their own with eager acceptance of a "learn now, repay later" plan.

The stage has been set for a realistically scaled loan program with a student able to receive up to a maximum of $1,000 annually, and with an average loan of $750 per student once the plan is firmly underway more than 250,000 college students could be assisted. If it is in operation by 1966, when another projection shows that 279,000—or more than half—of the 508,000 high school seniors in the top fifth of their class will not enter college, it can be the decisive factor in permitting young people from lower income families to continue their studies. Also, of equal importance, it can help in retaining 51,000 students in the same top scholastic percentile who will probably enter but not complete college.

Nevertheless, there will always be a percentage of qualified students who are unable to apply for loan assistance because of family responsibilities or because they are training for a profession where starting salaries are often too low, in their opinions, to permit them to carry the burden of student loan repayment after graduation or for other reasons. For such gifted high school graduates, a national scholarship program is indispensable. No educated man or woman believes that intelligence and income status are inevitably linked to one another. However, there is a marked correlation between a college student's family income and whether or not he receives his degree; HEW has reported that the median income of families whose children completed college was more than $1,000 higher than that of families where the student failed to finish the first registration period—and $500 higher in comparison with the families of students who dropped out later on.

The second half of the 20th century with its challenges, and its promises of greatness stretches before you. Later day historians may well describe the decades before you now as the decisive years for Western civilization which saw the dawn of a new American frontier where the heroes were pioneers in the fields of thought. To us, they will be the teacher, the scientist, the engineer, the lawyer, the researcher, the clergyman, the artist, the philosopher, and, yes, the politician, who is a practitioner of the art of a free society. What we do now in the field of higher education will determine the nature of our history for decades—it is also likely to determine the future of freedom and human dignity on this earth.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 30 Senators joined in sponsoring a similar amendment which was submitted in September 1960, to Senate bill 2710. At that time, hearings were held on the bill, but no bill of any sort was reported from the Subcommittee on Education—although I stand ready to be corrected on that point if I am mistaken. But hearings were held on the bill introduced by the former Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, now our distinguished Vice President; and that bill was almost identical in purpose with the measure which I have placed before the Senate today. So, Mr. President, this measure has been before the committee, and it was endorsed in principle, and also by their actual signatures on the bill itself, by 30 Senators.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that if he needs something with which to bargain in dealing with the House and with the House conferees, my amendments will give him something with which he can bargain and argue, and I honestly believe that the argument which can be made in favor of the program proposed by these amendments cannot be refuted.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Will the amendments of the Senator from Indiana substitute an FHA-type loan program for the scholarship program?

Mr. HARTKE. These amendments will not in any way affect the scholarship program. Instead, exactly the opposite would be the case. These amendments constitute a substitute only for those who do not have the money which they must have if they are to go to college. These amendments do not require a needs test. We have never had a needs test in the case of housing-fund programs.

Furthermore, my amendments do not provide that unusually high scholarship must be achieved. Instead, my amendments provide a program to enable children to attend college—a program similar to that under which money with which to build houses can be borrowed.

Mr. CLARK. So if the amendments of the Senator from Indiana are adopted, the scholarship provisions will remain intact, will they?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, they will remain unharmed and intact.

My amendments provide for a program which I believe the Senate should endorse.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I commend the Senator from Indiana for making this "FHA" proposal.

I may say that in New York, loans outside of the regular program cover approximately 2,000 students, according to figures which have been placed in the RECORD.

There is, therefore, an area in which such a guarantee program could operate. As the Senator so graciously said, a few years ago I endorsed the fundamental idea. I adhere to that endorsement. I hope it will work out under this amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I made my statement because I want no claim for originality in this proposal, and no claim for being a person except that of being a loyal follower of those who I think lead wisely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, we would have three separate operations; first, under the National Defense Education Act, which authorizes loans; second, under the new provision contained in the bill that provides scholarships; third, the establishment of a sort of FHA that will guarantee loans by students for use in going to college.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why does the Senator feel that there ought to be a guaranteed loan program as well as a loan program set forth in the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. HARTKE. The National Defense Education Act has two main differences from the particular measure now pending. The first requires that there be a need established on the part of the student. My amendment would not require that a need be established. No need test is required for Federal housing under the Federal Housing Administration. Second, there would be no requirement that the individual be exceptionally gifted. The money would go to individuals who wanted to go to college, who graduated from high school, but, frankly, had no money, or who took the full responsibility of paying for their education and then repaying it on the basis of a loan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, we would have one bureau administering the National Defense Education Act, another administering the gifts, and another the guaranteed loans.

Mr. HARTKE. Most of the administration under this proposal, and practically all of the administration, would be in the hands of the administrators of the colleges. They cannot use their own funds. If they want to borrow from other institutions, they are allowed one quarter of 1 percent, which is included in the loan, which would provide the cost of financing the program through the university.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is adopted, it will mean my amendment has been defeated, and the gift program is fixed. Is that correct?

Mr. HARTKE. The adoption of the amendment would in effect eliminate the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I think that is true. Whatever further amendments the Senator from Ohio wanted to propose would be in order, of course.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To go along with this amendment would be to yield on what I have been trying to do, and that I cannot do.

Mr. HARTKE. I would enjoy having the support of the Senator from Ohio on this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I want to make these arguments against the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

First, I want to say that the Senator has introduced a bill to carry out his purpose, and I assure him that his bill will have hearings before my subcommittee. The only step we have taken thus far has been to ask the departments for reports on his bill. The reports I regret to state are all adverse. The reports by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department, go into quite some detail in opposition to the bill.

Nevertheless, we all know that adverse reports from one or more departments do not stop us from seeing that consideration is given to a bill. We frequently recommend a bill over adverse reports. However, this is not the time to consider the bill. The best way to consider the bill is, first, in full hearing before the committee, and I pledge the Senator from Indiana he will get a hearing.

The Senator made reference to hearings in 1960. Let me tell the Senate about those hearings. There were 4 days of hearings on a whole series of bills, somewhat in the same category, but not identical with the bill the Senator from Indiana is talking about, save and except one, and my recollection is that there was really only one witness on this bill who gave any testimony at any great length. As chairman of the subcommittee, I say that those bills did not receive what I am talking about now, a full consideration. They were not reported from the subcommittee. I very respectfully say this, but I should report to the Senate that after we had the last hearing that we held it was the opinion of the subcommittee that there should not be further hearings held on them. That was the decision arrived at. That was the form of action taken.

I pledge to the Senator from Indiana that hearings will be held, but I think a case should be made in support of the bill, rather than the inadequate case which was made in 1960, when really only one witness testified in substance at all. With the departments having made adverse reports, with the departments urging us not to adopt the bill, without having had any hearings before the present committee—and do not forget that the committee has been reconstituted since 1960; there have been considerable changes in the personnel of the committee—in fairness to the committee, I think we ought to insist that the bill of the Senator from Indiana be given hearings and that we get reports.

That is the history of the bill. I shall, in due course of time, but not until the Senator has had every opportunity to use all the time which he has under the rules, move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HARTKE. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the bill has been introduced. It bears the number S. 611. Some of the reports from the departments are adverse. Some are rather sketchy. One of the reports expressed the feeling that the original proposal submitted by the President embodied all the proposals which they wanted to present at this time. The other statement was that there was no demonstration that finances could be available or that students would take advantage of this program.

I feel that if this bill was going to be considered, it should have been considered in conjunction with the bill before the Senate at this time.

I am under no illusion that if hearings are held or if action is taken adversely today on the bill, or in this Congress on the bill now before the Senate, and the bill which passed the House a few days ago, that further action in any field to provide for educational participation by the young people will pass in this Congress, or pass until there is another election and another Congress.

I would like to have this measure considered in view of the fact that 30 U.S. Senators who are still here have put their names on it and have endorsed the principles of this measure.

Mr. MORSE. I share the attitude of the Senator from Indiana that the bill should go to hearing. It will go to hearing. But the adverse report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is the Department which has assigned to it the primary responsibility of passing judgment upon the substantive value of the bill from the standpoint of its educational implications, certainly is an adequate report. It sets forth the Department's reasons in opposition to the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the adverse report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1962.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your requests of January 30, and February 6, 1961, for reports on S. 611 and S. 656, bill "To provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education."

These bills would authorize a Federal program of loan insurance on student loans in institutions of higher education, not to exceed $100 million for each of fiscal years 1962 and 1963. The Commissioner of Education would be empowered to issue insurance certificates against a maximum of $1,000 per student for any 1 fiscal year and a gross maximum of $5,000 in unpaid principal for any one student at any given time. The insured loans could be made by any institution of higher education to any student enrolled on a full-time basis. Repayment would begin 1 year after termination of full-time study and is to be completed within 10 years. No security or endorsement would be required unless the minor's signature under applicable State law does not create a binding obligation. Interest not to exceed 4¾ percent per annum would accrue from the date of the note but could be postponed for payment until the first installment payment is due. In addition, the institution at its own option could charge an additional ¼ percent per annum to defray the cost of insurance premiums, thus bringing the potential net interest charge to the student to 5 percent per year.

These bills also would authorize a Federal program of loan insurance on loans made to colleges for student loan purposes, provided that these institutional loans carry a maximum interest rate of not more than 4½ percent per year and are repayable in 20 years; and a revolving insurance fund established at $500,000 initially to contain payment of insurance premiums and other money. This fund would defray the costs of uncollectible loans which have been insured. For each loan insurance certificate, the institution will pay a premium not to exceed one-fourth of 1 percent per year of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest on the student loan.

This Department is aware of the value of insurance programs for certain types of student loans, and we have followed the development of State programs with interest. However, we have reservations regarding the value of a Federal program of loan insurance to achieve certain objectives. For example,

insofar as the proposed legislation is directed toward insuring existing institutional loan programs, we believe that the high rate of collection already experienced by the colleges makes loan insurance almost unnecessary. At prevailing rates of interest it is doubtful that many institutions of higher education could obtain loans from commercial sources at the 4½ percent maximum rate which can be charged on loans which could be insured under title II of the bill, the reduction, if any, resulting from the Federal insurance would probably be small. Also, all institutions would have to absorb the difference between the higher interest rate they have to pay in borrowing additional loan funds from commercial sources, and the 5 percent maximum interest rate they would be able to charge student borrowers under title I of the bill; this fact would tend to discourage additional institutional borrowing for this purpose, particularly additional borrowing by the financially weaker institutions where the difference in rates would be the greatest and where the ability to absorb such costs would be the least.

We question the value of the proposed loan insurance program as a means of providing additional aid for able but needy college students. The 5-percent interest rate, which accrues during college, places a heavier repayment burden on the student than should be the case. The fact that the bill contains no requirement that the student borrower show a need for financial assistance indicates that it is not addressed to the able but needy student.

Therefore, it appears that the primary value of the loan insurance program that would be authorized by the instant bills would be the encouragement of loans of convenience whereby any student and/or his family may elect to finance the cost of education on a credit basis rather than out of current issues and assets. We would emphasize that the function of granting loans of convenience is today being carried on by commercial banks, insurance companies, and a host of time-payment college financing programs. Within the past 5 years the numbers of these programs have increased several times over. Tuition Plan, Inc., for instance, one of the oldest installment payment programs for college, wrote $50 million in short-term loans in fiscal 1959–60. Thus the provisions of both S. 611 and S. 656 are directed toward that area of financing the costs of a college education in which there is already extensive and expanding commercial activity and, as far as we know, there is no demonstrated evidence of the need for Federal provisions in this particular area at this time.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. While the Bureau of the Budget and Treasury reports are brief, that is usually true——

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

Mr. MORSE. All my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

The reports of the Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget usually are rather brief. The substantive report really comes from the department which has jurisdiction over an evaluation of the legislative effects of a proposed bill. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report is adverse to the proposal on its substantive nature.

I think the only place to make a record is in our presently constituted committee, which has never conducted hearings on the bill. I do not share my friend's view that if action is not taken on his bill by way of an amendment today there will be no opportunity for action this year.

After we pass the bill today we shall not close the door to further action on other proposed education legislation this year. In fact, several pieces of proposed education legislation will be before the Senate this year. Some of those will be coordinated with and closely related to the subject matter of higher education in this bill.

Let us consider the national defense education bill. We shall have a debate in the not too distant future on that. It is inextricably bound up with many of the subject matters of this bill.

I say to the Senator from Indiana, I do not think he should be discouraged and pessimistic, in thinking that he cannot get consideration of the bill unless the Senate takes action today.

Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks. I merely say, as chairman of the subcommittee, I consider myself duty bound to make the plea that the bill go to the committee for hearings. I think the most courteous treatment, under those circumstances, parliamentarily, that I could extend to the bill is not to have a judgment passed upon its merits but to have a judgment passed on a parliamentary question. That is why, when the Senator gets through, I shall move to lay his amendment on the table.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, does my distinguished colleague from Oregon feel that the committee would be favorably disposed toward conducting any additional hearings, in length, if we are not successful in obtaining passage of any type of education bill in this Congress?

Mr. MORSE. As I told the Senator, in behalf of the committee, I pledge to him that he will get what hearings he wishes on the bill.

Mr. HARTKE. On the basis of the pledge of the chairman, I yield back the remainder of time, and I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Presiding Officer announced the withdrawal of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana yielded back the remainder of his time and offered to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes; Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator offered to withdraw his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the Presiding Officer ruled?

Mr. HARTKE. I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself, I offer an amendment to the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, between lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

CANCELLATION AMENDMENT

SEC. 202. Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school, or an institution of higher education, in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the total of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon which was unpaid on the first day of such service for each complete academic year of such service."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment, insofar as an explanation is concerned, and I shall not take a great deal of time. I yield myself 10 minutes.

I wish to say initially that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio is similar to the one which is proposed by the junior Senator from New York and by me. We intend to support his amendment, but we think there are certain relatively minor changes which well might be made in order to strengthen it.

Under the National Defense Education Act at the present time those who graduate from college and become teachers in public elementary and secondary schools are forgiven up to 50 percent of their loans on the basis of 10 percent a year. The junior Senator from New York and I propose to make this forgiveness principle applicable to all teachers in all elementary and secondary schools as well as in our colleges and universities. The amendment is as simple as that.

I point out that in administering the national defense student loan program colleges and universities, in providing loans to students, must give special consideration to those students who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools. The priority is given to those who hope to enter the teaching field irrespective of whether they plan to teach in private or public schools.

The National Defense Education Act also provides that up to 50 percent of the loan will be canceled in the event that a graduate of a college or university becomes a teacher in a public elementary or secondary school. A student who wishes to teach in either a public or private school after graduation is given a priority with respect to getting a loan,

but only the teacher who teaches in the public school is given the loan cancellation privilege as a result of his teaching service.

We feel this is highly inconsistent and that in all equity any college graduate who receives a loan under the National Defense Education Act and who wishes to teach should be granted the right to forgiveness for up to 50 percent of his loan, regardless of whether he teaches in a public or private college or university. That seems equitable and fair.

The purpose of the act is to encourage young people who graduate from colleges and universities to enter the teaching profession. It seems to me all who enter that profession should be granted the forgiveness loan feature which now applies only to some of them.

We have a very definite shortage of teachers in this country. This is a way to rectify that shortage. All the amendment would do is to make it possible for any college graduate who intends to go into the teaching profession to be granted forgiveness of up to 50 percent of his loan at the rate of not more than 10 percent a year, regardless of whether he teaches in a public or private elementary or secondary school or in a college or university. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, the amendment is very simple. At the present time the only persons who receive the forgiveness are those who go into teaching in an elementary or secondary public school. The amendment would extend that same privilege to those who go into teaching in a private school or to those who go into teaching in a college.

The present distinction in the National Defense Education Act really does not have much meaning or justification behind it. The need for teachers is great in private schools and in colleges. What we seek is the education of all our young people, to bring about a greater standard of excellence and scholarship. The extension of the forgiveness feature to teachers in the other schools seems to me sound and in the national interest. A good many teachers have talked to me about this problem. The discriminatory features of the National Defense Education Act are widely resented. They serve no purpose but to downgrade teachers in our private schools and in colleges and universities. I for one believe that the present limitation is wholly unwarranted.

For example, we can visualize a teacher who has received a loan and is teaching in a private school or college while a classmate who has received a loan, is teaching in a public elementary school or secondary school. The latter will have 50 percent of his or her loan forgiven; the former will not. There is no constitutional or other impediment or problem. The amendment would merely bring about equity.

As I stated in my earlier remarks, I favor the principle of loans as opposed to scholarships; and if the day has come when we must give scholarships to young people in order to get them to go to college, we have reached a pretty sorry state. In college I enjoyed a scholarship that was earned. I worked, too, and I got as much, or probably more, out of what I did in work to get my education as I did from the funds that were given to me; and what was given to me was based upon my maintaining a certain standard.

Under the proposed program a student would not have to keep up any standard of scholarship at all if he could get by. Our desire is to strengthen that scholarship provision and to do what is even more in the interest of the young people themselves than in the interest of the country. It would contribute to the building of integrity and moral fiber, and would make recipients realize the value of an education.

Today the President sent to Congress a message on education and recommended a five-point program which is designed to help improve the quality of American teaching through scholarships, institutes, special project grants, research, and administration projects in the field of education. Every bit of the language which the President has used in his message is equally applicable to teachers in all elementary and secondary schools, and not merely those who are in public schools. The President has not discussed the question specifically, but it certainly appears from his message that he recognizes the need for improved teacher training facilities for private schools as well as public schools and, indeed, for teachers in institutions of higher learning. If such is the case, it is wholly inconsistent with his position not to extend the present loan forgiveness terms for teachers under the National Defense Education Act.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and I offer the proposal as an amendment with the feeling that it would improve the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and would rectify an injustice. I very much hope that the Senate will see fit to agree to the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to associate myself with the sponsors of the amendment, and particularly to express my agreement with the principle of nondiscrimination in connection with the loans which are provided. The private colleges are carrying a very large part of the burden of education in this country. In my view it is as important to stimulate the training of teachers for these great private institutions as it is to do so for the teachers of public institutions, who are also doing a great job.

I also wish to endorse the principle of the loan in contrast to the principle of the scholarship. I have had some experience in this field as a trustee for many years of one of our great universities.

For a great many years we provided loan funds for students, and it was very interesting to see the way the program developed. A student would borrow money from the loan fund while he was in college. When he had finished, he would then go to work or enter the practice of a profession. After he had begun to establish himself, his money started to return. Sometimes 20 or 30 years would be required to pay back the loans, but nevertheless the students wanted to do it and they were glad to do it. There was no pressure on them. There was no discipline. Nevertheless, they recognized that they had had the advantage of a loan which was very generous in its terms, and they were glad to recognize the responsibility to pay it back as a token of appreciation for those who had made the loan funds possible.

I do not think our students who would be taken care of under the pending amendment would object at all to the loan procedure in contrast to the scholarship procedure, and I hope that it will prevail.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes, because I want the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to have the full time available. Whenever I know what our parliamentary procedure will be, I like to give notice of such procedure. After a conference we have reached the conclusion that in due course of time I shall move to lay the Prouty-Keating amendment and the Lausche amendment on the table.

My case against the amendments can be simply stated in the following way: We feel that the appropriate place for the consideration of the subject matter of the amendments is when, in the not-too-distant future, we shall have the National Defense Education Act before the Senate. We shall have a whole series of National Defense Education Act amendments. We think that the subject matter ought to be considered at that time in connection with the National Defense Education Act rather than in connection with the bill now before the Senate.

Therefore, when the proponents of the bill have exhausted all the time they wish to use, I shall move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In my earlier remarks I dealt with the question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Oregon as to the timing of the amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio would amend the National Defense Education Act. I see no reason why we have to wait until that bill is before the Senate when we now have the problem before us of whether we are to have scholarships or loans. Since the amendment in chief is before us, having been offered by the Senator from Ohio, it seems to me we

should take every step to perfect or decline to perfect the amendment which he has offered. That is the reason we press the amendment, and feel it is appropriate to consider the amendment on its merits at this time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes are remaining to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I think the argument can be summarized very briefly. Consider the example of two students who go to the same college. They have both expressed a desire to engage in the teaching profession after their graduation. They are given special consideration by the college in getting a loan because of that intention. After graduation one teaches in a public elementary or secondary school. His loan would be forgiven up to 50 percent at the rate of 10 percent a year. The second teaches in a private school or a college. He would receive no forgiveness whatsoever. There certainly is a great deal of inconsistency in such an approach. I think it is unfair to those who are not allowed the forgiveness by virtue of the fact that they teach in a college, university, or private school. It seems to be in the interest of fairness to all the students under the proposed program that we extend these benefits across the board so that anyone who graduates from a college and enters the teaching profession will be entitled to receive loan forgiveness up to 50 percent at the rate of 10 percent a year.

I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time. I do ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his yielding back the remainder of his time? I wish to take a minute or two. Perhaps he may wish to speak again.

Mr. PROUTY. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point the statement of our committee in its report on National Defense Education Act amendments pending on the Senate Calendar, beginning at page 6 under "Title II: Loans to Students and Institutions of Higher Education."

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

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A. Existing law—National Defense Education Act of 1958

Purpose: To increase opportunities for needy and qualified students to continue their education beyond high school by establishing loan funds at institutions of higher education.

Provisions: Undergraduate and graduate students enrolled full time, in good academic standing, and in need of financial assistance and students accepted for enrollment may borrow up to $1,000 a year over a 5-year period. In the selection of students to receive loans special consideration must be given by participating institutions to (a) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools and (b) students whose academic background indicates superior capacity for or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

The repayment period begins 1 year after the student ceases to pursue full-time college studies and continues over a 10-year period at an interest rate of 3 percent a year, except that a borrower at his own option may accelerate the repayment of the whole or any part of such loan.

The liability to repay a loan is canceled upon death of borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner. Scheduled loan repayments need not be paid during periods when the borrower is a full-time college student or during up to 3 years of military service.

Students who become full-time teachers in a public elementary or secondary school are "forgiven" 10 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding on the first day of teaching (plus interest) for each academic year of service, up to a maximum of 50 percent of the loan.

The institution must have in its loan fund at all times at least $1 of institutional funds for each $9 of Federal capital contributions.

The Federal contribution to an institution's loan fund cannot exceed $250,000 a year.

Appropriations now authorized: Under the 1958 act appropriations for this title were authorized as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1959	$47,500,000
1960	75,000,000
1961	82,500,000
1962	90,000,000

For 4 fiscal years thereafter such sums as may be necessary to enable students who had obtained a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete their education.

Appraisal: The national defense student loan program has had a significant effect on the 1,400 participating institutions of higher education, and on the lives of many thousands of deserving students in those institutions who are seeking, often against heavy odds, to obtain a college education. It is estimated that as of June 1961 over $130 million were loaned to 230,000 students, an increase of 100,000 student borrowers in 1 year's time. Five years ago, prior to enactment of the National Defense Education Act, 83,000 students throughout the country borrowed only $13.4 million. Last year 115,000 students borrowed nearly four times that amount under National Defense Education Act alone.

Colleges and universities have made remarkable use of this program. Of the 1,400 participating institutions, 630 did not have loan programs on their campuses before passage of the National Defense Education Act. Moreover, many institutions have been encouraged to bring all of their student assistance efforts—grants-in-aid, work opportunities, loans, and scholarships—to bear on the problem of meeting the particular needs of each financially needy student.

The committee is impressed with the testimony it has heard and the evidence submitted by the Office of Education indicating that the student loans are in fact accomplishing the important purposes for which they were intended. First, they are being used to encourage able students to enter college despite financial need. Of the 115,450 loans made in the fall of 1959, 11,133 were originally loan commitments to high school seniors, and of the 115,000 loans made this past fall 18,000 were committed to high school seniors in the spring of 1960.

Second, this program is helping thousands of college students to continue and complete their education. As would be expected, the facts show that 72 percent of the students come from families with an annual income of $6,000 or less. Moreover, by providing loans on terms adjusted to the student status of the borrowers, the program has contributed to a more general acceptance of the loan concept as a means of helping to meet higher education costs. This is evidenced in the dramatic increase in college and State loan programs since the start of this program.

There is also evidence that in a substantial number of cases loans are enabling needy students to devote more of their energies to academic work by eliminating or reducing the number of hours previously devoted to gainful employment.

The "forgiveness" provision for teachers is proving to be an effective instrument to encourage college students to become teachers—63 percent of all the borrowers plan to teach, of whom 31 percent are men and 32 percent are women. Of 86,000 borrowers surveyed 15 percent plan to teach in public elementary schools, 38 percent in public secondary schools, and 10 percent in college.

B. National Defense Education Act Amendment of 1961

Amendment and extension: The committee believes that there will be a continuing need for this type of financial assistance for college students and that the national interest is well served by continued and expanded Federal participation. As pointed out in testimony, college enrollments are expected to double in this decade and college education costs continue to rise. Accordingly, the bill provides for a continuing authorization for this program upon a permanent basis. Over a period of years, however, as the institutions' student loan funds are increasingly augmented through repayment to these funds, Federal and institutional contributions will begin to diminish.

Under the reported bill, the committee has extended and modified the authorizations as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1962	$100,000,000
1963	125,000,000
1964	140,000,000
1965	155,000,000
1966 and thereafter	160,000,000

The bill retains the feature of partial cancellation of loans for borrowers who teach in public elementary and secondary schools and extends this provision to present or future borrowers who after enactment of the bill teach in private nonprofit schools, in institutions of higher learning, or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States. The continuing shortage of teachers extends to private nonprofit as well as to public schools and to all levels of our educational system, and this amendment would encourage college students to consider careers in college and university teaching in all types of schools and at all levels.

The committee believes that this will permit a more equitable allocation of loan funds among students in both large and small institutions of higher education.

In order to give emphasis to the fundamental importance of English in the curriculum and in consonance with the findings and declaration of policy in section 101, the act is amended to provide that preference be given, in the selection of students to receive loans, to individuals whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in English as well as to those who excel in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign languages. The act is also amended to give special consideration to students who express a desire to teach in institutions of higher education as well as in elementary or secondary schools.

Summer session student loan programs: Section 205(b) of the present act reads in part as follows:

"Loans from any such fund to any student by any institution of higher education * * * shall be made only to a student who * * * (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student * * * or is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student."

Section 144.2(1) of the regulations for the national defense student loan program defines a "full time" student as one who is enrolled in a sufficient number of credit hours or their equivalent to secure the degree or certificate toward which he is working in no more than the number of semesters or terms normally taken therefor.

The Manual of General Information and Instructions (1959–60) for the student loan program further states (p. 11) that—

"A student who is gradually acquiring credits toward a degree by part-time study in regular or evening session, and/or by full-time study in summer sessions only, may not be considered a full-time student."

Thus, the statute, and regulations based thereon, effectively prevent any student from participating in the loan program who attends either part time or on a summer session only basis.

Traditionally, career teachers have been the most active participants in summer session programs. The early professional training programs for teachers, which developed during the 19th century, were based on summer sessions, since the teacher was not available as a student during the months of the school year, from September to June. This same pattern is very much in existence today, for teachers are accustomed to acquiring advanced degrees and training during the summer vacation months. No other professional group in our society continues with as much formal advanced training following career employment.

Many States and most colleges require extensive graduate work as a qualification requirement for certification and promotion. Teachers are encouraged to attain advanced degrees, especially in those areas where subject matter and techniques of instruction have changed radically in the past few years.

For many teachers continued graduate training constitutes a difficult, if not impossible, financial hardship. The level of teacher salaries in many areas requires those with families to seek part-time and summer jobs to supplement income from teaching salaries. For these persons, attendance at summer session programs is virtually out of the question since vacation time must be spent in gainful employment.

The need for financial assistance to teachers attending summer sessions is statistically documented by the following findings drawn from a recent National Education Association report:

National Education Association report on salaries, summer school attendance, and part-time job activities of public elementary and secondary school teachers

I. Average salaries, fall 1960:

A. All classroom teachers	$5,215
B. All elementary schoolteachers	5,034
C. All secondary schoolteachers	5,500
D. All men classroom teachers	5,472
E. All women classroom teachers	5,025
F. All teachers and principles and supervisors	5,389

II. Attendance at summer school, summer, 1960: A 22.2 percent of 1,526,079 or 338,790 instructional staff in public elementary and secondary schools attended summer school.

National Education Association report on salaries, summer school attendance, and part-time job activities of public elementary and secondary school teachers—Con.

III. Part-time work:

A. 27 percent of 1,526,079 or 412,041 instructional staff in public elementary and secondary schools have summer jobs.

B. 15.4 percent of 1,526,079 or 235,016 instructional staff in public elementary and secondary schools have part-time jobs during the school year.

C. 64 percent of 411,109 or 263,110 men classroom teachers have summer jobs.

D. 13.2 percent of 997,853 or 131,717 women classroom teachers have summer jobs.

IV. Academic work required by local school systems, as of 1957:

A. 43.1 percent of 1,408,962 classroom teachers or 607,263 were required by local boards of education to take college courses periodically.

B. An additional 29.8 percent indicated that additional course work was not required by their boards of education but felt considerable pressure to take them.

Extension of present loan eligibility criteria to include full-time teachers enrolled for summer session programs will accomplish these purposes:

1. It will allow for extensive upgrading of instructional personnel through increased teacher attendance in graduate programs.

2. It will enhance the professional development of persons now employed as teachers, thereby providing improved instruction during the regular school year.

3. It will allow many teachers, especially men, to resume graduate training or begin it for the first time.

It should be pointed out that the Congress has earlier recognized the unique characteristics of advanced training for teachers. During the years of the GI bill following the close of World War II only those persons employed as full-time teachers were allowed to interrupt training from one year to the next. All other veterans were required to pursue full-time college programs in consecutive semesters. There is, thus, a definite precedent for the amendment to title II of the National Defense Education Act. The committee, in view of all of these factors, amended the act to provide loan assistance to summer session students who are teachers in elementary, secondary, or higher educational institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence what we do in this section of the report on the bill is identical in principle with what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York seek to accomplish by their amendment to the aid to higher education bill.

There is this great difference, however. By seeking to add it to the higher education bill in the form in which they are submitting it, they are in effect defeating the scholarship provisions of the bill. We believe that if it is really a loan provision that they want in respect to National Defense Education Act, with the forgiveness provisions which we provide already in the bill pending on the calendar, we believe we take the proper position by saying that we should wait until the National Defense Education Act is before us for consideration. By bringing it in on this bill it has the effect of really canceling out the effectiveness of the scholarship program.

As I said earlier this afternoon, it defeats the plea of the President of the United States which he specifically made in support of the scholarship program and which I am seeking to defend on the floor of the Senate.

For this reason I believe it is appropriate to consider it in connection with the National Defense Education Act, and that is why in due course of time I will make the motion to which I previously referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by my office entitled "Federal Financial Assistance to Students for Higher Education."

I will not list the total number, but there are 15 different ways in which the Federal Government at the present time is assisting students to obtain higher education. I believe it is helpful to have this information added in the RECORD during the consideration of this bill and other education bills.

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

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Total Defense Department, 1958–59, $300,877,000.

(a) Federal funds expended for education of military personnel while off duty, 1958–59, Air Force, $2,938,434.

(b) Federal funds expended for academic training of military personnel at civilian schools and service academies, 1959–60, $49,567,407. (Estimate.)

2. Atomic Energy Commission awards, total Federal funds expended for educational purposes by the Atomic Energy Commission, 1959–60, $58,451,000. (Estimate.)

3. Geographical field research in foreign areas: No information.

4. International educational exchange programs, total for exchange programs and activities, 1959–60, $29,348.051.

(a) Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs, 1959–60, $28,902,010.

(b) Additional funds, 1959–60, $446,041.

5. Total Federal funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs, 1958–59, $5,023,000.

(a) Federal funds expended for training at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration research centers, 1959–60, $119,855.

(b) Federal funds committed for National Aeronautics and Space Administration research contracts with educational institutions, 1959–60, $8,420,000.

6. National defense graduate fellowship program, 1959–60, $12,650,000.

7. National defense modern language fellowship program, 1959–60, total Federal funds expended, $499,877.

8. National defense student loan program, Federal funds obligated for the student loan program, 1959–60, $40,700,000.

9. Federal funds for research fellowships, direct traineeships, and training grants awarded by the Public Health Service, 1959–60, $87,602,000. (Estimate.)

10. National laboratories resident research associateships: No information.

11. National Science Foundation, Federal funds obligated for basic research, facilities, and education and training, 1959–60, $143 million. (Estimate.)

12. Quartermaster Corps visiting scientists research associateships: No information.

13. Federal funds expended by the Veterans' Administration for education and training, 1958–59:
(a) World War II veterans, $380,588.
(b) Korean war veterans, $565,984,930.
14. Federal funds expended for training and traineeships in vocational rehabilitation, 1959–60, $6,200,000. (Estimate.)
15. War orphans' educational assistance, 1958–59, $7,663,348.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time, and I now make the motion that the Keating-Prouty amendment be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORSE. They have already been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Prouty amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Then I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the so-called Keating-Prouty amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Anderson	Hickey	Morse
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Beall	Holland	Muskie
Bible	Humphrey	Neuberger
Burdick	Jackson	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Cannon	Jordan	Randolph
Carroll	Kefauver	Robertson
Case, N.J.	Kerr	Smathers
Church	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Douglas	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Mansfield	Symington
Engle	McCarthy	Talmadge
Ervin	McClellan	Thurmond
Gore	McGee	Wiley
Gruening	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Monroney	

NAYS—28

Aiken	Dirksen	Murphy
Allott	Dworshak	Pearson
Bennett	Fong	Prouty
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Butler	Keating	Tower
Carlson	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Morton	
Curtis	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart	Fulbright	Russell
Chavez	Goldwater	Scott
Cooper	Hart	Yarborough
Dodd	Kuchel	
Ellender	Long, Mo.	

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. PROUTY and Mr. KEATING to Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allott	Eastland	Pearson
Beall	Ervin	Prouty
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Boggs	Holland	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Butler	Jordan	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Talmadge
Carlson	Lausche	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	McClellan	Tower
Cotton	Miller	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Mundt	
Dworshak	Murphy	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Anderson	Hickey	Morse
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bible	Humphrey	Muskie
Burdick	Jackson	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Pastore
Cannon	Johnston	Pell
Carroll	Kefauver	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Kerr	Randolph
Church	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Clark	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Magnuson	Sparkman
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Fong	McCarthy	Wiley
Gore	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart	Fulbright	Russell
Chavez	Goldwater	Scott
Cooper	Hart	Yarborough
Dodd	Kuchel	
Ellender	Long, Mo.	

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was defeated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "2-2-62—D." I ask to modify my amendment by inserting between line 7 on page 1 and line 1 on page 7 the following:

On page 6, line 2, before "institution," insert "public."

On page 6, line 3, before "higher," insert "public."

I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I think I can make it clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

The amendments offered by Mr. ERVIN, as modified, are as follows:

On page 2, line 17, before "institutions" insert "public".

On page 3, line 7, strike out "institutions of higher education or to" and insert in lieu thereof "public institutions of higher education or to public".

On page 3, line 12, strike out "institutions of higher education or" and insert in lieu thereof "public institutions of higher education or public".

On page 6, line 2, before "institution" insert "public".

On page 6, line 3, before "higher" insert "public".

On page 12, line 15, strike out "an institution" and insert in lieu thereof "a public institution".

On page 14, line 10, before "higher education" insert "public".

On page 14, line 1, strike out "(1)".

On page 14, line 13, before "institutions" insert "public".

On page 14, line 16, beginning with ", or (2)" strike out all to the period on page 15, line 4.

On page 38, strike out lines 18 through 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The term 'public institution of higher education' means an institution of higher education under public supervision and control, but does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States."

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A bill to authorize assistance to public institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in institutions of higher education, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consultation with the various interested Members of the Senate, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request, to which I ask the Senate to give its consideration: that debate on the Ervin amendment be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the author of the amendment, and 10 minutes by the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the amendment is very simple. It provides that loans of Federal tax moneys authorized to be made by title I of the bill be restricted to public institutions of higher learning.

The purpose of the amendment is to make certain that no funds shall be taken from the Public Treasury for the building of academic facilities at church-owned or church-controlled schools.

I say that my amendment is necessary to make this bill comply with the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment.

Everybody admits the Government cannot take funds and make absolute gifts to church-owned or church-controlled institutions of higher learning. The proponents of the bill contend, however, that while the first amendment prohibits the grant of tax moneys to church-owned or church-controlled schools, it permits soft, easy, low-interest-rate loans over long periods of time, such as 50 years or 100 years or 1,000 years, to be made to church-owned or church-controlled schools.

That argument is not flattering to the intelligence of the Founding Fathers who drafted and ratified the first amendment. It places a very low estimate upon their linguistic and legal abilities. If it were valid it would show that the Founding Fathers did not do what they intended to do. We know from the testimony of Thomas Jefferson exactly what the Founding Fathers intended to do when they drafted and ratified the first amendment. Thomas Jefferson has said they intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state. They did erect a wall of separation between church and state. That wall will stand until constitutional truth is rewritten or nullified to comply with the demands of those religious groups which demand that they be given access to the Treasury of the United States and be permitted to use tax funds to finance their activities.

Madam President, there is no basis whatever under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States for any argument that the amendment, which prohibits gifts, permits loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator allotted to himself has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Have my 10 minutes expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the understanding of the Chair that the Senator had asked for 3 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. No. I yielded to myself my entire time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the Supreme Court of the United States declared, on page 16 of the Everson case, that neither the Federal Government nor a State government is permitted by the first amendment to aid any or all religions. Madam President, it is absurd to argue that if the Federal Government makes a long-term loan, a low rate loan, to a church-owned or a church-controlled college and that church-owned or church-controlled college, by reason of the loan, accumulates fee simple title to valuable land and valuable academic buildings that the Federal Government is not aiding the church-owned or church-controlled college.

The Supreme Court of the United States has also declared that the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbids government to finance religious groups. Madam President, it is absurd to assert that the Federal Government is not financing church-owned or church-controlled colleges when it loans them money out of the Federal Treasury to build buildings of any character for any purpose and collects from them payments upon the principal of those loans and payments for interest on those loans. That is certainly financing church-owned or church-controlled colleges.

The Supreme Court of the United States declared, on page 16 of the Everson case, that the first amendment forbids government from participating in the affairs of religious organizations. When the Federal Government loans money to church-owned or church-controlled colleges for the purpose of building academic facilities of any character for any purpose, and collects from those colleges interest and payments upon the principal of loans, it is certainly participating in the affairs of those religious organizations.

The Supreme Court has declared in two cases—page 314 in the Zorach case and page 212 in the McCollum case—that the first amendment prohibits the Government from participating in the blending of secular and religious education. In a dissenting opinion which is not controverted by the majority opinion on this point, Mr. Justice Rutledge, declares that the reason we have these church-owned or church-controlled colleges is so that they can teach both religion and secular courses, and that any institution which teaches both secular courses and religion is barred from the

right to receive Government tax aid under the first amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I have very limited time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a brief question.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator's amendment have any effect upon the loans which are now being made by the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the building of dormitories?

Mr. ERVIN. No, because it is restricted to the pending bill. It is not related to anything being done under other bills.

Madam President, after I pointed out that the bill is a bald violation of the first amendment, the proponents of the bill advanced the theory that a church-owned or church-controlled college could segregate secular education from religious education and say, "This building represents a nonreligious activity of this college," and that building represents a religious activity of this college, and obtain loans for the construction of buildings of the first class.

That is precisely what Justice Rutledge said could not be done. Consequently, the Morse-Hill amendment does not harmonize the bill and the first amendment.

Madam President, if the Congress, whose Members have sworn to uphold the first amendment to the Constitution, should pass this bill in its present form; and if the President, who has repeatedly assured the American people that he believes in the separation of church and state, should sign this bill in its present form the resulting statute would mark the first major break-through for those religious groups which have been demanding that they be given access to the Federal Treasury and permitted to finance their activities with tax money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes of the Senator from North Carolina have expired.

Mr. ERVIN. May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I will yield the Senator 2 minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the issue raised by my amendment is very simple. No Senator should have any trouble reaching a decision as to how he should vote thereon. If a Senator favors giving religious groups access to the Treasury of the United States and permitting them to use tax moneys to finance their activities, he ought to vote against my amendment. However, if a Senator does not believe in giving religious groups access to the Federal Treasury and permitting them to finance their activities with tax moneys, he ought to vote for my amendment. This is true *because my* amendment makes it plain that no religious groups shall be permitted to place their hands in the Government till where tax moneys are deposited.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes from the time on the bill. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina a question.

Under the amendment, I take it the University of Chicago, which is a private university, could not get a loan.

Mr. ERVIN. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yale University, which is a private university, could not get a loan.

Mr. ERVIN. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could Harvard obtain a loan?

Mr. ERVIN. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Northwestern University, which I believe has something of a denominational tag, could get no loan?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not know about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Duke University, which is located in the State of the Senator, could receive no loan?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. I might say to the Senator from Illinois that the universities he has mentioned are in sounder financial condition than the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am also thinking of the small institutions that are spreading and need funds for academic purposes, but if they are not public institutions, but are privately endowed, no matter what their condition is, they would be excluded from the benefits of the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. The reason I have offered the amendment in that form is to make it certain that no religious institution would have access to the Treasury of the United States. I might say that under the decisions there is also some serious doubt whether Congress has authority to make provision for the support of private colleges on the theory that tax money can only be used for public purposes, and that the use of such money by a private nondenominational college is for a private purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I shall reply briefly to my friend from North Carolina. I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment shortly. In my judgment, the Hill-Morse amendment, which was added yesterday to the bill, is the answer to the Senator from North Carolina. It would accomplish, in my judgment, the legitimate purpose that the Senator has in mind without doing damage to a large number of young men and women going to private colleges in this country. I point out that 40 percent of the college students in America today are going to private institutions. Sixty percent of the colleges of America today are private institutions. Yesterday we agreed to the Hill-Morse amendment, which reads as follows:

(2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, (B) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (C) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

I say that that amendment gives us our protection of separation of church and state. I do not yield to any other Member of this body, including my very dear friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in support of the principle of separation of church and state. We have protected that principle through the Hill-Morse amendment.

I point out that we protected the principle also in connection with other loans that we have made through Congress.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] raised a point a minute or two ago. We have loaned money totaling $1,565 million-plus to the college housing program. Yesterday an attempt was made by my good friend from North Carolina to draw some line of distinction between facilities for the care of students on the campus and some other facility on the campus. I good naturedly said to him: "Of course, there cannot possibly be a university without students, and there can be no students unless we provide the facilities with which to care for them." The $1,565 million-plus involves many millions of dollars in loans to private institutions.

The Senator from North Carolina loses me in a matter of form when he tries to draw a distinction between what we have already done in college housing programs and what we propose to do in the program before us. Note also that under the bill we have the appropriation check in Congress. Under the provisions of the bill any private institution desiring to obtain a loan must come to the Federal Government, submit its plan for the loan, show what the loan will go into and what kind of building it will be spent on. We have all these safeguards. So I do not think there is any danger whatsoever in connection with the fear which the Senator has expressed here today. What I have said is in no way inconsistent with any decision that the U.S. Supreme Court has rendered.

I point out another area in which we have made millions of dollars available. Let us consider the National Defense Education Act and the amount of money that we made available under that program. Let us also consider other Federal expenditures. So long as we have safeguards and protections, we need not worry about the fears expressed on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has joined with us in bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate. The vote to do so was 10 to 2. He is a man whose

views on the issue of the separation of church and state are well known. I am sure I can speak for him when I say that if he had the slightest idea there was any danger that the bill would violate the principle that the Senator from North Carolina has advocated here this afternoon, the Senator from Alabama would not be standing shoulder to shoulder with me in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. PASTORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and then I shall yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, this question was thoroughly explored in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the Subcommittee on Education. The Senator who now speaks with knowledge in reference to this particular proposal, the Ervin amendment, will recall that no one more assiduously attacked this situation to find the answer which would be justifiable under the Constitution than did the Senator from West Virginia. I made a rather extended speech on this subject yesterday afternoon. I am thoroughly satisfied that, by the adoption of the Hill-Morse amendment, the protection of the principle of separation of church and state is adequate.

No one on the committee was more cognizant of the significance to our time of the fundamental principles so wisely adopted by the Founding Fathers of our Republic as they enshrined in our Constitution the protections of the first amendment. The solutions to safeguard this precious principle in the pending bill which have been adopted are to the best of my belief both real and wholesome. I had wrestled with this problem in subcommittee and in full committee, as my votes in executive session will show, in a determination that the limits in our Constitution should not be overstepped. The bill as now drafted I feel sets forth in the educational area a sound policy which flows directly from the philosophy of our founders.

With all deference to my colleague the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I must say that basically we are in agreement, but certainly I believe that the language of the bill as now drawn, to which I have referred, is comprehensive and leaves no loophole. I am satisfied, and shall vote with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from West Virginia has been very helpful to me, and I very much appreciate his help.

I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, is it fair to assume from the argument made by the senior Senator from Oregon that, insofar as Federal loans are concerned to institutions of higher learning and students who attend—let us say, Georgetown University—under the testimony there is no distinction between the room in which a student sleeps and the room in which he studies chemistry?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

I have only one further point to make and then I shall close. As was brought out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Ervin amendment would also apply to the many private institutions in this country that are not denominationally sponsored. Such a provision would be most unfair and unjust in its result. My friend from North Carolina has spoken about the financial status of great institutions like Duke, Chicago, and Columbia Universities. The costs of education are ever climbing. Those universities are rendering a great service to this country by developing to the maximum extent possible the potential brainpower of their students. We ought to be partners with them, to the extent provided in the bill, to see to it that the precious brainpower resources of our country are not wasted.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not the interest provisions for the repayment of the loans in the pending bill are identical with those in the National Defense Education Act relating to the construction of dormitories.

Mr. MORSE. It has been worked out very carefully with the Treasury Department, so that we have a formula which gives us assurance that the interest is high enough to pay for the cost of the use of the money.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not it is the same formula that is used for the dormitory provisions in the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. MORSE. No. It provides for an interest rate as high, but this is a different formula. It was submitted by the Treasury Department with respect to this bill. It is an adjustable formula which gives assurance that the cost of the use of the money is covered, so that there is no hidden interest subsidy in the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Bennett	Ervin	Robertson
Bible	Hayden	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hickey	Talmadge
Cannon	Jordan	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Tower

NAYS—72

Aiken	Gruening	Morse
Allott	Hartke	Morton
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Moss
Bartlett	Hill	Mundt
Beall	Holland	Murphy
Boggs	Hruska	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bush	Jackson	Pastore
Butler	Javits	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Pell
Carlson	Keating	Prouty
Carroll	Kefauver	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Kerr	Randolph
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Saltonstall
Church	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Clark	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Cotton	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dirksen	McCarthy	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Wiley
Dworshak	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fong	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart	Fulbright	Russell
Chavez	Goldwater	Scott
Cooper	Hart	Yarborough
Dodd	Kuchel	
Ellender	Long, Mo.	

So Mr. ERVIN's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, it was more than two centuries ago that John Pope made the observation:

"Tis education forms the common mind;
Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined.

Both before his time and since, the need for and benefits of education have been generally conceded. Tracing the history of this country, it is patently obvious that credit for the progress we have made can, in large part, be laid to the growth and extent of education. Our

modern day society offers challenges never before conceived. Our race headlong into space, with a landing on the moon at least an intermediate objective, raises technical problems of complexity surpassed in number only by the dollars required to make the space vehicle airborne. Closer to home, we have only to look at the myriad of fabrics devised to clothe us, cover our floors, wrap our foodstuffs; the appearance of computers and calculators, and a host of innovations taking place around us—to be convinced that education plays an integral part in the proper advancement of society.

S. 1241, the bill we are being asked to consider, has as its objective a three-pronged attack on the alleged needs of our college level educational system. In the first place, it proposes assistance, in the form of loans, to public and private, nonprofit, institutions of higher education; secondly, scholarship grants to high school students to assist them in securing a college education; and, finally, a formula of matching Federal-State grants to assist the construction needs of junior colleges. On those terms it is conspicuously all embracive.

Judging by the hearings held on this bill, it would appear that those associated with our colleges and universities today are in uniform agreement that Federal funds offer the only solution to the construction needs presently besetting them. The bill's provisions on that score offer loans up to $1.5 billion over a 5-year period for college academic facilities including construction, expansion, or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities, as well as necessary equipment. Loans are parceled out on a State basis, and provisions are made for repayment to the U.S. Treasury within 50 years at a very modest rate of interest. Other provisions assure that the money will not be spent on frills, that construction will be along frugal lines, and that a condition precedent for eligibility will eliminate those institutions capable of securing private financing. The companion program for assistance to junior colleges is far less broad and consists of a $250 million fund to be spent over a 5-year period, on a matching fund basis. In my own State we could look forward to a Federal allotment of $456,597 in the event Colorado would match that sum with $913,194. Unquestionably, this could go a long way toward meeting rudimentary needs, although I am informed that in addition to construction problems, some of the institutions in Colorado, at least, also have a pressing need for assistance in the area of housing needs which are not being met.

As a coauthor of the National Defense Education Act, I am keenly aware of the fact that buildings, classrooms, and other physical equipment do not of themselves form a college or university. It is the student body which forms the basis for the need and the continuing demand for such institutions. In my judgment, the obligation of educators today, on all levels from elementary through graduate schools, is to afford our youth the opportunity to extract the maximum learning to the extent of their abilities. Implementing this obligation must be private sources, as well as State and local funds. In the event none of those channels is responsive for lack of funds, then it behooves the Federal Government to fill in the breach. But, it should be made very clear that the opportunity to secure an education—within the youngsters' abilities—is not tantamount to the guarantee of a diploma for one and all, particularly at the college and graduate level, for such is not the case. On the contrary, education's goals should afford the right to schooling based upon the product of the individual's innate ability combined with the motivating force which drives him. So long as these factors exist, opportunities to satiate the thirst must be provided if we as a nation are to produce, progress, and perform.

As the scholarship portion of the bill is written, it would permit State boards, established for that purpose, to make awards based upon two criteria: ability and need. I take exception to the latter criterion. Realizing full well the basic obstacle which is sought to be overcome, nevertheless I caution my colleagues that we may be extremely nearsighted in our approach. We would do well to consider the fact that scholarships, in general, serve two purposes, the more obvious of which is to furnish students with an opportunity to attend institutions of higher learning, who, absent this assistance, might not attend. Although, parenthetically, I might add that even private scholarships do not, uniformly, attach the need requirement. Be that as it may, the more subtle purpose is the general stimulus which scholarships prompt. Naturally, each and every school wants to capture its share of these awards, with the result that there is a built-in incentive to raise the quality of the school's products in order to meet the competition. This is an exceedingly important and healthy factor, not to be overlooked. The net effect is to upgrade the standard of educational institutions generally. My concern is with the "need" requirement; my conclusion being that it will tend to reduce the stimulus which might otherwise be present. Despite the sliding scale implicit in the bill from a maximum of $1,000 per year to the minimum of a certificate, this whole approach represents an inherent weakness which ought to be remedied. It is to lose sight of the most important objective, namely, encouraging the able; and discriminatory, in a sense, to eliminate those worthy of recognition simply because they may come from families with means. I can foresee, as all of you can, the difficulties, well-nigh insurmountable, in deciding where the need line must be drawn.

The bill, apart from defects which I have attempted to underscore, has merit, and I will give it my support. My personal observations lead me to the conclusion that education today lays too much stress upon cultivating the average, giving inadequate opportunities to those who offer evidence of brilliance. I sometimes wonder whether, in the main, education does not assume the nature of an educational tranquilizer. However, I expect to have more to say on that subject on another occasion.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I offer an amendment to S. 1241 which would increase allotments in high-cost States such as Alaska. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, it is proposed to insert the following:

Strike out "and" on line 15 and insert the following on line 17 after ".75" and before the semicolon:

", and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of school construction in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate."

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the amendment I propose would apply only to junior colleges.

It is designed to accommodate those States where the high cost of living and the soaring cost of construction impede progress. The language I suggest is identical to that which was contained in S. 1021 as it was reported by the committee and as it passed the Senate last session.

My amendment permits the Commissioner of Education to aid those States where the cost of school construction exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of two or more. The Commissioner determines the median on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities as has been determined previously under law.

During the debate on S. 1021, I stressed that we in Alaska seek no special favors. We ask only that the unique aspects of our economy be taken into account as legislation is considered.

The unbearably high costs of transportation to Alaska can increase costs by as much as 100 percent above what is charged in other areas of the United States. Decades of indifference prior to statehood have deprived Alaska of Federal funds other States received automatically. Our lack of proper highways, our dependence on water and air transportation, have increased the cost of living in Alaska.

Our schools in the 49th State are scattered throughout four time zones. The Alaska State Board of Education has stated:

In most instances people, supplies, equipment, building materials, and fuel must rely upon airplane transportation.

Many times such transportation must be chartered, and this factor increases the cost of construction.

When a person comments that wages are high in Alaska, I agree. Then I explain that the cost of living within the State can vary from 30 percent to more than 100 percent over the average cost in most other States. We must never forget, nor neglect, to consider the extent of purchasing power.

It is common, perhaps, to bracket Alaska with wealthier States such as New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Illinois, but let us then recall that $500,000 spent in any of these four great States will buy a great deal more than an equal amount spent in Alaska.

The National Education Association has studied the per-pupil cost of education. I am not surprised that Alaska leads the Nation in this dubious honor. The amendment I propose will make it possible for Alaska to participate equitably and equally in the educational activities of the New Frontier.

We need the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act as we seek to educate our youth. We cannot expect this Nation to attain its maturity if its college facilities are substandard or, worse, nonexistent.

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy told us that college enrollment would double in 10 years. He quoted H. G. Wells who once wrote:

> Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe.

The President has passed the educational relay stick to the Congress. Let us not drop it during this important lap.

In his introductory remarks on S. 1241 the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expressed his belief that the mobilization of our intellectual resources in this decade can be more crucial to the Nation's future than was mobilization of physical resources in World War II. Probably no other Member of the Senate is better able to assess the true value of education than is the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

He approaches the Nation's need realistically, and it is on such a basis that I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, because the amendment is identical with the formula which we adopted in S. 1021 with respect to the recognition of extraordinarily high costs of construction in Alaska.

The amendment means that Alaska will get a $6,031 increase in matching funds, for which it will have to contribute $12,062 of its own money. The amendment merely brings the two formulas into line. It is fair and equitable. I accept the amendment and I am willing to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1134, H.R. 8900.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of H.R. 8900 be stricken and that the text of the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I think it is quite relevant to the program on which we are about to vote to be reminded of the college housing program which provides for direct loans at low interest in the development of housing and related service facilities for students and faculty where such assistance is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms. The program also includes assistance to hospitals in providing housing for student nurses and interns.

The program was established under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950. The law was amended by the Housing Act of 1955 to cover loans for such revenue-producing educational facilities as cafeterias, dining halls, student centers, and infirmaries, but excluded stadiums and gymnasiums. This law also contained specific provisions to bring into the program junior colleges offering at least a 2-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree. The Housing Act of 1957 extended eligibility to hospitals for housing facilities for student nurses and interns.

Program policies are directed toward assuring the soundness of all loans and thereby the full protection of the interest of the Federal Government, private lending institutions, and the borrower; and toward avoiding any interference with the applicant institution's academic policies and operations. Particular emphasis is given to the encouragement of the applicant's participation in the financing of the project, in order to minimize the required Federal investment.

INTEREST RATES

Initially, the interest rates charged on college housing loans were established by a mandatory formula specified in the Housing Act of 1950. The Housing Amendments of 1953 provided for their determination by the Administrator. The Housing Amendments of 1955 reestablished a mandatory formula under which the Administrator may establish a loan rate of 2.75 percent or the rate charged by the Treasury on program borrowings plus 0.25 percent, whichever is higher. Under the statute, the Treasury borrowing rate is fixed with reference to the average interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States. Outstanding loan commitments accordingly carry a variety of rates, dependent upon the rate in effect at the time the original undertaking was made. The current interest rate—applicable until June 30, 1962—is 3⅜ percent.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN FUND

The program is financed through a revolving fund which is supported by an authorization to borrow from the Treasury as a public-debt transaction. The initial enactment in 1950 provided a borrowing authorization of $300 million; this amount has been increased on several occasions to a total of $1,975 million, which amount shall be increased by $300 million on July 1 of each of the years 1962 through 1964. Within the total current program authorization, there are two specific sublimitations: First, loans for service facilities other than living accommodations, such as cafeterias, dining halls, student centers, and infirmaries, shall not exceed $205 million, which amount shall be increased by $30 million on July 1 of each of the years 1962 through 1964; and second, loans to hospitals for housing of student nurses and interns shall not exceed $130 million, which limit shall be increased by $30 million on July 1 of each of the years 1962 through 1964.

The unused balance in the college housing loan revolving funds as of December 31, 1961, is $183,314,000.

PROGRESS OF PROGRAM THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1961

As of December 31, 1961, the college housing program had contracted for a total of $1,565 million of loans to colleges, and $37 million of loans to hospitals for student nurse and intern housing. In addition commitments have been issued to colleges and hospitals for $190 million. Under existing contracts, Federal loans will be used to build 376,811 accommodations under the college dormitory program, and 8,081 accommodations for student nurses and interns.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks tables showing, first, State totals under the college housing program cumulative since its beginning; and, second, activity under the program for calendar years 1960 and 1961 by States.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

College housing program—Cumulative totals through Dec. 31, 1961

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Colleges			Hospitals		
	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations
Alabama	35	$29,577	7,719	1	$372	124
Alaska	2	2,920	339			
Arizona	13	15,398	4,286			
Arkansas	33	23,555	5,493	1	500	207
California	64	106,784	26,771	2	392	29
Colorado	39	42,227	9,799			
Connecticut	11	15,739	2,680			
Delaware	5	4,404	1,375	1	250	48
District of Columbia	12	16,204	2,988			
Florida	29	39,040	10,523	1	200	98
Georgia	27	22,936	6,977	3	2,645	672
Hawaii	3	1,249	220			
Idaho	10	4,632	752			
Illinois	68	73,659	17,403	4	2,277	508
Indiana	41	61,405	12,377			
Iowa	26	14,656	4,200			
Kansas	46	29,523	7,156	5	1,786	430
Kentucky	40	38,573	9,382			
Louisiana	32	47,443	9,915			
Maine	2	680	225			
Maryland	14	12,132	3,275	2	621	185
Massachusetts	41	50,825	8,768	1	300	60
Michigan	23	35,234	8,575	2	523	44
Minnesota	27	27,614	6,606	2	1,035	270
Mississippi	28	25,694	7,251			
Missouri	59	64,477	15,146	4	1,791	414
Montana	17	12,800	2,493	1	776	117
Nebraska	13	$5,471	1,243	2	$1,015	292
Nevada	1	2,042	400			
New Hampshire	6	5,959	1,364			
New Jersey	25	28,814	6,161	4	1,905	296
New Mexico	13	9,828	1,721			
New York	100	141,832	30,090	13	9,296	1,538
North Carolina	44	36,644	12,552	1	585	40
North Dakota	9	6,006	1,818			
Ohio	79	79,148	22,446	5	2,029	472
Oklahoma	19	16,317	3,919	2	725	176
Oregon	20	12,014	2,621	2	940	137
Pennsylvania	92	82,214	20,322	8	4,395	1,187
Puerto Rico	6	8,243	1,662			
Rhode Island	11	10,863	2,042			
South Carolina	20	14,520	3,609			
South Dakota	23	13,189	4,130	1	480	100
Tennessee	35	26,127	9,514			
Texas	100	101,610	26,298	1	356	92
Utah	14	12,150	2,574			
Vermont	16	10,650	2,503			
Virginia	18	10,153	2,545	3	913	361
Washington	38	51,374	10,563	1	498	20
West Virginia	33	18,632	4,158			
Wisconsin	24	41,341	9,776	2	600	164
Wyoming	1	635	136			
Total	[1] 1,507	1,565,156	376,861	[1] 75	37,205	8,081

[1] Combined projects are listed separately.

College housing program—Approval comparison between 1960 and 1961

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Colleges						Hospitals					
	Calendar year 1960			Calendar year 1961			Calendar year 1960			Calendar year 1961		
	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations
Alabama	6	$6,665	1,416	14	$12,033	2,703	1	$372	124			
Alaska	1	1,750	168									
Arizona	3	6,000	1,522	1	500							
Arkansas	4	5,160	1,312	6	4,122	904						
California	6	10,955	1,377	19	28,381	5,627				1	$165	14
Colorado	3	2,602	753	8	11,329	2,323						
Connecticut	5	7,552	979	2	3,250	621						
Delaware	1	1,190	550	1	335		1	250	48			
District of Columbia				2	3,700	750						
Florida	2	1,280	438	9	12,541	2,208						
Georgia	2	877	289	11	7,910	2,558				1	1,750	500
Hawaii				1	172	56						
Idaho	3	720	142	2	2,095							
Illinois	7	12,950	2,571	11	10,420	2,387	2	1,500	364			
Indiana	2	1,855	440	11	19,760	3,802						
Iowa	1	230	72	7	4,975	1,062						
Kansas	4	1,720	512	11	6,985	1,693	1	742	156	2	500	144
Kentucky	7	5,898	1,378	9	12,433	2,463						
Louisiana	3	5,509	1,075	9	16,984	3,959						
Maine				1	350	128						
Maryland	1	345	97	4	3,290	628	1	151	60			
Massachusetts	6	6,335	714	13	23,771	3,932	1	300	60			
Michigan	2	2,190	485	7	11,200	3,544						
Minnesota	3	2,985	722	5	5,745	1,181				1	725	200
Mississippi	4	2,015	666	8	6,693	2,240						
Missouri	7	7,273	1,365	16	23,927	5,812				2	666	114
Montana	4	4,693	692	2	1,495	296	1	776	117			
Nebraska	2	1,175	214	4	1,620	342	1	500	156			
Nevada												
New Hampshire				2	1,390	316						
New Jersey	6	8,230	2,129	6	7,220	1,351	1	500	106	2	905	88
New Mexico	3	1,435	188	2	2,550	536						
New York	14	22,301	5,925	18	31,630	6,341	2	1,375	232	3	4,160	437
North Carolina	3	3,371	1,220	14	11,790	3,784				1	585	40
North Dakota	1	1,200	436	2	1,650	423						
Ohio	10	9,298	2,454	21	26,410	8,098	1	500	114	1	670	150
Oklahoma	4	1,615	335	5	5,610	1,572				1	225	56
Oregon	2	1,610	360	5	3,564	661				1	440	33
Pennsylvania	12	11,286	2,268	21	23,306	5,841				3	1,650	242
Puerto Rico	2	1,275	319									
Rhode Island	2	1,785	452	2	1,720	229						
South Carolina	4	1,015	292	3	3,394	1,367						
South Dakota	2	2,475	550	5	3,220	936						
Tennessee	4	5,950	2,075	9	7,232	2,075						
Texas	7	6,529	1,534	29	29,408	7,066						
Utah	2	975	172	1	425	120						
Vermont	3	3,575	889	3	1,675	373						
Virginia	1	670	160	6	3,931	832	2	761	255			
Washington	3	2,771	476	12	21,805	4,311				1	498	20
West Virginia	8	5,356	1,089	5	2,512	356						
Wisconsin	3	1,255	223	5	10,505	3,139	1	350	92			
Wyoming				1	635	136						
Total	185	193,901	43,495	371	437,598	101,082	16	8,077	1,884	20	12,939	2,088

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the bill, if the minority leader is ready to do likewise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, based upon the arguments I have made in support of my belief about the infirmities of title I, although I believe in titles II and III, I still cannot vote for this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, believing, as I do, that title I of this measure violates the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment of the Constitution, I cannot vote for the bill, notwithstanding my belief in its other provisions.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the able Senator from West Virginia.

CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, last Friday, during the debate as recorded on page 1354 of the RECORD of February 2, a timely comment was expressed by the knowledgeable Senator from Oregon concerning juvenile delinquency and crime. The floor leader for this important pending legislation indicated that the youth in relationship to the growth of population have an aggravated record for lawbreaking. It was his belief, which I share, that a stronger educational system will mitigate against this tragic trend.

In this connection a comprehensive article has come to my attention which sets forth the disturbing facts and figures in regard to the rates of increase among the population between the ages of 10 and 17 in the United States.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article dealing with this subject. It was written by Bernard Gavzer, an Associated Press news features writer; and I ask unanimous consent that in printing the article there be included the various statistical tables in connection with it.

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

WE LIVE IN A CRIME EXPLOSION

(By Bernard Gavzer)

WASHINGTON.—Since the end of World War II, the U.S. population has increased by 39 million, the gross national product (GNP) has reached a record $503.2 billion a year.

In this period, we shot our first rocket into space, found an answer to polio, added two States to our Union, and put a television set into practically every home.

It was also the era of the crime explosion.

What you can see and hear of it is staggering.

What you can't see is bigger.

This is what Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover are talking about when they say crime ranks high among the Nation's major domestic problems.

FBI statistics for 1961 are not yet complete—and won't be until late February or early March—but it is already clear that it will go down as another year in which crime has continued the spiral begun in 1946.

The crime bill, says Hoover, now amounts to more than $60 million a day.

To most people, the word "crime" means violence. The murderer, the burglar, the sex offender makes a direct assault. His crime strikes close to home. The victim has a name.

But this is only one part of crime. There are two other broad areas:

Big time organized crime.

Nonviolent, white-collar crime.

All have been on the rise.

The evidence indicates that the greatest increase has been in white-collar and organized crime.

Says Hoover: "We can trace our increasing crime rates today primarily to two malignant conditions—public apathy and moral deterioration or decay of our population."

And Attorney General Kennedy comments:

"The television quiz scandals of several years ago; the basketball scandals; the corruption the McClellan committee found in important parts of labor, management, and the bar; the revelations that members of the Denver Police Department were themselves operating active and lucrative burglary rings, and this after similar revelations in Chicago; the corruption of public officials—all of this must be a source of sorrow and concern to every one of us."

Hoover and Kennedy have a special vantage point. Into their offices in the Department of Justice pours the daily story of breakdown in law and order. Bit by bit it comes together into an overwhelming picture. This is what they see:

ORGANIZED CRIME

A multibillion-dollar industry. The vice lords are no longer Al Capone-type loudmouths but shrewd manipulators who keep out of the public eye, wear banker's gray, send their kids to private schools and take European jaunts. They traffic in extortion, labor racketeering, narcotics, prostitution, bootlegging, gambling, and anything else that can turn a profitable dollar. They have steadily invaded legitimate businesses.

Illegal gambling alone produces a yearly profit of $7 billion. The handle, or amount of money gambled, comes to an estimated $47 billion—or more than the 1960 U.S. defense budget.

Its power and riches outclass anything organized crime could have dreamed of in the lawless prohibition era.

Organized crime, says Kennedy, is richer, more firmly entrenched and more powerful than ever.

WHITE-COLLAR CRIME

Because of its nature, white-collar crime is the most difficult to spot. But there are ways to measure it.

The Surety Association of America represents firms which bond people in positions of trust. It estimates that $1 billion a year is stolen by persons in such positions. This loss is nearly twice the amount caused annually in all known burglaries, robberies and auto thefts put together.

The Association of Better Business Bureaus says that schemers—fast-buck operators of all sorts—take the public and business for $1.5 billion every year. It's done through such gimmicks as stock frauds, fake charities, questionable diet aids, fake cures, various mail order dodges and so on.

CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS, PROPERTY

These are the crimes that fill the Nation's police blotters.

The serious offenses are murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, burglary, robbery, larceny over $50 and auto theft.

One serious crime is committed every 15 seconds.

Hoover points up the dimensions of the crime explosion by placing it alongside the population.

Since the end of World War II, the U.S. population increased by a little more than a third.

In 1946, there were 931,894 known serious offenses. In 1960, there were 1,861,300—an increase of nearly 100 percent.

In 1946 the crime rate (which is the number of offenses per 100,000 population) was 665.5. In 1960, the rate was 1,037.9—an increase of 56 percent.

The figures are gathered from more than 7,000 local law enforcement agencies by the FBI, which began the job in 1930.

Who causes crime?

Attorney General Kennedy says all segments of society are involved, and adds:

"No one group can point to another and say: 'There lies the fault.'

"No one section of this country can say: 'We are clean. They are corrupt.'

"No one financial or economic group can plead innocence."

Identifying the white-collar criminal is particularly difficult. He—or she—can be the secretary tapping the petty cash box for daily lunch money or the State official raiding the State's treasury for millions.

They are often the last people in the world to be suspected of wrongdoing—and usually they are the last to be discovered.

The crimes against persons and property—murder, burglary, rape, etc.—are increasingly laid to two specific groups: Negroes and juveniles.

The picture of their involvement comes from arrest figures.

They pose one of the paradoxes in crime. They have virtually no role in white collar and organized crime—the ones which produce corruption, cheat the public and eat away at the Nation's moral fiber. But they loom large in the area of crime that is quickly translated into headlines.

The role of the Negro in crime is shown in arrest figures for 1960, a year in which Negroes comprised about 10.5 percent of the total population. The figures are from 2,446 cities containing 46 percent of the Nation's population.

Crime	White	Negro
Murder	1,536	2,511
Rape	2,459	2,778
Aggravated assault	15,856	26,819
Robbery	10,994	14,155
Burglary	66,130	33,536
Larceny	129,158	65,063
Auto theft	32,271	10,601

There have been many explanations of the Negro involvement in crime. They blame pressures and conditions which restrict Negroes to the worst housing, poorest education, lowest-paying jobs, second-rate social status and the postwar population shift in which Negroes—as well as other citizens—found themselves in new environments with the added problem of trying to adjust to new ways.

The criminologist-sociologists Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, in their "New Horizons in Criminology," comment:

"Any appraisal of crime among Negroes must be prefaced by the evidence, amassed through the years in innumerable studies primarily by sociologists, but also by authorities dealing with Negro-white relationships,

of prejudice, discrimination, and differential treatment in law enforcement. This is true in both the North and South. Although there are many factors to be considered, there is no doubt that differential treatment of Negroes by arresting authorities, magistrates, juries and judges, plays an important part in assaying the crime rate of this vast minority group."

Arrest figures also show juveniles getting involved more and more on the wrong side of the law. These figures are based on age alone, and include those who comprise the statistics on race breakdowns. In the 1959–60 period the number of juveniles between the ages of 10 and 17 increased from 17.4 million to 25.1 million. But in the same period, Hoover says, the number of arrests in which they were involved more than doubled.

"This is an era when teenage terrorism has become so commonplace that the American public has virtually a shock resistance to vicious murders, rapes, assaults, robberies, and, in fact, the entire spectrum of atrocities committed by young people," Hoover says. "The brutality of crimes committed by teenagers certainly pales the all-inclusive pampering, palliative phrase of juvenile delinquency which is used today."

"There are many reasons why so many young people are prone to crime," say Barnes and Teeters. "Our socioeconomic structure is potent for disorganization and frustration. Old-fashioned family discipline has broken down and many parents themselves are bewildered by the changing mores. Divorce and desertion are on the increase, leaving as an aftermath many disoriented children.

"The complexity of our civilization, the increased contacts and stimulation of urban life, new concepts of education that develop a premature spirit of sophistication without a philosophy of self-discipline—all must be reckoned with."

Some of this reckoning may come in a new $30-million, 3-year program—backed by President John F. Kennedy—to combat juvenile delinquency. The money will be used to study a great variety of approaches, as well as training people, from police specialists and psychologists to probation officers and social workers.

Disturbing as the crime explosion has been, there is an even more depressing consideration:

What's known is the failures of crime—the people who get caught, the misdeeds that are discovered.

There's still the part that is unknown and unrecorded. It may be the biggest part of the crime explosion.

ARRESTS OF PERSONS UNDER 18

Percentage of change, 1955–60

	Increase
Larceny	61
Robbery	49
Burglary	44
All sex offenses	41
Aggravated assault	39
Murder	37
Auto theft	26

Age 10–17 population increase 25 percent, 1955–60.

Type	Estimated crime offenses, 1946 compared to 1960		Number of offenses per 100,000 population	
	1946	1960	1946	1960
Murder	9,814	9,136	7.0	5.1
Forcible rape	10,992	15,555	7.8	8.7
Robbery	66,002	88,970	47.1	49.6
Aggravated assault	78,148	130,230	55.8	72.6
Burglary	382,530	821,057	273.1	457.9
Larceny (over $50)	166,388	474,911	118.8	264.8
Auto theft	218,020	321,402	155.7	179.2

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, before relinquishing my time, I again express approval of the dignified and determined manner in which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] guided this vital measure to final rollcall. Passage of the bill, which I sense will be by a substantial majority, will be an investment in higher education which will provide a dividend for an improved economy and an enlightened citizenry.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for placing the article in the RECORD. I have read it, and I am glad to have it made available to the Senate for ready reference, because the article deals with a number of the problems with which the Senate will have to deal when it acts on the subject of juvenile delinquency.

I also wish to take this opportunity to express to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] my deep and continuing appreciation for his wise counsel and stanch support in subcommittee, in committee, and on the floor during this debate. No one is in a better position to testify than the Senator from Oregon that upon many of the complex problems which faced us at each stage of the parliamentary process all of us paid great heed to the sage advice we received from the Senator. I wish to pay particular tribute to his steadfastness of principle in adhering to the dictates of his conscience as we explored the constitutional issues relating to church and state. The determinations were not easy ones from the political standpoint, but to the Senator from West Virginia they were easy from the moral standpoint, since he based his position squarely upon the principles which the Founding Fathers wrote into our great Constitution. I honor and respect him for the steadfastness he has shown over these many busy and trying days of hard work as this legislation was shaped on the anvil of conscionable compromise.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, most Senators, I feel, have been during the days of this debate receiving many messages from citizens and organizations in support and in opposition to the various titles of S. 1241. The senior Senator from Oregon has likewise been the recipient of such sincere statements of conviction on the part of individuals and organizations.

Although as a Senator and as floor leader of the administration's bill, I cannot share many of the diverse positions expressed to me, I wish to express my appreciation to those who have written me upon these important matters. I respect the sincerity with which they advance their views and I want them to know that I have given careful consideration to the viewpoints expressed. Because I feel that it is important for the holders of these various positions to have their statements before the Senate in connection with S. 1241, I ask unanimous consent that these statements, letters, and telegrams to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 5, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Although not opposing Federal aid to private colleges we believe S. 1241 unwise and unconstitutional even with Morse-Hill amendment because it authorizes loans and supplementary scholarship grants for institutions wholly owned and controlled by religious organization. S. Ervin amendment or equivalent seems necessary unless religious organizations excluded otherwise.

GLENN L. ARCHER,
Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Will you please support House of Representatives bill for classrooms and laboratories for independent colleges.

FRANK E. MCCASLIN,
Vice Chairman, Board of Trustees, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.

FEBRUARY 6, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I object strenuously to our Government's spending any of my hard-earned tax money for any sort of aid to any privately owned schools or colleges. When I wish to contribute I can do so personally and deduct the contributions from my income tax.

MYRA A. PAINE.

FEBRUARY 3, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May I urge your support of House bill 8900 for matching grants and money for academic buildings for higher education when being discussed in the Senate.

DORIS BURLINGHAM.

FEBRUARY 2, 1962.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Would appreciate your supporting the House version of aid-to-education bill. Obviously, as a small college trustee, I am interested in scholarships but believe they should be discussed separately.

DAVE ABRAM,
Senior Vice President, U.S. National Bank of Portland.

FEBRUARY 2, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a Lewis and Clark trustee, I naturally am interested in the aid-to-education bill. Your support of the House version would be beneficial to a host of struggling independent colleges.

E. J. KOLAR,
President,
U.S. National Bank of Portland.

PORTLAND STATE COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., February 1, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Recalling your appearances at the college, and the strong leadership you have exerted in behalf of American education, I cannot pretend to a feeling that it is necessary to urge your support of legislation to provide Federal assistance to higher education, particularly when the bill in question is the Morse-Hill act. Nevertheless, I send this note to indicate that Oregon relies heavily upon your influence, and to say that we hope the Congress will take this step to help the State meet the very urgent needs facing our rapidly expanding institutions of higher learning.

Sincerely yours,

BRANFORD P. MILLAR,
President.

PORTLAND OREG., *February 1, 1962.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: As a member of the board of trustees of Lewis and Clark College I am strongly in favor of the college aid bill as passed by the House of Representatives. This would furnish the colleges with the means of filling their greatest need—that of classrooms.

I do not oppose student aid where needed but classrooms are our greatest need and the bill should not be scuttled because of controversial amendments.

I am strongly opposed to the proposition that the Government should say what should be taught in the classrooms—removing this freedom of choice from our independent, private institutions of learning.

Very truly yours,

FRED H. SLATE.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York, N.Y., February 5, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We note from the New York Times of February 3 that Senator ERVIN has objected on church-state separation grounds to S. 1241, a bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

I trust I may be forgiven for recalling to you that I testified on this bill before your subcommittee on August 21, 1961, outlining in detail the union's view that Federal aid to church-related institutions of higher education might constitutionally be provided to those which satisfy specific criteria showing them to be education rather than religion centered. Our policy statement of course appears in the printed record of your subcommittee's hearings; for your ready reference I enclose another copy.

The ACLU position turned out to be of such great interest to Senators HILL and RANDOLPH, who were present when I appeared before your subcommittee, that they allowed me considerably more time than I had expected to be given. Significantly, our position has been commented on favorably in a number of editorials, such as the one enclosed which appeared in the January 15, 1962, issue of the Des Moines Tribune.

Since the question raised by Senator ERVIN is a major one, is it too much to hope that the union's carefully thought out proposal be presented to the Senate?

Whether or not you yourself find merit in it, we should appreciate your presenting it on our behalf and having it read into the RECORD.

Yours sincerely,

PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
Executive Director
(Signed in Mr. Malin's absence).

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune, Jan. 15, 1962]

U.S. AID TO EDUCATION

President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, again gave his backing to the Federal school aid bill which failed to get approval at the last session. This bill proposed spending $660 million in general aid for education, including money for public school teacher salaries and buildings.

It is generally recognized that this bill is dead because of the dispute over whether aid should go to parochial schools as well as public schools.

The major administration drive at this session will be for aid for universities and colleges to improve instruction in primary and secondary schools. The proposed $100 million aid would include scholarship grants to teachers for special training at universities; money to finance short institutes at colleges for advanced study by teachers; grants to colleges for research and demonstration projects.

Similar proposals were made at the last session of Congress. However, all the major aid to education plans were lumped in one bill, in the vain hope that this strategy would result in aid for classroom teachers and school construction. The proposals will be offered separately at this session.

The new approach is wiser, because each aid program should be considered on its merits.

The position of the American Civil Liberties Union on school aid makes clear the distinction between aiding parochial elementary and secondary schools and aid to colleges and universities.

The ACLU opposed Federal aid to parochial elementary and secondary schools on constitutional grounds. It said these schools are "created for the precise purpose of communicating a body of religious teaching (and) are meant to nurture and fortify the faith of children already linked with the religious group."

The ACLU, however, found no constitutional barrier to Federal aid to church-related colleges and universities. It believes such aid is constitutional provided that: students and faculty members are not required to be members of the religious faith with which the school is linked; religious indoctrination is not a required part of the curriculum; and the curriculum is determined by those with educational, rather than religious, responsibilities.

We believe that the distinction the ACLU draws between the parochial schools and church-related colleges is a valid one.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION ON S. 1241

(By Patrick Murphy Malin)

The American Civil Liberties Union has examined S. 1241, a bill "to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions."

As a civil liberties organization we do not pass upon the propriety of the extension of Federal aid to either public or independent institutions of higher education. We address ourselves primarily to the question as to whether advantageous loans (which in our view are no different in principle from outright grants) for the building of academic facilities by church-related institutions of higher education, the granting of scholarships to students who attend such institutions, and the payment of an accompanying stipend to a church-related institution, are permissible under the "no establishment" clause of the first amendment.

TITLE I. LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

We note that S. 1241 authorizes the granting of low-interest long-term loans for academic facilities including sites, which may total in the aggregate $300 million the first year and rise to $1,200 million by 1965; that not more than 12½ percent of each year's appropriation may be allotted to institutions of higher education within a single State, and that the Commissioner is left free to decide how loan funds in each State shall be allocated among public, independent, and church-related institutions of high education.

Title I as a whole constitutes an unprecedented massive Federal aid program designed to strengthen the country's colleges and universities, both public and private, and is so drafted as to give the Commissioner maximum discretion in the selection of recipient institutions.

Section 106 merely specifies that to qualify as an institution of higher education, a college or university must (1) admit as regular students only individuals who have a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or its equivalent; (2) be authorized by the State government to provide education beyond the secondary level; (3) provide an educational program leading to a bachelor's degree; and (4) have been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency listed by the Commissioner.[1]

S. 1241 sets down no guidelines whatsoever to aid the Commissioner in determining whether a loan may be granted to a particular church-related institution of higher education without violating the "no establishment" provision of the first amendment. The ACLU believes such guidelines are needed to distinguish between institutions whose function is palpably a religious one and those others which, though church-sponsored, offer an educational program that can be defended as such.

In function and program, it is possible to draw a line of demarcation between church-controlled elementary and secondary schools, on the one hand, and on the other, those church-related colleges and universities which are education centered. In a statement on the Federal aid to education bill, submitted on March 23 to your subcommittee, the union said in part: "Our belief that subsidization of church schools would violate the establishment clause of the first amendment rests upon the very nature, and understandable purpose, of church-controlled schools. They are created for the precise purpose of communicating a body of religious teaching. They are meant to nurture and fortify the faith of children already linked with the religious group. They have additional functions to be sure. But they exist primarily to assure that children of school age will receive religious instruction and will be shielded from competing ideologies and values."

As compared with church-controlled elementary and secondary schools, church-related colleges and universities may in some instances be sufficiently different in degree to be different in kind. Institutions of higher education may be distinguished from the typical church-controlled lower school if (a) students and faculty members are

---

[1] The last sentence of (e)(4) of sec. 106 reads: "For purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered." On grounds of academic freedom, the ACLU believes that the Commissioner should "list those accrediting agencies which to his knowledge are regarded in educational circles as reliable authority concerning the quality of education or training offered."

not required to be adherents of the religious group with which the institution is linked; (b) indoctrination in the tenets of a particular faith is not a required part of the curriculum; and (c) determination of the instructional program is committed to the hands of those charged with educational rather than religious responsibilities. An institution that unconditionally meets those minimal standards may properly be characterized as educational, whether or not it was founded by or is now governed or financed (in whole or in part) by a religious group.

It is the union's view that Federal aid to institutions of higher education which truly meet the above criteria, even though conducted by religious groups, would not be contrary to the separation mandate of the first amendment, whereas Federal aid to institutions which place the inculcation of religious doctrine over and above the demands and standards of higher education should clearly be denied such aid on constitutional grounds.

The union therefore urges your subcommittee to incorporate in title I of S. 1241 a new section setting forth the criteria which a church-related institution of higher education would be obliged to satisfy in order to qualify for Federal aid. Each such institution should be required to present evidence in proof of its having met the conditions. It would then be the duty of the Commissioner to evaluate the evidence and determine whether the institution was primarily concerned with providing a higher education administered by a faculty for the benefit of students, without regard to the church or nonchurch affiliation of either group; or alternatively, with indoctrinating the tenets of the sponsoring religious group. Such a test would automatically rule out schools of theology, schools of divinity, or religious seminaries sponsored by one or more denominations.

TITLE II. SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

With regard to the scholarship program covered in title II of S. 1241 (in the form of amendments to title II of the National Defense Education Act), the union sees no civil liberties objection to the provision in section 207 that "an individual awarded a scholarship under this part may attend any institution of higher education which admits him." Just as we have held that under the free-exercise-of-religion clause of the first amendment, students receiving funds through the GI bill of rights should be allowed to choose their institution without regard to whether it was public, independent, or church-related, we believe that on the same grounds students qualifying for either loans, scholarships, or fellowships under the National Defense Education Act should be left free to choose the institution of higher education at which they wish to study, with the sole exception of schools of theology and religious seminaries.

In S. 1241, equal treatment of applicants for Federal scholarships is insured by the provisions (secs. 221 and 226) that recipients be selected by State commissions on the basis of "objective tests and other measures of ability and achievement." This is consistent with section 108 of title I, which precludes Federal control of a beneficiary institution of higher education. Both provisions meet with our approval on civil liberties and in particular academic freedom grounds. We urge, however, on church-state separation grounds, that section 228, which provides for a $350 "cost of education allowance" to be paid annually to the institution as an accompanying stipend for each scholarship student, be revised to exclude church-related institutions of higher education which fail to meet the criteria outlined on page 3.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

It has been argued that large-scale, long-term, low-interest loans for the building of academic facilities by institutions of higher education, including those which are church related, is a justifiable and proper extension of the dormitory loan program authorized by the Housing Act of 1950. While the ACLU did not in 1950 challenge this section of the Housing Act, we hold that a provision which is of questionable constitutionality should not be extended indefinitely. It is the union's view that in enacting the Housing Act of 1961 the Congress should have amended title IV so as to make loans to church-related colleges for the building of dormitories and other student facilities, dependent on the same conditions which we urge for the granting of loans for academic facilities.

Whether or not your subcommittee sees fit to revise S. 1241 so as to restrict the granting of loans and accompanying stipends to those church-related institutions which satisfy specified educational criteria, the union trusts that you will at least revise the bill so as to provide for prompt judicial review of a suit filed by a taxpaying citizen. Such a provision was included in S. 1482, a bill introduced on March 20 by Senator CLARK to authorize general building loans for private, nonprofit elementary, and secondary schools, on which hearings were scheduled by your subcommittee for April 18, but canceled.

We note that S. 1241 in section 105(c)(2) provides that the Commissioner may "be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this title without regard to the amount in controversy." Our interpretation of this provision is that it would enable an institution of higher education or a college building agency which had a contract with the Commissioner to sue him, but that it would not give the same right to an aggrieved taxpayer. Without such a specific provision as was included in Senator CLARK's bill, a citizen who believed either that the act was in contravention of the first amendment, or that the Commissioner had erred in his application of such educational criteria for church-related institutions as may have been included, would have no standing in court.

The union concedes that public and congressional interest has been focused on the School Assistance Act and a proposed expansion of the National Defense Education Act which would authorize special building loans to nonpublic, including parochial, schools. In our view the church-state aspects of the college bill, S. 1241, also call for your subcommittee's—and the Congress'—most earnest consideration. As recently as June 19 of this year, the Supreme Court made clear that it holds to its dictum in *Everson* (330 U.S. 1, 1947) that: "No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

While the Torcaso case concerned not education, but a religious oath, Justice Black in his opinion went out of this way to say for an undivided Court that it has not altered its view on either its dictum in Everson or its decision in *McCollum* (333 U.S. 203, 1948) where it said:

We are all agreed that the 1st and 14th amendments have a secular reach far more penetrating in the conduct of Government than merely to forbid an established church. We renew our conviction that we have staked the very existence of our country on the faith that complete separation between state and religion is best for the state and best for religion.

Should the Congress, ignoring the Supreme Court's reaffirmed, broad interpretation of the no-establishment clause, breach the wall of separation by authorizing aid either to church lower schools or to religion-centered institutions of higher education—and without even providing for judicial review—it would show a deplorable disregard for constitutional principles.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I have done likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the bill has been yielded back.

The question now is, Shall House bill 8900 pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 17, as follows:

[No. 15 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken	Gruening	Morse
Allott	Hartke	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hickey	Murphy
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Boggs	Humphrey	Neuberger
Burdick	Jackson	Pastore
Bush	Javits	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Pell
Cannon	Jordan	Prouty
Carlson	Keating	Proxmire
Carroll	Kefauver	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Kerr	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Church	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dirksen	McCarthy	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Wiley
Engle	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Bennett	Ervin	Robertson
Butler	Holland	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Tower
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—14

Capehart	Fulbright	Russell
Chavez	Goldwater	Scott
Cooper	Hart	Talmadge
Dodd	Kuchel	Yarborough
Ellender	Long, Mo.	

So the bill (H.R. 8900) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill 1241 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I was happy to support the important legislation, which has just passed the Senate, realizing that it represents a notable step forward in meeting the ever-growing problems of our education system at the undergraduate level.

With enrollment constantly expanding far beyond the capacity to meet today's needs, our colleges desperately need the type of assistance we are providing in this measure.

In Nevada, for example, the university could borrow, in each of 5 years, a total of $368,147 for construction, improvement, and rehabilitation of academic facilities.

Under terms of title II, my State would receive 33 scholarships during the next fiscal year, amounting to $23,100, while in the next 4 years it would receive 251 scholarships worth an additional $175,700.

An important part of our higher educational system in Nevada is the southern branch of the University of Nevada, located in Las Vegas. This school would be eligible for grants of $48,596 a year for the next 5 years.

It is my considered judgment, Madam President, that we are only fulfilling our responsibilities by providing our schools with the necessary tools to keep America's educational system abreast of the times and superior to any comparable system on earth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I wish at this time to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who has once again demonstrated his skill and field generalship in piloting a most difficult bill through the Senate.

I think the success of what has been accomplished in this and other measures relating to education is due in large part to the knowledge and skill displayed by the Senator from Oregon. I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I did not extend to him especially, and to the rest of the committee generally, my thanks for a job well done. That takes in the membership on both sides of the committee. My commendation extends to the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, because there was nothing in the way of a dilatory tactic, there was nothing in the way of a stalling maneuver. Everybody cooperated; the Senate did a good job, passed a good bill, and I think is to be commended.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I appreciate the kind remarks of the majority leader. I respond with no flattery, with no spirit of performing a formality; but I respond from my heart when I say that I appreciate very much the leadership and the direction that I received in connection with whatever I might have done in respect to taking this bill through the Senate yesterday and today.

I was really directed, assisted, and inspired by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], because without their assistance the present moment would never have arrived on the bill.

I also join the majority leader in expressing my appreciation to all the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Democratic and Republican alike, because this was a bill which was the product of long hours of hearing and executive sessions in subcommittee and in the full committee, and the hammering out on the anvil of conscionable compromise on the bill that we had before us, which in no way sacrificed a single important educational principle.

I think the Presiding Officer and the Members of the Senate who are now present in the Chamber know that, after all, Senators do not do these jobs alone, and that the basic research, the foundation work, is done by loyal, dedicated staff members who serve us so well in committee and on the floor of the Senate. There are many who could be mentioned, and undoubtedly should be mentioned, but I wish to mention especially four professional staff members who were of assistance throughout the debate, and give my thanks too as chairman of the subcommittee.

I refer to Mr. Jack Forsythe, the very able and brilliant legal member of the staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and Mr. Charles Lee, who is the education adviser to the committee, and who has performed distinguished service for the committee. Also I wish to express my deep appreciation to the counsel for the minority, Mr. Mike Bernstein and Mr. Raymond D. Hurley, who, as I have been heard to say in committee, and repeat on the floor of the Senate, serve the Republicans on the committee in keeping with their obligation, but who also recognize that they have an obligation to serve all members of the committee, as do Mr. Forsythe and Mr. Lee. Many times when, as a Democrat on the committee I needed assistance that I knew Mr. Bernstein in particular was qualified to give me, he has never hesitated to give me his honest judgment. I wish to thank him on the public record for the work he has done on the staff.

Next I wish to mention Mr. Stewart McClure, the staff director, and each and every one of the staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I do not know how we could possibly bring together a finer group of dedicated servants to the Senate than the members of that staff.

I wish further to pay tribute to the excellent staff assistance which has been provided by Commissioner McMurrin of the Office of Education and his associates. They have given us every cooperation, at all times, in furnishing data and expert advice on the many technical aspects of the bill. To them and to Mr. Peter W. Le Roux, of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the subcommittee owes a great debt of gratitude.

Let me say in closing that I believe that every Senator who participated in the debate—those who opposed the majority on some issues as well as those who participated on the side of the majority in the debate—have demonstrated one of the most outstanding examples of a high-order debate in the Senate.

I express to them and to all my colleagues in the Senate my appreciation for their wholehearted cooperation and their understanding of my shortcomings.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS AND DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 891, S. 2520, the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and other Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, including the chairman of the committee who will handle this measure, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that a unanimous-consent agreement, in the usual and customary language, allowing 1 hour for each amendment, motion or appeal, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who I understand has several amendments in mind, and the majority leader, and 1 hour on the bill, the time to be equally divided, be entered, effective tomorrow at the conclusion of the calendar call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, February 7, 1962, at the conclusion of the calendar code, during the further consideration of the bill, S. 2520, the so-called Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1961, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, no action will be taken on the pending measure tonight. After the call of the calender tomorrow and consideration of the Senate resolutions which have to do with the maintenance of committees the Senate will turn to the consideration of S. 2520, and the amendments thereto. There will be no votes tonight.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I call up my amendment to S. 2520, numbered 1-23-62—B, and ask that it be stated. Pursuant to the previous agreement made with the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be made the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "twenty-five" and to insert in lieu thereof "one hundred".

On page 5, beginning with line 1, it is proposed to strike out through the word "by" on line 6.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose in offering the amendment at this time, as I understand, is to make it the pending question. There will be no discussion on the amendment or the bill before the Senate until after the consideration of measures on the call of the calendar tomorrow and the consideration of the resolutions pertaining to Senate committees.

ORDER FOR REFERRAL OF S. 2650, RELATING TO SPACE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES AND THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BILL, AND FUTURE PROPOSED LEGISLATION, TO THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, on January 11 the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences introduced S. 2650, which concerns space communications facilities. Hearings on that bill have been announced to start before the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee on February 26.

In introducing S. 2650, the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences asked and obtained unanimous consent that the bill be referred to his committee, and in doing so, related to the Senate that he had had some discussion with me on the question of committee jurisdiction.

At first glance there would seem to be no possibility of conflict, for without question jurisdiction over launch vehicles is in the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and jurisdiction over communications facilities is in the Committee on Commerce. Theoretically, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee could exercise jurisdiction over those parts of a communications satellite venture pertaining to rocketry and the Commerce Committee could exercise jurisdiction over the ownership, use, and regulation of the communications satellite itself.

As a practical matter, however, the expense of placing a system of communications satellites in orbit—something not very far in the future—and thereafter operating them is not severable into segments which can be placed separately in the jurisdiction of our two committees. For that reason, I made no objection to the unanimous-consent request that S. 2650 be first referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. It has been my purpose, however, at an appropriate time, to claim for the Commerce Committee that jurisdiction which is conferred by the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Now seems an appropriate time to speak on this matter, as the President will shortly send to the Congress a message setting forth his recommendations with respect to a communications satellite program and transmitting draft legislation. In the interest of orderly procedure, I think that the President's message and his suggested legislation should first go where S. 2650 was sent, to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. However, the Committee on Commerce, and particularly its Subcommittee on Communications, in reliance on the Senate rules, has actively prepared itself to deal with legislation in this area. Under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] the subcommittee held extensive hearings last year and plans to hold more in this session.

In order that all may be advised of the respective relationships of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Commerce to pending and future legislation dealing with communications satellites, I make the following unanimous-consent request: First, that the President's message on communications satellites, when received, be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; second, that when that committee has concluded its consideration of S. 2650 and the President's bill and message, they be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and, third, that henceforth any proposed legislation dealing with the employment of any part of the radio or visible spectrum for communication or the transmission of intelligence through the use of satellites or otherwise shall not be considered by the Senate until such proposed legislation has been considered by the Committee on Commerce.

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

THE NATIONAL OBSERVER

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, on Sunday, the 4th of February 1962, a new national newspaper made its appear-

ance. I refer to a paper published in Washington, D.C., entitled "The National Observer."

This paper points out that among its objectives is the publication of a weekly newspaper, except that the community of the newspaper will be the entire Nation. It points out very properly that integrity demands that all the news shall be honestly reported, and states it shall do so.

It is also pointed out, however, that in the columns of the editorial page the paper is going to speak the thoughts of the editors, and that these thoughts will be based upon an admitted prejudice that a free society and a free economy can do more for the welfare of men than any other form of society ever devised.

Madam President, I think the objectives and the standards—particularly the editorial standards—set forth in the editorial in the first issue of the newspaper are commendable. I certainly wish the newspaper the greatest of success.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "A Word About Ourselves," be printed in the RECORD.

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

A WORD ABOUT OURSELVES

Today the National Observer joins the family of Dow Jones & Co., publishers of the Wall Street Journal. So we think we should begin by saying a few words about ourselves and our intentions.

This is not just fond pride, although that is a natural feeling. The National Observer is not only a new publication but a new kind of publication for this country. And since there is already no shortage of publications to compete for your money and your reading time, we believe these words are due you as a reader, so that you may know what we hope to be and how we hope to serve you.

First of all, this a newspaper.

What this means is that it is designed primarily to tell you what is going on now in the whole wide world around you. We hope that we can also entertain you, and that we can offer you some things that are just plain "good reading" to either stimulate or relax the mind. But we are not in the entertainment business. A newspaper's chief reason for being is news.

This, all by itself, offers a limitless expanse. News includes the great events that shake the world, the important happenings in the Nation, the ideas men have about exploring space or their thoughts about the organization of society. But it embraces, too, everything else that interests people—the fortunes of the Green Bay Packers, the fate of the latest fashion show in Paris, books and music, and the things that happen to ordinary people every day and which, because the news of them makes us laugh or weep, give us an insight into the tragedy and joy of life.

All these things, in their infinite variety, will be grist for the National Observer.

Yet this only partially explains our intentions. For there is today no lack of some kind of news about all of these things. On the contrary, there are times when everyone feels inundated with "news." What is hard to find in the flood is understanding.

We know that nothing can surpass radio and TV in the immediacy of its news about the bare event. No national publication can replace the local newspaper in telling you about your community or your neighbors. Magazines of all kinds play their useful roles.

The problem of most readers is to find their way through the sheer bulk. And we believe that a weekly national newspaper can help those who are interested in the world around them to see it whole and to understand it better. The National Observer hopes to do this by virtue of the fact that it is a newspaper and not a magazine, a weekly and not a daily, that it is national and not local.

The newspaper format has many advantages. Its wide pages and its headlines help the harried reader to see the whole of the news in a sweep. He can learn a great deal, and quickly, from a well-written headline. He can then pause or pass on, as his interest moves him. He can skim or reread. And the newspaper press can speed the news to him before the avalanche of events relegates it to history.

In a weekly newspaper the news does not come in broken bits and pieces. What the President said about Berlin on Tuesday is not lost amid the events in Germany on Friday; the hurricane sweeping the country is not a series of isolated disasters but can be seen and measured as a unified drama in the life of the Nation.

This time to sift the news, to put it in perspective, to present it in a manageable package, has always been the great advantage of the weekly paper. It is our oldest form of journalism and it endures as a vital part of many communities. We will differ from the familiar weekly paper in that our community is the whole Nation. We will treat the news in exactly the same way for the reader in Portland, Maine, and the reader in Portland, Oreg.

Yet these advantages are not enough unless we succeed at what a distinguished American editor, almost a century ago, called this art of making a good newspaper.

The editors must have available the resources to report the news of the world in all its many aspects. So the National Observer will make use of the Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters, the resources of its own organization that already publishes the Wall Street Journal and operates the Dow Jones News Service, and a network of its own correspondents. We will use pictures, when pictures speak more clearly than words or when they illuminate the news. In distribution we can use all or any combination of seven printing plants placed strategically around the country, as the demands of our subscribers dictate.

Thus we propose to assemble all the news of the world from as many sources as are, or as may become, available to us. But if news is anything that many concern, astonish, or amuse mankind, then there is far too much of it for any newspaper to print, weekly or daily. And if it could be produced, no one would have the time to read it. No newspaper, then, can avoid the responsibility for selection.

Our standards of selection are our own, and the success of this newspaper depends on the integrity of those standards. They are the standards which we think will best serve our readers, whom we take to be all those with a ceaseless curiosity about the world around them. They may be young or old; they may be infinitely varied in learning or in their supply of information about the subjects in the news. But they would not seek out better ways of seeing the world, in any form, if they did not have an intelligent desire to satisfy their curiosity, a yearning to understand more.

We seek to match their needs. That is, we hope that our standards of selection will be those which the readers themselves would adopt if it were possible for them to drop all other pursuits and set for themselves the task of collecting and studying all the available information about what is going on in the world.

Integrity demands that all this news shall be honestly reported. That, in turn, demands that we exercise judgments; even in the Congo not all riots are of equal importance, and the editor who treats them all as of equal importance performs no service of value for his readers. Some stories we will tell here in short compass. Some we will treat in far more length than most newspapers do. We make no apologies for these judgments. We will be ashamed only if we fail in the accuracy of our facts or in the precision and clarity of writing about them.

In this particular space where we offer our observations on events, we will make judgments of a different kind. We lay no claim to infallibility or even of special wisdom. Yet it is the business of newspapermen to devote their whole time to the flow of the news in the world around them, and out of this—if they do not shirk the responsibility of thinking—there come ideas on what it all means, and whether a thing is good or bad for their neighbors or their country.

In other columns, other views. Our letters column will be open to readers who do not agree with us, and from time to time we will publish special articles by people with some special competence in a particular field even if we do not agree with their conclusions. But here, in these columns, we will speak our own thoughts, speaking from an admitted prejudice that a free society and a free economy can do more for the welfare of men than any other form of society ever devised. We make no apologies for our convictions. We will be ashamed only if we fail to express our ideas clearly and forcefully.

So, with these words, here is the National Observer. We hope it will be a success. But our first imperative is to make it interesting and rewarding. For we know that the only way to success is to put out a good newspaper.

ANALYSIS OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE PROPOSALS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments held extensive hearings during the 1st session of the 87th Congress on the electoral college system of electing the President. The hearings also covered proposed amendments concerning presidential primaries and qualifications for voting, including age, residence, and poll taxes. The record of these hearings is 1,060 printed pages in length and many interested persons will not be able to take the time to analyze the evidence presented on this complex and controversial subject.

There are 14 separate pending resolutions on the subject of electoral college reform. However, they generally follow four basic approaches, direct national election, the proportional system, the district system, or perfection of the present system. Near the end of the first session, the subcommittee met and decided that it would be of great assistance to it, to the Congress and to the public if a single comprehensive and objective analysis were made of these proposals on the basis of the record made at the hearings. Although there has been much writing and discussion setting forth the provisions of various proposals and making arguments for and against each of them, too little effort has been made to analyze what the practical effects of each plan would be. There was a need for an objective study which would analyze as far as possible the operation of each plan in practice and just how it would affect the various features of the present system which produce demands for change.

The result was a study made by the staff of the subcommittee entitled "The Electoral College: Operation and Effect of Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States," which was published as a Judiciary Committee print during the adjournment. I believe this to be one of the best pieces of work which has been done on this subject. We have received several compliments from political scientists concerning it. I recommend it to anyone who is interested in electoral college reform. The study was printed in considerable quantity, and there are a number of copies still available for distribution. Anyone wishing a copy should either contact the subcommittee office at room 141, Old Senate Office Building, or telephone extension 5581.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, the Food and Drug Administration has done excellent work in the past and I have vigorously supported it. But they make mistakes at times and they have just made a big one in disapproving the sale of a protein concentrate, made from the whole fish, within the continental limits of the United States.

WHAT IT IS

This product is a high protein concentrate made from the whole fish. It is absolutely pure. Its purity is unchallenged and no charge by any responsible authority has ever been made that, in fact, it is anything but pure.

HOW IT IS MADE

Whole fish are first washed with water; second, ground; third, washed again with water. At this point, the product is 14 to 16 percent protein; 3 to 5 percent minerals; 1 to 10 percent fat; 70 to 80 percent water. Fourth, this product is washed with five washes of boiling solvent to remove the water and fat. It is now 70 to 75 percent protein; 12 to 15 percent minerals; 1 to 3 percent fat; 7 to 10 percent water. Fifth, this product is washed with five more washes of alcohol solvent to remove the odor and the nonprotein nitrogen, the remaining oil, and more of the water. It is now 80 to 85 percent protein; 15 to 20 percent minerals; a trace of fat; 3 to 6 percent water. This is a protein-mineral concentrate made from whole fish, with bland odor and taste. One pound has the protein and minerals of 6 pounds of fish. It does not spoil, does not become rancid, and keeps indefinitely in all climates.

This fish protein concentrate has great advantages. It can be made cheaply. A product containing 80 to 85 percent protein can be made at a cost of 12 to 14 cents a pound. It can be processed in such a way as either to remove or keep the fish taste, depending on the amount of alcohol used in the process.

Fish protein concentrate is a stable product and will not become rancid in either the hottest or the coldest climate.

Adding to the diet of the undernourished people of the world either by baking it in bread or sprinkling it on rice or in soup or gravies, it can and has worked miracles.

The raw product, namely fish, is available in huge quantities to almost every underdeveloped nation. Plants equipped to process it already exist in the United States and now we have a great opportunity to help the needy people of the world. Furthermore, at relatively low cost, such processing plants can be built on small ships and the product could be made cheaply and quickly available to areas of the world where there are millions of undernourished people.

SUPPORT OF U.S. AGENCIES

Our Food for Peace Agency is anxious to use this protein concentrate as a part of its program. Numerous individuals in our foreign-aid program believe it could be most helpful. Mr. George McGovern, our Director of Food for Peace, stated:

> Viewed against the pitiful backdrop of the world's children crippled through lack of sufficient protein, a decision to accelerate production and distribution of fish flour is of prime importance.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has said:

> I foresee that this protein supplement will someday enjoy widespread acceptance and usage. Such a product, which is inexpensive, versatile in use, resistant to spoilage, and highly nutritious is, in my estimation, the basic fishery product of the future.

Thus, fish flour, or this protein mineral concentrate, can be processed cheaply, is absolutely pure, is a stable product which does not rancify in either the hottest or coldest climate, can be stored almost indefinitely, can be a boon to the fishing industry, and is badly needed to help overcome starvation and malnutrition in the world.

FDA DENIES SALE AT HOME

Before this product can be used by any Government agency, such as Food for Peace or in the aid program, it must be allowed by the Food and Drug Administration to be used here at home. But the Food and Drug Administration has denied such approval. In my personal conversations with them they have admitted that fish protein concentrate is a pure and wholesome product but they have said, in substance, that it cannot be sold within the continental limits of the United States because some consumers might view it as unesthetic. Their decision has not been made on the basis of the facts about its purity but on what they say some people might think. This is ridiculous. It prevents the use of this pure food in any of our official programs and gives the Communists the argument that those who advocate its use in underdeveloped countries are trying to push off on to the poor people of the world a food which cannot be eaten in the United States. This is true even though the Food and Drug Administration has approved its use for foreign export.

FDA STANDARDS DO NOT IMPROVE EXISTING HIGH CLEANLINESS AND PURITY OF PRODUCT

On January 25, 1962, the Food and Drug Administration ruled that before processing, fish must first have the heads, fins, tails, and inner contents removed. This is nonsense. For one thing, such removal involves handling costs which will raise the price of the product from 12 to 14 cents per pound to 60 to 85 cents per pound. This would nullify the tremendous advantage of the low cost of this high protein product. For another reason, the removal of these parts of the fish in no way improves the purity or safety qualities of the finished product. Whole fish protein concentrate is perfectly safe and pure in and of itself. The purity of whole fish protein would be the same as the purity of the product when processed according to the Food and Drug Administration's proposed standards issued on January 25. The only difference between processed whole fish protein and processed filleted fish protein is cost.

YET FDA ALLOWS SALE AT HOME OF AMAZING ITEMS OF FOOD

The Food and Drug Administration's position on this is ridiculous because it already allows food which is much less pure and much less esthetic to be sold within the United States. Clams, oysters, snails, smelts, and sardines, for example, are whole fish or whole seafood products. When we have pointed out that fish protein concentrate is purer than these products and to ask why it is that these whole fish products can be eaten and sold domestically but fish protein concentrate cannot, the only answer is that fish protein concentrate is unesthetic, and that these other products have historically been eaten.

Madam President, I have specimens in my office of other products, such as fried ants, chocolate covered ants, chocolate covered baby bees, fried grasshoppers, fried silk worms, gelatins made from horses hooves and tails, pickled pigs feet, rattlesnakes, fatbacks, and hog jowls, a few among the many products which in most cases are a good deal less pure and certainly no more esthetically acceptable than fish protein concentrate.

In fact, in my office I have a jar of whole fish, which are to be allowed to be sold in this country. It has a most filthy appearance. These whole fish are moving about in a rather villainous compound of water and sauce which offends the esthetic emotions of anyone. Yet the Food and Drug Administration admits the product.

Those of us in Washington drink water which, before it was purified, came from the polluted Potomac River.

WHY NOT A PURE PROTEIN CONCENTRATE?

Each person may pick and choose what he or she likes to eat, but so long as the food is pure and safe to eat, the choice is there. In the case of this protein concentrate the Food and Drug Administration does not even give a choice. It took upon itself to decide in terms used previously by the Millers' National Federation, that consumers would object to this product made from the whole fish and thus prevent it from being placed on the market. In this important case, the market extends across the United States and throughout the world.

Yet the Food and Drug Administration has seen fit to deny approval here at home of a product made from whole fish. While I try hard not to question the motives of the Food and Drug Administration, I am startled to find the

wording of its regulation very close to the arguments against this product set forth by the Millers' National Federation.

WORDING OF FDA REGULATION FOLLOWS BIG MILLERS' POSITION

The millers fear competition from this product, and it is sad to note that it appears that they could persuade the Food and Drug Administration to keep this product from the market. Normally I support the Food and Drug Administration, and I realize the protection it renders the U.S. citizens in keeping unsafe and unhealthy foods and drugs off the store shelves. But it has made mistakes in the past, in discouraging the use of an improved bread, and they are making a big mistake now.

As I say, I try not to question the Food and Drug Administration's motives, but I find that the few mistakes made by FDA seem to result from their acceptance of the views of the big millers. In this case, as almost happened in the earlier example, the millers win and the rest of the Nation as well as the world loses. By adding 3 percent of this fish protein concentrate to bread, the bread could be made highly nutritious. By sprinkling it on rice, in soups, in gravies, and so forth, an insipid meal can be turned into a rich one with high proteins. Such meals can help solve malnutrition in a whole family at a very low cost. But this is prevented by the Food and Drug Administration's ruling, not because the product is unhealthy or impure, but because of esthetic objections only, backed up by the millers across the country.

CONCLUSION

Fish protein concentrate is important because it can help solve hunger and undernourishment in the world. People in many countries are undernourished and either cannot afford or do not have access to foods which contain sufficient proteins for their families. If we could ship fish protein concentrate to them, it could be added to their meager diets and they would thus receive the protein necessary for healthy lives.

The low cost of the product makes it an ideal item in such programs as food for peace, United Nations food programs, and other projects designed to reduce hunger in the world. It is important because it also can be used in our own country to increase the food standards of many families at a very low cost.

Under the restrictions by the Food and Drug Administration, the cost of this product would be so increased that those people who most need it could not afford it. The food is safe, it is pure, it is cheap, it is the best product we can offer to reduce hunger and increase world health.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the Senator from Illinois has very generously and graciously made the fish protein concentrate available to me. We have enjoyed it in our family. I recognize the very great value in using it, as the Senator has said, with rice and with bread. It is a marvelous product. It will make available to starving people all over the world food of very high nutritious value at a very low cost.

I am glad that the Senator from Illinois is protesting this decision on the floor of the Senate. I hope that somehow, in some way, the Food and Drug Administration can be persuaded to reverse its decision. It seems exceedingly arbitrary, and there seems to be no justification for the decision, in view of the fact that it was found to be a food that is absolutely pure.

As the Senator from Illinois has demonstrated so wittily and well, absolutely no damage to health could possibly result, and no real case can be made on the ground of estheticism. The fact is that this product is ground up, and anyone who looks at the product can see that there is nothing offensive about it. In fact, I understand that it is available in an odorless, tasteless form also.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As well as with a slight fish odor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has made a very real contribution this evening. I warmly and enthusiastically support him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. It is our intention to appeal from the decision of the Food and Drug Administration.

We will ask them to review their decision. If they refuse to do it, we will carry our appeal to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If he refuses to reverse the decision, some of us will introduce a bill in Congress to deal with this subject.

While I like to be guarded, I may say that I have a considerable quantity of the high protein concentrate in my office, and I will be delighted to give samples to any Member of the Senate or any member of the staff. If they wish, we will have a meal in which the high protein concentrate will be an element.

Diet is important, particularly to tens of millions of people in this world who are starving. This is food that these people can use at very low cost.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, during the course of the debate on the higher education bill there were times when we did not always read all the supporting evidence that we had available on some of the premises that were laid down.

I make a general unanimous-consent request that I may have unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the appropriate places supporting evidence from our committee files and other committee material where we deem it is necessary, including insertions of certain telegrams and letters which we have received that we feel ought to be made a matter of historical record in connection with this debate.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 6, 1962:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1967. (Reappointment)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dow Henry Drukker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the entire New Jersey delegation in the House of Representatives to make the following statement about my illustrious predecessor, Dow Henry Drukker. February 7, 1962, marks the 90th birthday of this illustrious citizen.

Dow Henry Drukker was born in Sneek, Holland, and was brought by his parents to the United States when he was but a few months old. The Drukker family settled in Grand Rapids, Mich., where young Dow attended the public schools.

At the age of 25 he came to Passaic, N.J., where his talent for community leadership was quickly noticed and his dedication to public service soon appreciated. Within a decade Dow Henry Drukker was elected to the Passaic County Board of Chosen Freeholders and served from 1906 until 1913, most of the period as its director.

On February 5, 1914, the death of Representative Robert G. Bremner created a vacancy in the Seventh—now Eighth—Congressional District of New Jersey. The people immediately looked to the popular former freeholder who since 1909 had been the president of the Union Building and Investment Co. Representative Dow Henry Drukker took his seat in the House of Representatives on April 22, 1914. He was reelected for

full terms later in 1914 and in 1916. He was not a candidate in 1918 and retired on March 3, 1919.

In the almost 5 years of service within this Chamber it was a mutual pleasure and honor for Representative Drukker to serve with the late, beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas; the learned Representative from Georgia, the Honorable Carl Vinson; and the distinguished Senator—then Representative—from Arizona, Carl Hayden.

Still vigorous and active, Representative Drukker is the publisher of the Passaic-Clifton Herald-News, which he acquired in 1916. He still holds the position of president of the Union Building and Investment Co. Queen Juliana of the Netherlands knighted this native son as an officer of the Order of Orange-Nassau for services rendered in the great flood of 1953.

Representative and Mrs. Drukker reside now both in Clifton, N.J., and Lake Wales, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to salute this great American.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., regarding a memorandum which he circulated to Members of the House about a bill 9923, which I introduced on January 26, 1962, "by request." I think it is important that this letter be printed in the RECORD to correct the commander's erroneous belief that this bill was introduced at the request of the American Legion and also to correct his erroneous belief that a bill introduced "by request" necessarily reflects the views of its author.

My letter of February 1, 1962, follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

Mr. JOHN BASHARA, Sr.,
National Commander, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMANDER BASHARA: Yesterday an employee of your organization hand delivered to my office a memorandum addressed to "Congressmen" dated January 31, 1962. This memorandum referred to H.R. 9923, which I introduced on January 26, 1962, and made the following statement:

"Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE has introduced H.R. 9923, which will amend 86–211, sections 521 and 541, title 38. He has increased income limitations in some scales and reduced the pension in other groups. It is interesting to note, that with all the propaganda by veterans' organizations like the American Legion and others regarding providing for the needy veteran, there is no increase for the veteran or widow who are in the $0 to $600 class. They are supposed to be the group placed in the most needy class but they have been overlooked."

In addition to the memorandum referred to above, news items appeared in the National Tribune which are based, apparently, on information furnished by your organization.

You seem to be under the impression that I am sponsoring H.R. 9923. Undoubtedly you fail to understand the procedure of introduction of legislation "by request." I introduced H.R. 9923 at the request of AMVETS. The American Legion had nothing to do with this bill and I am personally critical of the bill for the reasons you outline; namely, that it is devoted chiefly to raising income limits rather than helping those who need help the most.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have introduced 36 bills for various individuals and organizations. I do not agree with many of these bills. I do follow the procedure followed by most chairmen, however, of introducing bills "by request" in order that a group or individual can have its bill printed and brought before the Congress. Your assumption that this bill is my bill and represents my views is in error and thus has led you to write a letter to Members of Congress based on these erroneous assumptions.

Very truly yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

An Unfriendly Act of the Philippine Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, early in 1961, a group of 7 tobacco companies located in Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia sold approximately 7,000 hogsheads, worth $7 million of burley and Flue-cured tobacco to a Philippines cigarette manufacturer consigned to a Philippine importer. The tobacco was shipped from the United States during the period October-December and received in Manila prior to December 31, 1961.

This tobacco met all legal requirements of the Philippine Government in the fall of 1961 insofar as its import was concerned and the importers offered to pay the correct duty assessed on the tobacco. Importation was not permitted due to a pending injunction suit before the court of first instance in the Philippines.

Following the change of administration in the Philippine Government in January 1962, the tobacco was ruled illegally imported by the new Philippine Government. In the case before the court of first instance in Manila a decision was rendered on January 22, 1962, ordering the release of the tobacco to the Philippine importers for entry into the Philippines.

The new Philippine Government now has ordered the reexport of this tobacco which would cost the American exporters approximately $1 million in loss involving shipping charges, storage, insurance, and other expenses incident to the reexport.

The Philippine Government has stated that the American exporters had acted in good faith although they insisted that the Philippine importers had illegally imported the tobacco, despite the complete official approval of the shipment by the Philippine Government in the fall of 1961.

This appears to be a clear case of discrimination against American exporters by the Philippine Government and in view of the President's foreign trade program urging American companies to export more of their products it is a severe blow to American tobacco dealers who while acting in good faith have been caught up in what appears to be local politics.

The United States has imported in 1961 approximately 10 million pounds of Philippine tobacco and we are presently about to loan the Philippine Government a $300 million stabilization loan.

It seems amazing to me that the Philippine Government, a friendly ally, would take this method of slapping American exporters in the face, in view of the fact that they have acted in good faith, made a bona fide sale, met all legal requirements, and have followed President Kennedy's urgent directive of attempting to build greater foreign markets for American products.

This is a serious and terribly expensive blow to a group of American tobacco dealers and exporters, seeking to find foreign markets for our agricultural products. The State Department was aware of the action of the Philippine Government concerning this tobacco at the time that the loan was negotiated on January 17, 1962. I feel our own Government has indeed let down, in fact pulled the rug from under, Americans seeking to carry out the very policy enunciated by President Kennedy in seeking foreign trade.

In view of these facts, I urgently demand that the State Department reconsider its present program of assistance to the Philippine Government until assurance can be received that the tobacco shipment in question will be allowed to be received by the bona fide importers and Philippine manufacturers. An additional assurance in the form of a written agreement to set up long-term yearly quotas for importation of U.S. leaf tobacco for blending purposes should be forthcoming from the Philippine Government.

Then this matter can be cleared from the record in a manner satisfactory to those Americans who trusted in the good faith of the Philippine Government in making this sale.

The Wit and Wisdom of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of

"The Wit and Wisdom of Congress," edited by Edward Boykin.

This is a treasury of anecdotes and epigrams, quips and puns, nuggets of historic debate and gems of eloquence—all handpicked from the annals of the Congress, from 1789 to the present.

Mr. Boykin, a longtime student of congressional history, has watched the Congress in action for a quarter century.

His research into the records of Congress is probably unsurpassed by that of any other American historian today.

The work of compiling and editing the lively, the humorous, and the eloquent words and activities of the Congress is his unique achievement; no similar treatment of the congressional annals has ever been published.

While I have not yet finished my copy, I have found it thus far to be highly entertaining and informative, and I certainly would offer it as recommended reading for Members of the Congress. And, I might add, our Hon. Vice President JOHNSON, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING also offer their recommendations of the publication.

U.S. Role in the United Nations and its Effect on Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I made at Springfield, Oreg., before the League of Women Voters, on the "U.S. Role in the United Nations and Its Effect on Our Foreign Policy."

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

U.S. ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS EFFECT ON OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Speech of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, to the League of Women Voters, Springfield, Oreg., October 11, 1961)

Taken as a whole, and relative to other nations in the world, the role of the United States in the United Nations has been one of very active participation in this world organization. Reserving for a moment the question of whether we could or should channel more of our foreign policy through the U.N., the fact remains that our record of performance at the United Nations is a good one.

Certainly the United States provides the major financial support for the United Nations and its various operations, and without this support, the U.N. would probably collapse. Last fall when Senator AIKEN of Vermont and I served as U.S. delegates, Senator AIKEN was assigned to the budget committee of the General Assembly, the fifth committee. In our report, we pointed out that the United States pays about one-third of the regular annual U.N. budget of $63 million, which excludes the various police force activities, and as much as 72 percent of certain relief activities. Of course, assessments are handed out to member nations on an ability to pay basis, which means that we are assessed somewhat more than a third of most U.N. budget. But beyond this, it was the Rockefeller family which made possible the present U.N. headquarters in New York City and an interest-free American loan further helped to get the organization established in these new quarters.

The question of moving the headquarters out of New York—to Moscow, or Geneva, or Berlin—has usually foundered on the simple financial consideration that the United States has provided generous quarters for the organization and no other nation has backed up its offers or recommendations for a new site with the financing of comparable quarters.

One of the worst failings of some member nations—and happily it is one we are not as yet guilty of—is their refusal to contribute to U.N. activities to which they are opposed. The most obvious offender in this respect is the Soviet Union. Neither Russia nor any of its satellite countries has contributed 1 red penny, if you will pardon the phrase, to the very expensive U.N. operation in the Congo. This operation was possible only because the United States has financed about half of it. The Communist governments make it a regular practice to withhold funds from any U.N. program with which they disagree, and this practice has greatly weakened the U.N.

But the Communist countries are not the only ones which do this. The Arab countries refuse to support the U.N. police force in the Gaza strip because they refuse to recognize Israel as a country at all, and oppose the U.N. peace mission there. The annual cost of this U.N. Emergency Force is about $19 million. France, another country with a rather large assessment, also refuses to pay its share of activities it opposes, and has contributed nothing to the Congo operation.

Then there are a few countries in Latin America and Africa which plead poverty, as does Nationalist China, and have fallen rather far behind in their obligations. However, neither this group nor the Communist countries have fallen so far behind as to bring into action article 19 which states that the right to vote in the General Assembly shall be forfeited if they fall as much as 2 years behind in their dues.

The result has been that the United States bears an unduly large burden in the financing of the U.N. This is bad for us, and bad for the other members. It is bad for the United States because it tends to accentuate the feeling that if the body takes any action or position we do not like, we should withhold financial support. It deepens the feeling that because we pay so much to the piper, we ought to call the tune.

Most Members of Congress, including myself, receive occasional mail calling upon this country to withhold contributions to U.N. technical assistance programs in which Cuba is a participant. We receive even more mail calling for an end to all American financial support to any international body of which Communist China is a member. In fact, a provision to this effect was put into the foreign aid bill in the Senate this year, but was quietly dropped in conference with the House of Representatives.

I think we have been wise in rejecting that policy. In the first 15 years of the United Nations, the United States has never been on the losing side of a really important vote. We have never had to cast a veto in the Security Council. Yet, we cannot always expect to have our own way. It would do us more harm than good to let the threat go out that unless another government is rejected for representation, we will pick up our marbles, and for all practical purposes, quit the United Nations.

But, neither should the United States be expected to pay the cost of an organization whose nonpaying members may decide its policies and then bill the United States for the cost of those policies. This problem of collecting assessments is one that the organization is going to have to come to grips with. If it does not, then it must expect the feeling to grow in the United States that this country, too, should follow the policy of supporting only those U.N. activities we favor.

Even this, of course, would be quite different from withdrawing from an organization because another government is admitted. It would be hard to imagine a more ignorant and shortsighted action, yet the cry is being heard more frequently that we should withdraw if Red China is seated in the United Nations.

Those who raise it have never, in my opinion, understood what the cold war is about, understood the role of the United Nations in the world, nor appreciated the possibilities of the United Nations as a part of American foreign policy. For many of them, the Red China issue is really just an excuse for something they have long favored and that is American withdrawal from the U.N. and a return to unilateral power politics.

Nonetheless, the very question forces a reexamination of what role the United Nations can and should play in American foreign policy. I think it raises first the question of what is at stake in the contest with the Communist world.

One of the least understood facets of it is the role of the so-called neutral or nonalined nations. The recent Belgrade Conference, where the unalined powers met almost in the light and heat of Russian nuclear tests, was a great disappointment to Americans, including myself, because it failed to apply to the Communist world the same standards it applies to the Western World. As a result, there has been a somewhat increased opinion in the United States that we should stop worrying about what these countries think of us, stop considering what their reaction to a given American move might be, and go about protecting our own interests as best we can.

That leads to the question of what our interests are. Most of the critics of these neutral nations might well have said, 3 years ago: "Why worry about what Cuba thinks? What difference does it make to us what kind of government the Cubans have? It's Russia that counts."

Or they might have said: "Who cares about Laos, or South Vietnam? Let's stop worrying about what those people think, and concentrate on Red China."

Yet, today we find ourselves very much worried about what kind of government the people of Cuba will support, and whether or not the people of Laos and South Vietnam are willing to support non-Communist governments.

That is, after all, what the cold war really is. It is a struggle between the West and communism not over Russia and Red China on the one hand and the NATO countries on the other, but over all the world in between. The hot war may not develop between the two behemoths, but the cold war for control of what now lies on neither side will continue.

That is why we must be concerned about what the unalined countries want and think. One might say today that we should forget about the neutrals; but tomorrow that same person will charge that we had no business letting the Communists take over another nation.

The sad fact is that too many Americans really do not care much about the rest of the world until a given country does show signs of going Communist. Latin America is a particularly bad example of this. The former British colony of Guiana was about as unknown to Americans, including Members of Congress, as any part of the world

until the recent election there and the establishment of a largely independent government brought into charge of its affairs a man who is reputed in some quarters to be a Communist sympathizer. Now, we suddenly find a great interest in Congress in British Guiana.

Much the same is true in Africa. We pretty much ignored several of the new countries of Africa until they turned to the Communist world for support.

So I think we really do care what the other nations of the world think of us, and what kind of governments they have. If we do not, then we are in effect saying to the Communists that as far as we are concerned they are welcome to do whatever they wish in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, and that we will not interfere so long as they do not set foot on American shores.

Yet that policy would be a disaster. We simply have no choice but to seek to influence the countries outside the Communist bloc.

Probably the most important single way and place where we can try to exert some influence with them is in the United Nations. This is the one arena in which the dozens of small nations of the world have a chance to be heard, to take their equal place with the rich and powerful giants of the East and West.

Now, these small countries know, too, that the United Nations is where they are important. That is why they have supported such U.N. activities as the Congo operation. It is why they supported Dag Hammarskjold against the Communist tirade for his resignation.

It is why I think they will continue to support a strong and active United Nations against Communist efforts to cripple it with further extensions of the veto power.

It has not been any accident that in recent days, and especially since President Kennedy's magnificent address to the General Assembly, the Soviet Union has considerably modified its demand for a three-headed Secretariat.

Let us remember that these unalined powers are also the target of Soviet intentions, and that Russian policy has bent before the winds of neutralist objections before at the United Nations.

Even in the case of the Belgrade conference, I think Russian policy was carefully calculated to influence the conference. Many Americans have said that the resumption of nuclear testing by Russia on the eve of that conference was a deliberate insult to the neutrals, calculated to show Russian contempt for them and for their opinions. I do not think that was the case at all. I think it was only a difference between what this country would have done and what was a typical Russian Communist power play. Instead of appealing to the oft-expressed objections of the neutrals to nuclear testing, the Russians simply terrorized them. The Russian display may well have been calculated to frighten those nations into the position that anything would be better than a nuclear war, and that any price should be paid by the West to avoid it. If that was in fact the Russian intention, it came uncomfortably close to succeeding. The neutrals have demonstrated that they can be frightened into the abandonment of principle and abandonment of the very elements of self-determination which they demand for themselves.

Perhaps the result will be a more realistic attitude toward them by the United States. It certainly should not be an attitude of disinterest, of writing them off to communism. But it should take into account the limitations of these countries, the narrowness of their interests, and their own type of power politics which has been described as the tyranny of the weak.

Least of all should we quit the one place where we have a chance of exerting an influence—the United Nations. It is unthinkable, to me, that we should so easily be driven from the field where we have long dominated the play. Our ability to fight the cold war will depend in large part upon our ability to distinguish between what is fatal to our interests and what is not.

We should learn a lesson from a mistake the Russians made once and never repeated, and that was to walk out of the Security Council in the early stages of the Korean invasion. The result was that the rest of the U.N. acted against Soviet wishes and the Russians promptly walked back in again.

Walking out of the U.N. is the surest way to lose many times the influence we lose when another government walks in.

This is not to say that I think Red China is about to be seated, because I think its efforts will be defeated. But I do reject the suggestion that this country should inform the U.N. that whenever it admits Red China we will leave. The rest of the world knows we cannot afford to leave the United Nations, any more than Russia can, unless we are prepared to admit defeat in the cold war.

Because I believe the United Nations will continue to be the major forum of American policy in spite of the many dangers which confront the U.N., I also believe we should take more foreign policy problems to the United Nations.

The record of the U.N. in supporting American desires has been pretty good. The organization has been frustrated by the Soviet use of the veto. But when we have taken a firm position in support of principle, we have largely won the support of the organization.

Why not do that with such issues as Berlin? Why not do it with the troublesome question of Quemoy, Matsu, and the future of Taiwan? I would like to see the United States be the first to propose a U.N. settlement in Berlin, one that perhaps would put the entire city of Berlin under U.N. jurisdiction and move some U.N. activities to that city. I know that most editorial reaction to this proposal is highly negative. Strangely enough, it is usually opposed on the ground that the Russians would never agree to it. But the Russians agree to little of what the West stands for, and I think it is time we asked ourselves not: "what are the Communists for," but "what is the United States for."

Too much of American policy is based simply on opposing something the Soviet Union is advocating, or vice versa. Today we are standing firm in Berlin because the Communists want us out. If we are not careful, we are going to find ourselves standing before the United Nations trying to beat down a Russian proposal for United Nations action that would force us out of Berlin.

We have an opportunity now to present our own solution, one that would call upon the Communists to make their sector a part of a single city once again. After all, the same agreement which put the Western Powers in Berlin put the Communists in Berlin too. Their rights in East Berlin have exactly the same legal basis as our rights in West Berlin. Any change in one part of the city should be extended to the entire city.

But unless we start now to make this point we are going to see the discussion revolve around West Berlin alone.

Another advantage we would gain would be to broaden the world interest in access into Berlin. Today, we have only the rights of three conquering powers on which to stand. We would be in a much stronger position if we were suggesting that all members of the United Nations have the same access into Berlin which we have.

Conceivably, we could fail to obtain such a solution. Conceivably, it would be opposed and even defeated by the Soviet Union by one means or another. But it is vital to American interests in Europe that we stop talking about what concessions the United States should make in the name of peace and start talking about some concessions the Soviet Union should make, or that both parties should make.

We know perfectly well that an aggressive action by the Communists against our access in and out of the city will bring on war. Not limited or conventional war, but nuclear war because that is the kind that both sides are ready for in Europe. Should such an aggression occur, we have our answer ready. But what we are not ready for are arguments and proposals pressed by the Soviet Union that require the West to abandon Berlin in whole or part in the name of avoiding nuclear war. It is in this realm that we remain entirely on the defensive.

World opinion is a nebulous indefinite, intangible, and much-maligned force. But it cannot be ignored and it is not ignored either by us or the Communists, because it is the prize both of us are seeking short of war. It has its base in the United Nations. To the extent that we wish to oppose communism short of war, we will do that primarily in the United Nations. We have numerous mutual defense treaties with which to deal with direct aggression, but the weapon of propaganda, internal discontent and internal revolution cannot be defended against with such treaties. This is why we must be concerned with what the people of these countries think and what kind of government they will support.

For these reasons, I expect the United Nations to remain a focal point of American foreign policy. The extent to which we make it such a focal point may well determine the success of American foreign policy for the foreseeable future.

A Significant Anniversary: The 100th Year of Banking by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a significant anniversary, of interest to the U.S. Post Office Department, the Nation's banking community, and the American people, will occur on April 9 this year.

On that day, banking by mail in the United States will have reached its 100th anniversary. This fact in itself is worthy of commemoration but the circumstances surrounding the beginnings of this now taken-for-granted enterprise should be of interest to all our citizens.

Banking by mail has been an important factor in developing greater habits of thrift among our people. It has simplified the making of deposits for hundreds of thousands of persons for whom it is difficult to make periodic visits to savings institutions; it has contributed to the growth of the savings bank idea; in short, the privilege of banking by mail

provides people with a convenient means of saving regularly for life's emergencies.

However, 100 years ago the law prohibited such practices by specifying that deposits in savings institutions had to be made in person by the man or woman under whose name the account was held.

On April 9, a trustee of the Bank for Savings, the oldest mutual savings institution in New York State and one of the oldest in the country, succeeded in having introduced and passed in the New York State Legislature a bill which provided for the following change in the banking laws:

Resolved, That the requirement that the depositor shall be present and subscribe to the regulations of the bank shall be dispensed with in the case of persons in the naval and military service of the United States, whether regular or volunteers from the respective States.

This bill, designed for the convenience of men in the service during the Civil War, continued in use after the war ended, and eventually was applied to all depositors—thereby becoming the forerunner of present-day banking by mail.

I wish to call this important anniversary to the attention of my colleagues in this House and to the American public and focus attention on its historical significance. Since the facts which inspire this presentation are of patriotic interest to all Americans and of historic value to the Post Office Department, I am calling upon the Government to authorize the issuance of a special commemorative stamp, marking the 100th anniversary of banking by mail and honoring its invaluable contribution to the American way of life.

Dedication of New Post Office at Newry, Blair County, Pa., February 3, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1962, a new post office was dedicated at Newry, Pa., in my congressional district, at which time I was pleased to deliver the following address which, under leave granted, I include in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

It is pleasing to participate in this dedication program, since it is a memorable occasion in the history of the Borough of Newry.

The post office we are dedicating today is evidence of the progress of a postal modernization program inaugurated in 1953 that promises to revolutionize the operations of this indispensable American institution.

At that time it was found that 12,000 of the Nation's 36,000 post offices indicated the need for modernization or replacement because of lack of space or outmoded quarters and equipment.

Since Newry was among the communities in need of modern postal facilities, it was pleasing to me to be able to announce on April 29, 1960, that a new post office had been authorized for this community, in keeping with the postal modernization program.

This modern post office building was constructed under the Post Office Department's commercial leasing program, which means its owner will pay county, borough, and school taxes on it the same as other Newry taxpayers.

This modern post office provides the residents of Newry with the latest in modern postal improvements, assuring patrons more convenient mail service, as well as providing adequate facilities and improved working conditions for Postmaster E. J. Miller and those who assist him.

On this occasion it is appropriate to recall that Williamsburg is the only town in Blair County older than Newry.

Founded in 1795 by Patrick Cassidy, a native of Newry, Ireland, this community, which was incorporated as a borough in 1876, has nurtured generations of God-fearing men and women whose spiritual roots were imbedded in various religious faiths.

Their intense love of country is recorded in the history of the community as evidenced by the patriotic service of Newry's manhood and womanhood in every national emergency.

This display of patriotism by every generation recalls to mind the stirring example set by Newry's founder, Patrick Cassidy, who fought on the side of the colonists in the American Revolution and thus aided in securing for posterity our cherished ideals of liberty and freedom.

In dwelling briefly on the history of the postal service in Blair County, we are reminded that in 1846, when Blair County was formed from parts of Huntingdon and Bedford Counties, there were 13 post offices, including Newry, within its borders.

From 1846 to 1917, 44 additional post offices were established, bringing the total to 57 offices.

In 1962 or 116 years after the founding of Blair County, due to the establishment of rural delivery service and the consolidation or abolishment of post offices, the number of offices has been reduced to 15.

It is significant to state that in 1846 the original 13 post offices in Blair County served an estimated population of about 16,000.

Today, after 116 years of its existence, Blair County has a total population of 137,270.

Despite the amazing growth of the postal service, coupled with the expansion of its facilities which has brought increased demand for postal service, the 15 post offices provide efficient daily service for the entire population of the county.

Speaking of the increased demand for modern postal facilities, it is realized that exciting things are happening in the field of communications.

In the not too distant future instantaneous transmission of messages and pictures will be possible on an international scale.

Postal research is discovering new ways to apply recent technological breakthroughs in the field of space communications to our postal operations to make its service more useful and efficient.

Postal improvement has been a continuing process since the establishment of the American postal service.

The quality and extent of postal operations in the United States has grown—as our country has increased in size, population, and wealth.

Our postal system, which began with only 75 post offices and less than 2,000 miles of post roads to serve an area of some 868,000 square miles, has become a large and complex operation.

The U.S. postal service now handles over 63 billion pieces of mail and is the largest single communications system in the world.

The area served now extends beyond the boundaries of the North American Continent to include the Hawaiian and other islands in the Pacific.

The number of people who depend on this great service for the majority of their written communications has grown from a mere 4 million in 1790 to 185 million.

Throughout our history the post office has been the mainstay of our system of communications despite the introduction of a number of other media such as the telephone, the telegraph, the radio, and the television.

It has been able to retain this position by continually improving its modes of transport and expanding its operations to keep abreast of the increases in demand for its services.

We have now entered a new era in transportation and communications.

To meet the challenge of the space age our postal service is currently engaged in a research and modernization program that will have far-reaching effects on mail service in the next decade.

By 1970 our postal system will probably be using two completely new concepts of mail transmission.

Experimental use of both of these has proven they are technically practicable, but refinements are needed to make them economically feasible.

One of these involves the use of guided missiles to transport mail to areas not now readily accessible by conventional modes of transportation and communication.

The first successful mail delivery based on rockets and missiles was made in June 1959, with a Regulus missile launched from a submarine, a hundred miles off the coast of Florida.

The other recent major technological breakthrough in mail transmission is based on the use of space satellites.

A worldwide communications network linked by space satellites orbiting thousands of miles above the earth will make revolutionary changes in many forms of communications, including the postal system, possible within the next 5 or 10 years.

These satellites will act as microwave relay stations to serve as channels for teletype, telephone, radio, and television.

Mail transmission that utilizes this same principle is currently under study at the Post Office Department Laboratory.

The system developed to date involves converting written messages into electronic impulses, scrambling them for privacy, and relaying them by microwave to another post office.

When the satellite communications network is put into space this system of instantaneous electronic transmission will make it possible to send written messages across oceans and continents within minutes instead of days.

Truly the new post office structure we are dedicating today is an excellent symbol of the postal progress that is still underway.

This new building stands as a tribute to the constant process of postal advancement and to our country's scientific and economic achievements that make it possible.

Therefore, I wish to congratulate Postmaster E. J. Miller and those who assist him, as well as borough officials and businessmen, on this admirable addition to the area's postal facilities.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Kenneth Claar, of East Freedom, who was successful in obtaining the contract to construct and lease this new and modern post office building.

In addition I warmly commend the Newry Lions Club for sponsoring this dedication

program and the businessmen and residents who aided the sponsors.

As a Member of of Congress interested in providing adequate postal service through modern facilities, I am pleased to have been invited to join with you in dedicating your new and modern post office.

The Borough of Newry has gained a valuable and attractive asset and one that reflects credit on this community.

Blueprint for Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration's blueprint for the regimentation of American agriculture has now been introduced in the House of Representatives as H.R. 10010—a 106-page document which spells out in horrifying detail a program of harsh production controls, coupled with fines and jail sentences for farmers who run afoul of its provisions.

The measure tells farmers flatly that the alternative to this Federal straitjacket is no Federal price support assistance at all.

Apparently this administration has decided farmers are becoming an increasingly smaller minority in the United States. If farmers do not accept the production and marketing controls set forth in the new farm bill they would be denied future assistance under Federal price support programs, while, if farmers bow to this pressure and accept the program, they run the risk of fines or imprisonment for violating its many technical provisions.

The wheat section of the bill would, for example, subject farmers to four specific penalties ranging from liability under civil action to "a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than ten years, or both." Under the bill, wheatgrowers and dairy producers would be singled out for much harsher fines and penalties than could be assessed against producers of other commodities.

The bill specifies "the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this—wheat—subtitle including, but not limited to, regulations governing the acquisition, disposition, or handling of marketing certificates". It further provides that any person who violates "any regulation governing the acquisition, disposition or handling of marketing certificates shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 for each violation."

In other words, if a farmer should inadvertently violate a secretarial regulation relating to marketing certificates published in the Federal Register, he could be subjected to a fine of not more than $5,000 for each offense.

Never before has the Federal Government sought to impose such penalties upon American farmers.

The wheat program which would be submitted to farmers for their approval in a referendum is outlined in the bill but it leaves much to be answered. Although the producer would receive from 75 to 90 percent of parity for wheat consumed as food in the domestic market, wheat moving into export and other uses would be supported at 0 to 90 percent of parity. A national wheat allotment would be set and it would be perhaps 20 percent below the present allotment of 55 million acres. If growers turned down this entire package in a referendum, all price supports on wheat would be terminated and, to make the price situation even more chaotic, the Government would be empowered to dump 200 million bushels of wheat into the marketplace each year.

For producers of grain sorghums and other feed grains, the alternative choice is equally disastrous. If growers refused to approve a program calling for mandatory controls on all feed grains, price supports would cease and the Government could dump up to 10 million tons of feed grain into the marketplace each year.

American farmers deserve a farm program which offers them a better choice than complete regimentation or disaster in the marketplace.

Apparently this administration is determined to impose its solution upon farmers. The Kennedy-Freeman farm bill contemplates a so-called land use adjustment program which would have the effect of drastically reducing the number of farms and farmers over a period of years. Should Congress enact this legislative monstrosity, the liquidation of millions of small-family farm people would undoubtedly be achieved in even less time than the administration contemplates.

The United States and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks I delivered on the United States and the United Nations, before the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961.

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

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, before the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961)

Faculty, students, and friends of Portland State College, there is no greater pleasure for me than to return to the stimulating atmosphere of an Oregon campus, and this visit to Portland State is no exception.

The growth of this institution is one of the encouraging signs that higher education will not be allowed to lag behind population growth. As chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, it has often seemed to me that we have been bound to a somewhat stagnant concept of making big schools bigger instead of creating new 4-year universities that will take their place beside the traditional ones.

We do not hesitate to build new homes or highways for a bigger population. Why should we hesitate to build new universities? I feel that Portland State is proving that this is indeed the appropriate way to keep up with our needs in the field of higher education.

To this audience, however, I want to devote my principal remarks to foreign policy problems. Never in our history has there been more interest and concern with international affairs among Americans than today. This is true because we are the most powerful nation in the world and also because we are self-governing. Where decisions are made for a people by an imposed set of rulers, they may not need to know the why and wherefore of the decision; but where a government is elected in a free election, there is no substitute at all for an informed public.

Probably the one new and basic fact which has changed American thinking about international affairs more in the 15 years since the end of World War II has been the advance in Communist technology and production which now enables the Soviet Union to deliver upon the territory of the United States by long-range missile the frightful destruction of nuclear weapons.

This is a relatively new factor for Americans to consider. Prior to World War I, and prior to World War II, we were bystanding witnesses to the military might which swept over Europe and over Asia. We watched it; we debated whether it would eventually threaten our own territory. We considered at what point we should enter the fray ourselves so that the battle with Germany and Japan might be won before it ever reached the United States proper.

Today, it is the United States itself which is a central target of armed might, and it is an armed might that carries more destruction than any in history. We have an even more overwhelming nuclear force at our command. But I think it is safe to say there is no chance at all that either the United States or the Soviet Union can strike the other without being struck in return, no matter who unleashes the first blow.

That Americans are beginning to understand this basic change in our position is evident from the hot and heavy debate over civil defense, a subject we have scarcely even considered before.

Those of us who serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recognize that military technology and civil defense are part of the raw material from which foreign policy is made. The old tradition that war is just one more means of pursuing a national policy is, however, rendered pretty invalid by modern warfare. Our use of war has been for defense. War today, however, and I mean a nuclear war with the Soviet Union, will not defend what we want preserved. If we can destroy the enemy by means of war, the war itself will destroy, too, what we like to call the American way of life.

The dismal alternatives and the preoccupation with them by so many people has given rise to what I think is a highly falsified debate over whether it is better to be red than dead, or vice versa.

This preoccupation has also given rise to an old familiar refrain about stopping Com-

munist advances by investigating the American State Department. For many people, it is unthinkable that anything can happen anywhere in the world unless it is willed by the United States, and every change that appears to them as a threat to their sense of permanent American superiority is assumed to have occurred only because of connivance by Americans.

The plain truth is that both Russia and China are very large nations, with populations that greatly exceed our own. Once industrial technology and mass education was applied to these vast numbers of people and to their extensive natural resources, the result was a rise in their industrial and military power. We could investigate every person who works for the Department of State until the cows come home, but it would have no impact on Communist advances. We got on that merry-go-round about 10 years ago, and the only result it produced was to make the United States a laughing stock among people who did not see why they should be impressed with American foreign policy when the American people did not trust their own State Department.

This is no time for us to emulate the Communist folly of devouring its own. Actually, the free world has benefited from that Communist practice. The campaign to eradicate Stalin from history and even change the name of Stalingrad to Volgagrad probably has some unknown roots in the twists and turns of Communist doctrine. But the result has been a revelation of how ridiculous communism can get. It has also given rise to new questioning of present Communist policy. The party line is going to have to be buttressed with more logic and information than in the past, because the party faithful in many countries are already asking why they should believe in the present Soviet leaders any more than they should believe in Stalin. We should take every advantage of this confusion in Communist ranks instead of creating our own counterpart.

We help the Communist world by firing on our own State Department from the rear while the Communist fire on it from the front.

I have never been among those who believe that a democracy can find scapegoats. Many prefer to find scapegoats than to think. Many find it easier to argue with loyal Americans than with Russian Communists. But disunity, witch hunting, and suspicion at home will never improve our standing abroad.

Instead of this neurotic insistence on investigating individuals, what we really need is a national investigation and debate by all the American people of the policies our State Department should pursue, because the men and women who happen to work there are not separate from the American people.

We do need more public investigation of foreign policy issues and problems. We need some hard thinking about alternative to the choice between "red or dead." We need to learn more and debate more what policies and devices are open to us that will really save what we want saved of American life. This is a job that the whole American people must do.

One of the alternatives which I do not think has been fully appreciated and used is the United Nations. I have been critical of the State Department policy myself in this respect. But we need to have a realistic picture of the United Nations, of what it does, what it could do, and what it cannot do.

First of all, too many people who are critics of the United Nations and too many who ardently believe in it seem to regard the U.N. as representing chiefly the neutral or unalined nations. Too often, when we speak of the United Nations, we have in mind a so-called third force of countries who are party to the cold war. Many individuals think these nations, being militarily weak, should be ignored and therefore the United Nations should be ignored.

On the other hand, some Americans tend to ascribe to this bloc of nations some special pure and lofty motives, untarnished by self-interest, unsullied by the taint of ownership of nuclear weapons. This romantic misconception of the so-called neutral bloc also leads to some serious mistakes in our thinking about the United Nations.

Neither of these attitudes is sound. The fact is that the cold war between the Communist world and the free world is over the future of these presently unalined countries. If they lack military power, they still contain a huge proportion of the world's population and natural resources. What American who today says we should ignore the neutrals, would ignore any one of them which is taken over by a Communist form of government? Let that happen, as it did in Cuba, and the howls for American action will go up.

But neither are these nations any different from the United States or the Soviet Union in the pursuit of what they think is their national interest. Let us never forget that among the new nations of Asia and Africa, and in Latin America, too, nationalism is probably the strongest single driving force. Their nationalism is no less rampant than the nationalism of the Soviet Union nor of the United States.

If they are critical of the two great powers for failing to settle their differences, the small countries have not settled their differences, either, and they have not used the United Nations for peaceful settlement of them any more than we have.

That the United Nations remains as the center of world politics in spite of the nationalism of great and small powers is testimony to the universal need by all these powers to have a single agency which will tend to moderate conflicting nationalisms. It also points up the one common need of every nation—the avoidance of nuclear war. Nuclear war is the enemy of every country's national aspirations.

In this respect, the United Nations is as important to us as the so-called neutral countries. This is why we have supported it financially, and in fact, the United States has been by far the largest single source of U.N. financing. Since assessments are levied on the basis of ability to pay, however, we are contributing no more than our share.

But the Communist bloc, and some of the colonial powers, refuse to support any U.N. function of which they disapprove. This policy has been weakening to the organization. It has been restrained by the provision of the charter which deprives a nation of the right to vote in the General Assembly if it falls 2 years behind in its regular assessment. Unfortunately, such expensive operations as that in the Congo are not considered as part of the regular budget and so Russia and its satellites and France have simply refused to pay their share. This is one of the most serious problems the organization faces.

A second major problem of the United Nations is the veto power. When it was written into the charter in 1945, it was at our insistence as well as that of the Soviet Union. But it has hamstrung effective United Nations action in many areas. It has resulted in the withering of the Security Council as an operating body, and caused the U.N. to use the General Assembly for the making of policy which the Security Council was supposed to make. It has also forced the Secretary General to assume supervision over police actions authorized by the Assembly which were intended to be authorized and supervised by the Security Council.

As one who opposed the veto power in 1945, I continue to believe it should be eliminated, and that this country should constantly seek its elimination,

Above all, it should not be extended to the office of the Secretary General, and the fact that it was not is due to the outstanding diplomacy of Ambassador Stevenson, plus the conviction among the small nations that the secretariat must not be reduced to the impotency of the Security Council. Yet this battle was won only temporarily, because U Thant of Burma will only fill the unexpired term of Mr. Hammarskjold. In April of 1963, the battle against the "troika" will begin anew.

It is evident from a discussion of these two major problems facing the United Nations that they arise from the efforts of the Soviet Union to prevent effective United Nations action which tends to block their own objectives. A third manifestation of Russian dissatisfaction with the U.N. is its effort to move it out of New York City to Moscow, or some other place where Communist riots and demonstrations may more easily be organized as a means of influencing and intimidating U.N. delegates. Those ill-informed Americans who call for getting the U.N. out of the United States fail to understand how much we have to gain by having its headquarters in the United States, and how much advantage the Soviet Union would gain throughout the world if it were moved to Moscow.

The point of what I am saying is that because we do not want to compel other nations to be like us, but only want them to be independent, we share with them a common interest in the United Nations. It is the focus of common interest that has yet to be developed in American foreign policy. The unalined nations, being weak, are susceptible to Communist terrorism, as we saw when the Russian resumption of nuclear testing achieved much of its purpose at the Belgrade conference. It is an old American belief that in unity there is strength. We must see to it that the United Nations is an instrument that will reflect this commonly held desire for peace, and opportunity for national growth.

We can best do that by taking to the U.N. the big international issues that threaten the peace. We should not let these nations remain in the role of passive bystanders to the East-West struggle, where they are most likely to feel that since it does not involve them, they should merely bring pressure on whichever side is most reasonable to give in to the side which is more implacable. This tendency is all too evident among the neutrals.

Because we say, and believe, that in defending the freedom of West Berlin we are defending freedom for all nations, we should put these nations into Berlin with us. This is why I have often urged that we try to put the whole city of Berlin under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. It is why I have consistently urged that before we send American troops to one trouble spot or another which is outside the requirements of our immediate self-defense, that we first try to get the United Nations to act.

The right of self-defense is fully recognized by the U.N. Charter and will always remain our right and obligation. But the advances of communism elsewhere in the world must be met by something else. That something else must be a sense of unity against aggression, including subversion, and the strength to back it up. We have the strength, but when we use it unilaterally in matters outside our territorial defense, we fail completely to get others to see that they, too, have a stake in the outcome.

A hot war, in other words, which ends in mutual destruction has no victor. A cold war can be won or lost. It cannot be won, however, by the United States alone but only by the community of nations, and the community of nations today is the United Nations.

United Nations Peace Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of United Nations bonds, to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

The President has recommended enactment by Congress of a bill to authorize and appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations 25-year, 2-percent bonds to finance special operations in the Middle East and in the Congo.

This method of financing was approved by the General Assembly and has been formally offered by Acting Secretary General U Thant.

The need for this means of financing the United Nations expeditionary force and the United Nations operation in the Congo arises both from the refusal of some member states, and the inability of others, to pay their special assessments.

The United Nations bond issue will enable the United Nations to continue these special operations for which the General Assembly has granted authority. It will obligate every nonpaying or delinquent member state to pay its accumulated debt. It will reduce the U.S. contribution for these operations from approximately 47½ percent to a more equitable 32 percent. It is hoped that this remedial financing will encourage a greater sense of financial responsibility among member states.

I support the President's recommendation to Congress in the belief that the United Nations, however imperfect, is today an essential instrument of our national security and of our national policy, and in the hope that it may be made more perfect in the days ahead as mankind's best hope of finding an alternative to war.

I support our Government's participation in the bond issue, knowing that the United Nations is proving a powerful weapon against Communist imperialism and confident that in those instances where we have suffered reversals we can, through patience, wisdom, and courage, make them yield new victories for the cause of peace.

The refusal of Russia and its satellites to pay their assessments for U.N. operations in the Congo and in the Middle East is a crude confession of the effectiveness of U.N. actions.

It is argued that the United Nations bonds are a bad risk, and who would deny it. But I cannot think of a better diversified investment. We are risking $52 billion in a Military Establishment that, should war come, would not prevent massive destruction to America. We are risking $700 million in a civil defense program that may prove ineffectual in saving the 50 million Americans it is designed to accommodate.

Let us look at the far graver risks our failure to support the bond issue would entail. U.N. operations would be halted in the Middle East and in the Congo and new operations could not be launched to meet new crises. A war between Israel and the Arab States, direct U.S. intervention in the Congo or writing it off to chaos or to communism—these alternatives are perilous too.

It is debatable whether the United Nations could survive our lack of confidence or loss of hope. If not, what are the chances of mankind surviving?

Has anyone estimated the cost to us if the U.N. operations fail? How much more will we have to appropriate for our staggering new defense budget to allow for the greater risk of global war?

What thought has gone into an alternative policy should these special operations end or the United Nations collapse?

Or how might we strengthen the United Nations?

It is time the Congress gave these matters some thought.

United Nations bonds buy that time to think.

The United Nations bond issue offers the United States a priceless opportunity to build a better United Nations by reinforcing our collective responsibility through individual participation in its support, and in so doing to set an example for other member states.

With this purpose, I introduce a bill that would, following approval of the President's request, authorize the Treasury to issue for sale to the general public United Nations peace bonds in denominations of $25, $50, and $100 and bearing 2-percent interest compounded semiannually, which would offer to the American people an opportunity to underwrite any portion of the $100 million appropriated to the Treasury. The Treasury would thus have available a large sum that could be appropriated for other worthwhile programs.

I believe these peace bonds would give the people of America, as individuals, a long-sought, tangible, and potent means to share in the tasks and the objectives of the United Nations.

The ever-present threat of thermonuclear annihilation haunts the everyday thoughts of our men and women and children. In the face of this threat, it has been suggested that private citizens or the Government construct fallout shelters.

Serious questions have arisen in the minds of many people about the effectiveness, the strategy, the morality, and the humanity of such a defense. Whatever the validity of these questions, the fact is virtually no shelters have been constructed.

The constant menace of a nuclear catastrophe, coupled with a vision of the remoteness of the Government and the United Nations, instills a growing sense of helplessness or of outrage among our people, who want to take an active role in their own defense short of burrowing into the ground. Unless these energies are tapped, our Nation's strength and resolve will be seriously impaired.

United Nations peace bonds would allow the average American a concrete means of coping with this threat, of participating more closely with the Government's support of the United Nations, a way of making a personal investment in the task of positively and constructively building a shelter of peace through the United Nations.

It should further be considered that the man on the street could thus demonstrate convincingly to the world the overwhelming support of Americans for the United Nations. Such a clear, popular demonstration might encourage other member states to offer similar bonds to their citizens and thus not only make it easier for less prosperous nations to participate in the United Nations bond issue through public subvention, but also greatly enhance the possibilities for peace throughout the world community.

Making United Nations peace bonds available to the public would, moreover, obviate any possible suspicion that the Government's purchase is a "profitmaking venture by capital exporting nations, who will purchase the largest share of the bonds."

Finally, it would exert the strongest moral pressures on recalcitrant member states to pay their accumulated debt. I believe that if the American workingman and the American housewife and the American schoolboy buy United Nations peace bonds, their Russian counterparts will take a new look at America, and at themselves and their own delinquent government.

I am not in sympathy with those who argue against new proposals because of their novelty or who expect all things to be accomplished effortlessly, forgetting there are rewards that are most satisfying if they are commensurate with our efforts.

I am in sympathy with those who will offer better approaches to the problems and possibilities I have suggested.

In sum, I am convinced the issue of the United Nations peace bonds will strengthen the average American's personal commitment to the United Nations and set an example to the governments and peoples of the world. I ask your support for the bill I am introducing:

H.R. 10097

A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal-year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000,000 for the purchase of United Nations bonds. Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be used for such purchases at any time that the President determines it necessary. This determination shall not be contingent upon the sale of peace bonds nor any proceeds to be derived therefrom.

SEC. 2. Amounts received from the annual repayment of principal and payment of interest due on United Nations bonds shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United

States in a special fund which shall be available for redemption of peace bonds. Amounts not needed for such redemptions shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS

"SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as 'peace bonds,' in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to United States savings bonds except that peace bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date as of which issued, and shall be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 per centum per annum, compounded semiannually when held to maturity.

"(b) Peace bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, and $100 when held to maturity, and may be issued in such other denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine.

"(c) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of peace bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available for use in the purchase of United Nations bonds."

The Lighter Side of Life in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of frustration and uncertainty, it is always pleasant to look on the brighter side of things. Hence, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of February 12, 1962:

BARRY GOLDWATER "ACCEPTS"—THE LIGHTER SIDE OF LIFE IN WASHINGTON

(Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, a leader of Republican conservatives turned up as a political satirist and humorist at a meeting of Washington's Alfalfa Club.

(The club, a social group that includes many of the Capital City's most prominent citizens, annually holds a mock "national convention" to nominate the "Alfalfa" candidate for President. This year's nominee was the Arizona Republican.

(Text of an address before the Alfalfa Club in Washington, D.S., on January 20, 1962:)

Mr. President, fellow members of this convention, guests: Thank you, Mr. Graham [Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post and Times Herald]. Believe me, it is an honor to be nominated by a man of your distinction, and I am very grateful to Herblock [Post and Times Herald cartoonist] for giving you the evening off to perform this vital task. While seated at the table I turned to my friend and able colleague from Kentucky, THRUSTON MORTON, and remarked that there are a lot of Republicans here tonight and he quickly commented that Republicans cannot afford $100 dinners and settled for this $25 one.

This is the most exicting thing that has happened to me since [Walter] Reuther made me an honorary Auto Worker. Frankly, I feel that I am long overdue for this nomination. But in my modesty I can't believe that there are not others better qualified. Personally, I think Nelson Rockefeller would make a wonderful President. Although I don't know how the White House would look with those gas pumps out in front.

I notice that Mr. Kennedy and his chief scout aren't here tonight and if someone can carry the word to the President, tell him he would have been in no danger appearing with me tonight—we're not on television. I understand the President and Vice President are out raising money to pay off the campaign debt. They could each give up 1 week's allowance and take care of that.

Now, gentlemen, if my voice trembles a little at this historic moment, I'm sure you will understand. Emotion chokes me when I think that you have chosen a barefoot boy from the Arizona "valley of fear" to lead this underprivileged, undernourished, underhoused, underclothed, and over-Kennedied Nation of under 190 million underlings back to the old frontier of McKinley's day. The undertaking, naturally, overwhelms me. It takes my breath away even though I feel the White House is ready for me since Jacqueline remodeled it in an 18th-century decor, and I feel this is a double honor since I've never even been to Harvard.

But this has been a genuine draft—not just the kind felt by reservists—and I have yielded to it in the sincere belief that no man with a drop of patriotism in his veins could turn down such a golden opportunity to advance his family. Of course, the Goldwater clan is not as large as the Kennedy clan. And my brother Bob doesn't want to be in Government—he promised dad he'd go straight. Besides, somebody has got to mind the store. Which reminds me, I must have the books audited.

But I have a lot of uncles and cousins and in-laws whom I wouldn't mind shifting to the Government payroll. Anything at all—Peace Corps, Justice Department, Senator from Massachusetts—just anything so long as it isn't one of those dollar-a-year jobs. And don't forget I have a sister named Carolyn and a granddaughter named Carolyn, which I figure puts me two up in that department.

Since the Attorney General's famous parachute jump from the dome of the Capitol, we now have a three-party system—Republican, Democrat, and Teamsters. This opens a whole new vista for elections. Before, the Democrats had to carry away their own ballot boxes. Now the Teamsters can do the job, whether they dump them in the Illinois River or the Rio Grande.

Which reminds me, I have a grandson who's too young to vote but too old to be Attorney General. This may be an asset.

Now right at the beginning let me scotch one bit of campaign slander the opposition has come up with. It is perfectly true that, during the heat of the preconvention maneuvering, I said that, if nominated, I would not accept and, if elected, I would not serve. But that statement was lifted out of context and deliberately distorted.

In the first place, when I said it things didn't look so good. But do they tell you that? Of course not. They claim that I meant it. What I really said was that Sherman had said it first, Eisenhower had said it in 1948, Adlai had said it in 1952—and wishes to God he'd stuck to it—and Nixon is saying it now. It beats me how they can take a clear-cut sentence like that and distort it. Why, even Pravda garbled it in translation and they usually get things right.

I will not deny that I've thought about the Presidency. Somebody ought to think about it. And I'm not afraid of the Presidency. They say it's the loneliest job in the world. But those who say it have never been a Republican in this Senate. Besides there are many risks to being President—I saw that President Kennedy was Time magazine's "Man of the Year." Did you see his picture on the cover? I didn't even know that EVERETT DIRKSEN could paint.

I would not be truthful if I said that I was fully qualified for the office. I do not play the piano. I seldom play golf, and I never play touch football. I hope you will find it in your hearts to accept a President who just sits behind a desk and works.

Now, I must take note of the fact that my opponents call me a conservative. If I understand the word correctly, it means to "conserve." Well, then, I'm just trying to live up to my name and conserve two things that most need conserving in this country—gold and water.

I don't apologize for being a conservative. I can remember when "conservative" and "mother" were clean words.

Now let me turn to my campaign platform: As you all know, I have argued for some time that we should do away with the cumbersome and lengthy, unmeaningful and platitudinous promises that the platforms of both parties have become. We need bold, brief statements that all Americans can understand.

With this in mind and hoping to avoid any floor fight over the platform, I called the two gentlemen who wrote the 1960 Republican platform and asked the hopeful next Governor of California to have a midnight meeting with the current and next Governor of New York.

These things are no good, apparently, unless they are done at the witching hour of midnight.

Well, that was 2 weeks ago, and they're still arguing. They have a tentative draft that runs over 1 million words. You see, Dick has just written a book, which he thinks would make a good platform, that runs 500,000 words right there. And, of course, Nelson wants equal time.

And I gathered that they were both thinking of 1968, so I said, "The hell with that" and sat down and wrote a platform with only three planks. I've eliminated all the usual gobbledygook and tried to make it concise and concrete so that everybody will know just where I stand.

The first plank fits neatly on one page, but I think it's basically sound and honest. It will mean the same thing to you whether you live in the North or the South, whether you're a farmer in Maine or an industrial worker in California. It says, and I ask you to pay close attention: Elect GOLDWATER.

That's it. No nonsense, no shilly-shallying, no hairsplitting—just elect GOLDWATER. It's got a nice ring to it that I sorta like and is there anyone, from the highest to the lowest, from the ordinary schoolchild to the lowliest Harvard professor, who can possibly mistake this meaning? I'll go even further. Is there anyone in this room who doesn't understand it?

The other two planks deal with labor, education, foreign policy, and the farm problem. Here's plank No. 2: Elect GOLDWATER. Now you may notice a certain similarity between the first plank and the second, and I want you to know that that was deliberate. It has been my experience that the public is confused if you offer too many issues. The thing to do is to get hold of one good one and stick to it. Hammer it home. Repetition is the way Madison Avenue sells toothpaste and soap and it's the way the New Frontier stays in the limelight. But when repetition occurs at the White House—and it has since 1932—it's not a sales pitch, it's a giveaway. You don't even have to guess the price.

And now for the final plank—plank No. 3. This is the bellringer and it's even shorter. It just says ditto.

There you have a campaign platform in five words—elect GOLDWATER, elect GOLDWATER, ditto.

Just to keep things symmetrical, I think I'll hold the budget to five figures. Jayne Mansfield's for openers and I'll accept nominations for the other four.

Now, no campaign could get rolling without some slogans—words to quicken the patriotic pulses of the people and get them steamed up to go out and elect GOLDWATER.

You'll notice that they are set with the compass bearing of the New Frontier wagon train and some of them may even strike terror in the heart of Mr. Khrushchev.

The first one I borrowed from my friend L.B.J. It reads: "Forget the Alamo."

Others that are equally inspiring are: "Surrender, hell, I have not yet begun to negotiate." Or "Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for victory." And "54-40 or a reasonable compromise."

One more, "Damn the torpedoes—we're unilaterally disarmed."

Now, my inaugural address will establish precedent by the same kind of brevity. When I'm sworn in by Earl Warren—who will no doubt regard this act as a violation of his oath of office—all I intend to do is raise my hand and say, "I do."

That's all I said when I was married and it's all I've been able to say around the house ever since. But it's worked out rather well.

Now, I think you're entitled to know something about the caliber of men I will have in my Cabinet. In presenting the list, I'd like it understood that it is confidential. Also, all the men on this list have already leaked the information to the press and I have promised to respect the priority of their leaks.

For Secretary of the Treasury, I think I can do no better than to keep Mr. Dillon. Primarily because he has demonstrated that he possesses the one quality so badly needed in these days when we are being pulled one way by the extremists of the left and the other way by extremists of the right. Mr. Dillon is flexible. In fact, you might call him an extreme middle-of-the-roader.

My hat is off to any man who can argue under Eisenhower that we must beware of the inflationary tug of the mounting national debt and then make a rebuttal under Kennedy by saying a mere $7 billion added to the debt won't hurt us a bit. I believe that Secretary Dillon belongs in Government—I don't think private industry could afford him.

For Secretary of Defense, I'm sure you'll agree I couldn't do better than Linus Pauling. I figure if we give him 3 weeks on the job he'll give us a defense without going to the expense of nuclear weapons or bomb shelters, or anything else. That would save us about $60 billion right there and it ain't to be sneezed at.

Also I rather like his notion of replacing General Walker with Cyrus Eaton. If we're going to indoctrinate the troops, let's do it right.

Postmaster General is up for grabs. Adlai Stevenson is mad at the Post Office. He couldn't get back the Christmas card he sent to Nehru. It couldn't be delivered anyway because Nebru was at a peace conference—that's where he spends his time between invasions.

For Secretary of the Interior I certainly would be loyal to a fellow Arizonian and ask Stew Udall to stay on—I'll need that oil money anyway. But only if he promises to stay off Mount Fuji and other people's private property. If he does a good job, we might even build a statue for him.

I haven't picked a Secretary of Agriculture yet. I'm waiting to see what Governors are unemployed.

As for the State Department, I've been going over their records and have come to the conclusion we ought to abolish the whole damn thing.

I don't claim to have all the answers, but, since this administration took over, I don't even understand the questions.

And another thing: How is it that our Government did better against General Electric than they did against Cuba?

I don't want to seem critical. But our first ambassador in space was a chimp. And so far he's the only one in the State Department who hasn't made a mistake.

If I do have a State Department I guess I could keep Chester Bowles. He's the mystery guest in the Cabinet; in fact, he's going on "What's My Line?" as soon as he finds out what his line is. Of course, if the State Department doesn't work out I can always close it and keep the store open nights.

I think it's only fair to tell you I intend to be the President of the whole people and can promise you a nonpartisan administration made up of the best men obtainable. If there are some good scouts in the New Frontier—and I have my doubts—I'll ask them to stay even if they have to be approved by Walter Lippmann.

For example, I have some definite plan for Professor Galbraith, Ed Murrow, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. I can't reveal these plans, because if there's a leak they might get out of the country before I'm inaugurated.

I have some other notions that I shall reserve for my first state of the Union message. For example, I'm going to propose a constitutional amendment that any decision of the Supreme Court must make sense. I know it will be controversial, but I think it deserves an airing.

Further, I will state to the people, "Ask not what your country can do for you but rather what you can do for your country." I think I've heard that somewhere. Then I'll ask for a new Government agency to study and make recommendations on new things the Government can do for the people. This may take considerable research.

I think it's time to dust off that old shibboleth, "The people are too damned dumb," and really apply ourselves to the task of taking their property, spending their money, and living their lives for them. It's time they face up to the realties of life and start making some sacrifices.

The Kennedy administration has only scratched the surface in this field. Actually, as we mark the first anniversary of the New Frontier, I must say it's been a wonderful year. I wish we could afford it. Now I know why they call it the New Frontier—we're having a harder time crossing it than "Wagon Train."

Now, I suppose no acceptance speech would be complete without a reference to the candidate's background. Very simply, I think I'm in the American tradition. I was born in a log cabin, which I had moved to Phoenix, and, except for some air conditioning, a swimming pool, a bowling alley, a bar, a shooting range and a golf course, it remains the simple log cabin it always was.

I have nothing against millionaire Presidents. I'd just like to see the day return when people other than Presidents can be millionaires, too.

I've never hesitated with an answer. When anyone asks me how I stand on integration, I've only got one answer: Where are you from?

Now, gentlemen, I have told you the story. The rest is up to you. Go out and work from now to election day and fulfill our campaign pledge—elect GOLDWATER. Find more of those districts such as the one the New Frontier turned up in Cook County—the one that had 22 residents but came up with 77 votes. That's the sort of stuff I mean.

Gentlemen, I'm flattered that you thought first of my name. I have every confidence that, with all of you behind me, I could be another Alf Landon.

Do your share, and, I pledge you, I will do mine.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

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

God of our fathers, facing tasks that tower above our power to achieve, with a sense of our utter inadequacy when left to our own devices, we bow for the strengthening benediction of our morning prayer.

In all the tangled tragedy of our ailing world we ask for power to keep our goals clear, our hearts pure, and our spirits courageous.

May we hear Thy call in the thunder of these tumultuous times. When the hammers of Thy purpose are beating out new shapes on the anvil of the world, may this dear land of ours be fashioned into an instrument through which Thy will may be done on the earth in such desperate need of Thy guidance.

In the spirit of the Master we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 6, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;