may well determine whether democracy will survive or perish.

We must provide for the growth and well-being of an expanding economy, secure and train the necessary manpower for a world of advancing technology. We must insure new avenues of communication and understanding. Much of this responsibility rests to a large degree on our colleges and universities. They will not be found wanting. But make no mistake, meeting freedom's challenge is not just a task for educators. It is a job for every man and woman in this country. You, me, the fellow next door.

It is the challenge to freemen to maintain, protect and enhance the dignity and worth of the individual to increase the concept, the meaning, the understanding and the application of freedom to guard and protect the American way of life and to insure the growth of the spirit of man as he reaches for the stars.

In a material, down-to-earth sense the protection of our freedom is a manpower problem. In a word, we are outnumbered. We simply do not have the manpower that the totalitarian nations have. We cannot compete in numerical strength with the hordes that temporarily swept back the forces of freedom in Korea or overpowered our allies in Indochina, nor can we build our fortifications on the backs of coolie labor, nor would we even wish to do so.

We hear much these days about the increase in population. But the growth of population does not mean that we will automatically have a labor force that is adequate to all the Nation's needs in the years ahead. In 1940 we were a nation of 132 million. Today we have reached 170 million. By 1980, it is expected that our population will have grown to 250 million. But these figures bear a little study.

The fact is, the population explosion is largely centered in the groups at either end of the age scale—among the young and old. The number of people in the prime working years has remained relatively constant and will for the next 20 years.

Thus, by 1980, when our total population will have risen to the tremendous total of 250 million, we will have fewer people in the most productive bracket (40–50) than we have today.

Not only that, but our younger workers will be living and working in an increasingly complex and technical world. They will be responsible for the future productive balance, for progressively high standards of performance, and much of the leadership that this Nation and the entire free world will so greatly need.

This lack of raw manpower can only be counterbalanced by a determination to train and make available the skilled manpower which is the basic fruit of freedom. The needs of the future demand that every facet of our educational system must provide more rigorous training and demand higher levels of achievement and excellence. Unless we have the fullest possible development of the Nation's fundamental resources in the years ahead, we will indeed be in desperate danger.

Probably an even more important part of the challenge to freemen, is the necessity for rededication to that faith and to those ideals which brought freedom and democracy into existence—those essential character qualities that make a nation strong. Paradoxically the very qualities which have made us great have brought us a living that has weakened those qualities. We are called the affluent nation. We have more money, more prosperity, and more of the good things of life than any nation on earth. In possession of these material things, have we, perhaps, lost some of our respect for hard work, thrift, sacrifice, devotion to duty, and loyalty to common good? These are strengths which we must recapture in order to hold fast our freedom.

Recently I read from the letters of Theodore Roosevelt a statement that ought to be imprinted in the mind of every American today.

He said: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

The challenge of freedom has another front—a world front. We seek freedom not only for ourselves but for all men everywhere. But despite all we have attempted to do we have, somehow failed to communicate with them.

The true image of America is being grossly distorted in critical areas around the world. This is more than unfortunate in these crucial times; it is a serious threat. We have seen the resulting damage in the neutral countries, even in friendly nations, and certainly among the undeclared peoples. Our motives are twisted by vicious propaganda and we are made to appear as a rich and grasping nation, concerned only with our own selfish advantage. We see the evil effects of lack of understanding even in the shadow of our own coastline. It would indeed be a cruel turn of events if a generous people should lose because of their failure to adequately communicate the meaning of freedom. It would be a dangerous turn if we should fail to interpret the blessings of democracy and thus lose potential friends to a contrary way of life and find ourselves exposed and alone.

Our failure to enunciate clearly the meaning of democracy is not only a failure in communication but in understanding. Loyalty and love can't be bought. We have learned that lesson the hard way.

New technology has made it possible for us to communicate in many new ways, to inform, unify or divide our world as never before, but wonderful as the new technology tools may be, they are still only tools of transmittal. We must remember that the most marvelous media can communicate no more and no less than a man can feel and express and impart from the mind and the heart and the soul.

Though the transmittal be orbited through space to impinge upon this and other worlds for the rest of time, what still really counts is the substance of the message and its applicability and meaning to those for whom it is intended. And the substance depends upon the real meaning of freedom.

It is the substance that we must communicate to all the world. It is this substance which must be the warp and woof of all our education.

This is freedom's challenge to all of us. How shall we meet it?

1. We can meet it by increasing our education for democratic citizenship and in saying this I give much credit to Fairleigh Dickinson for the programs already in operation on every one of your campuses. The extension work you are carrying on, the evening school programs, the off-campus activities, the reexamination and reorientation of your entrance requirements, the sharpening of your curricula, the adult education programs, and your ability to fit into the communities you serve—all of these heart-warming activities bespeak your interest and understanding.

2. It is important that all our citizens gain new understanding of the meaning of democracy and liberty and freedom. Active participation in public affairs can no longer be left to the few. The right to vote is not only a privilege; it is an obligation. The duty of keeping informed is no longer a duty but a necessity. The study of government can no longer be confined to the pages of a textbook—it is a way of life.

3. We can meet the challenge of freedom with an old-fashioned rededication to the virtues which inspired that freedom.

4. We must educate for more efficient and effective manpower. Our present waste of human resources must be stopped. We must educate for the pursuit of excellence by building an educational program that will discover and encourage the abilities and potentialities of every single individual.

We must educate for greater understanding among all peoples. Education must challenge our own young people with an idealism, a feeling of mission, a better understanding of themselves and the world in which they live, and appreciation of the brotherhood of man and a realization of the power and the glory of a working democracy.

But we must export this education (and import a bit of it, as well) by the exchange of teachers and students with foreign countries, by the establishment of branch universities in other lands, by informational centers, by all the ingenuity at our command.

Such an educational program is now in operation and a number of governmental agencies have the responsibility to speed its progress. But the program cannot be entirely a governmental responsibility. Its success will depend in great measure upon the initiative, the resourcefulness, the ability, and the understanding of the individuals of our great foundations, of religious and social organizations, of educational institutions, of schools and colleges, and faculties and individual teachers. Only thus can success be assured. Only thus can we fully meet the challenge, the obligation, and the responsibility that freemen must meet, if freedom is to prevail.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Joseph Vaskas, Marian Hills Seminary, Clarendon Hills, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Almighty and merciful God, we adore Thee and we thank Thee for Thy loving providence, which from all eternity hath predestined this continent to be discovered by Western man only as recently as 1492 in order that it become a haven and a home for the oppressed and persecuted peoples of the world. We thank Thee for having enriched it so prodigally with the goods of this earth, that, according to Thine own example and precept, we are now able to help and succor the needy of the world from our own superabundant stores. We thank Thee for having given our forefathers a living faith, so deeprooted, vigorous, and unequivocal, they caused to have engraved on the metal of our coins the inscription: "In God We Trust." We thank Thee for the farsighted wisdom and prudence of the Founding Fathers of our Republic, who gave us a Constitution, the principles of which are but the eternal law as applied to the organization and administration of a free and ordered society of men. In Thy provident wisdom, Thou hast permitted the people of this Republic, strong in their faith in Thee and in the spiritual, cultural, and material wealth with which Thou hast deigned to bless them, to emerge today as the most powerful

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

and benevolent Nation on earth. Grant us to understand, O Lord, that this prerogative of eminence is weighted with a corresponding responsibility before Thy judgment seat and that of the world in which Thou hast allotted us to play such an important and decisive part. Faithful to its historic and noble national traditions of justice and charity in both its domestic and international relations, may our Nation and its Government persevere and triumph in the good fight it leads in waging for that peace, based on justice and charity, which is the tranquillity of order. It is for this tranquillity of order that captive, exiled, and free Lithuanians throughout the world are praying today, O just and merciful God, on the occasion of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, that in this peaceful order of justice and charity, enslaved Lithuania, together with her sister Baltic Republics Latvia and Estonia, and all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain and wherever in the world, would again and soon enjoy all the rights and blessings of a free, independent, and sovereign people.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1962, was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the acting majority leader if he will kindly inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will take up the Consent Calendar.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, to be followed by H.R. 10050, temporary debt ceiling increase for fiscal 1962, if a rule is reported.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week we will have H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

On Thursday, even though we may have not finished the Manpower Development and Training Act, we will have read the Farewell Address of President Washington.

Of course, conference reports will be in order at any time during the week, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file reports.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 21, 1962.

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

There was no objection.

POWERS IS NOT A SPY—ABEL IS

Mr. WALTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, there is real gain for the United States in the Soviet Union's release of Francis Gary Powers and Frederic L. Pryor in return for Colonel Abel's being permitted to go back to the Soviet Union.

From the time of Abel's arrest until the present the Soviet Union has refused to admit that this master spy was one of its agents. Now, Moscow itself has, in effect, confirmed the trial exposure of the espionage activities of Colonel Abel and the others who were members of his apparatus in the United States.

At the same time, I deplore the fact that a significant segment of the U.S. press is giving great aid to the Soviet Union by repeatedly describing Powers as a spy and his release in return for that of Colonel Abel as a spy swap.

A press dispatch of February 12, which was a featured page 1 story in newspapers across the country, opened with the following words:

AMERICAN U–2 SPY PILOT FRANCIS GARY POWERS

On February 11 and 12, articles written by two different New York Times reporters and published in that newspaper referred to Powers and Abel as two celebrated spies of the cold war.

On February 11, the New York Times went so far as to report falsely that Powers had earned the unusual distinction of having been acknowledged as a spy by the U.S. Government.

Numerous headlines and articles published in newspapers in this country during the past few days have referred to Powers as a spy pilot and to the exchange as a spy trade.

Thus, with the help of the U.S. press, Khrushchev has been able to get across to the American people and to the people of many other nations the one big propaganda point that he wants to sell them on—his phony claim of U.S. guilt in a flagrant case of espionage on the eve of the May 1960 summit conference which justified his torpedoing the conference and then reneging on his agreement to have President Eisenhower visit the Soviet Union.

Most competent newspaper editors, with the best interests of this country at heart, would flatly reject such Communist-serving statements if they were released by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Too many of these same editors, however, have accepted statements of this type put out by wire services and their own reporters.

From the very beginning the U.S. Government has correctly refused to admit Moscow's false claim that Powers was guilty of espionage. It has defended the U–2 flights as legitimate aerial surveillance and intelligence gathering that was essential and of vital necessity to protect this country from surprise attack.

Espionage, by its very definition, is secret and covert. Open intelligence gathering, which includes reconnaissance of various types, including plane flights, is not espionage. For about 4 years before Powers' crash in the Soviet Union, Powers, and possibly other U.S. pilots, had been flying U–2's in reconnaissance flights over Soviet territory. With modern methods of detection, these marked planes with their 90-foot wingspreads—even when flying at 80,000 feet—were about as secret or covert as a tank rumbling down a street. Whether Powers' plane was taking photographs or gathering some other type of intelligence data is beside the point. The important fact is that the Soviet Union, for a period of several years, had been able to detect these planes flying openly over its territory, obviously on reconnaissance missions.

It knew that they were there, but rather than admit to the world that it did not have any weapon capable of bringing them down, it made no public protest.

It is most unfortunate that some newspapers and a major wire service in this country are now undermining the correct U.S. position in the Powers case, giving credence to Khrushchev's false contentions and seemingly justifying his outrageous conduct.

The Soviet Union undoubtedly wanted Abel returned because although his value as an espionage agent is now destroyed, his experience in this country could be put to good use in training other Soviet agents for assignment here. Despite this, the United States gained by obtaining the release from Communist prisons of two American citizens who were innocent of the charges made against them. Although these men are not spies and have not been trained in espionage, we should get from Powers the answers to some important questions, including that of just what caused the crash of his U–2 reconnaissance plane on May 1, 1960.

THE LITTLE-PEOPLE-TO-LITTLE-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. RODINO. 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. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, thousands of our citizens have been inspired and are responding to the President's already historic words delivered in his inaugural address:

Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

Among those thousands is my 10-year-old son, Peter.

Like most American children today, Peter is vitally aware of the problems our Nation faces. He realizes the solution of those problems is the job and the duty of you and me, and all other Government officials, aided by all of our citizens. But he does not allow his youth and inexperience to curb his thinking of the problems and their solution.

Overriding all other problems is the threat to the very existence of our own and yet unborn generations of people everywhere that hangs over the world in the form of the Russian bombs' fallout cloud.

Peter knows that many fine men from our own and other governments have been trying through conferences to persuade the Communist leaders to stop atmospheric testing.

But—

He told us one night at dinner—

maybe Mr. Khrushchev does not believe the ordinary people in America and other countries really want him to stop the bombing. Maybe if a lot of children wrote him, he would believe it. If he gets a fallout of letters, he might stop the fallout of bombs.

So Peter wrote to Mr. Khrushchev. He talked about it with his chums. They wrote, too. And, as the idea spread, other children from beyond our neighborhood heard about, and now many of them are writing. Parent Teacher Associations, Boy Scout groups and veterans' organizations are encouraging still more children to write. It is beginning to take shape as a real children's crusade.

When the President appointed General Eisenhower head of the people-to-people program, it seemed that Peter's activity was a natural corollary—a little-people-to-little-people program. The general and Mr. Nutter, the executive director of the program, agree and I am working with them to develop the little-people program.

After some discussion, we have decided to broaden the scope of this modern-day children's crusade. We agree that a fallout of letters to the Soviet Premier would have a stimulating psychological effect on people throughout the non-Communist world; but we wonder if it will have much effect on Khrushchev or the Comintern. We are apprehensive, moreover, that a fallout of letters about the bomb alone would intensify the Comintern delusions of grandeur that they are the masters of world events.

The project that we feel will be most effective is a massive worldwide effort, started here in the United States, to discredit and destroy the myth of communism in the minds of men throughout the world.

We believe that an important task in this project is to enlist the youngsters of our Nation into this political warfare which we didn't start, but which we do have to fight.

To be sure, this is taking a page from their own book. The Communists start the political training of their citizens at an early age, enlisting their youth in the young pioneer movement, preparing them for more sophisticated political training. I think we must conclude that this has been an effective system for the Communists. It can be even more effective for freemen. For we shall write on the white pages of freedom, not on the red pages of tyranny.

Let us use their example to initiate a movement that will give the children of the free world some facts about today's world. We know from various polls that at the moment our own youth, and many among our adult population, believe that communism is bad, but they do not know for sure because they do not know what communism really stands for, and does and is. We know, also, from the experience of our men captured during the Korean episode, that there is a concomitant ignorance about America, what our country and way of life stand for, do and are.

My colleagues, I believe we have a unique opportunity and a special responsibility to organize that movement here. We in the two bodies of Congress come from every corner of our great Nation. Some bring our families here, but, as we hope will be shown next November, our roots are in the districts we represent. We have available to us the scholarly and timely publications of our distinguished congressional committees, of the executive departments and agencies and all other appropriate material as soon as it is published. What better than we can give this movement an auspicious start and insure its orderly, successful momentum? Who better than we who meet in the Chambers of this building understands the utter need of our Nation to lead the fight of freemen everywhere against the Red menace. Let us answer the Communist crusade for world domination with our children's crusade for world education. Let us give meaning to the battle cry of freedom—"better brave than slave."

I solicit your comments. I ask your help. I shall welcome both.

THE KREMLIN'S CRIME

Mr. RODINO. 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. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the session of Congress now before us promises to be one of the most crucial in our national history. Under your wise and dedicated leadership, it promises to be also one of the most fruitful.

Two among the many vital and urgent issues that will come before us stand apart in their importance. For while most issues are concerned directly only with our own domestic welfare today, these two transcend all boundaries, spatial and temporal. Their significance reaches across the seven seas, and touches everywhere all nations, their institutions, their people—even those nations not yet named, those institutions not yet founded, those generations as yet unborn.

The two issues of such heroic, historical importance are: first, resumption of nuclear testing; and, second, America's trade policy.

It is to the first that I address myself today.

My feelings about the bomb, about the entire armaments race, you know well. You will remember that I and others among you introduced bills in 1960 and 1961 that ultimately led to the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Through the leadership of our Agency, I hoped, I still hope, that the road to peace may be found for all the world.

But in November at Geneva I attended some of the meetings of the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests. My colleagues, it was a most distressing affair. For while the distinguished British Minister of State, Joseph Godber, and our own equally distinguished delegate, Arthur H. Dean, came and spoke with earnest dedication to the task at hand, the Russians prevented the attainment of any progress.

Having contemptuously disregarded the entire world and poured more poison into the atmosphere in their 1961 tests than the total of all previous tests, the Russians dared to take the pose of being opposed to nuclear weapons. With their 1961 series concluded, they ignored the carefully prepared test-ban treaty draft which had been submitted to them last April by Mr. Dean, and substituted for it a meaningless four-paragraph agreement on banning the tests—with no attempt at monitoring controls.

Mr. Dean has my complete admiration for the courageous way he maintained his composure, and for continuing with his sincere and determined efforts to achieve progress toward a test ban.

Shortly after my return from Geneva, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, speaking for the President, announced that the United States and Russia had agreed to the formation of an 18 nation committee to begin negotiations toward general and complete disarmament.

When I heard this, I thought back to Geneva. And when I thought back to Geneva, I thought of the utter hypocrisy of daring to speak about banning almost at the very time they were bombing.

Two weeks ago, the Russians delivered another blow against disarmament when they broke up the 3-year-old negotiations for nuclear test-ban agreements. This week their leaders are nonresponsive to the efforts of our President and Prime Minister Macmillan for a Foreign Ministers' Disarmament Conference.

We do not want to resume atmospheric nuclear testing, for our own sake, but, more importantly, for the sake of our children and of those not yet born all over the world. By the words of her President and Congress, America has proclaimed this again and again for all the world to hear.

As Americans we can all be proud of our Presidents, and their representatives, in their sustained and dedicated

attempts in the past 3 years to remove the threat of the poison of nuclear tests.

If further negotiations are not at the moment possible, if the atmosphere is again contaminated, it will not be because of America. For these crimes against humanity itself, the leaders in the Kremlin, and they alone, will be guilty.

LIMITATION ON PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. ROUSH. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill today to provide that the President be authorized to purchase up to $100 million in United Nations bonds in an amount equal to that which is subscribed by other nations or individuals.

The United Nations has been a valuable asset to the world over the 17 years of its existence. It has proven to be a valuable instrument of the U.S. foreign policy over these years. Basic to its past value and its future success in our own conduct of foreign affairs and in that of other member nations is the universality of its support.

As a financial transaction, the United Nations bond issue is rather noncontroversial. The bonds will pay interest and will be repaid over a period not to exceed 25 years. The U.S. Government has loaned the United Nations money before. The Republican-controlled 80th Congress authorized the lending of $65 million to the U.N. for construction of its present headquarters facilities. Repayment of that obligation has been in strict accordance with the lending agreement. As a debtor, the United Nations has established a perfect credit record with its creditor, the United States.

From the standpoint of fiscal operations of the United Nations, the bond issue is vital. United Nations obligations have exceeded income on its special project missions. This has been caused by reluctance of member nations to pay special assessments authorized by the General Assembly to carry on the police activities of the organization.

It is obvious, then, that the bond issue is sound financing by the United Nations and sound lending by the United States. The critical problem at issue in the current debate is whether or not the United Nations serves a useful purpose to the United States in the conduct of its foreign affairs and whether or not it merits further support as an instrument of our foreign policy. To analyze the issue, it is necessary, therefore, to make a general review of the activities of the United Nations, and how they have affected our Nation and its goals in the world.

The United Nations was created in 1945 prior to the end of World War II at a conference in San Francisco. It was organized with the support and with the insistence of the leaders of the Allied Powers who were fighting and winning the war against tyranny. The purposes set forth in the preamble of the U.N. Charter are basically the preservation of peace with the corresponding prevention of future wars, and the promotion of the basic concept of human dignity with a corresponding recognition of human rights.

When the charter was drawn, the atomic age had not yet dawned. The exploration of space was still a science fiction subject. America and Russia were allies and China was ruled by Chiang Kai-shek. The Security Council was formed with practical recognition of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and China as the political and economic leaders of the world. In the Security Council they were given broad powers to keep the peace and each given a veto power over proceedings in that Council. In practice, the General Assembly has grown more powerful and more dynamic in carrying out the objectives of the charter in recent years.

Since that San Francisco Conference just 17 years ago, the world has undergone the most rapid and most effective social, political, and technological revolution in history. More than one-fourth of all the world's people—700 million—have thrown off the yoke of colonialism since 1945. The progress of human rights and human dignity has been at its most rapid pace in man's history. Technology has opened new worlds and created vast new fields of opportunity for human endeavor.

In this complex and changing environment, the United Nations has stood as the central clearinghouse for disputes, the champion of civil rights and liberties, and the source of political guidance for all of the nations in the world. It has not always been as effective as it could or should have been. There are instances which anyone might cite as the failures of the U.N. to live up to its ideals and goals.

In the 17 years of the United Nations, the United States has relied heavily on it as its basic instrument of foreign policy. When the Korean peace was broken, President Truman turned to the U.N. to provide the solution. When President Eisenhower sought to promote peaceful use of the atom and to provide for disarmament through aerial inspection, he turned to the U.N. to present his "atoms for peace" and "open skies" proposals. When chaos developed in the newly independent nation of the Congo, Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy relied on the U.N. to establish the rule of law.

Certainly the United States has relied heavily on the United Nations and not always with complete success. The Soviet Union has been forced to use her veto power in the Security Council more than 100 times to thwart implementation of free world policies. With the increased membership due to the newly emerging independent nations, control of the actual voting assembly has passed informally from the Western democracies to the new nations of Asia and Africa. American dominance of the assembly has, therefore, waned, but there has not been an increase in Soviet-bloc control.

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy this year asked for a vote of confidence in the United Nations. He said:

> Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. For the troubles of a world organization merely reflect the troubles of the world itself. And if the organization is weakened, these troubles can only increase. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority, but as an institution, it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member that the United States of America.

A critical analysis of the United Nations and its role in U.S. foreign policy will show that the world organization has consistently been a force for peace and instrument for good which we have been able to use to good advantage. It needs our continued support and the support of all member nations to continue to be successful. I believe that this universality of support is a critical point in the prospects for the United Nations. The United Nations needs the moral, political, and financial support of all its members. It must have a universal foundation on which to build for progress. U.S. leadership in this support is good and worth while, but it cannot be a substitute for the participation of the entire membership.

The United Nations is a world organization with 105 sovereign member nations. Its value and its successes to a large degree are dependent on the scope of moral, political, and financial support that it receives from its members.

This is not a phenomenon unique to the world organization. It is a simple and basic fact of political life whether it be on the local scale of a village, on the metropolitan level, or the State level; it is also true in the international organization that the effectiveness of a governmental organization is largely dependent on the base of active support for that governmental organization.

I believe that a basic premise on which our support of the United Nations rests is that the organization has the support of its member nations and the respect of the world. Without this, it is bound to be ineffective and doomed to crippling inactivity.

I believe that this position should be made clear to the world. By limiting our own participation in the U.N. bond issue to an amount equal to that which has been subscribed by other nations, this basic promise of our support is emphasized.

The State Department has indicated that they have received favorable reaction to the issue from 25 other nations and that 6 nations already making commitments have agreed to buy nearly $30 million in bonds. This gives me great confidence that the other nations will bear their full share of the financial burden and that our share will eventually amount to $100 million. Other nations must recognize the need for strong universal support of the United Nations; and with our lead, I am con-

fident this method of authorization will not in any way imperil the total success of the bond sale but will, in fact, be beneficial to it.

The United States has long borne the major burden of financial support for the United Nations. I do not address myself to this fact or to its desirability or undesirability. There are certainly logical reasons for our large share of the financial support of the organization. But along with our support, there must be the support of other member nations. By charter, the United Nations demands universal support of its members through annual assessments. The reluctance to pay special assessments for specific activities is damaging to the moral strength of the U.N. as well as to its financial position.

Let us stand now and tell our fellow members that our support hinges on yours. What the United Nations needs is not more and more of our support, but more participation by the entire membership. Let us make our position on this vital point clear by authorizing the purchase of the bond issue only in such amount as that which is subscribed by other nations.

And let this not be construed as a lack of support on the part of our Nation of the United Nations. Let it be taken as intended as a declaration of support and a position favoring multilateral support of the organization. It is in the own best interests of the United Nations to have broad support. My proposal is directed toward the best interests of the organization and is aimed at strengthening its position in the world.

I ask the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider this proposal along with the request of the President. I believe it provides the substance for which he has asked and adds strengthening influence in recording the U.S. sentiment for broad and universal support of United Nations operations.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from some of the comments made by those attacking the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, one would believe that this new Department would be concerned solely with big cities. If this is a big city proposal, who would be concerned with the needs of our smaller cities and towns? After all, nearly 50 percent of the urban population of the United States live in cities and towns of under 50,000 population.

Part of the answer to this charge is in the President's message transmitting the reorganization plan. In that message he said:

> It should not be assumed that these are matters of concern only to our larger cities. Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated in a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities.

The evident concern of the President is certainly to the point, and one that should be considered by all of the Members of the House whose constituencies include small cities and towns. But also to the point is the extent to which the programs of the Housing Agency have been tailored to the needs of smaller cities and the extent of small city participation in these programs.

An outstanding example of this is the public facility loan program which assists small cities in obtaining financing for their public works at reasonable interest rates. With the exception of some communities in redevelopment areas, this entire program is concerned with the needs of cities with populations of under 50,000.

The program of Federal advances for planning specific public works is another Housing Agency activity which has been predominantly concerned with the needs of our smaller cities and towns. Eighty percent of the applications for these planning advances have come from cities with a population of less than 50,000. Of this 80 percent, approximately half have come from communities with populations of under 5,000.

The program of Federal grants for overall urban planning is still another outstanding example of the way in which the programs of the Housing Agency serve the needs of smaller communities, and of the way in which these smaller communities are voluntarily participating in the programs. Over 2,000 localities with populations of less than 50,000 have received, or are receiving assistance to help them to the kind of planning which is so necessary for sound local decisionmaking. This represents 85 percent of the total number of communities receiving assistance under this program.

The urban renewal program is frequently talked about as being a big-city program, but what is little recognized is that it is also a small-city program. Over 63 percent of the localities participating in the urban renewal program have populations of less than 50,000 and have undertaken 43 percent of the total number of projects. This Congress has recognized the special importance of urban renewal to small cities and the special problems involved. In the recently enacted Housing Act of 1961, cities with populations under 50,000 were accorded 75-percent grants as compared with the two-thirds grants available to larger cities.

Public housing is also a concern of smaller localities. Eighty-six percent of the more than 1,500 communities participating in the public housing program had populations of less than 50,000. More than half of the participating communities had populations of less than 10,000.

With this record before us, I think the conclusion is clear—the programs of the Housing Agency are meant for communities of all sizes and communities of all sizes have been participating in these programs. It is clear from the President's message that he intends this new Department to serve all of the cities in America.

MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. 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 gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in my view, the single most important domestic issue before the Congress this year is that of providing adequate medical and hospital care for the elderly. This is a "gut" issue that involves the health and welfare of millions of older persons who cannot absorb the costs of a lengthy illness. It is an issue that other major industrial nations in the West have resolved by adopting, as did Great Britain, a national health plan. As a larger proportion of our population is concentrated in the older age category, provision for adequate medical care will remain a major problem that can neither be avoided nor interred.

I think it instructive, Mr. Speaker, to look at the position of that great closed-shop trade union of the medical profession, the American Medical Association. And in recent months we have had an opportunity to peek behind the gauze curtain, so to speak, and see what is inside.

The Journal of the American Medical Association, an official publication, in September 1961, carried an article bearing on the remarks of a William DeMougeot, professor of speech at North Texas State University, to an AMA institute. He analyzed the arguments put forth by the AMA against any form of Government interest in medical care and what did he find? Well the speech professor is quoted to this effect:

> Remember that most of the arguments we've examined work quite well on most people * * * it's only when facing more informed audiences or arguing with an intelligent opponent who possesses some of the facts I've cited that the vulnerabilities I've mentioned become a problem.

So what are these arguments that the AMA seemingly with success palmed off on the uninformed?

The speech professor listed five that he labeled as scare arguments.

National health insurance will be a step toward socialism—well now, countered the professor, for those attracted by slogans this may prove an effective argument. But, said the professor:

> For more sophisticated people, it is the most flagrant sort of propaganda—name calling—and it has long since lost its respectability because conservatives have applied it to almost all social legislation.

Scare argument No. 2 is that the Federal Government will control medical care and both patient and doctor will lose freedom.

This—

Said our professor—

is simpy not true—of course, not everyone could have the best doctor, to prevent overloading; but does the average person have that privilege now? * * * This is a good argument with which to scare people, but you'd better not use it if you have an audience or an opponent who knows how foreign systems are run.

Scare argument No. 3: The quality of medical care will deteriorate. Mr. DeMougeot said:

There have been unnecessary calls and arbitrary demands but the person who has put off needed medical care because of costs will prefer second-rate care to no care. And, besides, he said 71 percent of physicians in Britain felt the system helped them to fend off serious illnesses.

Bogey-man argument No. 4 is that the system will be expensive. The reply given the AMA Institute audience here is that Britain spends only 4 to 4½ percent of its national income on the health service to give complete care to all, while we in the United States spend even more for much less care quantitatively and their percentage is going down while ours is rising.

He estimated that in Britain about $50 is spent per person for a rather complete system, while in the United States about $114 is spent for partial care. And he added:

Do not treat the taxes which support such a system as if they would be an additional burden on each American; most such taxes would merely replace what is now spent on medical care.

A national health plan has failed in foreign nations and therefore we should avoid it here. This final scare argument simply has no basis in fact, according to Mr. DeMougeot, since 59 nations have adopted a national compulsory system of State payment for medical care and none has abandoned it, this argument hardly holds. And he points out the United States is the only major nation in the world without such a national plan.

So now the arguments most frequently used by the AMA lobby have been shown to be both specious and demagogic.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the AMA News of September 4, 1961, under the business and finance section where physicians are shown how to get a tax break. There are Federal income tax advantages to the physician and his family which he should consider in deciding whether to have a member of his immediate family work for him in his business, the article points out.

Parenthetically I point out that the AMA's opposition to having physicians covered by social security is well known. But this article in the AMA News, also an official publication, boldly suggests that a doctor pay $10 a week to his mother for straightening up his office. He could then deduct 3 percent from her wages and send it along with a matching 3 percent as employer to the Social Security Administration. This would be employment creditable toward social security benefits for the mother and, happily, the article goes on, the physician would have a business deduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I really despair for the health of the medical profession when I encounter such items as I have been reading.

When the AMA is driven, as it is being driven, from trench to trench and finally takes up a stand in its final redoubt I have a feeling its final proposal to offset a needed comprehensive medical insurance plan will be on the order of providing medical and hospitalization care for Americans on condition they work off the bill by doing weekend ward duty in hospitals—carry trays, handle bedpans, work in the kitchen and the laundry. On past performances, I think the AMA is capable of making such a proposal There are thousands of devoted and able physicians in the United States, among them my personal physician. But I suggest that the AMA is unrepresentative of their thinking.

JAY N. "DING" DARLING

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the curtain has been drawn on the life of Jay N. "Ding" Darling, one of Iowa's most distinguished citizens and long one of the Nation's favorite cartoonists as well as a powerful leader in the battle for conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Darling died of a heart ailment in Des Moines last Monday at the age of 85.

Twice, in 1924 and again in 1943, Mr. Darling won the Pulitzer Prize. In 1934, in a poll conducted by Editor and Publisher, the Nation's leading editors named him the best newspaper cartoonist.

Alarmed by the critical drop in the population of migratory waterfowl as a result of the drought years, Mr. Darling left his drawing board in 1935 to take an $8,000 job as Chief of the Biological Survey in Washington and launched the successful campaign that stands today as a monument to his efforts. For this and his other great contributions to the conservation of natural resources he was made honorary life president of the National Wildlife Federation.

In 1949, after a 48-year career, "Ding" Darling laid aside his eloquent pen. He used it once again in 1958 when, seriously ill, he drew a last cartoon and instructed his secretary to keep it hidden until after his death. It was a farewell to his legion of friends and admirers. It was published in the Des Moines Register last Tuesday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I join today in mourning the death of this distinguished American, and personal friend.

"PHANTOM ACRES" PAYMENTS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Freeman's flimsy explanation of phantom acres payments in the 1961 feed grains program makes it apparent he will try to perpetuate this $150 million annual waste in the 1962 and future programs.

In a speech to a regional meeting of the USDA Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service February 8, 1962, in Atlanta, Ga., Mr. Freeman said:

The facts should phantomize the phantom acres into thin air—the same thin, hot air from which they came.

Actually, Mr. Freeman's facts bring the phantom acres down to earth with a $150 million thud that is loud enough for all taxpayers to hear. The responsibility and the blame rests with Mr. Freeman, not with the farmers. It is obvious he will do nothing to stop this waste. The 1962 feed grains signup has already started. Congress itself must take the initiative.

Under the 1961 program, Mr. Freeman was supposed to base payments on average 1959–60 plantings. In corn, for example, the average was 82.2 million acres, according to official USDA reports. Instead he based payments on 87 million acres—up 5 million acres.

At an average of $30 an acre these cost $150 million.

Why the difference? Why does the USDA use two different figures to represent 1959–60 average planting? Here is Mr. Freeman's explanation, a full transcript from the test prepared for his February 8 speech in Atlanta:

Another catchy phrase used to deride the efforts of more than a million farmers taking part in the program has been phantom acres.

At the risk of using too many figures, I want to be very specific—this is a charge that needs to be nailed.

A check of feed grain acreage on participating and nonparticipating farms reveals the true facts.

While participants were reducing their acreage even more than diversions under the program, acreage of feed grains on nonparticipating farms was increasing. The check shows that participants underplanted their permitted acreage by 6.2 million. Nonparticipants increased their acreages by 6.7 million.

Let's take this further. While the law based acreages to be used in the program on average 1959–60 plantings, it also wisely recognized the need to make adjustments for abnormalities and inequitable situations that might exist among farms. As a result, base acreages used under the program were higher than the simple 1959–60 planted-acre averages. But participants underplanted their actual 1959–60 acreage by 2 million acres more than the 25.2 million acres for which they received diversion payments.

A part of the effort of participating farmers to stop unneeded production was nullified by acreage increases on other farms. The increases by noncooperators could not be

known at the time the critics were trying to show discrepancies in program figures and to create their phantom acres. Now, however, the facts should phantomize the phantom acres into thin air—the same thin, hot air from which they came.

Mr. Freeman was on target when he alluded to the risk of using too many figures. He used too many which were meaningless. As a matter of fact, none of the figures he used has anything to do with phantom acres.

His figures relate to planting in 1961. Phantom acres relate solely to the 1959–60 average plantings.

What farmers did, or did not do, in 1961 cannot change the record for 1959–60.

Mr. Freeman takes note of the fact that participants underplanted their permitted acreages by 6.2 million. This is misleading.

It fails to mention that farmers were free to use these acres for other crops, that such underplanting is normal in all similar programs, and that the figure relates to 1961, not the period in question.

He mentions nonparticipants. Are farmers who did not sign up but increased their plantings by 6.7 million acres to blame for phantom acres? Of course not. Here again, the figure relates to 1961, not 1959–60.

Mr. Freeman states that participants underplanted their actual 1959–60 acres by 2 million acres for which they received diversion payments.

This is a back handed way of saying that farmers claimed underplanting 27.2 million acres but were paid for only 25.2 million acres.

One can reasonably conclude that Mr. Freeman thus eliminated 2 million phantom acres. Why? What's the difference between one phantom acre and another? Why pay for 5 million of them but deny payment for 2 million others?

If all phantom acres consist of nothing but thin, hot air, as Mr. Freeman says, why play favorites?

In the final paragraph of Mr. Freeman's defense, he blames phantom acres on increased planting by noncooperators. Once again, this is irrelevant, having no bearing on 1959–60.

Mr. Freeman's one and only statement which relates directly to phantom acres is this:

> While the law based acres to be used in the program on average 1959–60 plantings, it also wisely recognized the need to make adjustments for abnormalities and inequitable situations that might exist among farms.

In other words, in any program of this type, room is needed for corrections and appeals. Otherwise, inequities will occur. This is certainly fair and reasonable, but in all previous programs—tobacco, rice, cotton, wheat—this room for correction and appeals has been provided within the total acreage base.

In cotton, for example, USDA administrators reserve about 5 percent of the total acreage base to provide room to adjust for inequities among farms.

In drafting and voting for the 1961 feed grains bill, Congress confidently expected that the same administrative standard would apply here.

Nothing in the bill's legislative history gave a hint of what was to follow.

After enactment of the bill, the Department of Agriculture announced—Federal Register, June 15, 1961, page 5358:

> In those counties where the Department of Agriculture has established the average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage produced in the county in 1959 and 1960 for use as a guide in determining the feed grain base for farms in the county, the total feed grain bases for all farms in the county, excluding any increase in farm feed grain base resulting from corrections, requests for reconsideration or appeals, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 495.13 to the extent practicable, shall not exceed 105 percent of such average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage.

This was a clear invitation to 5 percent exaggeration in the 1959–60 planted-acre average, and it also opened the door so the acreage needed for corrections and appeals could be added to the 5-percent boost.

In corn alone, the 5-percent leeway produced 4,100,000 of the phantom acres. Allowances for corrections and appeals accounts for the rest.

The mystery of the phantom acres is solved. They are the result of an unprecedented regulatory interpretation.

This interpretation wasted $150 million last year and will do the same needlessly this year unless my bill, H.R. 9329—to prohibit payment for phantom acres—is passed.

For an account of previous efforts to stop payments for phantom acres, refer to page 563, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 18, 1962.

A PLEDGE OF PEACE AND LIBERTY

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend by remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to describe a most unusual ceremony, possibly the only time it has ever occurred in the United States, which took place at Brant Beach, Ocean County, N.J., on January 25, 1962, when a French flag which was found washed up on the ocean shore was identified and delivered to the French Consul for return to its owners.

This flag which belonged to a group of French Army recruits drafted in 1922 was found by two boys, Vincent Scali and James Walzak, both 11 years old and members of the fifth grade in the Long Beach Island Consolidated School, washed up on the beach and they took it home with them. Later they brought it to school and showed it to their French teacher, Miss Joan Singley. Inscribed on the flag were the words "Honneur Aux Conscrits—RF—Classe 1922—Blainville-Sur l'Eau," and Miss Singley promptly wrote to the mayor of Blainville-Sur l'Eau asking for any information he could give concerning it. Under date of October 27, 1961, she received a reply, as follows:

BLAINVILLE-SUR-L'EAU,
MEURTHE AND MOSELLE,
October 27, 1961.

Miss JOAN M. SINGLEY,
French teacher, Long Beach Island grade school, Ship Bottom, N.J.

DEAR MISS: I have the honor to inform you of the receipt of your letter of October 20, 1961, which didn't fail to surprise me. Here are the answers to your questions.

In France the custom is that young men having reached their 20th birthday, undergo a collective medical examination called the council of review which declares them fit or unfit for military service. These young men join together and make up a group called the class (nothing in common with school).

They all contribute and buy a flag with the lettering which you have seen. The care of the flag is confided, by drawing lots, to one of the draftees.

For the class of 1922, the young man chosen was killed in 1944 during the last war. His widow must have married again, an American soldier with whom she left for America. Most likely the flag was part of their baggage and was separated from it when it was no longer found useful. This is I believe the most reasonable solution to explain this long trip.

The letters RF are the initials of the Republic of France.

The golden metallic fringe decorates most of the French official flags.

I will add that the flag of the draftees is present at all the presentations to which they are called to take part; national holidays, parades, visits to military graves, etc.

Also, they call conscripts (draftees) all the young boys called to military service at the age of 20.

The class of 1922 were very surprised to find their dear flag so far away. All their attempts to find it had been in vain. They thank you sincerely for having respectfully taking care of their flag.

It obviously would be happy for them to see the flag travel again to Blainville before 1962 to celerate their 60-year birthdays.

Would you agree to send it to us? Will you let me know the price of the postage? I will send it to you so that you can proceed with the mailing.

Also thanks to your two students who will long be remembered for their discovery.

It's a pleasure to read your letter, and with my repeated thanks—please accept, sir, my most respectful greetings.

MR. AUDIBERT,
Mayor of Blainville-Sur-L'Eau, Counselor General.

Under date of November 17, 1961, I received a letter from Frank H. Klein, executive director of the Long Beach Island Board of Trade, and quote from it as follows:

> I am enclosing herewith two copies of a letter received from the mayor of Blainville-Sur-L'Eau, France. As you will note, one copy is in French, the other an English translation.
>
> This letter is a reply to a communication sent by our French teacher, here at the Long Beach Island Consolidated Elementary School, in reference to a flag found by two students, on the bayfront in Ship Bottom, N.J.
>
> As you will note from the tone of the mayor's letter, the flag seems to be of quite some sentimental value to the men of his community and they are anxious for its return.

In my humble opinion the return of the flag with appropriate ceremonies might well be the means of building another bridge of friendship between the people of France and the United States down at the grassroots level. It would most certainly be a fine experience for our future citizens here at the local school.

My thought at this point would be for us to have a luncheon here at Wida's in Brant Beach, at which some person representing the French Embassy would receive the flag and promise to return it to its rightful owners. Or perhaps the presentation could be made in the school auditorium with lunch either before or after the ceremony.

I am sending the mayor's letter in the original French for your use in interesting the Embassy in the matter, should you think the project worthwhile.

On the receipt of this letter I contacted the French Embassy here in Washington sending them copies of the letter from the mayor of Blainville-Sur-l'Eau and arrangements were completed for the delivery of the flag to M. Pierre Gabard, consul of France in Philadelphia, and the date selected was January 25, 1962.

The ceremonies were started at a luncheon held at Wida's Restaurant in Brant Beach on the occasion of the weekly meeting of the Rotary Club of Long Beach Island and I quote from the official minutes of that meeting as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

As predicted last Thursday was quite a day, one of the most heartwarming in many a moon. The sun shone from a cloudless sky, there was no wind, the temperature hit 50° F., and many of the flags that had been sold for our scholarship fund flew along the boulevard. And because two bright lads from the Ship Bottom Grade School had found a French flag on our beach and taken it to Miss Joan Singley, their teacher—

1. Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS drove up from Washington because, as he stated, the finding of the French flag seemed to him "an act of God."

2. French Consul M. Pierre Gabard came from Philadelphia to receive his flag and return it to its owners in France.

3. Freeholder A. Paul King came from Toms River to enjoy the occasion.

4. Reporters and photographers came from four newspapers to record it all.

Representative JIM AUCHINCLOSS told us the episode would be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to remain there forever as a bright moment in international friendship. To honor the occasion he brought with him to present to the grade school the national flag which had flown over the Capitol in Washington the previous day.

Miss Joan Singley told the story of how the flag had been found and brought to her by the two boys.

Monsieur Gabard told us of the flag's significance. It belonged to a class of conscripts of the year 1922. It had been sought by the survivors of the class to be displayed, as was customary, at a reunion on their 60th birthdays.

Dick Van Dyk presented each of the two lads with a $2 bill.

Sea Dog Tom Bossert suggested our Rotary banner accompany the flag to France. All agreed.

For this day Frank Klein must be thanked. He perceived this opportunity to advance international understanding. He brought it into being. So, Frank, thanks from all hands.

After the luncheon the meeting was continued in the gymnasium of the Long Beach Island Consolidated School and I include herewith an article appearing in the Asbury Park Press on January 26:

LONG BEACH TOWNSHIP.

The ties between the United States and France that have existed since the American Revolution were strengthened yesterday by an auditorium of grammar school children, two young boys, a French teacher, and the French consul in Philadelphia.

The story started several months ago when the two boys, Vincent Scali and James Walzak, both 11 and both fifth graders at the Long Beach Island Consolidated School, were walking along the Barnegat Bay beach.

Vincent and James spotted a bag floating in the water. They recovered it and found inside a flag with some French words on it.

They knew it was French because they studied the language in Miss Joan Singley's class at school. They took the flag to her. She traced it to the 1922 class of military draftees from Blainville Sur L'Eau, a town in France.

FLAG RETURNED

Yesterday, in a ceremony at the school, the flag was given to Pierre Gabard, French consul at Philadelphia, for return to Blainville Sur L'Eau.

The auditorium of children made their contribution at the ceremony. They opened the program by singing the "Star Spangled Banner" and the "Marseillaise," the French national anthem, and closed it by singing two French children's songs they had learned in class.

M. Gabard, obviously moved, grasped Miss Singley warmly by the hand at the program's end. He had told the auditorium of children, teachers, parents, and members of the Long Beach Island Rotary Club:

"I know these two young men are good citizens because they have respect for the flag of another country. In the name of France and the mayor of Blainville Sur L'Eau, I thank you from the bottom of my heart."

Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey, who had arranged with the French Embassy in Washington for M. Gabard's appearance, told the audience the return of the flag was nourishment "to that friendly feeling that has always existed between this great country and France."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS then presented School Principal Warren Hickman with the U.S. flag which flew over the Capitol Building in Washington on Wednesday.

"You can well cherish the meaning of this day for a long, long time," Mr. AUCHINCLOSS told the children.

Earlier in the day, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS had addressed a Rotary Club luncheon at Wida's Brant Beach Hotel.

How the flag came to be in Barnegat Bay is not certain, but Miss Singley learned this much from Mayor Audibert of Blainville-Sur-l'Eau:

Each class of draftees has its own flag to be used in memorials and other ceremonies. A guardian is picked to keep the flag. The guardian for this particular flag was killed in action during World War II.

Some American soldiers were billeted in the guardian's home after France's liberation, and the mayor guessed the flag might have been presented to one of them as a souvenir. In any event, he wrote, the men of the class—all of whom will be 60 years old this year—were pleased to hear their flag had been found and would be returned to them.

M. Gabard went away with another flag, too. Ralph H. Reynolds, Rotary Club president, presented him with one of the club's own flags.

At the school ceremony, Vincent told of finding the flag and James recited its history.

Vincent is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Scali, 510 Central Avenue, Ship Bottom. James is the son of Mrs. Pauline Walzak, 8 West 64th Street, Ship Bottom.

I conclude these remarks with the translation of a letter dated February 8, 1962, I have received from M. Gabard as follows:

FRENCH CONSULATE,
Philadelphia, February 8, 1962.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Member of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I permit myself to write you this letter in French because I know all the interest you have in my country and her language; you proved it at Brant Beach and Ship Bottom.

I was very honored to make your acquaintance on the occasion of the simple ceremony—but how moving—of returning to France a tricolor flag belonging to the conscripts who are now 60 years old.

As you very well said, our two Republics have already been sisters for a long time, and for a long time, as I said, I have been acquainted with American good will. It will remain for us all an important pledge of peace and liberty.

I thank you infinitely for the $10 bill, which I have sent in the form of a check to the mayor of Blainville-sur-l'Eau. I am certain that the old men of the class of 1922 will appreciate your generosity and your amiability toward them.

In the hope of receiving you soon at Philadelphia, I pray you to accept the assurance of my high consideration.

PIERRE GABARD,
Consul of France.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Friday, February 16, to file a report on H.R. 10050.

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

There was no objection.

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure and satisfaction that I offer this joint resolution to the House.

As one of the sponsors of the several bills to provide medical care for senior citizens, I am particularly concerned with the pressing need for action in this area. Over 50 million Americans are either approaching or included in senior citizen status. Medical advances in recent years have made it possible for the average person to expect to live to a ripe old age. In view of this fact, we are now faced with the distinct obligation to explore ways and means of helping to insure that these additional years will be useful, productive, and healthful.

Our older citizens still have an invaluable contribution to make to our na-

tional well-being. The enormous potential which they possess as a group must be put to good use. These individuals deserve to be recognized as needed and worthwhile on the domestic scene as face the American people in this generation.

The needs of our senior citizens are great. Older men and women are frequently discriminated against solely because of their age. For this reason, and by reason of the financial inability which often accompanies the later years of a person's life, many of them are forced to live in substandard housing and to suffer the ill effects which this condition invariably brings.

Employment opportunities for the elderly—even those in good health—are extremely limited. It is ironic that medical science has prolonged human life only to create the problem of chronic unemployment for the older age group. Well-planned vocational retraining and a positive approach to the problem of job placement should be of the highest priority.

While the previously mentioned problems are of great importance, the most pressing issue and the area in which there is the greatest need is that of medical care for senior citizens. I shall not attempt to review the desirable features of this legislation or to argue its merits. These things have been done by me and other Members before both the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House. I would like only to remind the House of the great need which exists—here and now—for the prompt enactment of this program. We should not and must not fail in this important task. It is my sincere hope that medical care for senior citizens will become a reality before the end of this session of Congress.

I would also like to make special mention of the fact that my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY, has introduced an important bill for the benefit of our older citizens, H.R. 10014. This farsighted measure would create a U.S. Commission on Aging and authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons. In my opinion, this is excellent legislation, and it deserves favorable consideration by the House.

May this resolution authorizing the designation of the month of May as Senior Citizens Month remind all our people of our obligations to the senior citizens of our country which, in effect, are obligations to ourselves and future generations as well.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include appropriate material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to be asked to head such a program as this one in celebration of the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. I am both proud and gratified to take part in it. To do so is to be identified with the finest motives of mankind. For the Lithuanian tradition is one which from antiquity has been marked by courage, devotion to ideals, development of civilizing influences, respect for one's fellowman, and the pursuit of liberty.

It is the mark of a great people, of great strength of character individually and collectively, that the Lithuanians have been able to emerge from the vicissitudes of centuries as a people distinct in their identity, determined in their preservation of high standards, undaunted in their faith in the future, and indomitable in their quest for freedom. Had it not been for such fortitude, such perseverance in the face of odds, the maintenance of high values, and such insistence upon liberty of thought, the Lithuanian people might long since have succumbed to the inundations of foreign forces to which they have been subjected over and over again in the course of their long history.

The present deplorable state of political dominance of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is by no means a hopeless situation. If we but look at the past record of these indomitable people, we can look to the future with hope and confidence. For theirs is a history of repeated emergence from the onslaught of their enemies, and an emergence not as a cowed and beaten people, but as proud Lithuanians unconquered in spirit and undivided, despite the temporary plight of their mother country.

More than once has the nation of Lithuania occupied an important place on the map of Europe. Though the independence which we honor today dates from 44 years ago, when the Lithuania of the 20th century became a democratic republic after World War I, that day in 1918 was not just a beginning. It was a rebirth of a nation.

Lithuanian history is a long and splendid one, though troubled. The Lithuanian people were known to Tacitus, who wrote of them in the first century of the Christian era. They can trace their identity through their language, which like only the Basque, in continued purity predates that of all of the other countries of Europe. Lithuania as a nation dates from the Middle Ages, when it was the dominant state of central and eastern Europe. History records it as divided into many principalities in the year 1009. But by the 14th century it was an entity stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In the year 1386, through the marriage of the thrones, Lithuania and Poland were joined together. Two centuries later these countries were officially joined by parliamentary action. The union lasted until 1795, though Poland twice suffered partition before then.

The development of Lithuania and Poland was far superior to that of the rest of eastern Europe politically, socially, and economically. Lithuania was one of the first countries of Europe to embrace Christianity. Respect for the individual, a corollary of Christianity, developed early, and the Lithuanians enjoyed more human freedoms than did their neighbors in countries on either side of them. In the general development of European civilization their part was an important one.

Because of their powerful independence and their superior culture they were able to protect Europe from the eastern hordes of Mongols and Tartars, at the same time withstanding for centuries the German drive to the east.

It was in 1795, at the time of the third partition of Poland that Lithuania fell prey to the domination of Russia. Repeated attempts to throw off the Russian yoke were unsuccessful during the 19th century. But equally unsuccessful were the tsarist efforts at russification of the Lithuanians. After a century of vain attempts to repress the Lithuanian spirit, to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with that of Russia, the policy was abandoned in 1905. While Lithuania remained politically a part of Russia until the Russian revolution of 1917 and the emergence of the new states after World War I under the policy of self-determination of peoples, the heart of Lithuania had never been conquered.

Nor was it conquered when invasion from Germany followed upon Russian withdrawal. Nor yet when, with Germany conquered, the Red army of Russia returned to install a Communist government. When political independence was finally a reality, it was to remain undisturbed only until World War II, when first German and then Russian invasions were renewed.

Despite, though, all ravaging and occupation of their country, the Lithuanians have never been conquered in spirit. They are an intrepid and indomitable people, and their independence will survive as it has for a thousand years survived. Lithuanian Independence Day is a day of triumph and of promise.

At this point, I take pleasure in inserting a series of gubernatorial proclamations designating February 16 as Lithuania's Independence Day.

The aforementioned proclamations follow:

GUBERNATORIAL PROCLAMATIONS DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 16 AS LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Persons of Lithuanian birth or decent, living in the United States and elsewhere in the free world, are leaders of the effort to liberate Lithuania from the Communist occupation it has endured for more than 20 years.

To these people, February 16 is a date of great significance since it was on that day in 1918 that Lithuania became an independent

state, and remained so until it and other Baltic nations fell under Soviet domination.

To call attention to the desire of the Lithuanian people themselves supported by all lovers of freedom everywhere, for a return to return to their independent status, Friday, February 16, is designated as Lithuanian Independence Day.

May the observance of this event inspire us to turn an attentive and sympathetic ear to the appeal for justice which comes from within Lithuania.

May the time be near at hand when Lithuanian Independence Day can be celebrated openly in that country itself, as it is here by those who recall the days when Lithuania was free.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania occurs on February 16, 1962; and

Whereas this 44th anniversary will be observed by Americans of Lithuanian birth and ancestry and friends of Lithuania everywhere with suitable commemorative exercises; and

Whereas it is altogether fitting and proper to accord official recognition to this anniversary in the name of free peoples everywhere: Now, therefore,

I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout Illinois and request the appropriate observance of the occasion.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Whereas the people of Lithuania were deported, enslaved and mass-murdered by Communists; and

Whereas their religion was repressed and their freedom obliterated; and

Whereas a liberty-loving nation is not easily shackled, particularly when that nation has known the experience of freedom; and

Whereas the plight of Lithuania is known to all of us, and we cannot, as Americans, take a casual view of the loss of freedom of any nation; and

Whereas those whose ancestors came from Lithuania, and their friends of all national origins, join them in their hopes and prayers for liberation from communism: Now, therefore,

I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, the 44th birthday of Lithuania's independence, as Republic of Lithuania Day in this State, in recognition of the faith and courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of all men who fight for freedom.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas Friday, February 16, 1962, marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, that once free and proud nation now humbled under the yoke of Soviet oppression; and

Whereas from 1918 until 1940 this small nation displayed the exemplary characteristics of maturity, political stability, and social growth; and

Whereas despite the invasion and annexation of Lithuania in 1940 by Russia, the people of this indomitable country retain their fervent hope that liberty will once again be restored to them; and

Whereas the United States has refused to recognize the annexation of Lithuania and deplores the continued suppression of human rights by the Soviet Government; and

Whereas the citizens of Lithuania should be given inspiration to carry on their fight for liberty and justice: Now, therefore,

I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Republic of Lithuania Day and urge the citizens of Massachusetts to pay tribute to the oppressed people of this brave nation.

STATE OF NEBRASKA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Lithuanian Council in Vilnius on February 16, 1918, proclaimed to the world in the oldest living European language the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian occupation; and

Whereas Lithuania, during a score of years of independence, demonstrated her ability to advance, grow, and prosper, and to become an active member of the League of Nations; and

Whereas the people of Lithuanian origin or descent have helped this country to establish its independence and then contributed their share in the development of its natural resources, industry, and life; and

Whereas Lithuania, with her sister Republics of Latvia and Estonia, and first to disappear behind the Iron Curtain and to suffer and expose the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia and thus to apprise the world of the aims and techniques of communism; and

Whereas this country has demonstrated our sincere devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania: Now, therefore,

I, Frank B. Morrison, Governor of the State of Nebraska, do hereby proclaim Friday, February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day throughout Nebraska and commend the day and its significance to the patriotic consideration of all our citizens.

STATE OF NEW YORK

The inhabitants of Lithuania are a proud people with a history of many centuries of independence. Toward the close of the 18th century their land was brought under complete domination of the Russian czars. During more than 120 years of Muscovite misrule, the Lithuanians never accepted their defeat as final, never gave up their struggle.

With the collapse of the German armies at the end of the First World War the Lithuanian people seized the opportunity and their National Council, on February 16, 1918, issued a declaration calling for the reestablishment of Lithuania on a democratic basis. Heroically they fought off an attempt by the Bolshevik government to reestablish the Russian yoke.

During the country's brief period of freedom, the Lithuanians maintained a government based upon equality of opportunity for all, a government which won the respect of the entire world.

This happy period of freedom ended in 1940 when by force of arms and under conditions of characteristic brutality, the Soviet suppressed Lithuania and forced it into the Soviet bloc.

We are fortunate in having among our citizenry, many Americans of Lithuanian origin. They are among our most valued neighbors and true friends. It is fitting that we join them in expressing the hope that the people of the land of their fathers may once again be freed of their bondage: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day in New York State.

STATE OF OHIO

Whereas February 16, 1962, will be the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of a free and independent Lithuania;

Whereas Lithuanians all over the world are celebrating February 16, 1962, as a memorial to a once free Lithuania; and

Whereas Lithuanians in America are observing this date by reasserting their belief in freedom for all people and reaffirming their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where we believe in and courageously struggle for liberty; and

Whereas Americans, citizens of a free Republic, have a warm and instinctive sympathy for the aspirations of freedom-loving people in other lands; and

Whereas citizens of Ohio of Lithuanian origin and descent have made a fine and substantial contribution to the growth and welfare of the State of Ohio: Now, therefore,

I, Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Day in Ohio and urge all the citizens of this State to join with those of Lithuanian descent in appropriately and suitably noting this date and the great significance which it has, especially for the Lithuanian people.

STATE OF OREGON

February 16, 1962, will be observed in many areas of the free world as the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Although presently this once-free country is behind the Iron Curtain of totalitarianism, I would hope that throughout America those citizens of Lithuanian descent and others who are concerned with the cause of freedom throughout the world may, through appropriate observances, recognize the continued need for support of those liberty-loving people of Lithuania who are prevented from observing this national holiday in their Soviet-occupied homeland.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the council of Lithuania formally declared Lithuania a free and independent Republic; and

Whereas Communist Soviet Russia, despite treaties and agreements, has suppressed and forcibly violated the political and territorial liberties of Lithuania and neighboring Baltic nations; and

Whereas Lithuanians and their neighbors were scattered and destroyed by murder, exile, and imprisonment in concentration camps; and

Whereas there is the fervent hope that Lithuania will regain her liberties and rights as a member of the world community. Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania as a free and independent state; and

Whereas Pennsylvanians of Lithuanian descent have contributed in many ways to the welfare and strength of this Commonwealth: Now, therefore,

I, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day, and I call upon all citizens of the Commonwealth to join with our citizens of Lithuanian descent in the observation of this important anniversary and to mark the occasion with appropriate ceremonies.

STATE OF TEXAS

February 16, 1962, will mark the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

While for the last 22 years this nation has been under the domination of Soviet Russia, the nearly 1 million freedom-loving Lithuanian-Americans annually observe this day when Lithuania obtained its freedom in World War I.

It is appropriate that Texans of Lithuanian descent be joined by their fellow citizens in marking this observance and continuing to work for freedom in Lithuania and other independent countries which have fallen under the heel of Russian communism: Therefore,

I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate February 16, 1962, as Lithuania Independence Day in Texas.

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Whereas the 16th of February marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of inde-

pendence to the more than 700-year-old Lithuanian state; and

Whereas although the Lithuanian nation has been under the oppressive tyrannical rule of Communist Russia since 1940, the love of liberty and independence continues to burn brightly in the hearts of Lithuanian people; and

Whereas all the people of Wisconsin and the Nation are in deep sympathy with the plight of this oppressed country: Now, therefore,

I, Gaylord A. Nelson, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Day and pay tribute to the heroic Lithuanian people who have struggled against so many odds for the peace and freedom of their beloved country.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR OF NORTH DAKOTA

We are proud to observe with you Lithuania's Independence Day. We certainly hope that this observance will be successful throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who chaired the famous Katyn Massacre Committee of several years ago, upon which I had the honor of serving. We investigated here and all over Europe the massacre by the Communist Russians of thousands of Polish officers during the war years; and thus we struck one of the great blows against this evil.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are again commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence which marks the 44th time which the people of Lithuania and their friends do honor to that eventful day in the history of that liberty-loving nation. The Lithuanian people for 800 years have at intervals enjoyed freedom and independence and regrettably on too many occasions have the people of Lithuania been compelled to live in virtual enslavement under control of more powerful neighboring nations.

During the 18th century, this nation was under the tyrannical yoke of Russian tyranny for over 120 years. But during this time against terrific odds, the Lithuanian people launched five major revolts against their conqueror. At each interval during its history when Lithuania enjoyed free government, its leader demonstrated outstanding leadership to rule and legislate for its freedom of all its people.

World War I brought about an international situation which gave Lithuania a long-awaited opportunity to proclaim to the world that it was a free and independent nation. For more than 20 years as a free country, no nation has ever demonstrated its capacity and ability for self-government more than Lithuania. Its civic leaders brought about long-needed land reformation, created and expanded industry, established an adequate transportation system, enacted social legislation, and an educational policy which could well be copied by other nations throughout the world. This great progress by a free nation continued up until World War II when Lithuania again became the victim of a powerful aggressor nation who succeeded in enslaving its people.

I have on former occasions spoken on the floor of this House outlining the infiltration duplicity and force used by the Communists to submerge Lithuania and I shall not repeat these sordid facts today. I can only say that the people of Lithuania will not be alone in their fight for freedom against the Soviet tyrants. Millions of others are today temporarily held under the yoke of Communist tyranny. They, along with the free nations of the world, including the United States, must keep up the fight not only to curtail the expanse of communism but to wipe its tyranny from the face of the earth and restore liberty and independence to the valiant and heroic people of Lithuania.

Back in the 83d Congress, I was a member of the special committee on investigating Communist aggression and particularly as it pertained to the Baltic States. That committee took the testimony of over 200 witnesses and recorded hundreds of exhibits at hearings held in the United States and Europe. This committee did major service over the period that it was holding hearings to expose to the world the unlawful and barbarous methods used by Stalin, Khrushchev, and other Soviet leaders in enslaving Lithuania and other small nations surrounding its borders.

Our colleague, Congressman DAN FLOOD, who has reserved this time today to honor the Lithuanian people was also a member of that committee and contributed major service to the successful findings exposing Communist aggression.

As a Member of the House Rules Committee during the last two sessions of Congress, I have fought within the committee to report favorably on the floor of the House the pending resolutions to create another special committee for the purpose of further exposing to the people of the world true facts, methods, purposes, and international crimes committed by the Communist leaders in their long ranged program to enslave the world under Communist tyranny. I do hope that we can get favorable action in this session of Congress on the creation of a Special Committee for Captive Nations. I have this week introduced House Concurrent Resolution 418, asking the Congress to condemn the false and oppressive persecution against all religions not only in Lithuania but in other satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain. Other Members have introduced similar resolutions and I do hope that we can get favorable action by the Congress on this concurrent resolution during the present session.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 418 along with my remarks commemorating Lithuanian independence.

Whereas the atheistic governments of the Soviet Union and the captive nations of international communism have directed their forces toward the complete destruction of all religious worship and other liberties; and

Whereas the prosecution of Roman Catholic priests in January of 1962 by the Government of Lithuania represents the latest oppression of religion in the Communist bloc nations; and

Whereas the false charges upon which such prosecution is maintained may indicate a final program by the Government of Lithuania to eliminate the Catholic priesthood in Lithuania; and

Whereas the prosecution of Roman Catholic priests in Lithuania may demonstrate a growing campaign throughout the Communist bloc of severe persecution of all peoples who believe in God: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress condemns the false and oppressive prosecution of Roman Catholic priests by the Communist Government of Lithuania and the Communist persecution of religion everywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of Congress, I have cosponsored a concurrent resolution which I have this week introduced in Congress asking for the creation of a committee to investigate these various countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], with whom I have served in the 83d Congress as a member of the Committee on Communist Aggression, will agree with me, that it was the leaders of Lithuanian folks in this country who were responsible for the creation of that committee. Hearings were held not only in this country but throughout Europe, during which we took the testimony of some 250 witnesses. The publicity from the committee's hearings was sent to nations over the globe revealing some of the startling international crimes committed by Stalin, Khrushchev and other leaders of the Soviets in their efforts to enslave Lithuania and other nations. Although 8 or 9 years have now passed, the effects and results of the work of that committee have been valuable in informing millions throughout the world of the true tactics of communism.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has appeared before the Rules Committee on a number of occasions, along with other Members, asking for the approval of a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. As a member of that committee, I have fought on behalf of those resolutions to get favorable action so that this Congress may be authorized to investigate the methods used by Communists in keeping the satellite nations enslaved. I hope that in this session of Congress the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be acted on favorably by the Rules Committee. I shall make every effort to get favorable action by that committee so that we may establish a special committee to investigate the Communist enslavement of captive nations in this session of the Congress. The people of the world should know the history of Soviet aggression in the satellite nations, including Lithuania, and the methods used in keeping the people of Lithuania and other people under enslavement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I am grateful to the gentleman from Indiana. He has recited well the history of our experiences in special investigations of committees of this House dealing with the Communist menace. I was especially pleased to hear him refer to my pending resolution now before the Committee on Rules calling for a special committee again for the investigation of the captive nations, which has struck a chord all throughout this Nation. I hope and pray with him that the Committee on Rules will see fit to report out this resolution so that this committee can be established once more and again show the world the weight of this body on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who has worked with me this session mainly to point out that this is a bipartisan approach or a nonpartisan approach, *if you will*, to the subject and who has helped me greatly in our efforts to create the Captive Nations Committee.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his forthright statement here today on the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I also commend him for his tenacious fight through the years, not only for the enslaved people of Lithuania, but the millions of others who are trapped today behind the Iron Curtain. It certainly has been my privilege, for the short time I have been in the Congress, to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania for legislation which would create a committee in the House—the Special Committee on the Captive Nations—to investigate the facts and the evidence of the peoples who are now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. He certainly is to be encouraged and commended for his fight has been a long and a hard one. But it has been a consistent one, and I hope that within the near future it will bear fruit here in the House of Representatives.

I can think of no more fitting commemoration of this anniversary of Lithuanian independence than for this House to establish the Captive Nations Committee to give voice to the struggle that these valiant people have withstood in the past 22 years. Too long this gallant little nation has suffered the domination of the Soviet Union. Her people yearn to be out from under the yoke that has suppressed them at various stages over the centuries. They want to determine their own destiny through a government and a way of life of their own choosing. To say that they chose Soviet tyranny would be to make a mockery of the free elective process which is held so dear by those who have experienced it.

Though small geographically, Lithuania possesses a great cultural tradition totally independent of the monster to the east which seeks to eradicate all significant singular characteristics of its conquered nations. This is but one of the crimes committed by the Soviet Union when she brings down her reign of terror upon another nation.

Today, through our commemoration, we attempt to shine a ray of hope through the Iron Curtain into Lithuania. We proclaim our friendship for her people and our intention to one day see them free.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Massachusetts is, as usual, most kind, and I, of course, hope that he will get his wish.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] who last year had the honor and the privilege of sharing this exercise.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for giving me this opportunity to speak today in paying tribute to Lithuania. I also want to commend him for the many years that he has handled the Lithuanian hour in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is a particular honor to take part in these exercises marking the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. During the Middle Ages Lithuania was a great and powerful nation. She successfully turned back the invasions of Germans, Mongols, and Tartars. Finally, in 1795 she lost her freedom to czarist Russia. After that there were many attempts by the Lithuanians to throw off Russian domination, but they were tragically unsuccessful. After the third revolt, which took place in 1831, the czarist government initiated an attempt to replace Lithuanian language and culture with Russian. This merciless and repressive policy was intensified after still another revolt in 1863, but the Lithuanians refused to give in to the overwhelming power of the foreign dictator and remained faithful to their language, religion, and traditions. The policy of forceful russification was abandoned in 1905, and the Lithuanian refusal to accept the full weight of Russian rule remains an example for all peoples who are under the ruthless Russian dictatorship today.

In 1915 Lithuania was overrun by German armies, and Russian domination came to an end. The cost of the First World War to the Lithuanians was great, with first the retreating Russians and then the Germans seizing or destroying everything that could be of use. In 1917, in response to Lithuanian pressure, the German Government authorized a gathering of 200 Lithuanians to discuss the possibility of Lithuanian independence. On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles. The defeat of Germany, combined with Russian revolution, gave the tiny Lithuanian people an opportunity to fulfill its ancient yearning for real independence.

But the hopes of a long suffering people were not so easily fulfilled. Less than a year after the declaration of independence whose anniversary we are celebrating today, German troops evacuated the city of Vilnius and the Red army entered the city and installed a Communist government. In 1920 the Red army was driven out by the Polish Army led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and Lithuanian fighting units. Having no other alternative, Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty.

But as is so often the fate of small countries the brute power of larger neighbors proves to weigh more on the scales of history than the rightful aspirations of the people, even when these aspirations are recognized in formal treaties. Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania, and a permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922, granting the Lithuanian people freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. But independence lasted only until 1939, when the Lithuanian people became one of the first victims of both German and Soviet aggression. In the summer of 1940 the Soviet Union engineered the establishment of a friendly government, which under Soviet pressure duly requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and the country was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. Lithuania was overrun by German invaders, and when the fortunes of war turned against the Nazis, Lithuanians returned not to independence but to Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, we know that deep in the heart of every native Lithuanian there is a passion for liberty and freedom which will never die. There is no earthly power that can forever hold in servitude a God-fearing people who are determined to overcome the will of the tyrants. On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian origin to salute the Lithuanian people everywhere.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who I am pleased to say has done as much as anyone in the many years that I have been here to join me and others in fighting this kind of cause with any weapon at hand against communism. He has served on several of the committees which we have heard named. I am pleased that he will speak today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman and express my sincere congratulations and gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] who has taken this opportunity to enable his colleagues to have time to give their remarks and observations with reference to the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence by that once great, free, and friendly independent nation of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania as a nation had never, during the many centuries of independence and Lithuanian rule over vast areas of Eastern Europe, practiced intolerance or oppression in her relations with the nationalities inhabiting those areas.

Defending themselves and Europe from the Mongol invasion, and defending themselves from the Teutonic conquest, the Lithuanians had maintained magnificent traditions of neighborly collaboration with their friends and subjects on terms of cultural and political equality. The Lithuanian underground struggle for the freedom of the printed word in their own language, represented

the unique 40-year epic which ended in a Lithuanian victory over the czardom in 1904. Following the pronouncement of the 14 points by President Wilson in January 1918, the Lithuanians were the first Eastern European nation to proclaim their independence within a month thereafter—on February 16, 1918. Their declaration of independence, promulgated in the ancient capital city of Vilnius, referred simply to "the recognized right of nations to self-determination," and the restoration of the Lithuanian state.

Independence was not won easily. Even while fighting battles against the encroaching enemies, the Lithuanians held free elections in 1920 and promulgated a democratic republican constitution.

Peace was signed with Russia at Moscow on July 12, 1920, and the Soviet Union renounced forever any and all claims to the Lithuanian people and soil. Lithuania soon thereafter was admitted in the League of Nations and scrupulously observed her international obligations. Her Government was active in every major international peace undertaking, such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Litvinov definition of "aggression pact." Nonaggression and arbitration pacts with Germany and the Soviet Union seemed to guarantee Lithuania's independence. Her people were energetically raising their cultural standards and economic prosperity. By 1938 excellent relations were maintained with all the neighbors of Lithuania.

Lithuania did not deserve the cruel fate imposed upon her by the predatory action of Stalin and Hitler. Lithuania is perfectly justified in continuing to resist the Soviet Russian oppression and in demanding that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be honored. The Lithuanian people have earned liberation—and liberation must come ultimately.

I pay my humble tribute to the valiant fighters for freedom of Lithuania. I condemn the horrible crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Soviet Russian occupant in Lithuania and the Baltic States.

Again I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for introducing his resolution to create a Captive Nations Committee. What is lacking in this world, I think, is candor and courage and fortitude to present to the world the fact that the Russian Communists, as well as the Chinese Communists, have by their predatory action deprived God-fearing people of the right of national self-determination.

We as a Nation were born in revolution and it is up to us, upon whom the mantle of world leadership has been placed, to present forthrightly to the world and to the United Nations the true facts of world Russian and world Chinese communism and imperialism, and to demand that the Russian and Chinese Communists live up to the agreements which they have made. It is about time that we in Congress set up this Committee on Captive Nations, the reasons for which have been so clearly presented by the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Because other nations and because our representatives at the United Nations are unwilling to bring up resolutions demanding that the Russians abide by the commitments they have made in the United Nations, such as the General Assembly Resolutions on Hungary, I think it is up to the U.S. Congress to set up this Captive Nations Committee which will bring to light the terrible events that have occurred and are occurring behind the Russian and Bamboo Curtains. The world will then again know that the U.S. Congress stands behind Public Law 86–90 in its determination that all nations, large and small, must have the opportunity to exercise the right of self-determination.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I urge the Committee on Rules to approve the Flood resolution. This committee, if it is set up under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], will be of inestimable value and assistance in the case of peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation which now suffers under the yoke of Soviet tyranny. We in the United States have never recognized the legality of this Soviet takeover and we look forward to the day when our country may resume diplomatic relations with a truly free and independent Lithuanian Government. It is fitting on this occasion as we commemorate the independence of a brave, though small, nation to ask ourselves what it is that distinguishes our American position toward the Russian satellite states. Why do we urge, at every opportunity that is offered us, that the satellite states of Eastern Europe be allowed the right of freedom and independence? It is because we recognize and uphold the essential dignity of the human being wherever that dignity is imperiled.

Man has an inherent and inviolable right to the choice between good and evil, truth and falsehood, right and wrong. When this right is destroyed, all our free civilization is endangered. National boundaries can no longer blind us to the dangers to ourselves when these rights are violated anywhere. It is for this reason that we call to mind today the search of the Lithuanian people for national independence and personal freedom.

The Lithuanian struggle for liberty has a long history. Five major revolutions took place during their 120 years under Russian domination from 1795 to 1915. The Napoleonic era saw Lithuanian volunteers unite to form nine regiments to fight for the liberation of their country. The defeat of Napoleon, however, brought an end to the provisional Lithuanian Government. Churches, schools, monasteries were abolished as Czar Nicholas decreed the policy of "Russification" that sought to turn Lithuania into a Russian province. Undaunted by previous failures, the Lithuanians again rebelled in 1863 and 1864, only to be crushed again with cruelty, Siberian exile, and forced emigration. In 1905, yet another revolt suffered the same fate.

Russian domination temporarily came to an end in 1915 when Lithuania was overrun by the German armies. And on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council adopted what may be called a declaration of independence. It called for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania on a democratic basis, with Vilna as capital and the severance of all political ties which had linked it with other nations. In 1920 the new Soviet Communist government agreed by a treaty to recognize the "self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania." This was the pledged word of the Soviet state that was broken when it suited the Communist dictators a few years later. Observe the words carefully. The treaty said that the Soviet Union renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

These events appeared to herald the birth of a long and glorious life of freedom for the Lithuanian people. Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations in September 1921. Sweeping reforms were initiated within the country. At the head of the list was land reform, a subject of intense interest throughout the world today. Before World War I approximately 450 families in Lithuania owned 3½ million acres or 22 percent of the land. Within a few years the new democratic government of Lithuania had made possible the establishment of over 45,000 new farms and more than 200,000 persons had been provided with regular jobs and permanent homes through agrarian reform. The nation flourished. In the 10-year period before World War II grain production increased almost 100 percent and there was a 15-fold rise in the butter output of this rich farming country. Industry and transportation increased as Lithuania moved forward in freedom for the first time in more than a century. Progressive social legislation was introduced. The 8-hour day was instituted and provisions made for medical care of the rural people. Tremendous changes took place in the field of education. In 1920, for instance, there were only 9,000 students in high schools; by 1939 the number had doubled. Progress was even greater at the grammar school level where the number of students rose from less than 72,000 in 1920 to almost 300,000 in 1939. During this time Lithuania became a modern nation.

World War II shattered all this progress as Lithuania became Russia's first victim in the holocaust. By means of threats and intimidations Russia extracted a so-called 15-year mutual assistance pact from Lithuania. But this was merely a smokescreen for Soviet annexation. On June 15, 1940, which is a day of infamy in recent Lithuanian history, Soviet troops occupied the land. With the exception of the 3 years of German occupation during the war, the Soviets have been there ever since.

Americans may well be proud of their relations with this courageous occupied country. The U.S. Government and its citizens made important contributions to the attainment of Lithuanian independence. During the First World War

the 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson, notably the principle of self-determination, brought inspiration to Lithuanians in their struggle for independence and facilitated their winning of independence. Americans of Lithuanian descent, who are fine Americans, have continued to furnish moral and material support to their friends and relatives at home. And I would emphasize again that the United States has steadfastly refused to recognize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania.

During World War II President Roosevelt met with Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain and issued a declaration of policy which has continued to be a true expression of the principles upon which U.S. policy is based. In the Atlantic Charter we pledged "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." May we soon see the day when those words are realized in Lithuania.

Nationalism, the desire for freedom and independence, is one of the most potent forces in the world today. But we sometimes forget that nationalism is not restricted to the colonial areas of Africa and the Far East. The people of Lithuania also want and richly deserve their freedom. In fact, their passion for self-determination may be even stronger than that of the colonial peoples because there is no freedom in Lithuania today, whereas there is in most African colonies. Soviet Russia poses as the friend of nationalism and the enemy of imperialism. But her continued subjugation of Lithuania is a living refutation of these Soviet claims. Let Khrushchev give the Lithuanian people their long-denied freedom before he again sings the praises of anti-imperialism. It is well to remember this today when we pause to honor the birthday of Lithuanian independence. Lithuania must again become a free and independent nation dedicated to friendly progress and cooperation with the citizens of the free world. And we pray that the arrival of that day may not be prolonged. Until then let us help to nourish the defiant hope of liberty that burns within the hearts of the people of Lithuania.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join once again in this annual observance of the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence as a sovereign nation. This independence was ruthlessly destroyed by the Soviet Union in 1940, and since that sad time, the people of Lithuania have been existing under the yoke of an aggressive foreign power which they detest and abhor.

In 1940, the Soviet Union repudiated its treaty obligations with this small and helpless neighbor, invaded the country by armed might and forcibly took over the government. It acted similarly against Lithuania's small neighbors, Estonia and Latvia.

Throughout these past 22 years, these little states have been exploited as mere colonial possessions of a ruthless Communist dictatorship, which is completely foreign to the ideals and aspirations of these defenseless peoples.

We observe this anniversary of Lithuania's former independence in order once again to bring to the world America's sympathy for these subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Let us ring out the message that we have not forgotten them and we shall never condone the deplorable action of the Soviet Union in denying these peoples the right of self-government, independence, and freedom.

As in other Communist-ruled nations in Eastern Europe, Lithuania and its small neighbors are ruled by the force of the Russian Army, their guns, their tanks and the secret police. They are the victims of intolerable oppression. They long for the day when they shall again live in the sunlight of liberty and independence.

The people of America join in their determination that this day will eventually come.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence for Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates elected a 20-member council which proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

Lithuanians were not fortunate enough, however, to be permitted to enjoy the blessings of freedom for any sustained period of time. Almost constantly since their proclamation of independence, the Lithuanian people have suffered under German occupation or the oppression of the Soviet Communist invaders. Under Communist domination, Lithuania has turned into a slave state, and suffered the loss of thousands of its citizens through execution or deportation to Siberia.

U.S. policy toward the freedom-loving peoples of Lithuania has never changed. The United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, and it has never recognized that nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. It continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of the former independent Government, which has a Legation in Washington.

The words of the late U.S. Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, marking the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the declarations of independence of the Baltic States, clearly reflect the attitude of this country today with regard to the method by which these countries were incorporated into the Soviet Union. The statement read:

> The United States was quick to denounce this aggression and refused to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Today, over 18 years later, we wish to assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia once more that they are not forgotten. The United States still aspires, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "To see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16 we take cognizance of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence and today we are reminded that 44 years have passed since these brave people originally broke the shackles that held them in bondage.

Twenty-two years ago the Russian colossus moved in upon the Baltic States and gave a demonstration to a war-occupied world of how coldblooded a totalitarian power can be when bent on world domination. The brave Lithuanians, in particular, since that hour of aggression have given all liberty-loving people everywhere an example of adjustments that must be made in the face of naked tyranny and there is evidence, despite the proximity of the U.S.S.R., that the spark of liberty still burns brightly within the breasts of these courageous people.

Americans sitting in the comparative security of the Western Hemisphere are too prone to accept the Baltic situation as something that does not concern them. Indeed, the fact must always be taken into account that when liberty is denied any race of people anywhere it can quite possibly threaten our own peace and security. Among us today are many brave sons and daughters of Lithuania and their hearts bleed for their compatriots who are held in thralldom by a ruthless conqueror. In this day and age when we are taking a forthright stand against colonialism let us not lose a single opportunity to point to Russia as the greatest colonial power in history. And on this anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us pledge our military, economic, and moral resources to the eventual liberation of this great people so that they can once more assume their rightful place in the commonwealth of free nations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, there is a particular appropriateness in the fact that the session of the House of Representatives began today with a prayer by a distinguished visitor, the Reverend Dr. Vaskas, instead of by our own Chaplain, for it set the theme for the speaking of what is on the minds of many of us today as we take notice of the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, which took place on February 16, 1918.

The free world is sad because Lithuania today is not independent. But even while the Kremlin pretends to the world that Lithuania and her Baltic sister republic, Estonia, are full-fledged Socialist states in the Soviet Union, the whole world knows—and to Russia's disgrace—that these and other states that ought to be free and independent are mere colonies of the Russian colonial empire, the largest but most constricted colonial empire that exists in the modern world.

For as long as I have been a Member of the Congress, I have participated in observances such as this, in recognition of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Much time has passed, and unless one has the opportunity to be informed as to real happenings behind the Iron Curtain, we might feel that we have been contenting ourselves with uttering empty words about the hopes which we have for the liberation of the Lithuanian people and for their early arraignment as an independent nation in the family of free nations.

There are stirrings in Lithuania, difficult though it may be for the people

even to maintain their language, their religion, their culture, and, indeed, in many instances, even life itself. Here in our own country there are stirrings too, that at the strategic time can have an important effect upon events which will mean independence again for Lithuania.

If it is among the many fine Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in my own district and in the districts of many of my colleagues, that these stirrings are most in evidence, that is only to be expected.

Through them, in their day-to-day relationships with their neighbors and fellow citizens, they can stimulate the interest of the American people as a whole. Such interest, as has been proven a number of times in our history, notable examples of which are Ireland and Israel, can be the most potent instrument in helping friendly but subject peoples to gain or regain their independence.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

I wish to join with my esteemed colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania who are striving to regain their freedom and national independence.

While the heavy yoke of Communist tyranny rests upon the shoulders of the Lithuanians today, their spirit has not been suppressed. The Lithuanian people, and Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, can take great courage in the fact that the free mind of man has always conquered the tyranny of an aggressor.

History rests on the side of the free world and of the people of the captive nations who are striving for freedom. But history is shaped by men. Hence, we must again pledge ourselves to the goal of a better world where all peoples will live in peace, freedom and justice. And we must continue to direct our actions to this goal.

I am confident that the American people will continue in their efforts to hasten the arrival of the day when the people of Lithuania, and the peoples of the other captive nations, will throw off the oppressive yoke of communism and once again resume the role of free and independent nations.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, this 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence provides freemen with two vital opportunities:

Again, it gives us a chance to express with all the people of Lithuania—both those enslaved in their native land and those who fled to freedom—our conviction that the force of righteousness will give Lithuania a new declaration of independence.

Second, it provides us with a telling chance to remind the world again that the Soviet Union is history's greatest and harshest enslaver of free people.

On February 16, 44 years ago, the proud and free nation of Lithuania marked its Independence Day, climaxing a statehood of liberty extending back to the year A.D. 1200.

In 1940, however, a long night of enslaved darkness fell on Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. The Soviet Union tore up treaty commitments, invaded Lithuania and imposed its force upon her.

Since that time, Lithuanian freedom and independence have been suppressed by the Soviet Union and the nation has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation.

But Lithuania has not been forgotten. Her spirit, her people, and her history of freedom burn brightly today in the minds of her children and her friends everywhere. The world will not forget and some day Lithuania will again be free.

In its present state, Lithuania has for the world a message in addition to that of freedom—a message of warning.

In an age when new nations are emerging by the dozens, the people of the new nations should remember Lithuania when the cynical salesmen of Soviet slavery appear on the scene. Far too many of these new nations seemed swayed by the spurious Soviet claim of anticolonialism when in fact it is the most vicious colonial power of all history.

I would strongly recommend that the case of Lithuania and its neighbors have a permanent place on any U.S. agenda for negotiations with the Soviet Union.

As the world's greatest free republic, the United States will not forget its friends in Lithuania and the smoldering fire of freedom that they personify.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, this February 16 will be the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence. But there will not be the rejoicing that such an occasion usually brings. Instead the day will be observed by solemn ceremonies, for the great expectations with which Lithuania declared its independence were dashed in 1940. Soviet Russia's treachery stamped out the liberty of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, scattering their peoples to the far corners of the earth. Yet, in the face of great suffering and cruel disappointment, the Lithuanians have continued to keep their hopes and courage high. Burning with idealism, those fortunate enough to escape the iron yoke of Russian oppression are constantly working toward regaining freedom for their brothers forced to live as captives in their Soviet occupied and dominated homeland.

The free world joins in commemorating the birth of Lithuania's century-old dream of freedom and pledges itself to advocating the continued censorship of Russia's colonization of the Baltic countries—the free world retains the firm belief that self-determination and freedom will once again return to the Baltic coast.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Each year we in the Congress recognize the 16th of February as a day to pay tribute to this proud and courageous nation. As we know, in the late Middle Ages Lithuania was a powerful state, and in the years following the First World War she was an enlightened and progressive republic. However, in the 1940's she was destined to fall prey to the totalitarians of left and right Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. Since then she has come upon days of sorrow. Despite all the horrors they have undergone, the sturdy Lithuanian people have not lost heart. They are determined never to accept Soviet domination as their ultimate destiny. They have not been broken and there remains hope within their hearts of a new day of redemption.

Let this day, therefore, be a constant reminder to the people of the United States of the evils of communism; let it also be a symbol of the meaning of courage. To the courageous people of Lithuania goes our fervent hope that true freedom and independence will come.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration of independence for any country is a heartwarming and thrilling occasion but this 44th anniversary celebration of the restoration of independence of Lithuania is a time of special significance. During these years the real heart of Lithuania has been glorified by the loyalty of its people to the highest standards of freedom and independence and their determination to exercise their will in the interests of peace and justice. The spirit of such a people can never be cowed or broken no matter how ruthless or how coldblooded the onslaughts of the godless ideology of communism may become. It is altogether fitting and most appropriate that we here in America who cherish these things should remember and draw inspiration from the example of the Lithuanian people. By their example they give us courage and renew our determination to guard our own heritage of liberty handed down to us through the years. May we ever remember these wonderful people and do whatever we can to bring about their liberation from the yoke of slavery and once again bring peace and righteousness among their people.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania is a happy and yet a solemn occasion. It is happy for us to contemplate the days when Lithuania was a free nation, when its people knew independence. It is solemn, for we must then bring our thoughts to the present time and the fact that another year has passed since we marked this anniversary and the people of Lithuania are still living under the hobnailed boot of the Soviet army.

Let us raise the torch of freedom a little higher and hope that its flame can be seen from behind the Iron Curtain. Let us reassure the people of Lithuania that our thoughts and prayers are with them on this anniversary. Let us work and hope for the day when a new independence anniversary for Lithuania can once more be marked.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuania is a small nation but it has suffered greatly at the hands of Soviet imperialism. Its people still languish under the Soviet imperial power today. They deserve our recognition and our

support for continuing to maintain their integrity and their hope for the future in the face of the overwhelming might of the Red army.

Let us look for a moment at the record of this small nation of brave men and women. It shows conclusively that the Lithuanian people recognize themselves to be a nation and have consistently fought for their right to self-determination. And when Lithuania achieved its independence in the years between the two World Wars it quickly proved to be a modern progressive state. The continued Soviet occupation of Lithuania, therefore, is a case of raw, unvarnished colonialism regardless of what the Communist propagandists may say.

From the late Middle Ages and almost to the end of the 18th century—from 1385 to 1795—Lithuania was united with Poland and formed one of the great states of central and eastern Europe. But in 1795 Poland was brutally carved up and Lithuania was seized by Russia. From then until 1917 she remained a Russian province. But on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian leaders proclaimed the political independence of their country and realized the ideals cherished by all Lithuanians for more than 100 years. In 1920 Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all its former rights of sovereignty. Let us observe the words of this treaty for they validate Lithuania's right to be free and show the full depth of the later Soviet treachery. The treaty stated:

> In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all people have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

The next 20 years saw a period of progress and of achievement in Lithuania. Following the World War, Lithuania made up for the lost time brought about by the foreign invaders. The government took the initiative in land reform and social legislation. Improvements in transportation and education were diligently pursued. The advancements made by the new republic would certainly serve as proof that Lithuania was capable of governing its own affairs and that national sovereignty had been long overdue.

This period of freedom with all of its precious liberties came to an abrupt end for the courageous Lithuanians. After achieving an admirable record in reestablishing their free nation on a firm footing, they were again threatened by Russia. The treaty of 1920 was conveniently forgotten by the Communist dictator, Stalin. In 1939 the Soviet Union violated Lithuanian sovereignty by signing a secret agreement with Nazi Germany turning over to the Nazis certain territory belonging to Lithuania. Despite these ordeals Lithuania opened her doors and offered assistance to the Polish refugees who came pouring across her borders after the fall of Poland. But the forced mutual assistance pact doomed the Lithuanians to Soviet domination. This pact provided that military bases for Soviet troops were to be established in Lithuania. From that time to the present the brave people of Lithuania have been subjected to the Soviet Union.

In the case of the Soviet Union we are faced with the greatest hypocrisy of the century. It poses as the friend of oppressed peoples everywhere, but refuses to give freedom to its own colonies like Lithuania. Make no mistake about it, Lithuania is just as much a colony of Soviet Russia as Angola is a colony of Portugal. Today world public opinion is incensed over the terror and mutual slaughter in Angola. And, indeed, opinion should be aroused over these events, for they are tragic. But where are the cries against Soviet imperialism in Lithuania and the rest of Eastern Europe? I do not hear the new and resurgent nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America complaining about this Soviet imperialism. They are concerned with their own problems and seem to care little about what happens in Europe. But I say today that if the neutralist nations continue to disregard the lessons of Eastern Europe they will do so at their own peril. Whenever the Soviet Union can win control of a foreign government it will do so. And it will use whatever means it possesses and that appear to be effective in the particular situation. Let us not continue to permit the Soviet Union to masquerade as the friend of the poor and the oppressed, and the enemy of colonialism. Let us tell the world over and over and over again of the treacherous Soviet hypocrisy.

Hear, if you will, what Khrushchev said about colonialism to a group of Indian newspapermen in 1958. He said:

> Colonialists are people with rather low morals. In their public statements they appeal very often to God, and at the same time they keep their knives in hiding, ready to use against the weak in order to seize their riches—oil or other assets. Now the colonialists are raving particularly against the Soviet Union, and trying to discredit it in the eyes of the peoples. Why? Because they see that the Soviet Union has won great respect among the peoples, since its policy is based on high moral principles.

But I ask, What are these high and moral principles that underlie Soviet policy? The Soviet record in Lithuania makes it plain that they are neither high nor moral, but low and immoral. They are the old principles of grab and plunder, only now they are dressed up with the fiction of "peoples democracies." Let us not permit the world to forget this truth.

Today we pause to honor the brave people of Lithuania and we will continue to do so until they have once again become independent. But this celebration has an even broader significance because it is one more instance when we can remind the world of what Soviet "anticolonialism" really means. Lithuania is the living proof that Soviet "anticolonialism" is really a mask for the most vicious brand of colonial imperialism of the 20th century.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be one of the speakers at the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day which was celebrated on January 21, 1962, in the common council chambers, city hall, Buffalo, N.Y.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address which I delivered on this occasion:

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Today marks the 44th anniversary of modern day Ukrainian national independence. After several centuries of occupation by the Russians, the Ukrainian people seized the opportunity made possible by World War I to declare their national independence. By this act, the people of Ukraine expressed their determination to be then and forever free of the imperial chains of Moscow. This was an act, a political act, which served notice on the peoples of the world that Ukraine was dissolving the bonds which connected them with the empire of the czars. More than that, it was an affirmation of the long held aspirations of the people for national independence, national identity and a rightful place in the world community of sovereign nations.

We are gathered here today to pay tribute to those patriots who led the fight for that independence, those who made the supreme sacrifice in this cause during the long twilight before 1917, those who led the way during the struggle of 1917–18, and those who continue to carry on the fight in Ukraine today. This is an unbroken chain of sacrifice, of dedication and of courage, which the new leaders of the Russian empire have come to know and fear. A people with this determination and national purpose cannot long be denied their aspirations for freedom.

Ukraine is no more a legal and voluntary part of the Soviet Union than it was a legal and voluntary part of the empire of the czars. Those who claim that Ukraine is a traditional part of the Soviet Union demonstrate their profound ignorance of the facts of history. And those who claim that it is undesirable for the U.S. Government to advocate the peaceful dismemberment of the Soviet Union, by advocating national independence of Ukraine, are taking us down the road to national disaster. Since the beginning of our Nation we have defended the right of all people to be self-governing. We have expressed this policy by our support for the principle of self-determination. In doing so we have acted in concert with our own Declaration of Independence and in keeping with our rich heritage as a self-governing people. Every time we have taken the bold initiative to support this universal principle we have been acclaimed by the common man the world over. When we have faltered in support of this principle, which thank God has been a rare exception, we have earned the distrust of the oppressed and brought crisis and calamity down upon our backs. Here the record of our national behavior is clear for all to see, who want to see the truth in its stark reality.

President Kennedy has said that we are living in the revolutionary age, that we are the legitimate children of the greatest political revolution in the history of the world. He has made it clear that we do not fear revolution by those who are oppressed and exploited just as he has made it clear that our basic goal as a nation is "a peaceful world community of free and independent states." This was the keynote theme of President Kennedy's state of the Union message given before Congress on January 10 of this year. I will support the President to the limit of my abilities in the winning of that objective. In doing so, I am confident that I serve the highest interests of our Nation

as well as the hopes of the people in all the captive nations behind the Russian Iron Curtain.

This is a most suitable occasion for me to pay a well-deserved compliment to the members of the Citizens Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week. This committee, established to support Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week resolution, has attracted national attention during the past 2 years. The work of this committee as a trail blazer in educating the public to the cause of the captive nations and the vital role they are playing in thwarting the Kremlin's plans for world conquest has won the acclaim of the national committee and similar committees established throughout the United States. Others are following the fine example you have set. Buffalo is an acknowledged leader in this fight for peace with freedom and justice for all nations and people. You are to be congratulated for this show of leadership.

But much remains to be done. The tidal wave of self-determination is sweeping the world. As President Kennedy pointed out in his address before the United Nations, "the crest of this wave is yet to hit the Communist empire. You and I know that no amount of propaganda, or no Iron Curtain, no matter how high or how deep it may be, can contain the human power of that tidal wave. The empire of the commissars will fall before this tidal wave, just as the old empires in Asia and Africa have been dissolved by its political power. You and I can hasten that happy day by standing firmly by our American traditions and ideals and supporting all who aspire to freedom and national independence. This is what the people in the captive nations expect of us. This is the formula for peace in our times."

The day is not far off when Ukraine will regain its national independence. That happy day will see all the captive nations returned to their rightful place in the family of nations. Let us move forward to that objective in the strong conviction that human freedom is the wave of the future, believing as we do that the death knell of tyranny and despotism has sounded.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 we commemorate the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Yet as we mark this day, the 3 million Lithuanian people who fought to obtain freedom at the end of World War I are perhaps further from that goal than ever before in the history of that nation.

As daily we work to halt the onslaught of the Communist menace in countries in this hemisphere, we scarcely have time to reflect on those captive nations in Europe where there is no longer an obvious struggle going on between the Red masters and their targets for tyranny.

Yet this struggle still does proceed as millions of freedom-loving people in the world are forced to live under the yoke of totalitarianism. Since that fateful day in June of 1940, when the Communist Russian hordes invaded Lithuania and forcibly incorporated it in the U.S.S.R., the spirit of these people has never been broken.

During the Second World War the Lithuanian people formed an active underground force to resist the Communist occupation. As late as 1949 the first Secretary of the Communist Party, speaking before the party congress, revealed that although 12,000 resistance fighters had been killed, the struggle was still continuing. We are told that as many as 100,000 patriots were massacred before active resistance was finally suppressed. Although the Lithuanian people have not known freedom now for 22 years, their spirit of resistance to the Red tyranny remains to this day.

On this occasion of the celebration of Lithuanian independence, we join with the friends of Lithuania and the other captive nations of Europe to look forward to that day when the founding of a new Lithuanian democracy will take place, a democracy which will rise above and persevere beyond the tyrannical forces which now enslave it.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a day of solemn commemoration and tribute. It is the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence from Russia by the founders of the Lithuanian Republic. We celebrate it now with pride in remembrance of this event and with sadness at the realization of the present plight of this great and tragic country.

Although freedom and independence have been denied to them, the Lithuanian people have won the admiration of the freedom-loving nations of the world who include them among the most brave and stalwart fighters for justice.

Recently it was my privilege to join with several hundred Americans of Lithuanian descent at a rally in Waterbury, Conn., in observance of this anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence.

It was a colorful ceremony, rife with the undying spirit of the Lithuanian people, and stimulated by the presentation of folk songs and dances by boys and girls of Lithuanian lineage.

I was moved, in witnessing this program, to give assurance to this gathering that the U.S. Government and we of the House of Representatives would continue to strive for the day when all the Baltic nations would once again be free.

I saw neither desperation nor resignation in the words of Anicetas Simutis, vice consul at the Lithuanian General Consulate in New York, who told his Waterbury audience that while communism is being imposed on the people of the Lithuanian nation, there is a longing for freedom in their hearts. He also expressed the opinion that the Baltic nations "are lucky in having the strongest and most dependable ally in the world, the United States."

As we observe this solemn anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we fan the still-burning flame of freedom with words of encouragement and hope. We make no reckless promises. We do offer sympathy and encouragement to a nation of people with whom we join in prayer for a new era of freedom. Above all, we must determine to keep their plight and fate before the people of the world.

I yield to no one in my admiration for the people of Lithuania and their courageous and continuing struggle. I know the people of this race in my district as warm, personal friends and associates. They are sturdy people, self-reliant and dependable. They are factory workers and business and professional people; musicians and politicians; merchants and men and women of letters. I am proud of my association with them.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we review the heights that have been attained through freedom and democracy, and the depths that have been plumbed as the result of oppression. The temporary enslavement of this proud race behind the Iron Curtain is the immediate concern of peoples of courage and determination in the free world. Our thoughts must be solemn as we contemplate the present plight of this once free nation.

I trust that the current efforts of the European Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the leadership of our colleague, Mrs. KELLY, will help markedly to dramatize the scope and acuteness of the plight of the captive nations. This committee is presently holding hearings to review the status of each of these tragic countries with the view to reexamining congressional attitudes toward this sad and difficult problem.

Our prayers and hopes on this anniversary date of independence are for the termination of the brutal slavery of the talented and courageous Lithuanian people.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is not a day of joyous celebration, for the independence which was proclaimed for Lithuania on February 16, 1918, has been denied by the Soviet Union since 1940. Instead, Lithuanian Independence Day is one of solemn commemoration of that nation's achievement of independence, a day of rededication to the cause of freedom everywhere.

Lithuania's achievement of independence in 1918 followed more than a century of domination by czarist Russia, a domination which began in 1795. Prior to this the history of the Baltic state is a long and proud one, dating back to the 11th century. During the Middle Ages, Lithuania was a powerful state which helped protect Europe against invasions from the east.

It is their long history as a nation, together with their distinctive language and culture, which provides assurance that their love of independence can never be eradicated. Just as the Lithuanian people in the past steadfastly rejected all the attempts of the czars to superimpose the Russian language and culture upon them, we can be confident that the Lithuanian people of today continue to long for free institutions to replace the totalitarianism which has been imposed upon them from Moscow.

On this 44th anniversary of their independence day, let us reassure the Lithuanian people that they have not been forgotten and that the United States will continue working toward the goal of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians, who in the Middle Ages and in early modern times had their glorious days, lost their status as a free nation toward the end of the 18th century. For more than 100 years they struggled to regain it. Finally, in 1918 they succeeded

in attaining their goal, proclaimed their independence, and established a democratic form of government. Under this government of their own choice they lived for more than 20 years, engaged in the task of reshaping a better life for themselves in their historic homeland. Before this self-imposed task was completed, however, the clouds of war descended over their country. The aggressors struck and in 1940 Lithuania as an independent state ceased to exist when the troops of Stalinist Russia invaded the country.

Since 1940 the Lithuanians have experienced the cruel tyranny of both Nazi and Communist domination. The end of the war brought no relief. In fact, since 1945 under the Communist Russians their suffering has been aggravated. Since then Lithuania has become a vast concentration camp for its liberty-loving inhabitants. Tens of thousands of Lituanians have been deported to distant areas of the Soviet Union, and their homes have been given to new settlers from Asiatic Russia. During all these years the country has been practically sealed off from the free world, and of course no Lithuanian is allowed to leave the country.

In celebrating the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we rededicate ourselves to the spirit of freedom which unites the Lithuanian people with all peoples of the world. We know that the Lithuanians will continue to resist the despotism thrust upon them. Their courage, their perseverance, and their loyalty to the historic tradition of their nation will defeat the guns and tanks of their oppressors. On the anniversary of their independence day our prayers are with them.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in observing and commemorating the 44th Anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, we are doing so under the most unusual circumstances. The perpetrators of Soviet colonialism and of Communist dictatorship are making extreme efforts to exploit the Lithuanian nation and its resources while, at the same time, hypocritically offering their so-called friendship and brotherliness.

Knowing that they will not be able to destroy by force the Lithuanian yearning for freedom, and that they will not gain the trust and friendship of the Lithuanian people by compulsion, the Soviets announced a utopian program of progress and well-being, purportedly designed to surpass even the most advanced countries of the world.

Yet the actual situation in Lithuania has not improved. On the contrary, freedom of conscience has been further restricted and the Lithuanian people remain bereft of their basic rights and are exposed to misery as well as to a constant threat of being deprived of their right to remain in their homeland.

While the people in Lithuania cannot observe their independence day, Lithuanians in the United States and we in the free world can and do commemorate and speak for these subjugated people.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1962, marks the observance of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, an independence only briefly enjoyed over a span of some 20 years.

Lithuania as a country is now held in Soviet bondage, but the people themselves will never be truly held in bondage. A free spirit is never daunted, merely dimmed by necessity until the moment returns when it may burn brightly and freely again.

Soviet tyranny and oppression hold forth at the present time in Lithuania and in other captive nations. The free world refuses to accept this situation as permanent.

This 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is a reminder of the hopes of the free world that the millions of Lithuanian people may once more enjoy the fullest measure of freedom.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, once again this year, as I did last year, I am privileged to join my colleagues in saluting Lithuanian Independence Day.

On the 16th of February, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared themselves forever free from foreign rule. In this freedom—the first they had known in more than a century—Lithuania flourished in every respect. Agriculture, the primary occupation of Lithuanians then and now, developed at its most rapid rate. Industry increased 100 percent. Grammar and secondary schools mushroomed everywhere. Just labor laws were enacted. Literature and music blossomed out in forms and expressions more beautiful and more numerous than ever before.

But this prosperity, this Golden Age of Lithuania, was shortlived. Despite the Lithuanians' stanch resistance, they were conquered and occupied—first by the Russians, then by the Nazi Germans, and ever since World War II by the Russians again.

Under the Soviet Russians, the Lithuanians have suffered untold hardships. In the prewar period of Soviet domination, the Russians shipped Lithuanian intellectuals by the hundreds from their beloved homeland to the bleak Siberian wastes, and executed other Lithuanian patriots by the thousands. Since the end of the Nazi regime, the Soviets have refined their methods of oppression, but the degree of oppression has not diminished in the slightest. Now, instead of Russian overlords, Lithuanian puppets perform the acts governing Lithuania—but the Kremlin still pulls the strings.

During the most unbearable periods of oppression, waves of Lithuanians have fled their fatherland and migrated to the free nations of the Western world. They and their descendants have become responsible, productive citizens in the countries which they now call home. I will personally vouch for the industry and integrity of the many wonderful Lithuanian-Americans in my home district, the 10th District of Pennsylvania.

On February 16, all over the world, people who are rightfully proud of their Lithuanian ancestry will be commemorating this, the 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Those in the free world can and will extoll the merits of this milestone so that all may know and honor its significance. Those behind the Iron Curtain must celebrate in silence. Let us speak out for those who cannot speak. Let us join Lithuanians everywhere in the fervent hope that Lithuania may soon wrest itself loose from the Soviet Union's crushing, crippling grasp, so that it may flourish as an independent nation once again.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of July, Americans at home and abroad manifest their appreciation of their cherished independence and freedom. Our celebration is without reservation and without hindrance.

Tomorrow is the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence for the brave people of Lithuania. Tragically, there will be no public celebration by these people in their homeland. The restraint imposed upon them by a foreign power will prevent them from giving voice to sentiments such as we here in America do each year. Moreover, the independence that was restored to them 44 years ago has again been taken from them.

This does not mean, however, that the aspirations and hopes for independence are dead in the Lithuanian people. Those of them who are in the United States and other parts of the free world are commemorating this day and expressing the dreams of their countrymen at home. During their earlier subjugation by Russia they continued to foster their hopes and refused to accept foreign ideologies and customs. Now under the Soviet's dominance they still continue to look forward to the day when they will again be free, and in their hearts they are commemorating this anniversary of the earlier restoration of their freedom.

The U.S. Government has not recognized the subjugation of Lithuania—or of Latvia or Estonia—and many Americans are today remembering the plight of these people. We all hope that one day in the not too distant future they may be able to indulge in independence day celebrations just as we do here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for several centuries unhappy Lithuanians had lived under alien regimes. Late in the 18th century their country had become part of czarist Russia, and for more than a century they had suffered under the oppressive czarist rule. They had tried to free themselves many times, but all their attempts were unsuccessful. In 1918, when the czarist regime was no more, the Lithuanians felt free and proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year.

Thenceforth for more than two decades, until the outbreak of the last war, Lithuanians enjoyed freedom in their historic homeland and they made their war-ravaged country a happy haven for themselves. The war and subsequent events, however, not only robbed them of their freedom but placed them under the ruthless Communist Russian regime. Since 1940 these liberty-loving Lithuanians have lost their country, their freedom and nearly all their worldly possessions, but they still cling to the hope of regaining their freedom. On this 44th anniversary of their Independence Day let us hope that they attain their goal and live in peace in their historic homeland.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian descent and their kinsmen in other free countries will observe the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence on February 16. Unfortunately, their ancestral homeland has fallen under the yoke of tyrannical communism and is today one of the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

The people of Lithuania have not relinquished their desire for freedom and independence, and I am sure they never will. Their quest for freedom, however, must be kept alive and vibrant for their own sake as well as for the sake of the free world. They must not think of themselves as a forgotten people in this very dark moment of their history, for if they lose courage then they are really doomed to extinction. This is what the ruthless rulers of the Kremlin would like to happen, so that they can forever wipe out the small peoples.

It is extremely important that we in this country and freedom-loving people of other free countries should continue to focus the spotlight of world attention on the subjugated and oppressed status of the captive nations of Europe struggling under the yoke of Communist imperialism. We must do so in order to gain the offensive in the cold war. We must do everything possible to put communism on the defensive and to subject Russia to worldwide criticism and derision.

On this day of Lithuania's anniversary of independence we pledge our continued support and we join with our fellow Americans of Lithuanian extraction in prayer for the early liberation of their ancestral homeland and their kinsmen who live there.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago tomorrow, the Lithuanian National Council, on February 16, 1918, adopted a Declaration of Independence providing for the "reestablishment of Lithuania on a democratic basis." Today, we commemorate the 44th anniversary of that memorable day in the history of Lithuania—a history that records the story of a suffering, yet courageous people, possessing an unquenchable will to freedom and liberty.

This land had been under the domination of its more powerful neighbor, Russia, for more than 120 years, but the determination of its people to stand as free men never wavered. The end of World War II gave the Lithuanians an opportunity, once again, to establish their own government. As a free people, they drove the Bolshevik invaders from their lands, and in July 1920 signed a treaty of peace with the Soviet Union, under which the Russians renounced all sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

During the short period as an independent nation, Lithuania became a full member of the international community of nations and won worldwide respect for its efforts to promote the social, economic, and cultural welfare of its people.

It was not long, however, before the Soviet Union rejected its treaty obligations, and despite its many declarations of respect for the independence of this small nation, demanded in 1940 that a government friendly to the Soviet Union be installed and that the Red Army be permitted to enter the territory of Lithuania. In this imperialistic manner, Lithuania was made a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

Although the yoke of communism hangs heavy in that land, neither the tyranny of oppressors nor time can erase from the memory of these people their glorious tradition of freedom and courage. We know that they cannot openly commemorate this cherished occasion, but we are sure that their faith in the deliverance of their nation and the restoration of their rights as human beings remains strong.

And so today, we rise in the Congress of this great and free nation to pay tribute to Lithuania and to the indomitable spirit of its people—a people who have so exemplified and fought for their freedom that they will never permanently accept the deprivation of their rights and of their human dignity. We rededicate ourselves today to the cause of justice and freedom for all men and reiterate our firm resolve to stand fast with all those who refuse to abandon that cause.

It is fitting also on this occasion to pay tribute to all Americans of Lithuanian descent who have made so vital a contribution to the strength and spirit of this country. I join with them in their prayers for the return of their homeland to the family of free nations.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania's 44th anniversary of independence is an inspiring occasion. It marks the survival of an ideal. It marks the survival of a people by virtue of sheer idealism and willpower, down through the ages. It marks the survival of independence of spirit despite oppression, extreme suffering, and repeated efforts at political extirpation. It marks the survival of hope.

The faith of the Lithuanian people in the eventual restoration of their country to its independent status is itself inspiring. Nor is this belief in some future revivification of Lithuania as an autonomous country merely a visionary dream without substantial backing. The history of the Lithuanian people and of Lithuania as a nation bears ample witness to the substantial basis for the conviction that the country will once again become independent. The Lithuanian people are among the oldest in Europe who have maintained their identity throughout all the changes of the centuries. The Lithuanian nation once occupied a large portion of the map of Europe. It was a powerful and highly developed state when the Russian regions around it were still barbaric. The people of Lithuania maintained their traditions and their individuality in spite of repeated ravaging from without. They emerged again as a nation after World War I. It is that independence which we celebrate today. And it is that independence as a nation which the United States has never ceased to recognize, despite Communist domination. On such a foundation rests the faith that Lithuania will ever endure.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Lithuanians will again commemorate one of their anniversaries. On that day, these hardy and independent-thinking people will celebrate the 44th anniversary of the declaration of their independence. The Lithuanians have not lost their taste for freedom, it has only been dulled for a time by a harsh deterrent, the Soviet Union—the aggressor who took over this little country as well as Latvia and Estonia, somewhat as a big bully dominates and rules smaller neighbors. This enslavement by force by colonial Russia will never kill the love of freedom living in the hearts of the Lithuanians. This flame of the love of liberty will live on forever.

The Lithuanian American Information Center at New York has made a number of very timely comments on the subjugated Lithuanian peoples, and I would like to insert in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, this brief statement:

THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 16, 1962

The people in Lithuania under the harsh yoke of the Soviet Union cannot observe their Independence Day, but Lithuanians in the United States and the free world can commemorate and speak for these subjugated people.

In 1940, the Soviet Union tore up treaty obligations with Lithuania, perfidiously invaded Lithuania and by force imposed its will on the three Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Lithuania's freedom and independence were suppressed by Soviet Russia and she has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation ever since. It is ironic that Eastern Europe countries with centuries of culture behind them should be colonies of the Soviet Union just as Asian and African countries are emerging from colonialism.

However, despite the long enslavement, Lithuanians in the old country still have an invincible will for freedom.

Lithuania is not a "new" state in Europe. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year A.D. 1200; she has a splendid historical record of tolerance, of individual, racial, linguistic and cultural liberty. She has every right to freedom and independence.

Our Government and other governments through their delegations at United Nations should declare the Soviet Union an aggressor and demand the withdrawal of its military forces and agents from Lithuania, to return all Lithuanians from exile in Siberia, prisons, slave labor and concentration camps and demand free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents.

The subject of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States should be brought up at any forthcoming negotiations with the Kremlin rulers and at international conferences.

The U.S. Government has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States—Latvia and Estonia.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues and the many friends of Lithuania in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

There can be no real joy in the observance of this anniversary, for we know that the people of Lithuania, now subjected to the tyrannical rule of Soviet Russia, are prohibited from observing it.

After many years of sacrifice, Lithuania was finally in a position to declare her independence to the entire world on February 16, 1918. She was not permitted to enjoy freedom very long; in June 1940 her territory and institutions were unjustly seized by Soviet Russia and since then her people have suffered persecution and tyranny. Our sympathy is extended to them and to the many Lithuanian Americans who deplore the enslavement under which their kinfolk in Lithuania must live.

We know that the ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year A.D. 1200. Lithuania achieved an enviable historical record of tolerance, of individual and cultural liberty. During the short period of their independence and before being brought under the harsh yoke of the Soviet Union, the people earned the admiration of all democratic peoples for their high ideals, industry, and courage.

Once again we salute the brave people of Lithuania. We extend the hand of friendship to them. The United States has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The cause of Lithuania is just and righteous; we maintain that she is entitled to her freedom. We hope and pray that the day is near when her independence will be restored to her.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. The people in Lithuania, now under the iron heel of the Soviet Union, cannot observe their Independence Day, but we can join with Lithuanians in the United States and the free world in commemorating this event for these subjugated people.

Forty-four years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania declared herself to be free of Russian domination. The small Baltic nations of Latvia and Estonia joined Lithuania in this gallant action, and all three nations formed democratic governments and made excellent social and economic progress in their brief years of freedom.

But, in 1940, the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania and subjugated the three Baltic States. Lithuania's freedom was suppressed by Russia, and she has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation ever since.

Despite their long enslavement, however, Lithuanians in the old country are keeping alive their desire for freedom. They have not lost hope for ultimate victory, and the indomitable spirit of the people lives on.

We must continue in our refusal to recognize this forcible seizure of Lithuania. To keep alive the cause of liberty and freedom everywhere, we must continue to strive for the restoration of independence to the people of Lithuania and the Baltic States.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian national anthem closes with the words "May our land ever stand peaceful and united." Tomorrow, on the 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence we are reminded that this pledge remains unfulfilled. We join with the brave Lithuanian nation, not only in celebrating the anniversary of their freedom, but in expressing the hope that the day may not be too far away when Lithuania will once more stand free, peaceful and united.

After a long period of czarist rule, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence on February 16, 1918. This act marked the realization of a goal for which this sturdy people had been striving ever since the Russians took over in 1795. But when the retreating German troops left the city of Vilnius in 1919, the Red army entered and set up a Communist government. The Lithuanians were able to realize their aims only after they joined a Polish army and drove out the Soviet forces. The perfidious Russians signed a treaty which "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." Yet only two decades later, after being occupied by the invading Germans at the start of the Second World War, this suffering nation was again occupied by the Red Army and fell under Russian domination. Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R., although this act of wanton aggression has never been recognized by the United States.

Thus vanished the independent and sovereign state of Lithuania. But the loss of national independence did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. The Communist regime has not been able to subdue and suppress the ancient spirit of freedom and independence of the Lithuanian people. This is the only bright aspect of their miserable and unenviable existence. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we hope and pray that the Lithuanian people will soon have freedom to enjoy life in their historic homeland.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, an independence which was achieved after more than a century of foreign domination. Farther back in its history, during the Middle Ages, Lithuania had been a powerful sovereign nation. However, it had entered into a union with Poland and, in 1795, when Poland was partitioned for the third time, had been annexed by Russia.

Lithuania remained under czarist domination until 1915 when World War I brought first merely an exchange of Russian rule for German rule but, ultimately, also brought independence. During 1917 the German Government authorized a congress of Lithuanians which elected a 20-member council. It was this council which proclaimed an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

The two decades during which Lithuania was independent were marked by trials as well as joys. No sooner had the German army evacuated the capital of Lithuania than it was overrun by the Red army. A year of fighting was required before the Soviets were driven out and Russia signed a peace treaty recognizing Lithuania as an independent nation and renouncing forever all rights of sovereignty. In the Second World War Lithuania experienced the aggression of both the German and the Soviet armies. At the end of the war, in blatant violation of the treaty of 1920 in which Russia recognized Lithuania's independence, the ancient nation was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Thus Lithuania today is one of the captive nations in the Soviet empire. However, by their long experience with foreign domination, for the most part Russian domination, the Lithuanians are well equipped to retain their identity, their culture, and their love of freedom in spite of all Soviet efforts to force them into the Communist mold.

We in this country commemorate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence as a salute to the valiant people of Lithuania who must live behind the Iron Curtain without an opportunity to enjoy the freedom for which their ancestors struggled so long and finally won. We commend the million Americans of Lithuanian descent for their contributions to the growth of our own country. Finally, on this occasion we rededicate our efforts to the task of building a world in which some day all men and women can live in freedom and dignity.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the ebb and flow of history many nations have wielded great power only to decline in time to a lesser rank. In the days of its greatest power, Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and covered over 350,000 square miles of territory. It was a Lithuanian-led force, which together with Polish, Russian, Czech and Tartar allies crushed the Teutonic knights at Grunewald in 1410.

But the Lithuanian people do not regard their past military prowess as their true glory. Rather it is to their independent Republic that they look back, a republic which managed to maintain itself for 22 years on the chessboard of Europe as a model of progress and enlightenment.

This Republic was proclaimed 44 years ago, on February 16, 1918. It was the climax of the Lithuanian movement for self-determination, a movement that had been suppressed under the Russian czars, who had ruled Lithuania since 1795. With the disorders in Eastern Europe following World War I, it took some time for Lithuanian territory to be cleared of foreign troops, but once its sovereignty was established, the Lithuanian Government compiled an enviable record. Land was distributed to the peasants, industrial production increased, great progress was made in transportation, health, and education. In its international dealings Lithuania displayed an open and friendly attitude. Unlike some other small European states, it was not puffed up with false pride. It allowed its record to speak for it.

But Lithuania paid a price for its international decency. In 1938 it was forced to accept a Polish ultimatum to recognize the cession of Vilnius, which Poland had seized 15 years before, and in 1939 the Nazis seized Memel, which had been awarded to Lithuania by international agreement. The Lithuanians felt compelled to fall back upon the Soviet

Union for friendship and protection, and now suffered the greatest betrayal of all. For with Soviet troops garrisoning much of the country, the pressure on Lithuania became intolerable. With the opposition largely under arrest, a plebiscite was held on July 14, 1940, and Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The day after hostilities broke out between the Germans and the Russians the Lithuanian population rose as one man, and once again declared its independence. But once again popular hopes were dashed, as the Germans showed no disposition to recognize Lithuanian aspirations, but treated the country as conquered territory. When the Russians swept back into the country in their 1944 offensive, Lithuania disappeared behind the Iron Curtain.

But the Lithuanian people have not accepted the fate meted out to them by their Communist masters. Officially they may be citizens of the Soviet Union, but unofficially—in their hearts—they are citizens of a free and democratic Lithuania. Soviet persecution and despoliation have not broken their spirit. Terrorism and brainwashing, the carrot and the stick, have not altered their determination to regain their freedom. On this 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian Republic we salute their brave resolve.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence in Lithuania is celebrated on February 16, but the ruthless Soviet dictators are still depriving the Lithuanian people of their freedom. What the Soviet Union has been unable to take from the Lithuanian people is its exalted spirit of liberty. Like the Russian czars who tried to impose an alien way of life on this sturdy little nation before World War I, the Soviet rulers have learned that it is easier to dominate a people by the brutal controls of a police state than to make them forget a historic tradition of independence. As time passes the free world more and more appreciates the devotion that Lithuanians in exile have for their native land, and by their persistent and continued efforts their flame of independence is kept a bright and shining example to all nations that cherish freedom.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I am proud to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian origin who yearn for national independence with political and social justice. Lithuania wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom, and I am convinced that the people of America are inspired and thrilled at such patriotic devotion. May we join with these courageous people in hoping that the day of deliverance for Lithuania soon will be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over their land.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence. Lithuania is not a new state in Europe. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to 1200 A.D. Their freedom was lost in 1795 and not regained until 1918. From 1918 until 1940 Lithuania enjoyed freedom. Then, in 1940, the Soviet Union discarded treaty obligations and invaded this small country and the two other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia. They were compelled to become a part of the Soviet Republic. In the years since, the people have endured oppression, slavery, and exile. It is a well-known fact that many citizens of these little countries have been in exile in Siberia, in prisons, and in slave-labor camps.

It is appropriate for us to pause here today to pay homage to the brave people of Lithuania. Lithuanians have contributed a great deal to the culture and welfare of Europe. Lithuanian-Americans have made great contributions to this country. The United States has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by Russia. In commemorating Lithuania today, we reaffirm our belief in freedom and our opposition to Soviet oppression. We pray that the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will regain their freedom.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join with my colleagues in this observance of the 44th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. At the same time, it is my hope that one day soon we may be able to celebrate the freedom of Lithuania and the end forever of the imperialist domination by the Soviet Union which exists there today.

This coming Sunday, the Lithuanian-American community in my home city of Rochester, N.Y., will gather once more in commemoration of Lithuanian independence and I look forward eagerly to being with them on that occasion. I have said before that many of us whose roots are buried deep in this country often do not appreciate our freedoms as do those who have known what it means to be denied the precious fruits of liberty. And so I look forward to renewing acquaintances with my Lithuanian-American friends, to whom freedom means so very much, and to joining with them in their solemn prayers for the early liberation of their homeland.

As we join together today in this observance, I hope that we can rededicate ourselves to the cause of Lithuanian independence and reaffirm our intention to leave no stone unturned in our efforts to secure the release of the Lithuanian people from the bondage of the Soviet Union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the 44th anniversary of the independence of a small but brave nation, Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have no independence today and are not even permitted to celebrate this anniversary of an historic event. But these speeches in the halls of the U.S. Congress will serve to remind the people of Lithuania that we have not forgotten them. And they will serve to remind the Soviet Union that we have not forgotten its imperialistic enslavement of the Lithuanian nation for these last two decades. It is indeed fitting that we should honor this anniversary of Lithuanian independence each year until independence has once again been achieved.

Soviet Russia has laid down many lines of propaganda which it pursues with fanatic zeal. But none has been more consistent and vitriolic than the charge of colonialism and imperialism which it has leveled against the United States. Khrushchev hopes to create in the minds of the Asians and Africans the image of the Soviet Union as their champion; that the Soviet Russians were in fact the leaders of all the forces opposed to colonialism; that they themselves stood as the perfect example of the spirit of anti-imperialism. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is the living refutation of these Soviet claims.

For centuries Lithuania had been an independent nation. But it was her misfortune to be absorbed into the old Russian Empire at the close of the 18th century. When World War I ended, however, Lithuania won her independence and succeeded in establishing an independent nation. And Lithuania prospered for two decades. In every way—economic, social, political and cultural—the Lithuanian people demonstrated to the world their ability to govern themselves. But on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union violated its treaty commitments with Lithuania and the Red army moved in. Without provocation or justification, and in utter contempt of international law, the Soviet Union overran the independent Baltic countries and installed regimes deliberately organized to obliterate the new-found freedom of these peoples. Is this the record of a country that is the champion of anticolonialism? No, it is not. Let the record be spread before the world to see in order that the Soviet Union's pretensions of righteousness may not go unchallenged.

We want the citizens of Lithuania to know that the people of America and of the free world have not forgotten Lithuania's glorious history of independence. The free world will never complacently accept Soviet occupation of Lithuania. And we will continue to hope that the national independence won 44 years ago will be recovered and that Lithuania will again be free.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, it is fitting for this House and for Americans everywhere to pause to pay grateful tributes to the gallant people of Lithuania and their noble heritage.

For centuries, the Lithuanian nation struggled for freedom and the advancement of democratic ideals and it is well to remind the world of the unconquerable spirit and outstanding contributions of the Lithuanian people to the cause of freedom and independence. Here in our own great land the sons and daughters of Lithuania have made conspicuous and outstanding contributions to the defense, the development, the welfare, and the protection of this nation. Their impressive culture, their inestimable gifts of loyalty and their richly constructive citizenship have contributed immeasurably to the advancement and glory of our own great country.

In hailing the cause of free Lithuania, let us not forget the cruel fate that now afflicts the unhappy Lithuanian nation. The oppression that the Lithuanian people suffer is not confined to Lithuania alone, but encompasses the Poles, the

Latvians, the Rumanians, the Serbs, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Slavs and many other free peoples who are victims of the callous brutality of the slave state and Red oppression.

The anguished people of Lithuania, stirred by poignant memories of a happier day, are unable to observe their Independence Day. Let us today here in America and let free peoples everywhere commemorate this anniversary for them.

At the same time, let it be known on this anniversary day that the American people stand by Lithuania and other oppressed peoples who are the victims of confiscation, aggression, exploitation, and brutal tyranny. Let us give hope and inspiration to the helpless and the oppressed by encouraging the forces of freedom in the world.

Long live free Lithuania.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest racial groups in northeastern Europe. For centuries they had constituted their own independent state and lived there happily, but late in the 18th century their country became part of the Russian Empire and they unwilling subjects of Russian czars. But these stouthearted people were never reconciled with their unhappy lot, and when the czarist regime was overthrown in 1917, they proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. Thenceforth for about two decades they lived happily in their homeland and enjoyed the blessings of freedom and democracy.

World War II was disastrous to the Lithuanians. In 1940 they were forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union. After suffering under Soviet communism for a year, their country was overrun by Nazi forces; then early in 1944 the Red army returned once more, and it has been there ever since.

Thus on the 44th anniversary of their independence day unhappy Lithuanians find themselves sealed off from the free world in their homeland, but they still cling to their hope of regaining their freedom. On their independence day our wholehearted sympathy goes to these gallant people.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day which should not be overlooked in the hurly-burly atmosphere of today's world. We have much to learn from the Lithuanian people, and it is good that we remember our debt of gratitude to them.

The Lithuanian people have given us an inspiring example of devotion to freedom. This independence day signifies their continuing love of liberty, although they had fallen victim to Hitler's armies, and now find themselves under the oppressive boot of Khrushchev's military forces. They still have not given up the hope of regaining their independence in the face of what presently appears to be almost overwhelming odds. Lithuanians have died before in their fight for freedom, and they are no less prepared today to give their lives in the name of this noble cause. Can we do less?

We have freedom. We know how it enriches our lives and gives purpose to our every action. If the Lithuanian people are willing to die for the freedom which they presently are denied by their Communist masters, we, too, should be ready to make sacrifices to preserve it. We are grateful to them for showing us the way. It is a pleasure to honor their courageous spirit on this independence day.

The American people hope that the freedom-loving forces within Lithuania will not be disheartened in the future struggle against Communist tyranny. Let them know that we stand by them; that we are making every effort to check Communist imperialism; that we are actively working for the day when people everywhere will be able to choose the life which they deem best. Lithuania has successfully asserted its independence before. The continued celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day indicates that they will again take their rightful place in the sun of nations.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we turn our thoughts to the countries under the domination of the Soviet Union on the anniversaries of their national holidays. We are ordinarily concerned in this House with the unsolved political, economic, and social problems of the United States. Without minimizing our difficulties in living up to the highest ideals of our country, I would like to suggest that directing our attention regularly to the plight of the captive nations helps us to place our own problems in the proper perspective. There are no more brutal police states in the world today than the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe. It is a sobering experience indeed to consider the human suffering which continues to exist behind the Iron Curtain, where freedom is unknown and the full force of Communist totalitarianism reigns supreme.

Today we commemorate the 44th anniversay of the restoration of independence in Lithuania, a once powerful nation which suffered for over a century under the ruthless domination of czarist Russia. On February 16, 1918, a group of 200 Lithuanian leaders assembled to consider the future of their country, which at the time was occupied by Germany. Like our own Founding Fathers, the Lithuanian leaders proclaimed their independence fully conscious that they would have to redeem their pledge with their own blood. When the German troops evacuated the capital city of Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red army entered the city and installed a Communist government. The next year the Russian forces were driven out by Polish and Lithuanian troops, the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty renouncing all future rights to Lithuania, and the steadfast Lithuanian people embarked on a regime of freedom and independence. But the era of Lithuanian independence which we recall today was not destined to survive, in a world which is ruled by force of arms rather than peace treaties. At the outset of the Second World War the long-suffering Lithuanian people were invaded by Nazi Germany, which after causing immeasurable human and material damage was driven out by the equally ruthless dictatorship of the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian state was forcefully incorporated into the U.S.S.R., an act which the United States has never recognized. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we are united in hoping that the future will bring a better life to the Lithuanian people and fulfill their ancient desires for freedom and independence in their historic national home.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Baltic nation of Lithuania. With my good friend and colleague, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, I join in paying a personal tribute to the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain and the American citizens of Lithuanian descent in our own land.

On last Sunday, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to address the American-Lithuanian Society of Washington, D.C., at their annual event commemorating the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. It was an honor for me to be the guest of the society and to receive the warm and cordial greeting from Mrs. Barbara Darlys, president of the society, and from other members and guests.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the address which I delivered at this inspiring event.

It is a great honor and privilege to be with you today to help celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Those who have come from that land to the United States have contributed much to the progress and to the strength of our own great Nation.

In my own congressional district we have some, but not many, American citizens who claim Lithuania as the homeland of their fathers. We are very proud of these fellow citizens because of their high cultural, moral, and spiritual standards, and the part they have played in the progress of our community.

In the Congress of the United States you have many friends and supporters of your ideal of freedom for your fatherland.

As a people you have a rich history, a glorious past, and a love of freedom. You have suffered the tragedy, not only of Soviet oppression and tyranny, but czarist rule and slavery as well.

Despite the long and enduring struggle for freedom in your fatherland, you have kept the faith and the determination to be free. That the spirit of freedom and national independence can still burn so brightly after years and years, generations and generations, of cultural and physical oppression is a tribute to the strong character of the Lithuanian people. It gives hope to all of us who share the Christian faith and love of freedom that liberty and justice, and not Communist and totalitarian tyranny, is the wave of the future.

You are to be commended for your faith and confidence in the future. Some of our own American citizens who are confused and overwhelmed by the almost insurmountable problems which we face could profit by your determination and efforts.

To look with suspicion and distrust on our own Government and its leadership creates disunity and unwittingly helps the Communist conspiracy.

President Kennedy understands the Communist threat. He has given our Nation and the free world new faith and confidence. I share with the President his philosophy that social reform is an effective weapon

in wiping out the conditions under which the Communist seed takes root and grows.

Khrushchev and the Red legions of China are ready to push forward at every break in our ranks. Dedicated agents of the international Communist conspiracy are now busily at work in Laos, in Vietnam, in Cuba, in Africa, and in every underdeveloped area of the world. Where arms can be used, they are employed. Where guerrilla warfare works better, it becomes their major weapon. And where the slow but steady subversion is required, that becomes their tool of destruction.

The Communist challenge is a total one, employing not only military means, but economic, propaganda, political, and ideological weapons as well.

There has never been a time in history when free men and women have needed to think more seriously about the past and use their historical knowledge to chart their course in the fight for freedom.

It would be wise for those of us who are here today to take a moment from our festivities and consider the deep historical significance which the biography of Lithuania holds for people everywhere.

Although Lithuania regained her independence after World War I, this historic event did not mark the beginning of an independent Lithuania. Nor did it mark the appearance of a new people on the stage of history. Both of these occurrences had taken place centuries ago, long before the arrival of Christianity in the Baltic States.

During the early Middle Ages, the Lithuanian people had established one of the most powerful and independent states in Europe—a state which was almost as large as France and Germany. Because of their power and their love of independence, the Lithuanian people were the chief defenders of Western civilization against the Mongols and Turks. In their golden age, they encouraged education and toleration and played their part in the general development of European civilization.

But in 1794 the Lithuanian people were overwhelmed by superior numbers and placed in the bonds of czarist slavery. For the next 120 years, they and their children, and their children's children lived under the cruelist oppression and brutality.

Schools, churches, and monasteries were closed. Repressive measures were taken against all forms of Lithuanian culture, including language, schools, the Catholic religion, and the personnel in the nation's administrative offices.

Condemned patriots were shackled, brought to their home communities, and executed publicly with fanfare and display. Priests were beaten and murdered. Parents were forced to witness the execution of their sons. Many thousands were exiled to Siberia.

Yet, in spite of all the oppression and cruelty, there had never been a single generation within those 120 years in which the Lithuanian people did not take up arms in a desperate effort to recover their lost liberty. It was the First World War, however, that again made possible the freedom of Lithuania. With the collapse of czarist Russia and the end of hostilities, the nation of Lithuania was finally able to return to self-government.

A permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922. It was truly a liberal document. The state of Lithuania was termed an "independent democratic Republic" and sovereign authority was vested in the nation, which exercised it through its Parliament, Government, and courts. The people of the Republic were guaranteed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and religion.

The new state was a progressive one. Its land-reform program was a most effective one. Within a few years after its initiation over 45,000 new farms had been established, and more than 200,000 people were provided with regular occupations and permanent homes.

Along with land reform came the improvement of traditional farming methods.

In education, great progress was also made. Between 1920 and 1937 the number of elementary schools more than doubled and the number of teachers and students increased over threefold.

There was also a great deal of social legislation in the new state. Numerous hospitals were built and community medical centers were set in operation. The 8-hour day became firmly established, and provisions were made for the medical care of the rural population. A sickness insurance system was taking care of 133,000 workmen and their families. It is evident that in the area of progressive and humanitarian legislation, this newly formed Republic was even ahead of us in the United States.

The industry of the nation also thrived during this 20-year period. And the new Republic quickly set to work to improve the neglected railroads and inadequate highways which were left by the czarist henchmen.

The record of the Lithuanian Republic was a highly commendable one. I relate it to you today because it is a record of what a free people can do when they join together in a common effort. I relate it to you today because it is a record of which you and your countrymen can be justly proud.

But just when the fruits of 20 years of hard toil and labor were being realized, war rumblings were heard again in Europe, and the Kremlin leaders broke their promises of peace and friendship and resorted to cynical treachery. Proclamations of Lithuanian neutrality meant little to the Soviet leaders.

Leaders of the young Republic foresaw the real Soviet intentions and were forced into exile. On June 15, 1940, the tiny Baltic nation was crushed by the iron heel of Communist tyranny.

Almost at once, all non-Communist parties and political organizations were abolished. Only the Communist apparatus remained as the legal political party. Elections became a mockery of the democratic process.

On August 25, 1940, a Soviet constitution was shoved down the throats of the Lithuanian people and a long-range program for the sovietization of the Lithuanian political, economic, and social order began.

After the war these efforts increased. A vigorous drive against individual farmers was waged, and complete collectivization of these people became the Soviet's goal. With this regimentation the productivity and living standard of the farmers diminished.

Books were burned, churches were razed, monasteries closed. Hundreds of priests were beaten, tortured, and deported to Siberia. Those people who were brave enough to openly observe their religious holidays were summoned, intimidated, and arrested. The teaching of religion to children was absolutely forbidden.

In 1 week alone in 1941, more than 34,000 persons were deported to remote areas of Siberia and the Arctic.

Between 1948 and 1949, when Lithuanian farmers resisted Soviet collectivization of farmlands, about 10 percent of Lithuania's population was driven to Siberia.

The story of Lithuania is a tragic one. It is a story which tells us much about the nature of our enemy and the will of a courageous people to be free and secure.

The experience of Lithuania is evidence of Communist hyprocrisy and their cynical definitions of words like "freedom" and "democracy."

Between 1920 and 1940 the Soviet Union, time and time again, made solemn pronouncements of their policies of noninterference in Lithuanian affairs and of their desire for peaceful coexistence and friendship.

Those who know the story of Lithuania, of Poland, of Lativa, of Estonia, of Hungary, of East Berlin, of Czechoslovakia, understand the real meaning of Soviet peace movements and overtures.

The story of Lithuania teaches us that the will to be free cannot be extinguished in a courageous people. Neither the United States nor any other free country has recognized the Soviet conquest of the Lithuanian people.

The situation existing in Lithuania today is a blot on the conscience of mankind. It makes a mockery of every Soviet expression of "self-determination" and "national independence."

People of future generations will bear witness to the fact that history is against Communist oppression and dictatorship. Even a hundred and twenty years of most brutal and czarist oppression could not stifle the breath of a freedom-loving people. Despite brutality and conquest, I am sure that the old Lithuanian phrase will, in the end, prevail. "Kas bus, kas nebus, O Lietuva neprazus."

The ancient and wonderful people of Lithuania have been bred to hardship. They have endured pain and suffering from time immemorial. They have seen nations in turmoil. They have felt the stirrings of nations on the move. They have known hardship in warfare against the Crusader, the Tartar, the Russians, and the Germans. They have passed through the crucibles of hate, and have never completely bowed before Slav or German. Their will to be free has never died.

The people of Lithuania have a faith that no amount of brutality and oppression can destroy. The people of Lithuania have a courage that the Soviets can never vanquish. The people of Lithuania have the character and strength to survive all the fraud and the force and the fear of Communist tyranny.

The people of Lithuania have been free in the past. They will be free in the future. And those of us in America will again welcome her to the world of free and peaceful nations.

Your faith in the future can be strengthened by rumblings behind the Iron Curtain. Many in the Soviet Union are living in the hopes that they, too, will one day enjoy the freedom and liberty that all good people hope and pray for.

Time and history are against the rule of tyranny and dictatorship. The desire and determination to be free are universal, even where it seems hopeless today. The spark of human freedom never dies. It burns deeply in the human breast. It will again one day burst into a flame. We trust that the day is not far away when your fatherland and people everywhere will enjoy their God-given rights and move forward to a world of peace, friendship, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include with my remarks the following resolution which was adopted by the society last Sunday:

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C.—RESOLUTIONS

Citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area gathered February 11, 1962, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Society, at the Washington Hotel, in the Capital of the United States, for the observance of the 44th anniversary of the restitution of independence of Lithuania, after due deliberation voted the following resolutions to be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the United Nations, Members of Congress of the United States, the diplomatic representatives of the Republics of

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to the press:

"1. We wish to add our voices to other expressions by fellow American citizens of their gratitude to the several succeeding administrations which, ever since July 23, 1940, steadfastly refused to recognize the fruits of the Hitler-Stalin connivance at aggression and continued to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States.

"2. Viewing with gratification the steady progress and peaceful accession by various peoples on the Asian and African continents to sovereign statehood and independence since World War II, achieved in most cases in cooperation with the countries formerly possessed of those areas, we deplore the contrary trend on the European Continent, where the Muscovite Soviet Empire subverted or conquered and reduced to colonial status a number of formerly independent countries with centuries-long traditions of sovereignty and which had played an active part in the development of the Christian European civilization, viz., Lithuania and other countries of central and eastern Europe.

"3. The Washingtonians, Marylanders, and Virginians gathered at this commemorative observance, urgently request the Government of the United States to concern itself more actively, in its quest for peace with liberty and justice, with the urgent problem of removing the major obstacle to peace in Europe—by promoting actively in the United Nations and in meetings with the leaders of the Soviet Union the effects to restore to the peoples of Lithuania and other similarly situated countries their untrammeled sovereignty and to provide the conditions enabling those peoples to choose their own government without the presence of the troops of a foreign dictatorship and of its political arm.

"4. Finally, we extend our greetings and best wishes to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of their cherished independence day."

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, once again we direct our thoughts to the brave people of Lithuania, who today observe their Independence Day as best they can behind the Iron Curtain. It is now over 20 years since the Lithuanian people lived in freedom under rulers of their choice, and 44 years to the day since 200 Lithuanian delegates, meeting with the permission of their German rulers, proclaimed an independent Lithuania based on democratic principles. Shortly after this proclamation German troops evacuated the capital city of Vilnius and the occupation from the West was succeeded by a new occupation from the East, led by the Red army of the new Soviet Government. Only after driving out this army with the help of Polish forces were the Lithuanian leaders able to realize their proclaimed aim of independence, thus fulfilling the legitimate historical aspirations of the Lithuanian people to be the masters of their own fate. After 1921 the Lithuanians enjoyed a few years of freedom, but the interwar period must have seemed very short indeed for this once mighty nation which had just emerged from 120 years of czarist Russian imperialism.

With the start of the Second World War Lithuania was once again overrun by ruthless invaders, first from Nazi Germany and then from the Soviet Union. The Russians tore up their treaty obligations and incorporated the three tiny Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Today the captive nations of Eastern Europe constitute the largest colonial empire in the world, just as the other subjugated peoples of the world are receiving their freedom. But the people of Lithuania have not forgotten their ancient heritage, despite Soviet efforts to cut them off from the world and make them forget that their homeland was ever free. The Communist efforts to make the national minorities in the Soviet Union forget their traditional loyalties has failed in Lithuania, as it has failed in other parts of the Soviet Empire.

Thus we commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day without joyous celebrations, but with a deep sense of responsibility, which I know is shared by every Member of the U.S. Congress. Just as we dare not give the Lithuanian people false hopes regarding their chances for regaining their freedom in the immediate future, so also must we commit ourselves totally to the cause of the free world, which is also the cause of the Lithuanian people, in order that this ruthless Communist dictatorship will eventually give way to an international order which respects the rights of all people to enjoy peace and independence in their homelands. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to salute the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their independence.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, we pause to celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. By doing so we help to keep alive the hopes and aspirations of the Lithuanian people who languish under the heel of Soviet Russian imperialism. Lithuania has every right to independence and we must not let the world forget these truths.

The state of Lithuania is actually more than 1,000 years old and its modern-united state reaches back to the beginning of the 13th century. The Lithuanian Lincoln was Grand Duke Mindaugas. In the year 1236 he already led a united Lithuanian Army against the Teutons. In 1251 he adopted Christianity and in 1253 he was crowned King of Lithuania. So the modern Lithuanian state is at least 700 years old. During 120 of these years Lithuania was occupied and ruled by the Russian Empire and many Lithuanians were exterminated and deported to the depths of Russia during this period. The Lithuanians did not, however, surrender to Russia. Succeeding generations rebelled against the occupying force until finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed the severance of all ties with Russia and her restoration as an independent Lithuanian Republic founded on a democratic basis.

For more than two decades Lithuania stood as a bulwark of democracy until, in the name of liberation, it was overrun and forcibly incorporated under the totalitarian tyranny of Soviet communism. But the Lithuanians' love of liberty and democracy could not be extinguished—they burn as brightly as ever.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will celebrate again this year the anniversary of their nation's independence. They will again voice their sympathy for their enslaved countrymen and once more protest vehemently against the alien forces of darkness that have seized their homeland. I think that today we all realize our commitment not only to the people of Lithuania but to those people in all areas of the globe under Soviet tyranny—a commitment to keep uppermost in our minds the goal that they will again be free. Therefore, we resolve it to be our duty to see that political freedom again takes its proper place in the world scene.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, is the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, however, this day will not be one of rejoicing in Lithuania for these brave people are under the firm grip of communism. Nevertheless, this anniversary date does offer the people of the free world an opportunity to express their hope that this brave nation, with a history filled with the determination to be free, will once again be able to celebrate its independence day.

During their period of independence—from February 16, 1918, until their occupation by the Nazis in 1941 and later their incorporation with the Soviet Union in 1944—the Lithuanian people showed the world what they could accomplish living in an atmosphere of freedom. This free nation through the creative efforts of her people became a progressive, independent, democratic republic. Rapidly, she became a respected member of the international community.

Communist control of Lithuania, however, marked the end of liberty for the Lithuanian people. Since then, this captive nation has been unable to observe February 16 as a day of celebration. Consequently, this day has become an occasion for the free world in the name of these silenced people to protest the fraudulent incorporation of this helpless nation into the Soviet Union.

In this country, all Americans join with Lithuanian-Americans in expressing this concern for the subjugated Lithuanians by proclaiming that their conscience will never know peace until Lithuania once again will resume her rightful place among the free nations of the world. Furthermore, this day offers us an opportunity to reiterate our promise that we will never accept the bondage of these brave people. In all fairness, we should never encourage false hopes for liberation, but we should assure them that we will continue to work realistically for the truth expressed so appropriately in the Atlantic Charter—that all peoples have the right to choose the form of government under which they desire to live. We are confident that this truth in the end will prevail and that freedom and liberty once more will be restored in Lithuania.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all wars and revolutions cause death and destruction, but some of these bring happiness and joy to some people. The First World War and the Russian revolution of 1917 ushered in a new era to many oppressed nationalities in the defunct

Russian Empire. Many of these asserted their freedom after the overthrow of the czarist regime in 1917, and proclaimed their independence. Thus the Lithuanian independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, was a child of the Russian revolution of 1917.

Since the late 18th century, Lithuania had become part of czarist Russia and for more than 100 years Lithuanians had to endure the oppressive yoke of Russia's autocratic regime. The czar's callous and cruel officials during that long period did all in their power to eradicate and uproot all signs and symbols of Lithuanian nationalism. Yet against all oppressions the Lithuanians retained their sense of nationality. They venerated their national traditions, clung steadfastly to their ideals, and longed for their national independence.

On February 16, 44 years ago, Lithuanians regained their freedom and proclaimed their political independence. In the employment of that freedom they worked ceaselessly and tirelessly, and in the course of two decades, during the interwar years, they rebuilt their war-ravaged country as a model of prosperous and progressive democracy. Then came the Second World War, which in the course of its first year swallowed independent Lithuania and made it, much against the wishes of the helpless Lithuanians, part of the Soviet Union.

Since 1940, except for the 2-year period during the war, the unfortunate Lithuanians have been oppressed by the tyrannical government imposed upon them by the Communist rulers of the Kremlin. This they suffer in misery and under conditions approaching servitude beneath the heel of their detested and despised overlords. At the same time, in their hearts they all cherish the hope that someday, somehow, freedom and independence may dawn over their heads in their historic and beloved homeland. On the 44th anniversary of their independence day I am glad to join all freedom-loving Lithuanians and echo their genuine patriotic feelings for a free Lithuania.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in Connecticut, February 16 has been officially designated as Lithuanian Day to commemorate the 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. Whereas all of America will be marking this day, Connecticut will be taking special note to honor the many citizens of Lithuanian descent who reside in Connecticut. While honoring the Lithuanian people on this day, we also join them in their sorrow and in their hope for their native land.

The tragic history of Lithuania's abortive attempt at independence has been recorded in the hearts of freemen as a lesson in the cruelty of Soviet subjugation and also in the faith and tenacity of a nation striving to retain her national identity. Lithuania's fate has typified all too realistically the conflict between freedom and totalitarian communism, between the very elements of good and evil. Lithuania had the courage and the spirit to resist tyranny, but because it lacked the force of arms, Bolshevik Russia reconquered the young nation.

To their everlasting honor, the idea of freedom has never been erased from the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. Although the conquering Bolshevik hordes executed or deported her intellectual leaders and crushed with unlimited terror the valiant resistance movement, the Lithuanian people have heroically clung to their cultural and spiritual heritage. Thus, in its oppression and frustration, Lithuania has become a living symbol of the love and sacrifice of freedom.

We who are free from the restrictions of the Iron Curtain can openly honor and commemorate Lithuania on this day and reaffirm our support of Lithuania's fight for freedom.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of Lithuanian independence, February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people emerged from several centuries of domination by their Russian neighbors, as well as from several years of occupation by the German forces of World War I. Liberty was won at last, but difficult to retain.

Lithuanian freedom lasted only the length of the interwar period. A few days after the German attack on the Soviet Union, in 1941, Lithuania was overrun by Nazi troops. Later when the tide of war turned against the Germans, Lithuania came under the equally ruthless domination of the Soviet Union. Since that time Lithuania has remained a Russian captive, virtually isolated from the West.

But Lithuania's brief taste of freedom has been enough to keep the will to be independent alive. Today, in observing this day of independence that is the symbol of Lithuanian aspirations, we reflect upon the tragic history of that brave land. We cannot allow the desire for freedom, the hope for independence, to go unnourished. The future does not belong to the Soviet Communists any more than it did to Hitler's "master race." The United States has not and will not forget the plight of the Lithuanian people. Today we rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom everywhere, in the name of Lithuania, and in the name of justice for all men.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania and the attainment of a long cherished dream of freedom from foreign domination. On that date in 1918, before the end of World War I, a few million people courageously overcame generations of despotic rule and, at the same time, inspired the hearts of freedom-loving people all over the world.

Our celebration of the freedom won by the Lithuanian people is clouded, however, by the knowledge that these people are again in captivity. In the tragic events which preceded our entry into World War II, two decades of independence ended abruptly with the Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1939. Along with the other Baltic Republics, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania was drawn by the force of the Red army into subjugation by the Soviet Union.

There was the pretense of free elections during the occupation, but the very presence of Soviet force made it dramatically clear that those elections were only a mockery. The need for such force, furthermore, demonstrated that the Kremlin had not completely defeated the desire for liberty by the valiant Lithuanian people.

Today, Americans of Lithuanian descent are continuing to keep alive the many aspects of Lithuanian tradition and culture which have enriched our country. They also nourish the hope that national independence may be restored and under a regime which truly seeks social and political justice.

All Americans, I know, share with me the earnest hope that Lithuanians will again enjoy the God-given rights of freedom and liberty. I join the other Members of this House to express sympathy and friendship to a brave people. We pray that for them the future will bring independence to their homeland and the right to pursue in peace their own national destiny.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and later during the same year in 1918 Lithuania became a republic.

The anniversary of this day which we now celebrate brings to our mind very vividly the birth of independence and freedom in our own country many years before.

We realize full well the long road that was traveled by the Lithuanian people prior to the time they could shake off the yoke of bondage and call themselves free. This freedom was not theirs for long, however, for in 1940 Lithuania was seized by the Russians and immediately the cloak of censorship was dropped over that little country and today it is engulfed with the other satellite nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Just as the spirit of freedom lived on in the minds of the early American settlers during the days of the Revolution, so also does that spirit of freedom still grow in the hearts of the Lithuanian people in their own country.

Today we honor these people and it is our fervent prayer and fond hope that one day they too will regain that precious gift and to that end we join them in our hopes and our prayers.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues in expressing tribute to the people of Lithuania on this 44th anniversary of their independence. February 16, 1918, marked the end of well over a century during which Lithuania suffered under a hostile, foreign rule. There was confidence and rejoicing that day as independence became theirs at last. Lithuania's social and economic record between the World Wars was a good one and she assumed the obligations of a modern progressive state.

Her hopes for continued freedom, however, were soon crushed between the pincer drive of Germany and Soviet Russia into the Baltic area. After a preliminary period of conquest by the Russians, occupation by the Germans, and then reconquest by the Russians, Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union in 1944. Since that time Lithuania has been held

within the Russian orbit as a Soviet republic. The U.S. Government, however, has consistently refused to acknowledge this imperialistic conquest and still recognizes Lithuania as a free and independent nation.

One could not blame the Lithuanian people if they were to assume a defeatist attitude after such tribulations. And yet the spirit of independence still fires the hearts of these courageous men and women. They live for and dream of the day on which the flag of free Lithuania may once again wave over their land. Let us salute them today and pledge our continued efforts to support their undying fight for freedom.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is rightly said that the whole world is kin. That is why we, as liberty-loving Americans, take cognizance that tomorrow, February 16, 1962, will mark the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. We feel a kinship with our fellow human beings on the other side of the ocean which strikes a responsive chord in our hearts. We understand and appreciate the longing for freedom and independence that the brave people of Lithuania have.

Forty-four years ago, Lithuania regained her freedom which, unfortunately, was short lived. In 1940, during the course of the last war, Lithuania's independence was lost and that unhappy country fell under the ruthless heel of Communist tyrants who were bent on destroying the rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, the spirit of liberty and the dedication to self-determination still lives strongly in the bosom of every person in that now unhappy land.

Here we can see a striking example that the world cannot take the word of the Russians nor believe anything they might say or agree to. By the Treaty of Moscow of 1920, Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and forever renounced all rights possessed by it over the Lithuanian people and its territory. Notwithstanding such guaranteed liberty and a solemn treaty and agreement of nonaggression, Russia regarded such formal covenant as a mere scrap of paper and violated it with wanton disregard.

The mere fact that we, here in the Congress of the United States, take time out from our pressing legislative duties to not only take note of Lithuania's plight, but to recognize Russia's failure to live up to their treaty obligations, should give new hope to the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot, we will not, abandon these people who have been so sorely oppressed by the evil and dark forces of communism. I maintain that it is our duty as human beings to encourage enslaved peoples everywhere in their hopes for freedom and the achievement of dignity to which man is fully entitled.

It so happens that during the month of February, the United States joyously celebrates the birthdays of two truly great men, Washington and Lincoln, fighters for human freedom, liberty and justice. We Americans are, indeed, blessed to possess such precious rights and feel that people in other lands are also entitled to them. That is why I am in favor of House Resolution 211, a measure calling for the establishment, in the House of Representatives, of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

To our fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent who have contributed so very much to enrich our own culture and economy, we must show that we will continue to support the cause of liberty and freedom everywhere and strive for the restoration of true independence for Lithuania. This we must do until their liberation is an established fact.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of special significance, and I hold it a great honor to join in this commemoration of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuania's history as a nation dates back to the year 1200. She possesses an inheritance of rich cultural values and a splendid record of individual people who have a deep sense of compassion for their fellow men.

Lithuania's long struggle toward freedom has been marked with blood and tears. The forcible seizure of this freedom-loving country by the Soviet Union, and the occupation by the Soviet of Lithuania's two neighboring states, Latvia and Estonia, is an indelible stain on the history of civilization. This illegal action has never been recognized by the United States, and we are committed to the restoration of freedom in these brave nations.

Untold sufferings, privations, and blood have been paid by liberty-loving Lithuanians to gain their freedom. To retain this glowing spirit of liberty, to strengthen and to expand it, requires constant vigilance and perseverance, and that is our task.

On this occasion, we rededicate ourselves to principle and to the long hard struggle of regaining freedom for Lithuania. May the courage and loyalty of Lithuanians the world over draw the admiration and praise of all liberty-loving people of every nation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on Friday the 16th of February, the men and women of Lithuania and Lithuanian descent will be celebrating the 44th anniversary of that nation's independence. Only in Lithuania itself, where the iron rule of a Communist Russian dictatorship holds sway, is this day not celebrated.

Today we pay homage to a proud but enslaved nation, and in so doing, we serve warning to all oppressors that freemen everywhere look with disdain and repugnance on the deeds of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a hundred years, in the 19th century, patriotic Lithuanians worked for their day of freedom from czarist oppression. At last their cherished dream came true in 1918. For more than 20 years Lithuanians enjoyed their newly won independence. They organized a democratic form of government, enacted many progressive social and economic institutions, and became a respected member in the family of nations. But, unfortunately, in the fall of 1939 it was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union, and in the summer of 1940 it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then Lithuanians have not known freedom. First came the Nazi occupation, and then in 1944 the dreaded Red army returned, and has remained ever since. Lithuania has been cut off from the outside world and the country is again under foreign domination.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues on this memorable occasion in sympathetic greetings to all those in Lithuania in the hope that we may soon see a new day in which Lithuania may again enjoy freedom as a nation and contribute to the progress of a free world.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, once more it is with a feeling of privilege and honor that I join my colleagues here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in tribute to Lithuania. Tomorrow marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of that proud country. After a prolonged period of Russian domination followed by German occupation during World War I, the Lithuanian people finally reached the goal for which they had been striving on February 16, 1918. As history records, that freedom was short lived and Lithuania was once again dominated when occupied by Russia in World War II. In July of 1940 she was forcibly made a part of the Soviet Union.

The dedication of the people of Lithuania to regain their independence as a nation and to reestablish personal freedom throughout their land remains steadfast—this despite the cruel yoke of Russian suppression which has held Lithuania in virtual slavery.

Today all patriotic and liberty-loving Lithuanians in the free world celebrate their national independence. Unfortunately their brothers in the homeland are not permitted to do so by their Communist overlords. That sacred privilege is denied them. Let us all hope and pray that soon they will once again become masters of their own destiny, and that they will be able to celebrate this great day in freedom and honor.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has been known to history since the year 1009, when it was a nation divided into many principalities. As a result of repeated threats from abroad these principalities joined together in a united state, and in 1253 a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas, who had been baptized 2 years earlier, as the king of a united Lithuania. By the 14th century the Lithuanian state had extended its boundaries into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Lithuanian influence was further extended by a union with Poland, first in the 14th century as a result of a marriage between the rulers of the two countries, then as a legal union which lasted from the 16th century until almost the end of the 18th. During the Middle Ages the Lithuanians established a powerful and independent European state, which successfully turned back various foreign invasions. The eastern Slavs enjoyed far more freedom than the residents of Moscow and

were able to live in peace with neighboring countries.

It may help us to understand the present unfortunate condition of the Lithuanian nation if we recall that Russian domination goes back to 1795, when Poland was divided for the third time. The Lithuanians repeatedly tried to throw out the Russians, but without success. The Russians reacted to the revolts by trying to replace Lithuanian culture and language with Russian, but the Lithuanians remained loyal to their traditional religion, language and culture, and the Soviet attempts at Russification were finally abandoned in 1905.

Lithuania was overrun by invading armies in the First and Second World Wars, and on both occasions she was at the mercy of both German and Russian conquerors. However, the Russian revolution and the defeat of Germany provided Lithuanian nationalists with a long-awaited opportunity to make good their suppressed desires for freedom. In 1917, 200 Lithuanians received permission from the German Government to hold a congress on the future of Lithuania, and on February 16, 1918—44 years ago today—this meeting proposed an independent Lithuanian state based on the principles of freedom and democracy.

But the evacuating German troops were replaced by members of the Red army, who promptly installed a Communist government. Only after the Soviet forces were driven out by the Polish Army, led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and with the help of Lithuanian soldiers, did Russia sign a peace treaty. This document, signed in 1920, proclaimed Russia's recognition of Lithuania as an independent nation and a Soviet pledge that "Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." How ironic do these words sound 40 years later, and how little weight do legal documents carry when pitted against the overwhelming force of a large nation.

The peace settlement with Russia was followed by a dispute between Lithuania and Poland over their common boundary and the city of Vilnius, which the Lithuanians wanted as their capital. This controversy was resolved by the League of Nations in 1923. The Lithuanians lost Vilnius but gained the formerly German territory of Memel. Lithuania was herself admitted to the League of Nations in 1921 and like so many other smaller powers served as a constructive force for peace. Meanwhile the Lithuanians elected their first president and adopted a constitution, guaranteeing the basic civil liberties and freedom to all its citizens.

The Soviet Union's sympathy for Lithuania, expressed in the decisive language of the 1920 peace treaty, is explained by the geographical position of the small Baltic State, with her common frontiers with both Poland and Germany, which made Lithuania a convenient pawn in the diplomatic and military game. During the interwar years the Soviet Government consistently supported the Lithuanian claim for the return of her historic capital of Vilnius from Poland, even though the Lithuanian Government of this period were strongly anti-Communist. But Soviet friendship was, of course, deceptive. When Russia and Germany divided Poland between them in 1939, the Soviet Union returned the city of Vilnius to Lithuania, but the gift did not cost the Russians anything, for shortly thereafter they annexed all of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. The tiny country of Lithuania was overrun by successive waves of Soviet, German, and in 1944, once again, Soviet armies.

After their incorporation into the Soviet Union the three Baltic States were kept sealed off from the outside world. Until 1959, when Vilnius was opened, no Western observers were allowed into Lithuania. The rest of the country remains closed today, perhaps because the Baltic coast is ideally suited for missile bases.

Mr. Speaker, I have recalled the unhappy modern history of the Lithuanian people in some detail because I believe it important that we appreciate the background of Lithuanian suffering. The Kremlin can deny the freedom to work, talk or travel, but the Lithuanian people still remain the masters of their souls, and the passionate desire for freedom remains. This desire is a common heritage of the people of Lithuania and the people of the United States; it forms a bond no Iron Curtain can break.

And therefore, the privilege we have today of celebrating the Lithuanian independence, like all privileges, carries with it a responsibility. We here today, and the entire free world, have the heavy responsibility and the awesome challenge to be sure that someday Lithuania again will be free. We have this responsibility not only because Lithuania deserves her freedom, but also because the free world would not long remain free if it forgets those who are less fortunate.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the American people take the opportunity to tell the people of Lithuania that their plight is not forgotten and their hopes are also our hopes. This is an opportunity too to give notice to the Soviet jailers that we have not forgotten the brave people of Lithuania they hold as prisoners. And so today is primarily a day to rededicate ourselves to the age-old struggle for freedom that has characterized the history of both the United States and Lithuania, a struggle for the dignity of man, a struggle to free him from oppression of all kinds, a struggle full of hope for the coming day of deliverance. I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, with the entire American people and with the whole free world in a salute to the people of Lithuania.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is an impressive fact that Lithuanian Independence Day is being celebrated here in America. Here we cherish freedom. We honor those who defy domination. We welcome the heritage from a rich past, the contribution of a determined present, and the inspiration of a faith in the future. The Lithuanian people brought to America their love of liberty, their courage in the face of vicissitude, their tradition of centuries of civilization, their industry, and their hopefulness.

Though the Lithuania whose 44th anniversary we celebrate on February 16 is currently dominated by the Russians, it has a confidence in its regeneration which is supported by the very vicissitudes of its centuries-old past. For Lithuania, with a history and a civilization older than that of most of Europe, has been repeatedly overrun by hordes from east, west, and south. Repeatedly, it has emerged, retaining its traditions, its individuality, and its hope. The Lithuanian people have remained free in spirit, stalwart in their resistance.

There have been long periods in Lithuanian history of great progress and renown. Politically, socially, economically, and culturally the contributions of Lithuania to the development of western civilization have been great.

We in America have benefited greatly from the Lithuanians in our midst. The Lithuanian-Americans have perpetuated here their culture as old as the Christian era. A religious people, they have maintained their piety and their ideals. The suffering of generations under violence from without, domination, and disaster has but refined their endurance and their determination to retain their native characteristics. They have lived in closely knit groups, pursuing their particular arts, crafts, religion, and social habits; but with great concern for one another. Philanthropy has marked their contributions to society.

They have given, too, of their talents to the outside world. Lithuanian farmers, journalists, tailors, musicians, and artists have made names for themselves in the history of American development. The progress of the United States has depended upon the blending of such ethnic groups as these, maintaining withal their individuality, their hardihood, and the pursuit of their ideals.

Those who are aware of the richness of their past, the tenacity, the courage, and the vigor of her people today will have no doubt as to the future of an indomitable, indestructible Lithuania.

Mrs. KELLY. On February 16 we commemorate the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Lithuanian nation.

The history of Lithuania has not been a happy one. For a century and a quarter czarist Russia ruled the small Baltic state and even attempted to replace the Lithuanian language, culture, and traditions with its own. This forced Russification was, however, unsuccessful, and with the collapse of the czarist regime the Lithuanian people reasserted their desire for independence and, in 1918, proclaimed the Republic of Lithuania.

The next two decades saw the new nation grow and progress. It was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921 and thus became a member of the community of nations. Its infant industry expanded, and a successful land-reform program was put into effect. Lithuanian literature flourished, and significant

achievements were made in opera and music. On August 3, 1940, however, this progress came to a halt. The Soviet Union forced the formation of a friendly government, occupied the country, and finally declared Lithuania a constituent republic in the U.S.S.R. After this occupation the country was overrun by Nazi forces and then once again, near the end of World War II, by the Red army.

Despite the heavy yoke of communism which they bear, the Lithuanians have never lost their hope for freedom and independence. They have caught what Thomas Jefferson once called "the disease of liberty" and refused to relinquish their inalienable right to self-determination. We Americans, as leaders of the free world, have an obligation to keep that hope alive not only in Lithuania but in all the countries behind the Iron Curtain. It is for this reason that I have established within the House Foreign Affairs Committee a Subcommittee on Captive Nations. In its hearings on captive nations, the subcommittee will have the following objectives in mind:

First. To focus attention on the people of the captive European nations.

Second. To study present conditions within the captive European nations, including the possibility of changes from their present status, to study present policies of the United States regarding them, and to provide the Congress with the latest and most reliable information on the situation in the captive European nations.

Third. To expose to the rest of the world that the Soviet Union has ruthlessly welded these captive nations into the Soviet colonial empire and is despotically keeping their peoples oppressed, while at the same time falsely and hypocritically posing as the international champion of those seeking liberty and independence.

On this anniversary I can only pledge my continued support for the Lithuanian people and hope that they will soon see the realization of their dream of a free and independent Lithuania.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, since 1918, the Lithuanian people, having tasted of the precious fruit of freedom, have never relinquished their hope that one day it will be theirs again. It was in 1918, after centuries of subjugation to czarism, that the people established their own government and chose the pattern of independence, but the securing and maintaining of liberty is a never-ending battle as the Lithuanians have learned again and again. They fought off the Bolsheviks in 1920 only to find that 22 years later they were once again subjected to Soviet rule.

Thus the celebration of Independence Day by a people no longer free is not a contradiction in terms but a massive symbol that the spirit of liberty is alive. This celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day is not only a reminder to all of us how many peoples still live in subjugation but it is also a reminder, as history proves again and again, that tyranny carries within it the seeds of its own destruction.

The friends of freedom hail Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join with my fellow Representatives here today in paying tribute to the great people of Lithuania and our own Lithuanian-Americans who are celebrating the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Forty-four years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

In this year of 1962, our observance here is, unfortunately, shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that the Kremlin is using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and, perhaps, even for war, and a substantial part of the slave force has been kidnaped from Lithuania.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

We must dedicate ourselves today to the continuing revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania, so that the United Nations and the free world shall accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania. May God grant that this restoration will soon be accomplished.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people constitute one of the smaller ethnic groups in northeastern Europe, but in the past they have played an exceptionally important part. The state they founded some 700 years ago endured for centuries, and at one time was a real force in all east European affairs. Then late in the 18th century Lithuania became part of the Russian empire, and for more than a hundred years Lithuanians lived under czarist autocracy. During the First World War when the czarist regime was no more, they asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918.

Having thus attained their national goal they worked hard in making Lithuania a model democracy, and there they lived happily for two decades. Then came World War II and with it Lithuania's tragedy. In 1940 it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union and independent Lithuania vanished in thin air. For a couple of years during the war it was occupied by the Nazi forces. Then in 1944 Russia returned and reoccupied the country once more, making it again part of the Soviet Union. Since then unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom and have been suffering under oppressive regimes instituted and maintained there by the Kremlin. But the people of Lithuania have not surrendered their right to freedom and independence, and today in their Independence Day we hope that they attain their goal once more and live in peace in their historic homeland.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent state. This proclamation signaled the end of more than a century of foreign domination and the beginning of a new era for the Lithuanian people. On July 12, 1920, Lithuania's right to freedom was recognized by Russia when that country pledged to renounce all rights of sovereignty over Lithuanian territory. It was recognized as a sovereign and stable member of the world community when, on September 22, 1921, it was admitted to the League of Nations.

The next two decades were marked by the fulfillment of many of the hopes which had sustained Lithuanian nationalism through the long period of czarist rule. A constitution was adopted which accorded freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and communication. A land reform program enlarged the number of farms, and new industries were established. Lithuanian culture, unfettered at last, flourished with new accomplishments in literature and music.

Unfortunately, the location of Lithuania, with Germany to the west and the Soviet Union to the east, rendered it almost impossible for it to survive the aggressions of the Second World War. Although Lithuania attempted to maintain its neutrality, it was occupied first by the Soviets, then by the Germans, then again by the Soviets. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

The freedom which the Lithuanian people enjoyed between the two World Wars stands in sharp contrast to the subjugation which Lithuania has experienced in the past two decades. In place of freedom of speech and communication and other civil liberties are rigid controls and restrictions. In place of mutually beneficial contacts with the West there is the Iron Curtain which keeps at a minimum the number of meetings between Lithuanians and outsiders.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is my hope that these statements in the U.S. Congress will demonstrate to the Lithuanian people that they have not been forgotten. If freedom-loving people throughout the world continue to have faith in their beliefs and to work unceasingly to strengthen liberty, we can be confident that ultimately freedom and democracy must be victorious over totalitarianism and tyranny.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today free people throughout the non-Communist world take a few moments from their daily activities to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people. Forty-four years ago today, the freedom-loving Lithuanians reestablished their independence and proclaimed the formation of a

Lithuanian Republic founded on the principles of liberty and freedom.

Lithuania was united in 1253 when the many principalities of Lithuania were formed into a single state. Mindaugas, who had been baptized 2 years earlier, was crowned as king by a personal delegate of Pope Innocent IV. This was one of the first expressions of the Christian faith of the Lithuanian people, and Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state in 1387.

It was this same Christian faith that contributed strongly to saving Europe from barbarism in the late 14th century, when the Lithuanians successfully repulsed the Tartar hordes seeking to sweep in upon Europe. During the Middle Ages they also defended their independence against the Germans and the Russians. At that time they were one of the greatest states of eastern Europe, as Lithuania's boundaries in the 14th century reached into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Through marriage ties and parliamentary action Lithuania and Poland were joined legally in the 16th century. In 1795, by the third partition of Poland, Lithuania was annexed by czarist Russia. The Lithuanians struggled in vain to throw off the Russian yoke. The Russians responded by attempting to destroy the Lithuanian language and culture, but they too were unsuccessful, as the Lithuanians tenaciously clung to their historical religion, language, and cultural traditions. Finally the Russification policy was abandoned in 1905.

During the First and Second World Wars Lithuania was overrun by both the Germans and the Russians. In these two terrible wars, the innocent Lithuanians, due to an unfortunate accident of geography, stood on the lines and march between the two giants of Europe, and as the military advantage changed from one side to the other, the country became a tragic battlefield, ravaged by gigantic armies.

During the ebb and flow of World War I the Lithuanians capitalized on the conditions favorable for asserting their independence. In 1917 delegates representing the people of Lithuania met to determine the future course of the Nation. Out of this Congress came the announcement of the formation of the Lithuanian state, on February 16, 1918. It is the 44th anniversary of this proclamation that we honor today.

But Lithuanian independence had not yet become a reality, as the Red army invaded the capital and set up a Communist puppet regime in January of 1919. During the following year Lithuanian and Polish fighting forces under Marshal Pilsudski drove out the oppressive Bolsheviks.

In the peace treaty signed with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, Russia pledged to recognize Lithuania as an independent nation and to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The language of the agreement reads in part: "Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." How false and cynical those words seem today, over 40 years later. Today it has become such a commonplace to speak of Communist duplicity that sometimes we tend to disregard the tragic consequences of that duplicity. The pillaging of a proud and freedom-loving nation is not a matter to be lightly passed over, and I would maintain that if ever we should become apathetic to such outrages, the moral fiber of our country will have been gravely weakened.

When the Russians forced a mutual assistance treaty upon Lithuania in October 1939 they were acting in direct violation of the peace treaty of 1920 and the Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of nonaggression of 1926. Under the terms of this so-called mutual assistance treaty, Lithuanian sovereignty was drastically compromised as the Russians demanded the right to have airbases and Soviet garrisons on the soil of Lithuania. In June 1940 the Russians compounded their tyranny by demanding the formation of a friendly government. Then they ruthlessly occupied the country, and by August 1940 Lithuania had been incorporated into the U.S.S.R. After the Nazi attack on Russia, Lithuania became a German colony for 3 years, until it was recaptured by the Soviets in 1944.

From World War II until 1959 all of Lithuania was closed to Western observers. Since 1959 some Americans have been allowed to enter the city of Vilnius, but the rest of the country remains sealed off. From scattered reports we can put together a pretty clear picture of what has been happening inside Lithuania during the years it has suffered under Communist domination. The picture is not a pretty one. It tells of brutal murders, of deportations, and of slave labor camps. It testifies to a vicious campaign to scatter the Lithuanian people and replace them in their homeland by Russians. And it exposes a brutal plot to destroy the religious faith and love of liberty of the Lithuanian nation. But from this somber story emerges a message and an inspiration for freemen everywhere. The Lithuanian people love God and they love their country deeply. And no Soviet atheist totalitarianism can destroy this precious heritage. The Lithuanian passion for freedom will never die, and communism will not be able to hold in bondage a proud people yearning and determined that one day they shall again be free.

The United States has on many occasions reaffirmed its support of Lithuanian independence. We recognized the independent Lithuanian Government in 1922 and have never accepted Soviet domination of the country. Emphasizing our moral commitment to the cause of Lithuanian freedom, we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with a representative of the former independent Government, which still has a legation in Washington.

Lithuanians who have come to settle in the United States have made many unique contributions to American civilization. The first known Lithuanian immigrants landed at New Amsterdam in 1688. Today there are an estimated one million Americans of Lithuanian descent. These Lithuanians have been widely praised for their patriotic devotion, their religious piety, their close family ties, and their community spirit.

Today I take great pride in joining with loyal Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in celebrating this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people brought to an end the ruthless rule of czarist Russia, which had lasted 120 years. During the Middle Ages Lithuania had been a powerful and independent state, whose borders extended into the heart of what is now the Soviet Union. The legitimate national aspirations of the Lithuanian people were crushed in 1795, when their country was annexed to Russia as part of the third partition of Poland. Yet the steadfast Lithuanians repeatedly revolted against their Russian overlords and remained loyal to their ancient language, culture, and traditions despite continuous Russian efforts to make them forget their independence.

In 1919 and 1920 the Lithuanians established their independence by force of arms, and during the next two decades they made significant contributions to the cause of world peace, both through the efforts of their spokesmen at the League of Nations and by living peacefully with their Polish and Soviet neighbors. The history of this tiny independent state between 1920 and 1939 effectively destroys the Soviet claim that their domination of the captive nations of Eastern Europe is necessary to insure the security of the Soviet Union. Yet the period of independence was not destined to last. Despite the Soviet renunciation in 1920 of "all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory," Lithuania was forcefully incorporated into the U.S.S.R. in 1940. It was one of the first countries to suffer under the brutal occupations of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. After the war the Soviets ordered large-scale deportations of Lithuanians to Siberia and many Russians have settled in Lithuania. For a long time the country was completely closed off to foreigners, who are now permitted to visit the capital city of Vilnius. Stalin's attempt to disperse the Baltic peoples has since been abandoned, and in the small towns and farms of rural Lithuania the ancient tradition of national independence has not been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is no longer a free and independent nation, but the spirit of freedom lives on in the hearts of this sturdy people. As happens so often in the history of Europe, a small nation is in bondage because the military force of a larger neighbor proved more powerful than its legal commitments. We Americans may take some pride in the fact that the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania into the Communist empire, has never given its sanction to this lawless act of brute force perpetrated on a

small and defenseless nation. We salute the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their national independence with a sense of deep responsibility and commitment to the ideals of liberty which they share with the entire free world.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to celebrate the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation. In doing so we pay tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania who cannot themselves publicly celebrate this important event which marked a milestone in their struggle for freedom.

Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918, after centuries of subjugation, sometimes German, but mostly Russian. Never during those years of struggle did the Lithuanian people lose sight of their ultimate goal of self-determination. In 1940 Lithuania lost its independence once again when the Soviet Union annexed it and its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, and made them republics of the U.S.S.R. This act was in such callous disregard of the sovereign and human rights of the Lithuanian people and in complete violation of international law that it has never been recognized by the United States. Yet despite their many trials the people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged. The passion for liberty and freedom is heightened, not dispelled, by this adversity. Their courage and indomitable will to resist Soviet attempts to inculcate communism and the Soviet way of life, remain strong.

On this day the American people who cherish individual freedom and national liberty as their most priceless possession, join their hopes and aspirations with their fellow men in Lithuania. We renew our devotion to the cause of Lithuanian independence. We hope that the day may not be prolonged when Lithuania will once again regain her rightful position in the family of free nations which she so richly deserves.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the nation of Lithuania has been known to history for almost a thousand years. During that time the Lithuanian people have experienced the joys of greatness and independence as well as the tragedies of war and subjugation. Today Lithuania is in one of its darkest periods. On this Lithuanian Independence Day it is fitting that we who are fortunate enough to live in the free world pay tribute to the gallant Lithuanian people and express our hope that the light of liberty will someday shine in their land again.

The first great period of Lithuanian independence was in the Middle Ages. During this period the Lithuanians established a powerful state which was able to check the German drive to the east and protect Europe from the Mongols and the Tartars. They gave their people a degree of freedom which was far higher than in neighboring countries, and through their education and toleration played a significant role in the development of European civilization.

In 1795, however, this bright period of Lithuanian history came to an end and Lithuania was annexed by Russia. The Lithuanians undertook many revolts against czarist oppression, but they met with no success. Following these revolts the Russians launched attempts to wipe out the Lithuanian language and culture and replace them with Russian ways, but such attempts proved impossible and eventually had to be abandoned.

This long dark period of Russian domination was brought to an end by the First World War. Although the Lithuanians paid a terrible price in that war, in terms of lives and devastation, they emerged as an independent state once again. It was this period of independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, that we commemorate today. The Lithuanians thrived in their work of improving the economic and social conditions of their people and building an independent state, and the next two decades marked one of the happiest periods in Lithuanian history.

But just as the First World War had brought freedom to the Lithuanian people, the Second World War deprived them of their liberty. Although Lithuania tried to remain neutral, it was occupied by the Red army and in 1940 was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. Later, in 1941, it was overrun by German forces. Still another reversal took place in 1944 when Lithuania was retaken by the Soviets, and today Lithuania remains under the Soviet domination imposed at that time.

Thus it is that today Lithuania finds itself again in a period of darkness, with an iron curtain draped around its borders to keep out rays of light from the free world. However, it is impossible to prevent all contact with the outside. I feel sure that the statements being made here today, showing that the Lithuanian people and their love of freedom have not been forgotten, will find their way to those who cling to their ideals. It is my hope that in some small way our words will add to their faith that the free world will eventually triumph in the cold war and the Lithuanians and all other peoples denied their political and human rights will be able to hold high the torch of liberty once again.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, only the marked sadness of this, the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence as a free nation, mars the conscience of the free people of the world.

The sufferings of its people in the bloody grip of Soviet rule, first under the czarist oppression for 123 years and now under Soviet tyranny and slavery since 1940, have not destroyed the will of its people to be free. This brave race, cultured in the glorious traditions of its heroic leaders dating before the Christian era, facing the many sufferings of her people with tolerance and with prayers to the Almighty, courageously awaits the day of her liberation from Soviet domination.

The 7 mass deportations of her citizens and many lesser ones—2,000 to 3,000 a month—totaling 600,000 souls, has failed to quench this brave nation's thirst for the freedom of those enslaved within and without her borders. One-fourth of her sons have been transported to the interior of Russia, as slaves. Thousands have died in prison camps and in exile. Thus, through mass fear, the inevitable weakening of her patriotic national will lies diluted with despair, questioning if freedom will ever be realized.

The great problem confronting the United States is, Can we really maintain our own institutions of freedom for long—as we view the encroachments made by the Communists upon the free nations of the world—each falling within its aura of godless enslavement?

The United States has already moved with celerity to curb the menace at our own doorstep. This administration, in 1 year, has put the seal of the Monroe Doctrine on the North and South American Continents. Our neighboring nations are alerted to the communistic practices that lead to domination.

We must do more—we must use every force to release the small nations throughout Europe and the Baltic areas. The West must force its preparedness programs to the extreme of our national abilities to pay, in order to give confidence to the new nations of the East and Africa, that no one dare controvert our desires to keep the world of freemen free.

The nations enslaved must be freed, that Christianity prevail. The bodies of men may be enslaved, but the "self," "the spirit," "the soul," can never be lost to tyranny. Lithuania must be saved. Her independence must be restored. The dignity of man must be preserved with free institutions to protect it. America is the one hope that keeps alive the fires of freedom among all men—let us not let them down. We are prepared to march in freedom's name—with God's guidance, we will prevail.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has had a stormy history. For 22 years, following the war of 1914–18, it was an independent state. In the era of its greatest power it stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. After it was converted to Christianity in 1385, it was dominated by Polish influence for more than 400 years. It was annexed by imperial Russia in 1795 but at the time of the Communist revolution it broke away from the Soviet Union and proclaimed its independence.

But the lights of freedom were soon put out by the sharp winds of World War II. In June 1940 Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops, and soon after was blackmailed into becoming the 14th Soviet republic. Thousands of Lithuanians were deported to the east as the Soviet war lords sought to communize the country. The United States refused to recognize the Communist conquest.

The whiptides of war loosed the Soviet hold on Lithuania and the German Nazis occupied the country from 1941 to 1944. But with the German defeat Lithuania was again annexed to the Soviet Union. It remains a captive nation, tied to its eastern overlords in unhappy bondage.

Lithuania looks to the West, not to the East. It has a Christian heritage. Like all people, the Lithuanian people

would like to be free to decide their own destiny. And some day they will be.

For if there is one thing that we can be sure of, it is that the wave of the future is on the side of human liberty, and that the various totalitarianisms, whether they be Communist or Fascist, will eventually die away. This is the hope which those of Lithuanian descent in this country can always hold out to their kinsmen behind the Curtain.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since I have been a Member of this historic body annually on the 15th of February or the date nearest thereto, when the House is in session, to observe the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* with some remarks in memory of the 266 Americans who perished with the *Maine* in Havana Harbor, and the war with Spain that followed.

Today I have an especially warm sense of audience receptability in talking of the Spanish-American War. The eminent and beloved gentleman who is now the Speaker of this House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a great American in every sense and by every measure of accomplishment and human qualities, is from Massachusetts, and in the Spanish-American War, the outfit to which I belonged—the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan—was brigaded with the great 9th of Massachusetts, and during the years JOHN MCCORMACK has been the unfailing friend of the Spanish War veterans. I feel I am speaking in a sympathetic atmosphere with this great gentleman in the chair, one who has always been understanding of the spirit of 1898 and of the volunteers who went to Cuba and who saw action in the siege of Santiago.

Mr. Speaker, 92 veterans of that war of 64 years ago, a war that started our country on the road to a world destiny have served in this body. When I came here in the 81st Congress, I was one of four Spanish-American War veterans who were Members of that Congress and with two of the other three I had soldiered in Cuba in the same regiment, the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

I am the last remaining, the last veteran of that war in the Congress. My colleagues have been sympathetically understanding of the sense of solemn obligation that possesses me to set the record straight so far as it is within my humble power to do so in the brief time remaining, of the history of a war that was preceded by the Civil War and followed by two World Wars, conflicts that engaged vastly larger numbers and extended over much longer periods of time which despite its tremendous impact on the history of the world and the brilliance of its action on both sea and land because of the overshadowing events that followed has become the forgotten little war, as one latter-day historian not too aptly described it.

I think that future historians when the passage of time has furnished a truer scale of measurements more accurately will say that the rise of the United States to world power was preceded by a 50-year war commencing with the war with Spain, then an interlude of peace when military muscles were being flexed, then World War I, and then another interlude of peace, and finally World War II.

I look back 64 years, and it does not seem very long. Yet when in 1898 events that had happened in 1834, as I read of them in history, seemed so far, far away. What changes had come to our Republic in the 64 years between 1834 and 1898. What changes have come in the 64 years between 1898, when the United States was rising to meet the challenge of her destiny, and 1962—all in just a part of the span of my life.

The seats of this historic Chamber are filled with the veterans of World War I and World War II, many with years of the test of combat. The story of their deeds, if it could be compressed in a volume, would be a classic epic of heroism.

But one by one, two by two, they will depart in the march of the years until one day in the Congress, where had served with distinction and dedication so many hundred veterans of the World Wars, but one will remain. I wish for him the warmth in his association with his younger colleagues that you have given to me. From the bottom of my heart wells a sentiment of gratitude.

When the Honorable James Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois, was in the other body, he was a member of Columbia Camp of the United Spanish War Veterans, a camp to which I have belonged for many years and twice have served as camp commander, once in 1915 when I was Lieutenant Governor and again some years later. There were close to a thousand members of Columbia Camp at that time. Now few remain. The column of the names of past commanders on the camp letterhead is almost a solid row of asterisks, which a footnote explains means deceased.

I am reading from a letter I received some months ago, a letter signed by Charles Ziesenhenne, commander, and attested by Sam Black, adjutant:

> Seven of our members live outside of Chicago, and of the 11 who do live in town, only 3 of us are physically able to attend meetings. The same officers have to hold over year after year because there are no others able and willing to take over the jobs. We no longer pay camp dues and our per capita tax to national is paid up for some time yet. Our only expense is for funerals. Columbia Camp will not be disbanded. We will continue to the last comrade, whoever he may be. We have been friends as well as comrades. But now we are all so near to that last turn in the road of life that we can no longer function as we would like, and can only do the best we can for just as long as we can.

RESEARCHERS' MEASURE FOR EVALUATION

Mr. Speaker, I can only trust that what I am saying here today, on the 64th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, and which will find its lodgment in the permanent pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will furnish to future researchers some measure for the evaluation of writings in recent years on the Spanish-American War that have given me great concern. These writers in the main seem to have been obsessed with a passion for downgrading the United States and converting the Spirit of '98, which was the expression of the finest idealism of any people in any period of the world, into a coarse and vulgar and selfish thing.

Within the last year my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], who is high on my list of the ablest Members of this body, told me of his indignation on reading a book by a French writer of some repute and which he understood was being widely circulated and read in the United States. He thought that I could perform a service to my country and to the idealism that always has motivated Americans by making some reply thereto. Fortunately, perhaps, I could not obtain a copy of the book. I inquired at a number of bookstores and found it on sale at none, and from this I concluded that it was finding little reception by the American people.

Some months ago Mr. Geoffrey Gould, a highly respected member of the Press Gallery of the House, wrote a special article that was carried nationwide by Associated Press newspapers and in which he made overgenerous comments on my combativeness during many years for causes in which I believed and which I thought embodied the idealism of our country. In this connection he mentioned my service in Cuba, a lad just turning 16, one of the 19,000 Americans in the fighting days of the siege of Santiago.

A well-known columnist, whose father, although 15 or 20 years older, had been a warm personal friend of mine in my earlier newspaper days, responded with an article in which he took issue. I had no resentment, smiled a bit when I read that he doubted that he had ever met me since some years ago we did meet at the annual banquet of the Chicago Press Veterans and he informed me that his father, then past 90, was still living and I sent to him a message of old time friendship, and this columnist and I chatted for a long time in an atmosphere that to me was warm and genuine.

In his article he got a little mixed up in his data, and some of my friends thought that he was unduly unkind and others thought, as did I, that his motivation was only to give me an additional bit of publicity, in the doing of which friendly service he was handicapped by the fact that he is spokesman for a different philosophy than the one to which I, during the entire period of my life, have given my devotion and my humblest ability to the fullest extent.

But this paragraph I must answer, not because it has personal reference to me, but it is something, that on reflection, the son of my old friend I know will agree should not have been said in honor to the memory of the 266 Americans who died in Havana Harbor 64 years ago today and to the memory of the youth of this Nation that went out as volunteers to establish freedom in this world of ours, went out, fighting in the Tropics

with winter clothing and antique weapons with little food and the very minimum of medicine, went out in the greatest adventure in idealism in the history of any country. This is the passage that I wish my good friend, the columnist whose father was a warm friend of mine, had omitted:

> Congressman O'HARA has a reputation as a scrapper. This includes the firecracker war in Cuba where nobody could possibly have run up a timecard of more than one 8-hour day in battle, although the cumulative pensions of some of those boys by now have amounted to thousands of dollars an hour.

The fact, my friends and colleagues, is that the veterans of the Spanish-American War, both individually and cumulatively, have received from the Government far less than any other veterans' group in the history of our country. They served for $13 a month. They were ill equipped and subsisted in the Tropics on a diet of sowbelly, which they heated into streams of grease in which they soaked their hardtack. This, mind you, in the Tropics. There was no record kept of their injuries. On their return home many were sick in bed for weeks and months. Thousands died at home of illnesses contracted during their service, those who had been in the disease-infected camps in this country suffering as severely from this neglect as those who had served overseas, and their families, not the Government, had to bear the expenses of doctors and medicine. There were many families impoverished and placed hopelessly in debt, in the care of their son, returning from the war with Spain to languish in illness and die. There, of course, was no provision for their education and rehabilitation. It ill becomes anyone to cast aspersions on the Spanish War veterans and to imply that they were moochers.

Moreover, the Spanish-American War brought to this country greater revenues and greater wealth than any other war in our history.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to congratulate my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], who is so highly revered by all his colleagues for his ability, his courage, and for his continued and effective fight for truth and justice.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my good friend from Ohio. Without warm friendship, on the pattern of the understanding friendship of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois, this could become a dreary world.

There were families at that time who had exhausted all their savings and were hopelessly in debt by reason of having to provide doctors and medicines for the veterans of the Spanish-American War who returned home sick. And for anyone to say that these veterans have been mooching at the expense of the public is just beyond my comprehension.

Hawaii never would have become a State in the Union but for the war with Spain and the spirit of 1898 that changed the thinking in the minds of men everywhere. The Philippine Islands never would have had an opportunity to expand and become a bulwark of free government and our ally and ever a faithful friend in time of peril and of need except for the Spanish-American War. Far out in the Pacific there is the little island of Guam, the most far-flung American territory, which has the same kind of a government that we have, a State legislature, exactly on the pattern of our own State legislatures, and without the Spanish-American War, Guam would never have been part of this great country of ours. Since I have been in the Congress I have been the steadfast friend and champion of little Guam, and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I know perhaps better than some how important to us in world understanding is Guam, the showcase of democracy in the far Pacific, the base of our naval strength. As I speak, my youngest son, Howard, is lying grievously ill in the Guam Memorial Hospital. He has given many years of his life to Guam and her people, and I think that in this dedication to a task he has experienced some sense deep within him that he in his lifetime was continuing the boyish dreams and ideals of his father. Anyway, Guam is part of the expanded world for freedom that was opened by the youth of 1898, who, as volunteers embarked upon the greatest adventure of idealism in history. I know that in the hands of the people of Guam, my son in his illness will receive every care and attention that affection can accord.

If it so could be measured—and God forbid there ever should be such a rule of measurement—but if it should be measured by returns to us of dollars and advantage, the Spanish-American War would top all the wars in history.

Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with some of the books that have been coming out. Here is one somebody sent to me last Christmas Day. It is supposed to be a history of the Spanish-American War. There are parts in it that are good, that are thrilling. In parts it is interestingly and dramatically written, but throughout the book is enough poison to undo in the eyes of the world, if this book were read all over the world, so much of the good in world opinion that came to us as the result of the idealism of 1898 and the war with Spain. I hope this was not by intent, merely that the writer, reaching for a gullible public that would flock to the bookstores, reached into the forgotten files of trivialities, picked out, as from the gutter, distended statements of proven untruths that he dressed up in lurid, gossipy, scandalous attire as the fact of the history.

This book says on one of the early pages:

> Salute.
>
> The helpful and valuable cooperation is most gratefully acknowledged of: Thelma E. Bedell, Chief of Readers' Service, U.S. Military Academy Library; Olga J. Carney; Sidney Forman, Librarian, U.S. Military Academy; Maj. Gen. Philip E. Gallagher, U.S. Army (retired).

And then follow some other names, giving the impression that the material in this book is on the authority of the U.S. Military Academy and of the U.S. Government. I shall direct a letter to the Department of the Army pointing out the grievous mischief to us in the eyes of the world by some of the statements, entirely without foundation in the fact, and conclusions at which any author has the right to reach and to present to his readers as his own conclusions, but should be forbidden by punitive law from presenting by implication as the findings and conclusions of the great Academy at West Point, a school with an unblemished reputation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer in due course a bill to state that hereafter when anyone gives credit to these research government libraries that it shall be stated that the writings and conclusions based thereon are not to be attributed to the U.S. Government. The research libraries do a real service for the Congress and the other branches of Government. They are entitled to protection against exploitation.

This book says that the Cuban soldiers were cowardly, that the only time they were seen was when they were stealing from knapsacks. That is what this book says. And it is the barest faced lie ever put between book covers. What are the facts? I ought to know. I ought to know because I knew some Spanish when I arrived in Cuba on June 27, 1898, and had had some experience in jungle traveling about in Central America before I was in Cuba. I was assigned six Cuban soldiers to serve on a squad to do observation work. With those Cuban soldiers we penetrated the Spanish lines day after day, of course, encountering all of the perils that soldiers always encounter when they are on duty in densely wooded terrain far within the enemy line with sharpshooters around.

Mr. Speaker, I was with General Garcia, stationed just outside of Santiago at an outpost in the area of greatest danger far beyond the outer American lines. I never saw better soldiers in my life than the Cuban soldiers that fought with us at the siege of Santiago. When after an absence of 57 years, I returned to Santiago, where I had not been since I was a boy just turned 16, Two Cubans came up and threw their arms around me and hugged me. I hugged them and we hugged again and kissed one another, old men of the two armies that had fought together to free Cuba. They were two of the Cuban soldiers with whom as a lad of 16 I had been on that mission. For a modern American writer, lured by the sale of his book, at this late day to throw mud at the Cuban soldiers at Santiago is hitting below the belt with the instinct of a sadist.

Then, when I find that someone writes a book like this, without one iota of fact, but fiction, and the publisher puts it out and says that at the time of our present relations with Cuba this will make a contribution to better understanding, yes, that is why I am taking this full hour today. There must be some answer to this.

Mr. Speaker, there is also in this book an attack—a sneaking, cowardly attack—on General Shafter, the commanding general of our army in Cuba. Yes, he was a large man. He weighed, I think over 300 pounds. He was badly affected by the climate. But all military men are agreed that he was a great strategist. Yet this fellow says that he had no plan of battle. It apparently was more convenient to say that than to take the time to look at a chart of the campaign. Now, let me explain the plan of battle to you. We hear so much about San Juan Hill, and we should. It is one of the great chapters of heroism in the history of our country.

But it was only part of the action. The action extended from San Juan Hill to Fort Aguadores. At Fort Aguadores 8,000 Spanish reenforcements were reported on their way. That point was defended by 3,000 Cubans and 900 raw American troops, of which I was one. The action was scarcely as tame and placid as a day at a summer picnic. I did not feel that way when, within minutes, four of my comrades nearby were killed by cannon fire. As far as the author of this book was concerned the death of my comrades meant nothing to him. The 33d Michigan did not exist. He had reached the conclusion that Shafter was just a fat, old, crazy fool, that General Jose Toral, commander of the Spanish forces and, as brave, competent and gentlemanly as any general in Spanish history, was a cowardly incompetent, and he persisted in his determination to have his way by burying every known hurt in the graveyard of his determined will. We had left Siboney at 4 o'clock in the morning of July 1, 1898 carrying heavy luggage. In those days you had heavy cartridge belts around your shoulders and around your waist. It was a long walk, but we got there.

And here was a great river with a bridge that had been partly destroyed, and across it fortifications in the mountains. It was not long until we suffered our first casualties. And where were those casualties? In Company M, composed of the sons of Civil War veterans. Each one of the members of Company M was the son of a boy in blue. Five of them were killed or maimed.

Now, mind you, in this book there are some parts that are good and exciting. The publisher says that this man successfully writes history because he makes it readable. Well, he does. It is absolutely just as readable as one of these gossip magazines; you know the kind, they hear a whisper someplace and a lot of gossip. That is all right in its place, although it is no place I wish to be. But when it is put in there to reflect upon veterans of the Spanish-American War, to reflect upon our officers, to reflect upon the privates and the individuals, to reflect upon the honor of our Nation, there is a limit to patience and toleration. The cruelest cut of all was an acknowledgment that put the West Point Academy right in the center, and that was not coming to a military academy—that is part of our dearest traditions.

Now, the day will come when the researchers will be trying to reconstruct the period through which we have gone and, believe me, my friends, the Spanish-American War was just part of one 50-year war that started America on her course of destiny. When they come to that period they will be reading so many of these books that are coming out now, written by people who think that the way to get into the writing business and to get people buying new books is to avoid facts and write what the people will read. So I hope that when these researchers of the faraway future may be thumbing through the forgotten pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will find what I am saying today on the floor of the House of Representatives in my 79th year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how often again I will be talking on the 15th of February on the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*. As long as I am here, I am going to talk on that subject on this anniversary. But I have no way of telling what measure of years are left. My own philosophy is that I will be here for many, many years. But I could be very, very wrong. My own philosophy is that one lives best when one lives in the present. When one is young and wants to be older, he loses the joy of living in the present of his youth. So it is when one has gone far toward the setting sun. I have heard a saying, not that I take it too seriously, someone told me once that there was a rumor around, and I hope it is only a rumor, that every man has to die. Well, I am not going to believe that rumor until they prove it in my case, and then I will be past the point of protest.

NO REALLY GOOD HISTORY OF THE WAR

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have looked over many of the books on the Spanish American War. We have no really good history that has been written of the Spanish American War. I was looking for some mention of the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan. When I was in Cuba after 57 years absence, I went out to the place at Siboney where we had landed 2 or 3 days after Teddy Roosevelt, getting out of small boats, as they did in the recent war, to fight our way shoreward. There I found a plaque, I suppose some commercial concern had made it up and put it there. It had been there a good many years. It announced that the 33d Michigan Volunteers had arrived weeks after the fighting and then some other regiments were mentioned as having been in the fighting which were not there until some time after the fighting.

As I have said there is no mention of the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan in the book I have been biting at. I thought if I left this record stand, my good friend, the columnist whose father was a good friend of mine, will say, "Now there is a phony—he talks of getting to Cuba with that regiment of his a few days after Teddy Roosevelt and of being in all the fighting and here these modern writers do not mention it. He must be a phony."

Well, I want this to be in the RECORD. Maybe I am enough lawyer to want a little something in the record, this is admissible under the laws of evidence, to combat the things good people get into their heads when they listen too much to chatty gossipers, you know the species. This is from the history of the war by the then Secretary of War Alger:

June 27 the *Yale* arrived at Siboney with General Duffield and part of his brigade consisting of the 33d Michigan and 1 battalion of the 34th, about 1,200 officers and men.

Then he goes on to explain that an invasion of 8,000 new Spanish troops was reported and that the action had been held pending our arrival, and so we were immediately pushed to the front in that gap.

Only 900 men of General Duffield's brigade had landed in Cuba at that time, the remainder of our brigade being delayed, but only a few days after that, the 9th Massachusetts arrived and the 34th Michigan arrived.

He goes on to say that in this circumstance the first to arrive in Cuba on the 27th day of June participating in all the fighting that lasted from the 27th to the 2d day of July—the armistice was not until the 17th, but the fighting practically ended the 2d day of July—were these 900 men of the 33d Michigan Volunteers.

So Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks what Secretary of War Alger said about the 33d Michigan Volunteers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FROM SECRETARY OF WAR ALGER'S HISTORY OF THE WAR

June 27th the *Yale* arrived at Siboney, with General Duffield and part of his brigate, consisting of the 33d Michigan and one battalion of the 34th, about 1,200 officers and men. General Duffield was at once directed to place a large force at work upon the road leading from Siboney to the camp of the army in the vicinity of Sevilla. Late in the afternoon of the next day, General Shafter was informed that General Pando, with 8,000 Spanish regulars, was advancing from Manzanillo to relieve the garrison in Santiago. Pando was reported to be within 54 miles of the city, and moving at the rate of 12 miles a day, with an abundance of supplies in the way of pack-trains and beef on the hoof. If the Spanish general met with no opposition, this would bring a strong force, with a large quantity of food, for the relief of General Linares, by the 2d or 3d of July. General Shafter determined, if possible, to prevent General Pando's entering Santiago, and to make the attack without waiting for the additional reinforcements, consisting of the remainder of Duffield's brigade, then en route.

General Garcia, with 3,000 Cubans, was requested, on the 29th, to proceed from Siboney to the west and northwest of Santiago and guard the approaches over which the advancing Spanish reinforcements, under Pando, would come. The American outposts were pushed forward to within 1½ miles of Santiago, and General Shafter established his headquarters in advance of the whole army on the Santiago road at the point where it branches with the trail leading to Caney. The next day he determined upon his plan of attack, and gave directions for the disposition of the several divisions, preparatory to the assault, July 1. He proposed to throw his army against the entrenched

position of the enemy on the heights of San Juan: Lawton's division on the right Wheeler's division in the center, and Kent's division on the left. Bates' brigade was ordered up from Siboney to the front, to be held in reserve, with two batteries of light artillery, and three troops of Rafferty's mounted cavalry. The remaining troop of the 2d Cavalry was sent with Lawton, as well as a battery of artillery—Capron's (the father of Captain Capron, who was killed on the 24th at Las Guasimas)—while General Shafter directed General Duffield, with one regiment, to make a demonstration against the extreme right of the Spaniards at Aguadores Bridge.

Only 1,200 men of General Duffield's brigade had landed in Cuba, as the Navy had directed the *Harvard*, transporting the remainder of his brigade, to convoy a repair ship which could make but 8 or 10 knots an hour. This delayed the arrival of his command by nearly 2 days—too late to take part in the engagement of July 1. General Duffield's command on the 1st of July consisted only of the 33d Michigan and one battalion of the 34th Michigan. The latter acted as a guard at Siboney. It was not intended that General Duffield, with his small force of 900 men, should attack, across the San Juan, the fortified heights which rose abruptly from that river 300 or 400 feet; but, as General Shafter stated in an official report, General Duffield "was expected to make such a demonstration at Aguadores as would hold at the place all Spanish troops occupying it, and prevent their reinforcing the main body at Santiago. This he accomplished perfectly."

A deep and wide ravine separated the Spanish position from General Duffield's advance. At this season of the year the river, which flows between the high and precipitous banks of this gorge, was broad, swift, and deep—600 to 700 feet in width, and spanned by an iron girder bridge 60 feet above. About 100 feet of the trestle on the Spanish side of the San Juan had been blown up. Moreover, as was subsequently learned and at the time suspected, all that was left of the bridge had been mined. Then, too, the river was not fordable, and had General Duffield's instructions contemplated an assault, which they did not, it would have been impossible for him to cross the San Juan River, since he had no boats or means of throwing any part of his small force across the swollen river.

The enemy, protected by stone forts, blockhouses, and rifle pits along the cliffs, was subsequently learned to have been 500 strong, supported by artillery—a force almost equal to that which kept General Lawton's division of over 4,000 a whole day at Caney. In addition to these troops, two companies of marines (about 400 men) from Cervera's fleet were at Las Cruces and vicinity, where they were held in reserve at a distance of about 5 miles on the railroad leading to Aguadores and from where they could be brought to this place in a very short time. The local conditions were such that our warships could not see nor reach many of the trenches across the river confronting General Duffield, and at the very instant the vessels firing upon the heights signaled "there are no Spaniards in the rifle pits," a volley from the enemy wounded several of our men.

General Duffield's demonstration, coupled with the movement of Garcia on the northwest of Santiago, brought about what General Shafter had hoped—i.e., the Spaniards were kept in doubt as to his real movements and deterred from concentrating their forces at San Juan Ridge.

While General Duffield was making the beforementioned feint at Aguadores Bridge, Admiral Sampson was requested to bombard that place, as a part of the maneuver, and to direct such firing against the Spanish works at the mouth of the harbor of Santiago as in his judgment might seem best to further divert the enemy's attention from the main advance. This he did.

Before moving out to take up the positions assigned them, preparatory to the attack the next morning, General Shafter called the general officers to his headquarters and explained to them fully the plan of battle and the part each was to take in it. This meeting was attended by the division commanders Lawton and Kent, acting division commander General Sumner, and the brigade commanders Chaffee, Hawkins, Ludlow, and Duffield, as well as the Cuban General Castillo. The battle of July 1 was conducted in direct accord with these plans, with the exception that it took Lawton's division a day instead of 2 hours, as estimated, to reduce Caney.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am closing with a voice that is shaky; and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I am very close to tears, all from the feeling within me that I have not adequately treated and as is my solemn obligation to my comrades of a war of 64 years ago, most of them gone, this subject which to me is sacred. I would have wished that I could have made it as crystal clear as clearness itself that the war of 1898 and the spirit of 1898 were the embodiment of the greatest ideals that ever moved any people in any stage of history. I have tried, Mr. Commander of Columbia Camp, to follow your orders to our remaining veterans: "To do the best we can for just as long as we can."

Mr. Speaker, I have finished.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President of the United States is reported to have discussed with King Saud of Saudi Arabia continued United States presence at the Dhahran Airbase, I believe that it is important for the Congress, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, "to square our politics with our principles" and to make clear our unyielding opposition to discrimination by foreign governments against U.S. citizens.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas it is a fundamental principle of the United States Constitution that there shall not be discrimination against United States citizens based on race, religion, creed, or color; and

Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the basic rights of United States citizens in their lawful pursuit of trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of United States sovereignty; and

Whereas any attempt by foreign nations to discriminate among United States citizens on the basis of race, religion, creed, or color in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that any such discrimination directed against United States citizens is incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, that the United States should issue a strong protest against such discrimination, that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state, the United States should insist upon the elimination of such discrimination, and that the United States should not be a party to any agreement which allows a foreign nation to discriminate against United States citizens because of race, religion, creed or color.

The Dhahran Airbase was established during World War II. In 1951 a 5-year agreement for the use of the Dhahran facilities by the United States was signed with the Saudi Arabian Government. The agreement was extended for an additional 5 years in April 1957. Both the 1951 agreement and the 1957 treaty gave the Saudi Arabian Government the right to reject any member of the American mission which it considers objectionable or unacceptable. The practical effect of this clause has been to exclude American Jews from serving at Dhahran.

By acquiescing in the barring of U.S. personnel from our installations at Dhahran, our Government has countenanced affronts to our citizens and cast doubt upon our ideals. It is impossible to defend and deny democracy simultaneously. Either our men are serving overseas to defend freedom and our principles—in which case they must be permitted to live up to them—or they are men without a mission.

Last year Saudi Arabia notified the United States that the lease would not be renewed in April 1962. Now there are reports of negotiations for continued use of the base. I urge the administration to insist that there be no further restrictions because of race, religion, creed, or color upon the admission of military personnel to the base. We should not send a single American to a base where all Americans are not accorded equal treatment.

Our Government should make it clear that the ethnic, racial, or religious background of American citizens is not the legitimate concern of any foreign government. Ever since our Nation was founded, we have opened our doors to the people of many nations and given them new life, new hope, and a new nationality. The rights of American citizens under the Constitution must be upheld.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination by Arab countries against U.S. citizens is well known. Only last year Helen Hayes and the American Theater Guild Company were banned from Cairo because the group planned to visit Israel on its tour; a former Washington, D.C., WAC on her way from Bombay to Rome was forced to remain on the plane during a stopover at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, because the crew feared that the Saudis would discover that she was Jewish and the plane would be detained; the central office of the Arab League Boycott of Israel in Damascus, Syria, announced that Actor Eddie Cantor and six American business companies were placed on the blacklist.

Arab discrimination has persisted since May 15, 1948, when after almost 2,000 years of exile and after the slaugh-

ter of 6 million of their brethren the Jews of Palestine proclaimed the State of Israel.

Although the creation of the new state was sanctioned by the General Assembly of the United Nations, six states set themselves above the community of nations. Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia attacked Israel with the announced intention of effecting "a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades." However, they were unsuccessful. Israel defeated the invaders, and in the spring and summer of 1949 Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan signed armistice agreements with Israel.

The armistice agreements had been concluded with a view to promoting the return of permanent peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace. As a provisional measure they were generally expected to be a brief prelude to formal peace treaties. This hope was short lived. Most people are familiar with the military aspects of the continuing Arab war on Israel. Not so well known is the economic warfare employed by the Arab States to undermine Israel's economic stability and to isolate her.

In May 1951, the Council of the League of Arab States adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of economic boycott offices in all of the Arab States. The boycott itself was applied to all firms with branches in Israel and all companies doing business with Israel. They were blacklisted. In addition, any ship calling on an Israel port was prevented from docking in an Arab port, and no planes landing in Israel were permitted to fly in Arab skies. These were the original provisions of the Arab boycott.

Since 1951, however, the scope of the boycott has been vastly extended to include: the blacklisting of many American companies having Americans of the Jewish faith among their officers, owners, directors, or even personnel; the refusing of visas to Americans of Jewish faith and forbidding them to disembark in some Arab countries.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department should be resolute and vigorous in protecting our citizens from such religious discrimination. On August 15, 1961, during the debate on the foreign aid bill I fought for a strong statement of policy against these abuses of our national sovereignty and indignities inflicted upon our citizens. I said then, "we must be resolute on this issue or fail to live up to our ideals." Our principles are basic. Justice and equality are empty slogans unless we demand equal treatment for all our citizens from all nations.

In considering the question of the Dhahran Airbase and the Arab boycott, we might well recall the words of Woodrow Wilson, then Governor of New Jersey, on December 6, 1911, in protesting Russian discrimination against Americans of Jewish faith. He stated:

> They are not Jews in America; they are American citizens. * * * By our action for them shall be tested our sincerity, our genuineness, the reality of principle among us. * * * There is here a greater stake than any other upon which we could set our hearts. Here is the final test of our ability to square our politics with our principles. We may now enjoy the exhilaration of matching our professions with handsome performance. We are not here to express our sympathy with our Jewish fellow citizens, but to make evidence our sense of identity with them. This is not their cause; it is America's. It is the cause of all who love justice and do right.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in upholding the finest traditions of our Nation and support this concurrent resolution.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from New York.

You will recall last year I offered a similar amendment to the Peace Corps bill, and it was adopted by the House but taken out by the Senate. The conference committee agreed to the Senate's elimination of the amendment. I agree with the gentleman. I feel this should be true in the armed services as well as in the Peace Corps or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I am happy he has been one of the leaders in this fight to eliminate such discrimination wherever it is.

CERTAIN FRANKING PRIVILEGES

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the Post Office and Treasury Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, inserted a clause in an appropriations bill which would give Members of Congress the right to send mail under their franking privilege merely by addressing the envelope "Occupant." At that time, I opposed the particular amendment to the bill, and we were successful in defeating it.

Last year the same amendment was inserted in the appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury. Adding this clause giving Members of the Congress the right to send "Occupant" mail to their constituents was one of the last things the House of Representative did under the final supplemental appropriations bill of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It is interesting to note that the measure came to the floor in the wee hours of the morning. I tried to open it to debate, but I was ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker, originally, 2 years ago, I stated on the floor of this House that the privilege would be abused if given to Members of Congress. I further stated that it was unfair to the taxpayers of the United States because they did not enjoy the same privilege and that if we were going to extend it to Members of Congress, then all the taxpayers should have it as well.

Several weeks ago this House of Representatives passed a postal rate increase amounting to 25 percent on first-class mail and up to 61 percent on other classes of mail. In total, it is an increase in rates to the taxpayers of $700 million. We have an enormous postal deficit at the present time and that was the reason for approving the postal rate increase. We are now compounding the felony by adding to the future deficit of the Post Office through increasing the amount of "Occupant" mail that it must handle without payment. This is a flagrant use of a double standard—one for the taxpayers and another for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all Members of the House to take a walk down through the tunnel from the Old House Office Building to the cafeteria in the New House Office Building. There, lined up like a camel caravan, are millions of pieces of mail addressed "Occupant" and ready to be sent out to people all over the United States. It is my understanding that the House folding room is over a month behind in its work because of the vast increase in the use of "Occupant" mailings. I hope that this year, when the appropriations bill is considered by the House, we can offer a successful amendment to repeal this legislation.

Furthermore, only recently the House passed a bill providing $475,000 to study fire hazards here in the buildings on the Capitol Grounds and to make certain improvements to prevent fires. Certainly, if I have ever seen a fire hazard here in the Capitol Buildings, it is that hall crowded with piles of mail that nearly close off the passage. Up on the wall in that same hall is a sign sometimes hidden by the stacks of mail, designating it as a "shelter area." This, to me, is just another mockery of the nationwide effort to provide protection against the dangers of atomic attack, for the number of people that could possibly use the hallway as a shelter has been greatly reduced as a result of its usage as a storage area.

Many of our constituents have written to us that they dislike receiving junk mail from mailing houses throughout the country. I agree with them. And, I know that if I were an American taxpayer, I would resent receiving an envelope carelessly marked "Occupant" from any Congressman. To me it would be just as objectionable as receiving junk mail. I hope that we will repudiate this measure yet this year.

AIR FORCE CONTRACTS WITH CONVAIR

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the House

to the yearend report by the Comptroller General which examines cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts made by the Air Force with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., for special tooling pursuant to the B–58 program.

The report discloses that Convair received unwarranted fee allowances to the amount of $382,000 on a $6 million contract. Under the present system, as the Comptroller's report points out, the Air Force has categorized its contracts in two ways: The first is for routine procurement, for example, industrial facilities which procurement regulations specify should be acquired under a no-fee facilities contract; the second is for special tooling and permits special fee allowances. Special tooling by definition includes "acquisitions by the contractor for use in performance of the contract, which are of such a specialized nature that, without substantial modification or alteration, their use is limited to the production of such supplies or parts thereof, or the performance of such services, as are peculiar to the needs of the Government."

The present grievance concerns the fact that Air Force contracting officials allowed Convair to acquire at Government expense, hangar-type buildings and certain test equipment as special tooling under supply contracts for B–58 airplanes and to receive additional fees of $328,000 on the estimated cost of these items, even though ample information was available to show that the buildings and equipment were not special to the B–58 but could be readily adapted for use with almost any military or commercial aircraft in service. Thus by classifying the hangars as special tooling the Air Force bypassed a number of procedures specifically designed to insure that such overcharging and misclassification did not occur.

As the Comptroller emphatically points out:

> Convair and Air Force contracting officials should have recognized * * * that the items were not special tooling but were industrial facilities which procurement regulations specifically designate to be acquired under no-fee facilities contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that through the combination of the practices of Convair and sloppy administrative procedures by the Air Force, Convair has been allowed to charge exorbitant special fees for the procurement of routine hangars for airplanes. Necessarily the cost of such sheer inefficiency and incredibly poor business practice falls on the taxpayers.

Only because of this study by the Comptroller General were we able to detect these high overcharges in one $6 million contract. I believe that such discrepancies as the study uncovers pinpoints the immediate need for a correction of such procedural loopholes in Government contracting and I urge the immediate formulation of more business-like procurement and administrative reforms to insure against duplicity or oversight.

Specifically, I recommend that the Air Force should initiate action to recover the additional charges on the Convair contract. It should also change its records procedures to transfer the B–58 run and maintenance stations from a special tooling contract to a nonspecial facility contract.

In closing, I would like to reemphasize that, as in the B–58 hangar case, the improper treatment of facilities resulted in bypassing reviews needed to assure that contractors do not procure facilities already available in Government inventories.

We need to institute new procedures which protect us against overpurchasing and against overcharging. The taxpayer can ill afford such unnecessary waste.

I hope that the recommendations and the report of the Comptroller General is given early and positive consideration.

ABUSE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which I believe will terminate a serious abuse of the franking privilege.

A few weeks ago, the House passed the Postal Revision Act of 1962, the chief purpose of which is to abate or eliminate the recurring deficits in the operations of the Post Office Department, which have become a serious drain upon the Treasury.

The bill, as it passed the House, made an allocation of costs to public service operations by the Post Office Department which apparently nearly all of the Members here regarded as fair and reasonable. Then, to bridge the gap in postal revenues between costs and receipts, we increased to nearly all users of the mails the rates which we will require them to pay for such use.

The rates for users of first-class mail, which is the type which the general public uses most in its own mailing, are increased by 25 percent in the Postal Revision Act of 1962 which the House passed and sent to the Senate. The rates for the various types of commercial users of the mails have been increased by even higher rates, ranging up to 61 percent.

Although the general public appears to be tolerant of this necessary increase in rates, it is apparent that some of the commercial users of the mails are not happy, but so long as the rates are equitable in relation to the extent the postal service is used, we may expect that the increases which have been proven necessary will be absorbed as part of the increased cost of doing business.

In the hearings last year on the Postal Revision Act, and in discussions off the floor, there has been a lot of discussion about junk mail. All of us I am sure, have been receiving from some of our constituents a considerable volume of mail concerning it. Junk mail may be an inappropriate term, depending upon whether you are the sender or the receiver; but the term has come to be applied to all third class bulk mailings, and particularly to those which are sent to no addressee by name. In the bill which the House passed, the minimum rate for third class bulk mailings has been increased to 3 cents. The minimum bulk rate, as compared with what it was in 1950, has been increased by 150 percent.

The justification for these increases is that the Government needs the additional money to run the Post Office Department.

Under the circumstances, then, it seems particularly inappropriate, unwise, and unjustifiable for us as Members of Congress to use the franking privilege in a way that is extravagant and outrageous.

The bill which I have introduced today would repeal the authority given in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962, passed by the House and by the Senate and signed by the President on September 30, 1961, to send mail to occupant at every address in every post office, on city carrier routes and on rural routes, and to send it under the congressional frank.

I have never used this type of mail. Perhaps my mailings are less extensive than those of some other Members. But at a time when the postal deficit is a matter of such great concern to the Congress, it seems to me self-evident that it is up to us as Members to help to eliminate it or to keep it within bounds by restricting the use of the frank to what has been customary and acceptable throughout our history.

My bill today would eliminate the mailing of matter by Members of Congress with a simplified form of address. If commercial firms want to send out tons of mail to "Occupants," let them pay for it; but, under the terms of my bill, the Members of Congress will not do it.

In eliminating this, I suspect that we may be doing ourselves a favor. Advertisers and commercial firms insist that the average citizen feels no resentment when mail is addressed to him as an "Occupant" and not by his name.

Be that as it may; but I believe that the average voter likes to be addressed by name when his Congressman communicates with him, and not as a faceless, anonymous "Occupant," communicated with only in bulk.

At any rate, I sincerely believe that the bill which I have introduced will clarify a situation which is unsound from every standpoint. I hope that it may receive prompt and favorable consideration at this session of the Congress.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE FIRST SOKOL (FALCON) EDUCATIONAL AND PHYSICAL CULTURE ORGANIZATION IN PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues this afternoon in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the first Sokol Educational and Physical Cultural Organization in Prague, Czechoslovakia, on February 16, 1862. This organization, which was to have a profound effect on history, was organized by a group of public-spirited men to whom liberty and democracy were a cherished ideal. These men, well versed in the history and philosophy of the past, wanted freedom and liberty for their people. They realized that only a nation which is willing to prepare for and retain independence must maintain it by constant vigilance. They stressed, realized, and fought for the development of the entire individual—physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. The founders of this organization created a terminology for calisthenics, apparatus exercises, and games that is so precise that units thousands of miles apart can practice the assigned drills, then meet at the great Sokol exhibitions and after only one general rehearsal, perform as if they had trained together for months.

The first Sokol unit in the United States was organized in St. Louis in 1865, and within a few years units were organized in Chicago, New York, Milwaukee, and other cities in this country. Today, they reach from coast to coast—from Canada to Mexico, and there are also Sokol units throughout the world—all dedicated to freedom and liberty. Their loyalty and ability to serve is proverbial. In every war in which this country has been involved, Sokol gymnasiums have become bare of their men's and junior classes. Within the last few years, units have been built new or expanded their old gymnasiums in Baltimore, Cleveland, and other cities. Many more are planning new improved facilities in dozens of localities. They support their own gymnasiums, community centers, and children's camps. They have trained and given outstanding coaches and leaders to colleges, high schools, and playgrounds by the hundreds. Now, on the threshold of their own centennial, they are intensifying their efforts to bring more of their fellow citizens into their active life.

The Sokols are respected in every land that is free. They are hated and feared by every form of dictatorship. They were the first organizations to be dissolved by the Nazis and Communists wherever these usurped power. The Sokol leaders were the first to be imprisoned and liquidated. The Second World War saw 90 percent of the Sokol leaders liquidated in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The few that were left have found a similar fate at the hands of the Communists. The great mass of the former powerful Sokol organizations in Europe are far from being exterminated or completely docile. The great spirit of freedom, liberty, and human justice instilled in them by courageous men and women for almost a century is still very much alive and is transferred to each new group of children. We know that those who have once known freedom and liberty as we know it will never forget it.

These Sokol trained people have faith in the inexorable destiny of mankind. The Sokols in America have produced their own great leaders and thinkers. Men and women in all walks of life have felt that their greatest contribution to this great land would be to devotedly serve in the Sokol ranks, to constantly train the young in that physical, mental, moral, and spiritual strength that is the bulwark of a nation.

FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sincerity that I appear before this House today to extend appreciation and gratitude to Members who have played an important part in providing funds for flood control and water conservation projects in southern California.

As you have seen and read, the Los Angeles area was recently struck with a vicious, multiday rainstorm. After 6 days of driving rain, Los Angeles residents thought they might be living and working in an oversized bathtub. The Small Business Administration has declared Los Angeles County a disaster area.

Television and newspapers recorded pictures of the scene: rivers of water running down city streets, front lawns that served as bottoms of huge lakes, automobiles submerged to their rooftops.

Certainly, the damage done by city street flooding is terrible, but it is far better than having an entire mountainside come tumbling down onto our cities and towns. Fortunately, this was not the case and we in southern California can thank the Members of this House for the part they played.

I have appeared before numerous committees since coming to the Congress, pointing to the need for Federal funds to protect the Los Angeles metropolitan area from the potential disasters of the Angeles National Forest. The Angeles National Forest, which lies almost entirely in my district, is a Federal responsibility—and that responsibility must be met. The dangers of flood and fire are ever present. And, as we have also said many times, the taxpayers of Los Angeles County have not been remiss in their responsibilities in helping to protect their lives and property.

The recent tremendous rainstorms, which dumped 10 to 23 inches on the Los Angeles area, supplied the first real test of preparations we have made over the past 8 or 10 years. Cogswell Dam above the foothill cities of Monrovia, Sierra Madre, and Arcadia—all in my congressional district—was deluged with 23 inches of rain, but this and other check dams held fast.

These dams were constructed, in part, through funds supplied by the U.S. Congress. This heavy rainfall is a test which proves the worth of such measures. Much more is to be done, but the progress already made has protected lives and property.

City street flooding was serious. The problem of city street flooding must be met by more and better local storm drain systems. Yet, Federal funds and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, under the magnificent guidance of Chief Engineer M. E. Salisbury, staved off potential disaster. Floods coming out of these mountain canyons are more than walls of water; they are composed of debris, rocks and stones, and boulders which reach the size of automobiles.

I pay thanks to my colleagues in the House today for their splendid support in the past and we in southern California shall hope for that support in the future.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 142d anniversary of the birth of a great woman and noble American, Susan B. Anthony.

Her life was dedicated to achieving equality for the women of America. Through her influence and effort, the New York Legislature passed the act giving married women the guardianship of their children, the possession of their earnings, and a greater degree of equality under the law. Her most notable contribution to our society was, of course, her part in securing the enfranchisement for American women. But more important than these legal measures were the opportunities they opened to women to contribute to the cultural, intellectual, and professional progress of our great Nation.

Susan B. Anthony was a native of Adams, Mass., which I have the privilege to represent. Her crusade took her across our land though, and to accomplish her goals, she became a teacher, newspaperwoman, and lecturer. We are proud of Susan Anthony, not only for what she did for the status of American women, but because she has become a symbol for a cause still being fought in many parts of the world. By no means is the battle over, nor will it be until all the women of the world are given equal educational, political, and economic rights and opportunities. This Nation has led the way by maintaining a firm belief in equality of opportunity. This principle has been amply substantiated when we look at the role played

by women in the professions, politics, and all walks of life.

On this, the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to her memory and with women everywhere who are grateful for her having devoted a lifetime to their cause.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I should like to pay tribute once again to the memory of Susan B. Anthony, on this the anniversary of her birth.

Susan B. Anthony, born February 15, 1820, was perhaps the most devoted and courageous leader of the women's suffrage movement in America. She was a dynamic, selfless crusader who devoted herself completely to the cause of equality for women. She had few equals as a leader, for she possessed those qualities of greatness which marked her immediately as a giant among women.

Miss Anthony spent much of her life in Rochester, N.Y., my own home city, and her memory lingers today in the minds and hearts of many women of our community. Her home has been restored as a memorial and the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc., has been established to perpetuate her memory and the memory of the great work which she accomplished.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has designated today as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State, and I should like to include at this point in the RECORD the text of the Governor's proclamation concerning Susan B. Anthony:

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER

Although Susan B. Anthony was born in Massachusetts, we proudly claim her as one of the great New Yorkers who helped to make history. Most of her adult life was passed and her effective work for freedom, justice, and equality was accomplished in the Empire State.

She was agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society for New York State before she began to devote herself almost exclusively to the agitation for women's rights. Her motto was: "The true Republic—men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less."

Susan Anthony could not foresee the preponderance in numbers of women over men which exists today. Her work resulted in adoption of what we know as the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the 19th amendment giving women the right to vote.

It is right that we honor this great and fearless American. Courage of a rare sort was needed to carry her and her associates through the hostility, and above all, the ridicule they encountered: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 15, 1962, as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State. Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 6th day of February in the year of our Lord 1962.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

I should also like to include in the RECORD at this time a resolution adopted by the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc. regarding the proposed equal rights amendment to the United States Constitution:

Whereas Miss Susan B. Anthony believed in perfect equality of rights for women, civil, legal, and political; and

Whereas at first women obtained only political; and

Whereas women now are working to secure civil and legal equality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc., at the corporation meeting held in the Anthony Home on November 28, 1961, go on record as favoring the civil and legal equality which Miss Anthony in her lifetime approved; and be it further

Resolved, That the Anthony Corp. approves the equal rights amendment which reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex," and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Representative JESSICA WEIS and to Representative HAROLD OSTERTAG and to the New York State Senators KEATING and JAVITS.

Mrs. GEORGE HOWARD,
President.
Mrs. FRED WILKINSON,
Recording Secretary.

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. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 1 hour, for Tuesday, February 20, 1962.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for Wednesday, February 21, 1962, vacating his special order for Monday, February 19, 1962.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 2 hours, on March 8, 1962.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today.

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 in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech by the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD.

Mr. LANE.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. POFF.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. AYRES.

Mrs. WEIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 12, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85–699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa; and

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 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:

1691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, pursuant to section 201(b) of Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1692. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1693. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a selective examination of payments for construction of facilities and installation of equipment under Department of the Air Force combination firm fixed-price and cost-reimbursement prime contracts negotiated with Air Products, Inc., Allentown, Pa., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) and the authority of the Comptroller General, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1694. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of selected activities of the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in the State of Tennessee, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1695. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report on review of selected highway transportation activities, Post Office Department, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and Public Law 86-682 (39 U.S.C. 2206); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1696. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of procurement and storage of general-use hand tools for the Air Force by General Services Administration, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1697. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1698. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend sections 1821 and 1825 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1699. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid under section 2672 for the period from January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1700. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 7652(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 448. Resolution amending rule XXXV, Rules of the House of Representatives, 87th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 544. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8399, a bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 530. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 10050. A bill to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Fong Kai Dong; with amendment (Rept. No. 1357). 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. VINSON:

H.R. 10202. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10203. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10204. A bill to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 10205. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10206. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for flood control and other purposes on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Tex. and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10207. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotion of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the cabaret tax in the case of certain fund-raising affairs conducted by nonprofit charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10209. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10210. A bill to provide an increase of 15 percent in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 10211. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide medical care for certain veterans of armed forces allied or associated with the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10212. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 165th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation* at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 10213. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 10214. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to define the term "person" or "producers" under the 1962 wheat and feed grain programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10215. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10216. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10217. A bill to repeal the provision of the Hill-Burton Act which permits Federal assistance for hospitals which discriminate against persons on the basis of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 10218. A bill to authorize the purchase by the United States of United Nations bonds, and to provide that the dollar value of such bonds purchased by the United States shall not exceed the aggregate dollar value of such bonds purchased by other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 10219. A bill to place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 10220. A bill to eliminate the mailing of matter by Members of Congress with a simplified form of address; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 10221. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 10222. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Charlottesville, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 10223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit life insurance companies to be taxed on capital gains in the same manner as all other corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10224. A bill to relieve ship operators of part of the cost of designing vessels as required under operating-differential subsidy agreements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10225. A bill to amend sections 2 and 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital," approved September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 903); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10226. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages

lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10227. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for family clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 10228. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 10229. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.J Res. 629. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of "Hearings on Small Business Problems in Poultry Industry, 87th Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination against U. S. citizens by foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 545. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which employment in the Federal Government is denied to individuals because of age; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 546. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States authorizing the Director of the Mint to issue a commemorative half-dollar coin in honor of Arizona's 50th year of statehood and so that the people of the whole Nation may join hands in honoring this significant event; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the urgent need for the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10230. A bill for the relief of Lilias Jane Reid McKnight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10231. A bill for the relief of Olimpia Barbano Clingo, Rosa Clingo, and Pietro Clingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10232. A bill for the relief of Myra Milne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10233. A bill for the relief of Umberto Vecchiarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10234. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilya Spigland, Shila Spigland, and Nitsana Spigland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10235. A bill for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 10236. A bill for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10237. A bill for the relief of Eleni Andrikopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 10238. A bill for the relief of Chryssanthi Stavros Katsaras and Andronikos S. Katsaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10239. A bill for the relief of Lidija Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 10240. A bill for the relief of Dennis Koutroubis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10241. A bill for the relief of Dan Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10242. A bill to amend Private Law 86–339; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10243. A bill for the relief of Sheu Chwan Shaiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10244. A bill for the relief of Arie Abramovich; to the C mmittee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

238. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of taxpayers of the town of Masonville, Delaware County, N.Y., relative to welfare relief regulations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

239. Also, petition of the Community Garden Club of Newburgh, N.Y., urging passage of the wilderness bill, S. 174; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rt. Rev. Michael Kemezis, pastor, Sts. Peter and Paul's Lithuanian R. C. Parish, Elizabeth, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Our Divine Majesty, Lord and God, look down, we beseech Thee, upon this august gathering of the Senators of our Nation and hear our suppliant plea.

O God, how long, how long is our sister nation Lithuania to suffer. We realize that Thou chastiseth those whom Thou lovest, and it will always be the prayer of Thy Son—not our will but Thine be done.

We beseech Thee to listen to our plea. We, who are of this great land which Thou hast blest, thank Thee for our President, our Vice President, and for our great men and women in Congress.

O Lord, help and assist them to be imbued with a spirit of prayer and divine inspiration to work and make our laws and our country's commitments according to Thy will.

O good and almighty God, help our Lithuanian brethren in their bondage, give them courage and hope, so that by their suffering and sacrifice, they may gain Thy favor, so that once more they may live as freemen in a world created by Thee—to serve and honor Thee—to live in peace with our fellow men and our sister nations.

Peace Thou came to give—yes, peace Thou can give to men of good will. We pray and beg of Thee to make us understand Thy charity for our fellow men and our sister nations.

May God bless you and keep you. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 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 Monday, February 12, 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.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Walt Whitman Rostow, of Massachusetts, to be Counselor of the Department of State;

Vice Adm. Edward Nelson Parker, U.S. Navy, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Pakistan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF STOCKS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7652(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of Tennessee, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected highway transportation activities, Post Office Department, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT AND STORAGE OF GENERAL-USE HANDTOOLS FOR THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of procurement and storage of general-use handtools for the Air Force by General Services Administration, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SELECTIVE EXAMINATION OF PAYMENTS MADE UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED WITH AIR PRODUCTS, INC., ALLENTOWN, PA.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the selective examination of payments made for construction of facilities and installation of equipment under Department of the Air Force contracts negotiated with Air Products, Inc., Allentown, Pa., dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF SUBSECTION (d) OF SECTION 2388 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 1821 AND 1825, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ALLOWANCES OF WITNESSES

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 1821 and 1825 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in the case of certain aliens, relating to adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the

Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF FEDERAL AID AUTHORIZED TO CITIES AND TOWNS IN THEIR CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES

"Whereas one of the great problems facing the local, State, and Federal Governments today is water pollution; and

"Whereas although great progress has been made on this problem, a great financial burden has been placed on many cities and towns because of the requirement to appropriate large sums of money in carrying out this program: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation increasing the amount of Federal aid authorized on approved projects from 30 to 60 percent of the cost of construction of sewage treatment facilities and to increase the maximum amount authorized on each project to $800,000; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 9, 1962.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 34

"Resolution relating to the initiation of Federal studies and programs regarding the condition and exploitation of the North Pacific and Bering Sea fisheries

"Whereas the vast fisheries of the North Pacific and Bering Sea are a natural resource historically recognized as vital to the economy of the United States; and

"Whereas in addition to the tremendous take of salmon and halibut in these international waters the immense Russian and Japanese fleets have been harvesting more than a billion and a half pounds of other fish and shellfish annually; and

"Whereas both Russia and Japan have yearly expanded their operations in the taking of salmon, halibut, and other demersal and pelagic fish which abound in the waters beyond the 3-mile limit; and

"Whereas both nations, but particularly Japan, are now operating extensive and expanding oceanographic and marine fisheries research in these areas, thus establishing strong prior rights through subsidized fishing and research; and

"Whereas at the present time the U.S. fleet plays only a secondary or tertiary role in the research regarding and the actual harvesting of the offshore fishery resources except for salmon and halibut; be it

"Resolved by the senate in second legislature, second session assembled, That the Government of the United States is respectfully urged to take immediate steps to initiate projects for offshore fish and shellfish studies and the necessary oceanographic, processing, transportation, and marketing research essential to the proper implementation of the Nation's right to the beneficial exploitation of this natural resource in international waters; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be directed to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; and the honorable members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate January 22, 1962.

"FRANK PERATOVICH,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 19

"Resolution relative to the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, with letter dated January 15, 1962, forwarded to the Congress of the United States reports recommending the early authorization of the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project and related units; and

"Whereas the facilities to be constructed are vitally needed to supply water to areas within Placer, Sacramento, El Dorado, and San Joaquin Counties; and

"Whereas the supplemental water which will be made available by the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project is urgently needed, in part, to preserve the use of large acreages of highly productive farmland which is now endangered by a rapidly falling water table and a lack of adequate surface water supplies; and

"Whereas the proposed facilities are necessary for the full development of the American River as a working unit of the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas these facilities will provide much needed additional flood control protection, for the city of Sacramento, along the lower regions of the American River, along the Sacramento River, and within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; and

"Whereas the entire State of California will benefit from the proposed project by additional flood protection for the capital city of the State and by the provision of an adequate supply of water for an important agricultural and urban area of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of California commends the Secretary of the Interior for recognizing the urgent need for the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of California urges appropriate action, particularly by the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and by the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, directed toward the early authorization and construction of the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

"J. A. BEEK,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Order of St. David, Camden, N.J., signed by Andrew E. Griffith, national president general, favoring the enactment of legislation to designate St. David's Day, March 1, as a general holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND WATERSHED PROGRAM—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas is greatly interested in programs of conservation of soil and the control of water runoff within our State.

At a budget session of the Kansas Legislature, the legislature recognized the importance of this work and urged Congress to vote sufficient funds to carry on an expanded program.

I am personally familiar with the fine work that is being done in our State and, therefore, urge the Senate to vote a fund of not less than $250 million this session for our agricultural conservation program.

The State Association of Kansas Watersheds held its annual meeting December 12, 1961, at Topeka, Kans. This organization has been actively engaged in the control of water runoff through the watershed programs. We have completed some of the projects in our State and many others are ready for construction and completion as soon as funds are available.

The future growth and development of our State will be determined largely by the amount of water that we can conserve and use for beneficial purposes. The watershed program should be the basis of this operation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 22 and the resolutions adopted by the State Association of Kansas Watersheds at its annual meeting in Topeka on December 12, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the agricultural conservation program

Whereas the ever-increasing demands for effective soil and water conservation impose a major responsibility on Kansas farmers; and

Whereas watershed development in the State of Kansas involves accelerated conservation work; and

Whereas the farmers of Kansas have demonstrated a willingness to spend more of their own time and money for conservation of soil and water in the public interest; and

Whereas for the past 14 years the Federal appropriation for agricultural conservation

work on a cost-sharing basis has remained at $250 million; and

Whereas before the end of the year 1961 more than 60 counties in the State of Kansas were using advance allocations of funds appropriated for the year 1962; and

Whereas in the State of Kansas these funds have consistently been used for fundamental and permanent conservation activities such as terraces, waterways, restoration of native grasses, and other projects and practices of enduring value; and

Whereas some States do not use their full allocation of the Federal funds, commonly known as agricultural conservation program money: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to maintain the appropriation of agricultural conservation program funds at no less than $250 million per annum; and, be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to amend the basic agricultural conservation program law so as to permit unused funds in any State to be reallocated to States which demonstrate a need for additional funds for permanent conservation work; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house February 1, 1962.

ALLEN L. MITCHELL,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 5, 1962.

HAROLD H. CHASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED DECEMBER 1961 BY THE STATE ASSOCIATION OF KANSAS WATERSHEDS

I

It has been accepted procedure the past several years for proposed Federal flood control and other water resources development projects to be reviewed by the State water resources board. It also has been accepted procedure that the recommendations of the water resources board becomes the official state recommendation. In line with this, we will oppose congressional authorization of those proposed Federal projects which did not in this past year win the recommendation of the State water resources board.

II

In connection with several bills pending in the Congress on the subject of water resources planning; we endorse the objective of coordinating the planning activities of the Federal and State agencies dealing with water resources. However, we do not believe that efficient and economical coordination can be achieved by interdepartmental review; and we favor the creation of an independent advisory commission to review water resources projects proposed by various departments and agencies. We believe such a review commission should function on principles, standards and procedures approved by the Congress; and that the sovereign rights of the States must be protected in State projects and water allocation.

III

We recommend that on small streams where watershed groups are active, the authorization for large reservoirs should be delayed until the watersheds' development has an opportunity to prove their value.

IV

A fundamental need for implementation of a complete nationwide soil survey is vital and necessary. We urge the Congress to establish a commission composed of the presidents of land grant colleges to immediately institute and complete a survey of the Nation's soil productivity and capabilities. The survey should be taken with full cooperation of the individual farmer.

V

More than 60 Kansas counties have been using 1960 ACP funds since late summer. There is a severe shortage of SCS planning and construction funds in Kansas and a few other States—while such funds allocated to other States are unused. We recommend that State ACP and SCS funds be transferable between States; and that the Kansas congressional delegation strive to secure passage of the necessary legislation.

VI

We urge the SCS to exert strenuous effort to identify downstream benefits in order that the most comprehensive watershed program can be developed.

RESOLUTION OF GOVERNING BODY OF CANEY, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the governing body of the city of Caney, Kans., at a regular meeting of the council of that city on February 5, 1962, adopted a resolution approving the survey report of the Corps of Engineers of the Tulsa Engineer District covering the Verdigris River and tributaries in Kansas and Oklahoma, with particular respect to the Copan Reservoir.

The control of the water runoff is vital to our State and early action by Congress on the resolution submitted by the Corps of Engineers would be of great value to Kansas and the community of Caney. It is my hope that we may get early action on it.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution endorsing the survey report of the Corps of Engineers be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas said survey report proposes construction of certain improvements for flood control, water supply, pollution abatement, recreation, development of fish and wildlife benefits, and maintenance of low flow in certain streams in the vicinity of Caney, Kans.; and

Whereas said survey report has been reviewed by and between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Kansas Water Resources Board, and the proposed design of the Copan Reservoir has been adjusted to the mutual satisfaction of both agencies; and

Whereas the construction of said Copan Reservoir as proposed by said survey report will result in a very favorable economic impact and accelerated development in the city of Caney, Kans., and its surrounding trade territory; and

Whereas the said survey report includes estimates of cost for relocating, reconstructing, or protecting utilities and other facilities in the same condition as they exist at the time of reservoir construction at no expense to the city of Caney, Kans., or private interests; and

Whereas the said Copan Reservoir, in conjunction with certain upstream projects proposed by the State of Kansas under Public Law 566, will result in improved ability of the city of Caney, Kans., to provide for future supply of industrial and domestic water: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the governing body of the city of Caney, Kans.:

SECTION 1. The governing body of the city of Caney, Kans., after thorough consideration of such survey report and by reason of such benefits which will accrue to the city of Caney, Kans., and its surrounding area, hereby endorses said survey report.

SEC. 2. The governing body of the city of Caney, Kans., will cause copies of this resolution to be placed in the hands of its elected representatives in the legislature and in the Congress of the United States. It will also make copies of this resolution available to the congressional delegation of the State of Oklahoma.

Passed and approved this 5th day of February 1962.

W. E. JONES,
Mayor.
F. G. FRANKS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS OIL MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the oil industry in the United States is in a depressed condition. We must keep this in mind as we consider future programs for oil development in the United States.

Kansas is one of the large oil-producing States of the Nation and the annual production of oil in the past 5 years has declined from a high of 124 million barrels to 113 million barrels.

We should also keep in mind that crude oil sells for less than it did in 1957, 5 years ago. Our wells are producing the minimum allowables and with not much apparent hope for an increase in price or allowables under present conditions. The drilling operations are at an alltime low. It is essential that we maintain incentives for increasing discovery of new oil reserves, not only in Kansas, but in the Nation, if we are to maintain our oil production for national defense and for economic expansion.

At a meeting of the Kansas Oil Men's Association, held in Wichita on January 22, 1962, a resolution regarding the importance of percentage depletion to the oil industry was adopted.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

Whereas an adequate supply of oil and continuous oil exploration is essential to the national welfare and defense; and

Whereas Congress in 1926, recognizing the need for an incentive for oil exploration, enacted a provision for percentage depletion, allowing 27½ percent of gross income from an oil well as a tax deduction, limited to any 1 year to 50 percent of the taxable income from the well; and

Whereas attempts are being made to reduce this rate which, if carried out, would sharply reduce drilling activities; and

Whereas less drilling activity would soon cause shortages of domestic supplies bringing about higher prices for gasoline and oil products, contributing to inflation and accelerating the trend toward smaller cars, resulting in less tax revenue: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention here assembled, That we strongly oppose any effort to reduce, eliminate, or otherwise tamper with present percentage depletion for oil and natural gas.

That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Kansas congressional delegation in Washington, D.C.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2840. A bill to provide authority for the President, under the control and direction of the Congress, to make such necessary adjustments in the trade policies of the United States as may be necessary to meet the complex and rapidly changing economic and political conditions prevailing in the world, and to provide the means for assisting domestic enterprises, communities, and individuals to adjust their productive activities to change economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2841. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 2842. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2843. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Speer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2844. A bill for the relief of Alice Amar Froemning;

S. 2845. A bill for the relief of Dieter F. Scholz; and

S. 2846. A bill for the relief of Drs. Manuel S. Lina and Constancia L. Ortega Lina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2847. A bill to provide for U.S. participation in international programs of assistance which utilize agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. WILEY) (by request):

S. 2848. 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 Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2849. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2850. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use surplus grains on land available under section 3 and section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2851. A bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 2852. A bill to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 2853. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francisco B. deCarvalho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2854. A bill for the relief of Joo Yon Ohm Cederberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2855. A bill for the relief of Weng Chiew Wong and Moy Chong Wong; and

S. 2856. A bill to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the period from February 10, 1963, to February 16, 1963, as Negro History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize certain construction at military installations. This bill is requested by the Department of Defense. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Defense, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2841) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1962, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This legislation would authorize military construction urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in essential prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for military construction is provided for in the budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1963.

Titles I, II, and III of this legislation would authorize new construction for the Active Forces totaling $1,099,415,000, of which $148,750,000 is for the Department of the Army, $206,312,000 for the Department of the Navy, and $744,353,000 for the Department of the Air Force. Titles IV and V would authorize new construction totaling $133,517,000 for defense agencies and activities. Title IV also makes provision for fallout shelters in military facilities of the Active Forces and Reserve components, including the National Guard. Title VI is for general provisions relating to these titles.

Title VII would authorize construction of 16,503 new units of family housing at a cost of $311,451,000. In addition, it would authorize establishment of a new military family housing fund, and it contains other legislative recommendations considered necessary to implement the Department of Defense family housing program.

Title VIII totaling $46,500,000 would authorize construction for the Reserve components, of which $11 million is for the Army National Guard, $9,900,000 for the Army Reserve, $8,200,000 for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $12,700,000 for the Air National Guard, and $4,700,000 for the Air Force Reserve. Consistent with the desires expressed in Senate and House reports accompanying Public Law 87-57, title VIII contains provisions necessary in reverting to the lump-sum method of authorizing facilities for Reserve components which was in effect prior to fiscal year 1959.

With respect to deficiencies in prior construction authorizations, this proposal would provide additional monetary authority in the amount of $5,527,000 on projects authorized under previous laws. This amount is distributed: $66,000 to the Army, $5,276,000 to the Navy, and $185,000 to the Air Force. Also, this legislative proposal would repeal as of June 1963 all authorizations for military construction contained in laws enacted prior to June 9, 1960 (with certain specified exceptions).

In summation, the total authorization requested in this legislative proposal for all of the agencies mentioned, including military family housing, is $1,596,410,000.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, requesting the proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 2848) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. WILEY), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The letter presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1962.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Herewith submitted is a draft of a bill "To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes."

Aside from changes in the dollar amounts and other figures involved, the only major difference between this bill and Public Law 87-98 (75 Stat. 216), the corresponding authorization act for fiscal year 1962, is that appropriate revisions have been made to combine the present "Salaries and expenses" appropriation with the "Research and development" appropriation, which is retitled "Research, development, and operation," and is to remain available without fiscal year limitation if so specified in an appropriation act. The objective of this change is to achieve more effective use of funds and greater fiscal flexibility by permitting NASA to apply its financial resources to those areas of its activity where they are most urgently required. It is not intended that this combination have any effect other than to combine the two existing appropriations into a single "no year" appropriation. That is to say, except as to the elimination of the current fiscal year limitation on the present "Salaries and expenses" appropriation, the scope of the combined appropriation is intended to be as broad as the two current appropriations but no broader.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration recommends that the enclosed draft bill be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of the enclosed draft bill will be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF SOLAR ENERGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the establishment of an Office of Solar Energy within the Department of the Interior.

Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO is introducing similar proposed legislation in the House today.

The new developments and the unmeasurable potential of solar energy are matters of great interest to me. Many private firms have pioneered with research and development projects in this field in the past few years, producing limited numbers of devices which transform the heat and energy of the sun into controlled electricity.

The Federal Government has played an active and effective role in the development of hydroelectric power and, more recently, atomic energy.

But in this relatively new but exciting field of solar energy, the Government needs to coordinate and to step up its activities for development of solar energy devices and techniques.

With stepped-up research and development, we can utilize solar energy for a vast array of positive purposes. Power for communications, hospitals and agricultural equipment, to name a few purposes, can be placed in isolated areas of the Nation—and the world—where no power exists now.

Man has long hoped to harness the sun's energy for practical purposes, but only in recent years have specific devices been developed.

I add that in our missile program, particularly in respect to the Mercury project, the solar energy batteries will be used, which indicates the possibilities for this type of energy.

Two methods are now under study and limited utilization. One is to store the sun's heat energy for conversion later to power. The other is to channel the light energy of the sun through particular metals for immediate conversion to electrical power.

Several agencies of our Government are presently interested in the potential of solar energy. The Department of Defense is experimenting on the use of solar energy for communication devices, and has already utilized solar cells to power electronic devices in our satellites.

The Department of Commerce has considered the possibility of ocean buoys, remote weather stations and auxiliary generators on ships powered by solar energy.

The U.S. Forest Service has considered utilizing solar energy for some of its more remote stations.

No one agency or office of the Government, however, has an overall responsibility or total interest in solar energy research and development. The Department of Interior, with its great interest and experience in the development of power and energy sources, would have much to offer.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of Interior to conduct solar energy research and development projects and would direct him to work closely with other departments with potential uses for solar energy power.

This bill also would direct the Secretary of Interior to establish a Solar Energy Advisory Board, composed of five scientists, to work with him on a consulting basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2849) to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

USE OF SURPLUS GRAINS ON CERTAIN LAND UNDER TAYLOR GRAZING ACT

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to use surplus grains on land available under section 3 and section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act.

Portions of the Taylor Grazing Act lands, administered by the Bureau of Land Management, could be improved by better conservation practices. In several Western States, recent droughts have seriously depleted range available for permittees. In some cases, a temporary reduction of grazing, in conjunction with range rehabilitation practices, would permit more rapid recovery of the range.

Range improvement, to be attained through seeding and other rehabilitation measures, will in the long run increase carrying capacity. However, reduction of grazing privileges by itself would work a hardship on some users of the Federal range. Some stockmen would have insufficient range, and perhaps have to reduce foundation herds.

This bill, Madam President, would permit an alternative feed source during the period of rehabilitation. The bill would permit stockmen who are entitled to BLM range to receive surplus grains held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, provided they reduced the length of time on which their stock used the range. The Secretary of Interior would charge those receiving grain an amount equivalent to that which they would have been charged had they made use of the Federal range, with funds so collected going to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

To illustrate how the program might operate, let us assume a northwestern rancher has 200 head of Herefords. In normal years he would bring the cattle in from the BLM range about October 1. They would be grazed on hayfield for about a month, fed hay and perhaps concentrate, and returned to the range about April 1. But under this plan, the turnout would be deferred a month. The rancher would have received surplus grains prior to this time, which could be used as supplemental feed through the winter.

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

The bill (S. 2850) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use surplus grains on land available under section 3 and section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO THE TRAINING SCHOOL, VINELAND, N.J.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the disposal of Ellis Island for use by the training school at Vineland, N.J.

Several years ago Ellis Island was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and the General Services Administration was authorized to arrange for disposal of the property. In 1960 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare invited applications for acquisition of Ellis Island at up to 100-percent public discount to groups acting in the field of health, education, or welfare, or a combination thereof. After review of the applications submitted at that time the Department rejected all applications and, in effect, returned the problem of disposing of Ellis Island to the General Services Administration.

Early in the first session of this Congress several bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate directing the Administrator of General Services Administration to convey Ellis Island to different organizations for varying financial considerations and varying purposes.

The training school sought to purchase Ellis Island outright from the General Services Administration but was informed that inasmuch as these bills were pending in the Congress, the agency could not consider any bids.

It is apparent that the General Services Administration is looking to the Congress to make the policy decision as to the purpose to which Ellis Island should be devoted in the future and the organization which should acquire the island to carry out this purpose.

The training school at Vineland is a nonprofit corporation of the State of New Jersey which has pioneered in the field of mental retardation since 1888. The school was one of the first institutions in the world to establish a laboratory for basic research in mental retardation and to establish a school for the training of teachers in this field, leading to the development of techniques of special education which are commonplace today. One result is that the training school has become a demonstration center receiving annually more than 5,000 visitors to observe these techniques and methods in action.

The board of trustees of the training school is headed by Pearl Buck, of Dublin, Pa., the author. Besides the chairwoman, the board of trustees include John B. Prizer, of Chestnut Hill, Pa., vice president and general counsel, Pennsylvania Railroad; Elwood F. Kirkman, of Margate, president, Boardwalk National Bank, Atlantic City; George K. Batt, of Morristown, executive vice president of Dugan Bros. Bakery; Bernard Shanley, of Bernardsville, attorney; Morris Feld, of Clifton, secretary of National Cleaning Contractors, Inc.; Bayard England, of Linwood, president, Atlantic City Electric Co.; Mrs. Margot Studer, of Montclair, civic leader; Webster B. Todd, of Oldwick, businessman; Carl R. Bopp, of Drexel Hill, Pa., president, Federal Reserve Board of Philadelphia; Warren Somers, Jr., of Northfield, businessman; Judge Francis A. Stanger, of Cedarville, attorney; Albert C. Strang, of Vineland, president, Tradesmans Bank & Trust Co.; Dr. Harry Vandegrift, medical director, Children's Seashore House, Atlantic City; and Richard C. Bond, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., president of John Wanamaker, Philadelphia.

It is interesting to note that exactly 50 years ago, in 1912, the then research director of the school, Dr. Henry H. Goddard, made a preliminary study of mental deficiency among immigrants at Ellis Island which aroused much interest. This study reached the conclusion that even with the limited techniques then available a successful screening process to identify defectives at Ellis Island could be established. While Congress at that time did not see fit to provide funds for such a program, today current research studies at the training school receive Federal Government support from both the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Science Foundation.

It has become increasingly evident that competent, comprehensive diagnosis in the area of mental retardation is properly a matter of national concern. Such a diagnosis is necessarily the first step in any program of training or treatment.

The training school seeks to acquire Ellis Island to expand its programs in this vital area by establishing there an international diagnostic center for development and exposition of efficient methods of diagnosis of mental deficiency. Such a center would also afford greatly expanded clinical study and examination in a comprehensive variety of fields related to mental deficiency. A research and professional training program in the field of mental retardation would be developed in cooperation with universities and other organizations interested in mental deficiency. All of these services would be made available on an international basis, with worldwide dissemination of the information acquired.

The bill which I am introducing would direct the Administrator to convey Ellis Island to the training school at a price equaling the appraised value as determined by the Administrator of the General Services Administration less such public discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In making this recommendation the Secretary would apply the principles which have evolved under the policy established in section 203(k)(1)(C) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Appropriate safeguards are included to insure that Ellis Island will be used only for the intended purposes.

The training school is an outstanding institution which has been pioneering the frontiers of knowledge in mental deficiency for nearly three-quarters of a century and has achieved a worldwide reputation in this field. For much of this period arrival at Ellis Island, in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, represented the achievement of years of work and hope on the part of millions of people yearning to be free—free from tyranny, free from persecution, free from lack of opportunity.

Only recently have more than a few dedicated people come to realize that millions in the world today suffering from the cruel burden of mental deficiency can—through improved diagnosis and training based on continuing research—make equally dramatic progress toward freedom from their own intolerable handicaps: the tyranny of total dependence, the persecution of prejudice and the lack of opportunity to achieve the best that is possible with the limited endowment accorded them.

To those concerned with the symbolic value of Ellis Island, there could be no more exciting prospect than that the historic gateway to freedom in the New World be rededicated as a new and perhaps even more dramatic gateway to freedom.

If it is found—as I am confident it will be found—that the program envisaged by the training school is feasible and desirable, and that the training school is the most responsible organization—professionally and financially—to carry out this program, I would hope that this bill would be enacted promptly.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2852) to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to assure that the property known as Ellis Island, in the harbor of the city of New York, will be utilized effectively in the public interest, the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized and directed to dispose of the real property constituting Ellis Island, including buildings, fixtures, and equipment situated thereon, as provided in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. Within a reasonable period after the date of enactment of this Act, not in any event to exceed two years, the Administrator shall, subject to section 4 of this Act, convey the property described in section 1 to The Training School at Vineland, New Jersey (hereinafter referred to as the "school") (1) for such monetary consideration, if any, as may remain after reducing the appraised value of such property as determined by the Administrator by such public benefit discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as consistent with the policy established in section 203(k)(1)(C) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and (2) on such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Administrator may reasonably determine to be necessary to insure the use of the property by the school for the establishment and operation of an international diagnostic center for mental retardation which shall include opportunities for research and training in the field of mental retardation.

SEC. 3. With respect to the property which is transferred pursuant to this Act, the Administrator may exercise the authority which is available to certain other desig-

nated officers of the Government in connection with certain other transfers of property under paragraph (2) of section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to the extent that the provisions of said paragraph are not inconsistent with this Act.

SEC. 4. In the event that the school has not accepted the conveyance authorized by this Act within two years after the date of enactment thereof, the property which is subject to this Act shall revert to the status held by it prior to such enactment, and all authority conferred by this Act shall terminate.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 245 OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HART. Madam President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the adjustment of status of refugees resident in the United States who are natives of countries contiguous to the United States or of any adjacent island.

The exclusion of such aliens from adjustment of immigration status while in the United States from temporary status to permanent status stems from the assumption that investigations and determinations of eligibility can be better determined by the U.S. consular offices in the alien's native country, and with a minimum of inconvenience to the alien because his country is in close proximity to the United States.

Since we have terminated diplomatic relations with Cuba, we, of course, maintain no consular offices in that country and Cubans cannot return to their native land to arrange for reentry into the United States as regular immigrants.

The Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which I have had the honor of being chairman, recently conducted extensive hearings on the plight of the Cubans who have fled to the United States from the Communist regime of Castro. Over 94,000 Cubans are presently in the United States as nonimmigrants, parolees, or refugee overstays subject to voluntary deportation orders. The majority of them are concentrated in Miami, Fla. Most of them presently aspire to return to their native land when Cuba is freed from its present Communist tyranny. Until that happy day arrives, opportunities must be found for the Cuban refugees to find employment and pursue a reasonably normal life. At present, a major effort is underway to resettle them throughout the United States where employment opportunities exist.

Some of them, however, wish to go to Central or South American countries where their familiarity with the Spanish language and Latin American customs are important assets. I believe that we should encourage democratic anti-Castro Cubans to emigrate to Latin American nations. Certainly we could find no more effective spokesmen to describe the destruction of freedom under Castro's brand of communism.

Cuban refugees, however, are often hesitant to leave the United States without some assurance that they can return if necessary. Ordinarily, the breadwinner proceeds ahead to establish himself in the new country before calling his family to join him. In the event that the opportunity which he hopes to develop does not materialize, he wants the assurance that he can return to his family in the United States. Under the present law, there is no assurance that his immigration status of visitor, parolee, or overstay will permit his reentry into the United States.

The bill which I now introduce would remedy this situation. It would permit Cubans as well as refugees from other adjacent Western Hemisphere nations to adjust their status without leaving the United States. They would be accorded no privilege not already enjoyed by most other aliens. In the event that political upheavals occurred in other countries in the Caribbean and some of their residents fled to the United States for asylum to escape persecution, they also, as refugees, would be eligible for adjustment of status.

I hope sincerely that the Senate and the House will act promptly to enact this legislation.

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

The bill (S. 2856) to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would authorize the President of the United States to proclaim the period from February 10 to February 16, 1963, as National Negro History Week.

One of the outstanding traditions of the people of this country is the erection of monuments to distinguished citizens who have been pathfinders and leaders of movements that have made this great Nation of ours.

Another of our long-continued traditions is the practice of holding rites and celebrations honoring various faiths, creeds, races, and nationalities. The combined efforts of all peoples have made the United States the most important free republic of the world today.

Such a proclamation will give the President an opportunity to say to America and to the whole world that the Chief Executive of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the people of these great United States have made eminent forward strides in the conventional acceptance of the recognition of the heritage and history of Americans of African descent. This is indeed in the interest of all Americans. It is in the interest of freedom. It is in the interest of world peace.

Although the Emancipation Proclamation became effective January 1, 1863, it was issued by Lincoln on September 22, 1862. For that reason, I thought this year would be the appropriate time to issue a proclamation to mark National Negro History Week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. Res. 156) authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the period from Febuary 10, 1963, to February 16, 1963, as Negro History Week, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

CROPLAND RETIREMENT ACT OF 1962 — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1962, the name of Mr. MILLER was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2822) to establish a cropland retirement program, introduced by Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) on February 7, 1962.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Vance W. Collins, of Kansas, to be U.S. marshal, district of Kansas;

Leo A. Mault, of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal, district of New Jersey;

Alvin Grossman, of New York, to be U.S. marshal, western district of New York, term of 4 years, vice George M. Glasser; and

Edward L. Shaheen, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Louisiana, term of 4 years, vice T. Fitzhugh Wilson.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations

to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, February 22, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. SKELLY WRIGHT TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 22, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice J. Barrett Prettyman, retired.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK B. ELLIS TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 23, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frank B. Ellis, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Louisiana, vice J. Skelly Wright, elevated.

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

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

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. SALTONSTALL:

Address delivered by Representative SILVIO O. CONTE at Lincoln Day dinner, on February 8, 1962, in Boston, Mass.

MONTANA AND THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the feed grain program of the Department of Agriculture has generated more controversy and discussion in Montana than any other issue in recent months. Because of the many communications which my colleague, Senator METCALF, and I have received, we have endeavored to summarize for our own purposes and for the edification of our fellow Montanans exactly what the program is and what it is designed to do.

Both Senator LEE METCALF and I have had with Department of Agriculture officials many conferences at which the Montana situation was thoroughly reviewed. It was contacts such as those which recently brought about the reclassification of Campana barley as a malting barley for the 1962 program. This will be of considerable value to Montana graingrowers.

The President's message on agriculture has been submitted to the Congress, and the program which will be enacted will govern the 1963 crop year and a period thereafter which has not yet been determined. Extensive hearings will be held in both the House and Senate. Senator METCALF and I will present to the Senate committee Montana's problems and recommendations. We appreciate receiving from our constituents sound, reasonable suggestions which will help us in supporting a new farm bill which will benefit Montana and the general agricultural economy of this country. We are also happy that we were able to make it possible for a delegation of Montana farmers to appear before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on February 28. It is our understanding that the same group will appear before the House committee on March 1. We are indebted to the chairmen of the two committees, Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and Representative COOLEY, of North Carolina, for showing this consideration and courtesy to this group.

We intend to recommend that consideration be given to increasing the number of specialized grains which can be grown on diverted acreages, inclusion of safflower production in determining barley acreages, and special consideration for grains which are not generally in surplus, such as the varieties of high quality wheat now grown in many areas of Montana.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my impression and understanding of the farm program now operating in the State.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The American farmer's techniques and rate of production in recent years have improved to such an extent that he can produce far more in quantity and quality than ever before. They are producing more with less land and fewer people. As a result of this progress in technique and conservation the United States is confronted with a massive oversupply of agriculture commodities. The most immediate result has been a decline in the market price for the items in surplus. A 1960 report issued by the Joint Economic Committee on economic policies for agriculture in the 1960's summarizes the problem as follows:

"In spite of the isolation of existing surplus stocks, a conservation reserve of 30 million acres, and continuation of Public Law 480 exports from current production, prices for farm products would decline sharply in 1965 in the absence of programs to balance supplies with market outlets available. A prolonged period of severely depressed farm incomes adversely affecting all who deal with farmers appears probable if agriculture's full production potential is utilized in the 1960's."

To return our farm economy immediately to the natural law of supply and demand would undoubtedly bring chaos. Because our farmers are producing in excess of the market demand the price would naturally be less and the farmers will try to produce more to make up the difference. It would result in a sharp drop in agriculture economy. The small farmer would be forced off his land. Heavy concentration and control of our agriculture by a few persons would be a natural tendency if this happened. The farming communities of the Nation would suffer and there would be considerable displacement and unemployment. Some Federal guidance and cooperation with farmers appears to be the best means of providing some stability into the farm economy until such time as production can be leveled off to meet demands. This will give protection in the future of the family-operated economic farm unit.

There are some who propose that price supports and production controls be abolished altogether, leaving farmers to face a free market at a time when agricultural production is outstripping consumption. Few who advocate this step fully understand what the consequences might be.

This subject has been studied at great length by two universities in agricultural States (Iowa State and Cornell), by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, and by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the previous administration.

Here is the consensus of these reports:

They foresee, within 4 years after the end of price supports and production controls, farmers' net income cut almost 40 percent below the present level.

They predict drastic drops in the prices farmers would receive for the crops that are now supported—and also for the livestock, dairy, and poultry products that are produced from feed and grain.

Here are their projections of the national average prices farmers would receive 4 years from now for major Montana farm commodities if price supports were abandoned:

Wheat, 92 cents per bushel, a drop of 48 percent from the national average price of $1.78 farmers received during the first 9 months of 1961.

Barley, 63 cents per bushel, a drop of 28 percent below the 88 cents received nationally on the average during the first 9 months of 1961.

Beef cattle, $14.77 per 100 pounds, a drop of 27 percent below the national average price of $20.20 received during the first 9 months of 1961.

Milk, $3.44 per hundred pounds, a drop of 17 percent below the $4.14 per hundred average farm price during the first 9 months of 1961.

The best judgment of the Nation's foremost agricultural economists would not give us a very pleasant picture to contemplate in the future of Montana agriculture if Government programs were eliminated.

However, Government farm programs must deal with agricultural problems on a realistic basis. The price support program for feed grains has been in trouble. Uncontrolled production has pushed feed grain surpluses to unreasonably high levels. This has greatly increased Government costs through heavier storage costs and larger initial costs in acquiring feed grains under the price support program.

In an effort to cope with the increasing surpluses of feed grains, with their threat

to the stability of important segments of agriculture, the administration recommended and the Congress passed the feed grain program which has been extended to 1962 crops of corn, grain sorghums, and barley.

In 1961, the first year of the program, feed grain production was rolled back below utilization and a 10-year trend of yearly additions to the feed grain surplus pile was reversed. The Government's total holdings of all feed grains will actually drop instead of continuing on upward as they have every year since 1952.

The Government inventory of feed grains has increased constantly during the past decade and at mid-January totaled more than 1,780 million bushels of the 5 feed grains of corn, grain sorghums, oats, barley, and rye. At the end of December, nearly 100 million bushels of barley were either in the Government inventory or under price support loans from 1961 and previous crops.

Montana has made its contribution to these Government feed grain holdings. Since 1952, more than 80 million bushels of Montana barley has been taken over by the Government under the price support program. While Government holdings of barley in Montana at the present time are somewhat limited due to the present drought, the Commodity Credit Corporation did have more than 3.2 million bushels in bin and commercial storage in the State at the end of December. More than 6 million bushels of Montana barley from other crops were still under price support. Chances are most of this barley will eventually be turned over to the Government in payment of loans. In the meantime, Montana farmers are earning storage payments on farm-stored barley under the older loans that were resealed.

Another factor in reduced stored surpluses in Montana is the more rapid shipment of grains for export from Montana to the west coast. But let us not forget that massive Government programs to encourage these exports through export payments, donations to friendly nations, barter, and sales for foreign currencies have contributed greatly to the favorable export total. While the second highest combined volume of corn, barley, oats, and grain sorghums exported from the United States during fiscal year 1961—11.5 million metric tons valued at $531 million—25 percent of this total value moved under Government programs, Public Law 480, and the mutual security programs.

Under the feed grain program established by Public Law 87–128, the Secretary of Agriculture has set a 1962-crop barley support price of 93 cents per bushel national average. Barley price supports will be available to producers who participate in the feed grain program. Participation is voluntary. The alternative to a voluntary program may well be no program at all with a resulting disastrous drop in barley and other feed prices.

The feed grain program is designed to restore a more orderly supply situation for the benefit not only of grain producers but also of the livestock industry which could be dangerously overexpanded as a result of present feed grain production potential.

Any producer can choose to participate in the program or not—as he wishes. If he participates, he will be eligible for price support on the normal production of the 1962 acreage of barley on each eligible farm based on its average yield for the 1959 and 1960 acreage.

In addition, farmers will receive a payment for shifting land out of barley production and into a conserving use. About half of this payment can be obtained at the time the farmer signs to participate in the program in February and March. The minimum acreage diversion under the program is 20 percent of the farm's base acreage, and up to 40 percent of the base acreage can be diverted. Many areas of the State will undoubtedly welcome some added cash income this winter. The payments to be made will result in a saving for the Government over a period of years because of the tremendous costs incurred in storing and handling grains taken over under price support. The 1961 program has already resulted in a large saving, with Government expenditures over the next 9 years estimated to be approximately $600 million less because of the lower level of feed grain carryover, resulting from the rollback in 1961 corn and grain sorghum production.

The program applies to all States and there has been no shifting of acreage from one State to another. The Montana base acreage from which farmers may cut back their plantings is 1,862,050 acres. This is higher than any single year's planting with the exception of 1959 when 1,949,000 acres were planted to barley in Montana.

Montana acreage of barley has expanded greatly as has the national acreage during the past 10-year period when the surplus of feed grains has been building up. The base acreage of 1.8 million acres for Montana is nearly four times the barley planting of 582,000 acres in the State in 1953. During this same period, national barley plantings went from 9.6 million acres to 15.8 million acres in 1961. I realize that the increase in Montana barley acreage coincided with the decrease in wheat acreage, and barley provided a much needed alternative for the acreage taken out of wheat. However, this program gives Montana farmers in total a base acreage that is very nearly at their highest planting's figure. It offers substantial payments for diversion of acreage out of barley production this year.

Some farmers have requested that the barley yields on which payments would be based be established on 5- to 10-year histories instead of a 1959–60 average. The Department of Agriculture has refigured a number of barley yields set in Montana counties and has adjusted yields in some instances to reflect 5-year averages (1956–60) where higher than the 10-year or the 2-year average.

Each farmer has the right to appeal the yield set for his farm through his county ASC committee. The feed grain program is voluntary and participation is not required if the farmer does not desire the protection afforded.

Montana: Price support activity for barley, 1952–60

[Bushels]

Year	Number of loans	Total loans	Delivered to CCC	Total CCC-owned barley on June 30
1952	173	328,088	52,521	57,664
1953	2,056	5,122,229	4,332,778	10,100
1954	7,109	17,438,181	15,548,362	471,561
1955	7,835	23,711,191	21,393,055	12,866,906
1956	4,533	15,040,182	13,281,733	3,055,202
1957	8,152	24,736,794	20,740,412	3,807,651
1958	3,386	11,417,942	3,302,511	5,542,606
1959	2,368	5,444,171	1,337,881	7,787,374
1960	1,864	6,051,354	[1] 414,312	8,065,810

[1] The following resealed barley in all probability will be delivered to CCC in the near future. 1958 crop reextended reseal 1,724,838 bushels: 1959 crop extended reseal 1,733,180 bushels; and 1960 reseal 1,722,342 bushels.

Exports of barley

[Millions of bushels]

Year beginning July:	
1953	19.0
1954	43.5
1955	102.9
1956	61.8
1957	91.6
1958	116.7
1959	118.7
1960	85.6
1961	70.0

Montana and national barley plantings

[Millions of acres]

	Montana	National
1953	0.6	9.6
1954	1.4	14.7
1955	1.4	16.3
1956	1.2	14.8
1957	1.8	16.5
1958	1.7	16.3
1959	1.9	16.9
1960	1.8	15.6
1961	1.8	15.8

REGULATIONS GOVERNING STAFF PERSONNEL OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and with the concurrence of the committee's ranking minority member, Senator CURTIS, I have recently issued regulations governing the committee's staff personnel.

For the information of the Senate, and in the belief that other committees may wish to consider the issuance of similar regulations, I ask unanimous consent to have these regulations printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION
REGULATIONS GOVERNING COMMITTEE STAFF PERSONNEL

Section 202 (a) and (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, relating to staff personnel of congressional committees, provides, in part:

"Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

* * * * *

"The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work."

By way of implementation of the above provisions, and to enhance the effective management and coordination of committee business, the following regulations shall govern the staff personnel of the Committee on Rules and Administration:

1. Under the direction of the committee chairman, the chief clerk and counsel of the committee shall exercise general supervision over the committee activities and assignments of individual staff members and shall be held primarily responsible for their efficient execution.

2. All absences from work due to illness or pressing personal business shall be promptly reported. All periods of vacation shall be scheduled and approved in advance.

3. Except as may be required within the scope of official committee business or personal family matters, no employee of the committee shall perform services for any outside employer. Questionable situations shall be resolved by the chief clerk and counsel or the committee chairman, as necessary.

4. Any action taken by staff personnel beyond the regular committee duties assigned or additional work performed for any member of the committee, which action or work purports to reflect the interest of the committee or any individual member thereof, shall first be cleared through the chief clerk and counsel and, by him, with the committee chairman or individual member concerned.

5. Staff personnel shall refrain from pursuing any activity in behalf of or in the

name of the committee or any Senator without first obtaining the express permission of the committee chairman or the Senator involved. In all cases wherein action has been taken after permission given, a report thereon shall be made, as appropriate, to the chief clerk and counsel, or to the Senator concerned.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman.

OAKLEY, ILL., DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill (S. 2645) to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River, in the State of Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a clear and concise statement with respect to this proposed project. The statement is dated February 6, 1962, and was submitted by the Association of Commerce of Decatur, Ill.

Let me take this opportunity to say that this association is now in its 58th year. It has rendered valuable and outstanding services to the people of that area of the State.

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

STATEMENT SUPPORTING SENATE BILL 2645

From the very beginning, the community of Decatur, Ill., through the association of commerce, and the city of Decatur, have urged the kind of long-range planning that has helped to bring about the present status of the proposed dam and reservoir known as the Oakley project.

This project will bring to our region a variety of benefits, both local and regional in impact. The regional benefits lie in the following two areas: (1) flood control; (2) recreation.

Flood control: Oakley Reservoir will be the uppermost one on the Sangamon River. In the engineers' proposed overall plan for the Illinois River Basin Oakley Dam will provide full benefits without the installation of other flood control reservoirs farther downstream in the system; thus will protect from periodic floods several thousand acres of land downstream from Decatur. It will protect Lake Decatur itself and the city's water plant, which was seriously affected in the flood of 1943 (and at other times from 1926 to 1943).

Recreational facilities: The State of Illinois, through both its Governor, Otto Kerner, and its director of the department of conservation, Mr. William Lodge, have stated that Oakley Reservoir could be a great recreational asset to this section of Illinois and have expressed their sincere interest in the possibility of establishing a State park in the general vicinity of the proposed reservoir. Such a facility as Oakley would make possible recreational facilities for many central Illinois citizens, students from Millikin University, the University of Illinois and also enlisted personnel and officers of the U.S. Air Force who are located at Chanute Air Force Base nearby.

Local benefits: Local benefits can be classed into two categories: (1) recreation and (2) water supply.

(1) Recreation: The same benefits expressed under the heading of regional recreational benefits would apply even more fully in the local area.

(2) Water supply: This reservoir is planned as a multiple purpose facility. The city of Decatur, through the association of commerce, the city administration and other civic groups, is very much interested in obtaining water supply which will be made available by this project. Decatur, since 1939, has been planning in order to provide a water supply to meet the growing needs of the Decatur area and to offset the continued silting of Lake Decatur.

Lake Decatur has been expanded to its maximum practical size. If the city continues to grow at its predicted rate, Lake Decatur could become inadequate as a water supply during years of maximum drought. As early as the late 1960's it will become imperative that additional storage be provided. The Oakley Reservoir will be the most logical additional storage. The site is ideal. Being immediately above Lake Decatur, it would constitute a protection to Lake Decatur by reducing the silting and would also make administration of the lake more efficient.

Decatur has expressed a willingness to bear its share of the cost in this multiple purpose project from the early thirties when the Corps of Engineers first displayed any consideration for such a plan. The effort of the corps resulted in their first report in 1946.

FORTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, February 16 is the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania as a republic. However, its independence was short lived—for several years later it fell under the yoke of the Soviet Communist power which took in many other nations, such as, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and East Germany.

Mr. President, the Members of Congress are well aware of the fact that the Soviet Communists have introduced a reign of terror against these peoples, such as in Luthuania, and have deprived the Lithuanian people of their human rights and fundamental freedoms, confiscated their properties and business enterprises, converted them into slaves of the Soviet Union, deported approximately 300,000 of them to Siberia and other parts of Russia. There have been resolutions introduced into the Senate and speeches have been made on the floor of the Senate urging that the United States ask the United Nations to request the Soviets, first, to withdraw all Soviet troops from these enumerated nations that are behind the Iron Curtain and, second, to permit free elections so people may have the right of self-determination which has always been a principle of our American way of life.

Mr. President, since many of these speeches were made last year on the various independence days of these countries behind the Iron Curtain, we have seen the Soviet Communists through their Communists leaders in East Germany and East Berlin throw up an impregnable wall to stop the free flow of East Berliners from going across into West Berlin, which had been the practice and procedure prior to that time. We have also seen what has happened in Laos, the Congo, Cuba, and other parts of Asia and Africa where the Soviet Union is trying to force upon those peoples the Communist doctrine, which, if successful as it has been in several areas, will subjugate more people to the Communist thinking.

Sometimes it is difficult in this great country of ours with its many freedoms and many blessings—where even the most renowned Communist or hardened criminal is given protection under our laws—to visualize and understand the struggles, oppressions, and deprivations that are inflicted on a people who were once a part of proud nations who are now under the heel of a Communist dictator.

Mr. President, I have made speeches on the floor of the Senate on Americanism versus communism so people of this country can understand what Americanism really is and in the hope that everyone who is well indoctrinated in Americanism can understand the onslaught of the Communist doctrine. It is this belief in Americanism that gives me the privilege to speak out against Communist infiltration into the freedom-loving areas. It is my fervent hope that when next Lithuania Independence Day rolls around the peoples of the free world will have made some gains in moving the machinery of the United Nations toward greater freedoms to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters written by Mary M. Kizis, director, Lithuanian American Information Center, New York City; Albert L. Zakarko, of Chicago; and Miss Lillian M. Sasnauskas, of Philadelphia, in which these people have shown the concern for the plight of those people behind the Iron Curtain, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N.Y., February 5, 1962.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senator From Illinois,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: We are again asking the friends of Lithuania in the Congress of the United States to pay tribute to her on the 44th anniversary of the restoration of her independence, Friday, February 16.

We hope you can be in the Senate that day, Senator DIRKSEN, to pay tribute to Lithuania.

Only Lithuanians in the free world can commemorate this anniversary and speak for a silenced people.

Lithuania overcame insurmountable obstacles in throwing off the yoke of nearly 120 years of Russian misrule. The reborn Lithuanian state made remarkable progress in all fields of endeavor. She was an honored member of the family of free nations.

After the Soviet occupation of 1940, the Soviets propagandized that Lithuania voluntarily joined the Soviet Union, but the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation.

Conditions in Lithuania have not changed from previous years. The youth is still being sent for "volunteer" labor to distant parts of the Soviet Union; the religious are continually persecuted, and Russification goes on.

In remembering Lithuania, we are remembering a gallant little nation silenced temporarily. But just as she shook off the previous Russian yoke, so she will again shake off this Soviet one.

We are grateful to you, Senator DIRKSEN, for your many kind considerations in the past.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY M. KIZIS,
Director.

JANUARY 29, 1962.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: During 1961, Lithuania again suffered another year of enslavement by the iron-fist rule of colonialistic and imperialistic Soviet Union.

This enslavement is really unfortunate and sad not only to the people within the border confines of Lithuania, but to all of the world. The world certainly needs a variety of cultures and traditions, such as Lithuanian, to enrich all of our lives. Yet we see nations such as Russia try to suppress, confine, and destroy not only national customs and traditions, but also nationalities.

The people of Lithuania, with the protection of God, will never succumb to the propaganda of Communist Russia and will one day remove their chains of enslavement and be free to further enrich the world in Lithuanian culture.

Although Lithuania is far from being a free nation, if it is possible, I would like to urge you to give public moral support to commemorate the 44th aniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16, 1962.

Sincerely,

ALBERT L. ZAKARKO.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: The 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated by millions of Lithuanians on February 16.

For the past 22 years, however, Lithuania has been under Russian rule.

It would be sincerely appreciated if you would commemorate this day in the Chamber of the Senate.

Yours truly,

Miss LILLIAN M. SASNAUSKAS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues today in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, which will be observed on February 16.

At a time when so many millions of freedom-loving peoples of the world are forced to live under the yoke of Communist totalitarianism, it is appropriate that we pay tribute to Lithuanians all over the world and particularly to those 3 million stouthearted Lithuanians now living under Soviet enslavement.

Lithuania has been subjugated to frequent conquest by tyrannical rulers since the 13th century. After years of valiant struggle, this little freedom-loving country finally was able to break from the bonds of Russian domination, and proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918.

The next two decades saw the Lithuanian people make remarkable strides in all walks of life, and they soon established a model democracy in their area of the world. However, with the outset of World War II, this industrious nation was overrun again by the Russian Army and subsequently stripped of her right of self-determination and national identity.

Despite all the trials and tribulations under Soviet domination, the Lithuanian love of liberty, fortified by a firm belief in Christian principles, has not died. Americans of Lithuanian descent have kept these ideals of their homeland intact. They have contributed to the culture and political heritage of our country through demonstrated devotion to democratic ideals and a strong belief in justice and liberty.

I share with all Lithuanians their aspirations for the freedom and independence of the land of their forefathers, and fervently hope and pray that the day is not too distant when this country justly will enjoy true and lasting independence.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, if it had not been for Russian aggression in 1940, the people behind the Iron Curtain in Lithuania would tomorrow be openly celebrating the 44th anniversary of its independence. It is an irony of our time that these brave people are enslaved after two wars were fought to preserve democracy and the right of all people to be free.

We who are free should stop on this occasion to ponder on the hardships of the Lithuanian people and consider what we can do to encourage them. We should stop on this occasion to renew our pledge never to relax our efforts to help them. It is our responsibility. It is the responsibility of all free peoples.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. It is appropriate that the Senate should pause each year at this time to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people who, for years, have had to endure Soviet oppression.

It has been said that one cannot appreciate freedom until he has known slavery. The people of Lithuania have known both. Today, Lithuania is not free. Today, the people of Lithuania do not enjoy the freedom and liberty they once knew. Today, as we pay tribute to the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we must also take note of another anniversary—that of her enslavement.

Since 1940, Lithuania has been dominated by the Soviet Union. Her people have witnessed mass deportations to slave labor camps. The Soviet Union has exploited this country to the point where freedom exists only in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. I salute the valiant people of Lithuania, who, in the face of such great odds, have continued to fight against oppression.

Unfortunately, our salutes and tributes have little value unless we are prepared to back them up with action. The U.S. Government does not recognize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania. We all know that this is just another case of Soviet aggression.

Let us, then, do more than eulogize freedom. The time has come for this Nation to press the question of Soviet exploitation of the Baltic States. If we are to give meaning to the principles which we hold so dear, then we must speak out officially on this question.

This subject should be raised in the United Nations and at every other international conclave where the Soviet Union is represented. In this way, perhaps, we may truly look forward to the day when Lithuanian independence will be a reality rather than a memory.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, we are edified today in being led in our devotion by a minister of God whose homeland has felt the heavy crush of its oppressors' shackles.

Let us heed the request for grace asked by one who knows the terror of a heathen tyranny, the hopes of a beleaguered people.

We must rededicate ourselves to that highest objective of God-fearing peoples—that all men shall live in dignity as freemen. We must be inspired by the strong hearts which beat today in Lithuania, on this anniversary of restoration of independence, and take a fresh and deep vigor from their great demonstrations of faith and courage.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is the power and the glory of America that many peoples have contributed their cultures to her character of humanity, equity, opportunity and responsibility.

We are ever grateful, ever ready to recognize our debt to each who shares our democracy.

In a special way at this time in February we find it fitting to pay our respects to Lithuania.

A million men, women and children of Lithuanian descent add their merit to the mosaic of our Republic. One might think that 1 million in a panorama of 180 million might make only a faint coloring. But in the natural clinging of newcomers to one another, there is a concentration of Lithuanians in favored places. Rhode Island is fortunate to be such a place.

From their churches we know our valued neighbors to be God fearing and God serving. From their organizations, we know their helpful activities in our community life. From their record we know their loyal part in the development and defense of our country. From their personal history, we know their gifts for leadership evidenced in the places of honor they have attained in scholarship, statesmanship and citizenship.

We share the Lithuanian pride in the 1,000 years of their recorded history as a nation.

If I were to borrow one paragraph to describe that history it would be this:

The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and Tartars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

But, as we share their pride, we share the pathos of Lithuanian history. They lost their liberty as a nation just at the time that we had won our independence.

Russia's heel was upon Lithuania from 1795 to the Russian Revolution of 1917.

February 16, 1918, was Independence Day for Lithuania. On that date she had chosen to become a republic in those days of self-determination.

But night closed in on Lithuania's dream of liberty when the hordes of Soviet communism moved in with treachery and torture in August of 1940.

Lithuanians by countless thousands were sent to death or to an existence worse than death. I will quote another paragraph of Lithuanian history. We will look over the shoulder of a Soviet commissar to read the instructions on how to torture the Lithuanians.

The document is labeled "Top Secret." It reads in this section:

The deportation of anti-Soviet elements is a problem of great political importance. It must be borne in mind that operations must be accomplished without noise or panic so as to preclude outbreaks or other excesses by those scheduled for deportation. Since most of the deportees are to be arrested and placed in special prison camps and their families sent to special settlements in remote districts, it is necessary to remove the heads of families along with other members of the family without notifying them of their impending separation. The whole family will be conveyed to the loading station on the same cart; only at the station will the head of the family be separated from the family and placed in a special car designed for the heads of families.

Such is the efficiency of terrorism. Such is the introduction to extermination. That quotation is from the authoritative book, "What We Must Know About Communism."

The Lithuanians in their blood and tears have taught us a lesson in communism.

That lesson is that only in strength can we preserve freedom. We must never forget that lesson—and we must never forget the people in whose suffering the true character of Soviet aggression is written.

We shall be vigilant—or we could be next.

We salute the Freedom Day of February 16, 1918, because we salute the Lithuanian people whose love, desire, and daring for freedom will never die.

Lithuania will live forever.

America has never ratified the Russian rape of that courageous land. America never will.

America's prayer is that one day Lithuania shall again be free and at peace.

America's promise is that she shall ever be more powerful—but that she shall use her power for peace—to the end that the whole world may be one in humanity, equity, opportunity, and responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence in 1918.

On that day, after centuries of czarist subjugation, the people of Lithuania threw out their Russian overlords and declared their independence. The Soviets tried to reinvade the country but were driven out and signed a treaty with Lithuania in 1920 voluntarily renouncing all sovereign rights imposed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

The country was invaded by the Nazis early in World War II. Then, in 1940, in precise violation of their word the Soviets reentered. Since that day, for over two decades, Lithuania has been under Russian rule. During that time constant attempts have been made to wipe the country's culture out entirely. The night Lithuania was occupied it is estimated that 30,000 of its people were deported to Siberia. Hundreds of thousands more deportations followed in subsequent years. Thousands of intellectuals were executed or deported and Russian settlers brought in in order to convert the Lithuanian civilization to Russian civilization.

The Russians have also systematically oppressed the Lithuanian Catholic Church. The last bishop in a country that had once been overwhelmingly Catholic was placed under house arrest last year. Last month, Roman Catholic priests were put on trial in Lithuania on false charges of currency speculation. Sources believe this may be the beginning of a program to eliminate the priesthood and the Vatican feels it may provide a starting point for attacks on the church throughout Eastern Europe.

All these actions indicate that the Russians are determined to eventually eliminate all traces of Lithuanian religion and culture as it once existed and to make it unrecognizable from any other Soviet province. I am glad to say that the U.S. Government has refused to recognize the Soviet occupation of this country since 1940. I know that all Americans will join me in deploring the actions taken by the Soviets against the sovereign people of Lithuania and hope as I do that some day these people will be free from Soviet tyranny and able to live under a government of their own choosing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to join today with the millions of Americans of Lithuanian descent who are commemorating the 44th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people, after centuries of czarist domination, established their own Government and proclaimed their independence. This period of independence lasted until 1940, when Lithuania was again brought under Russian rule.

Today we here in the United States should reflect upon the valiant struggle for freedom which Lithuanians have waged. Our thoughts should go out not only to Lithuanians but to all the peoples of the world who have no right of self-determination.

The Lithuanian struggle for national identity and freedom will continue. We all join in the hope that they will some day soon become one of the free and independent nations of the world.

Let these words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt be a constant reminder to all of us:

It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence. Lithuania's independence has only temporarily been put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again. This will happen much sooner than you may expect.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, February 16 this year is the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania in 1918—an independence which unfortunately lasted only until 1940, when Lithuania was occupied by the Soviet Army. Since then, following 3 years of Nazi rule, Lithuania has been a component republic of the Soviet Union.

Our own country recognized the independence of Lithuania in 1922 and has never recognized its incorporation by the Soviet Union. We continue to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent government, which has a legation here in Washington.

The political, religious, and cultural freedom of the Lithuanian people in a world of freedom is a continuing U.S. objective. We must continue to work by all peaceful means for the day when Lithuania and her sister Baltic States will be able to emerge from their present condition and join in the mainstream of free national development.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week we celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day and it is altogether fitting that we pause to mark this important event in the history of a brave nation. February 16, 1918, marked the end of well over a century during which Lithuania suffered under a hostile, foreign rule. But on that day she stood forth as an independent democratic republic. There was cause for rejoicing and confidence in the future as Lithuania joined in the great flowering of national self-determination at the end of the First World War. But we all know that this independence came to an end little more than 20 years later when the Soviet Union decreed that Lithuania was to become a constituent "republic" of the U.S.S.R.

Some people may ask why we continue to celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day here in the U.S. Congress. They may point to the massive power of the Soviet Union and to the fact that Red troops have occupied Lithuania continuously since the so-called liberation in 1944. What hope, they may ask, is there that Lithuania will ever again be independent? Why keep on fooling ourselves and the 1 million Lithuanian-Americans by celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day each year? But I say that this view is shortsighted, presumptuous, and constitutes a betrayal of our own democratic faith.

We have no power to know what possibilities the future may bring. The Lithuanian people may find the way to independence and freedom opened to them by means that we do not even dream about today. Let us not, therefore, help to consign Lithuania to an eternal colonialism by failing to keep alive the memory of the independent Lithuanian nation. We are not engaged merely in a sentimental recollection of something that happened 44 years ago and has no importance today. We must help keep alive the hope that the brave Lithuanian nation will once again become a sovereign unit of this world.

But there is a second and equally important reason for marking Lithuanian Independence Day here in the U.S. Congress. If we truly believe that man ought to be free and that totalitarianism is evil then we cannot cease to proclaim these convictions. If we forget our fellow men who live under the heavy yoke of Soviet Russian imperialism then we will have betrayed our own faith. We must not permit the truth that man was created in the image of God and that he has a right to justice and freedom in this world to be obscured by the actions of the Soviet dictator. Let us continue, therefore, to celebrate Lithuanian independence here in the United States in order to speed the day when Lithuania will again be independent and to affirm our belief that man was created for freedom.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the independence of the people of Lithuania was proclaimed on February 16, 1918; and I am proud to join in the observance of the 44th anniversary of that historic day.

For 21 years after that date the Lithuanian people enjoyed the reestablishment of their freedom; but shortly after the outbreak of World War II, their country was overrun by the Soviet armies. Conquest by the Kremlin was followed by deportations, imprisonment, religious persecution, labor camps, and other repressive measures; but the spirit of the people could not be broken, and the hope of regaining their liberty continued to burn brightly in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

The right of the oppressed people of this unhappy country to liberty and independence is upheld by the principle of self-determination which the United States has championed.

This principle applies to Lithuania as well as to all other captive peoples who are striving to keep alive the light of liberty and the hope of independence. In the fight against Communist imperialism, all the resources of diplomacy, morality, and our friendly relations with other peoples must be brought to bear in support of this principle of self-determination. I hope the people of Lithuania will find encouragement for their hopes for independence and freedom from Communist tyranny in the not too distant future.

So, Mr. President, I call attention to the unflagging spirit of freedom of the Lithuanian people; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the proclamation on Lithuanian Independence Day, by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York.

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

PROCLAMATION BY GOV. NELSON ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK

For two happy decades the people of Lithuania enjoyed freedom. They won worldwide respect by setting up a government based on the ideas of equality of opportunity and the dignity of the individual.

In 1940 the Soviet Union trampled on its treaty obligations and the rights of its neighbors. Lithuanians suffered under a ruthless process of colonization and systematic decimation.

Soviet cruelty has been unable to quench the eternal spirt of freedom in the people of Lithuania. They cherish, as we do, the principle of full human right for all human beings, no matter what their station, race, creed, or color. We have an obligation to them which we must discharge in ways small, and large, and in ways private and public. We must show our solicitude for the Lithuanian people by our prayers for them, by demonstrating our sympathy by every legal means. By our words and our actions we can continue to give them hope, trusting that, by the intervention of divine providence they may enjoy again that freedom which is so close to their hearts: Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1961, as "Lithuanian Independence Day" in the State of New York.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the Capitol in the city of Albany this first day of February in the year of our Lord 1961.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Friday we mark the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania in 1918 from czarist Russian rule. It should be a joyous occasion. It is not, for today Lithuania suffers once again Russian rule—that of Soviet Russia—in the form of one of the cruelest tyrannies in history.

Although there is no cause for rejoicing today, we should pause nonetheless and commemorate if nothing else the shocking fact that in this enlightened 20th century, in Europe—the cradle of one of the great civilizations in the world—an ancient and noble people with a long and glorious history and a high culture is victimized by the savage imperialism of Soviet Russia.

Whereas since the close of World War II in other parts of the world colonial areas began gaining their freedom and emerging as sovereign nations, in Lithuania, a hitherto free and independent nation in the Western community of nations, there was imposed by Soviet Russia as ruthless and bloody an imperialist regime as the world has ever seen.

Not only were the Lithuanian people deprived of their freedom, not only were they viciously exploited economically, but great numbers of them were deported to Siberia and other inhospitable areas of Russia there to live a dog's life or die.

The infamous Russian methods of systematic repression were instituted. The intellectuals of Lithuania were liquidated, the beautiful Lithuanian language was forbidden, religious orders were persecuted, and churches closed.

Mr. President, throughout its history down to the very present day, Europe has stood in danger of being engulfed by the autocratic despotism of the East. In the 14th century, Lithuania freely associated with Poland, accepted Christianity and the elevating values of the great Greco-Christian-Judaic tradition and thus became a part of Europe. For centuries thereafter Lithuania with Poland fended off Eastern pressures, holding back the inimical forces of autocracy which constantly threatened Europe from the vast Asiatic landmass.

To play this role in history, to develop their beautiful music, their literature, and their high culture, the Lithuanians had to be a sturdy, inventive, and persevering people. And today, despite monstrous oppression, the Lithuanian people, true to their history and their traditions, remain utterly devoted to the European idea of individual dignity and freedom and with all the meager means at their disposal oppose their oppressors.

Americans of Lithuanian background today reaffirm with their brothers in Europe the Lithuanian ideal of freedom and dignity for all human beings. They in their country preserve the Lithuanian language and music and culture, and constantly press upon the world's conscience the plight of the Lithuanian nation. From this and the reiteration that America has not forgotten them, let us pray that the Lithuanian people take added strength in their continuing fight for freedom and liberty.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to recognize, with my colleagues in this body, the fact that tomorrow will be Lithuanian Independence Day.

Our hearts are with our Lithuanian friends. Lithuanian Americans have made a great contribution to the progress of our country in the fields of art, literature, music, commerce, and all forms of education. We all look forward to the day when Lithuania as we once knew it will again breathe the fresh air of freedom.

Forty-four years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent state based on democratic principles. Today, in sharp contrast, the nation of Lithuania is submerged in one of the most extensive totalitarian empires the world has ever known. It is my hope that our tributes today in the Senate of the United States will encourage the Lithuanian people to keep alive the hope that someday they will again know the joys of freedom and of democratic institutions.

Many times in its 1,000 years of recorded history Lithuania has been subjugated by one of its larger neighbors, but never has its culture been lost and never have its people lost their love of freedom. For example, in 1795, Lithuania was annexed to Russia, and in 1831 the czarist government launched an attempt to replace the Lithuanian language with Russian. Although the policy of forced russification was followed for several generations, it was so unsuccessful that it was abandoned soon after the turn of the 20th century.

The many years of resistance to tyranny and of striving for independence were rewarded at the end of the First World War. After occupation by the Russian Army, then the German Army, and then again the Russians, all the invaders were at last driven out and Lithuania emerged as a sovereign state. Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania, recognizing it as a sovereign state and promising to renounce all rights of sovereignty forever. For the next two

decades the Lithuanian people had an opportunity to experience the liberty which they had cherished as a goal for so long.

Unfortunately, the Second World War wiped away the independence which Lithuania had achieved in the First World War, and from it Lithuania emerged unwillingly as a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. But just as the Lithuanian people have survived other dark periods in their history, let us have faith that they will survive this one. On this 44th anniversary of their independence day, let us reassure them that the United States is continuing in the never-ending effort to strengthen freedom throughout the world. Let us reaffirm our hope that someday all people everywhere will have the right to choose for themselves the system of government under which their nation shall live.

THE BUDGET RECORD — FISCAL YEAR 1954 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, very shortly the Senate Appropriations Committee will be dealing with the Federal budget and with the appropriation bills, if it has not already done so. I have caused to be prepared what I believe to be a careful and authentic budget record from the fiscal year 1954 through the fiscal year 1962. I ask unanimous consent that it and the appended papers be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

THE BUDGET RECORD—FISCAL YEAR 1954 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1962

FISCAL YEAR 1954

Prior to leaving office in January 1953, President Truman submitted to Congress his final budget covering his recommendations and estimates for the fiscal year 1954. In comparison with final results for fiscal 1953, the budget reflected a reduction of $8.1 billion in new obligational authority—almost wholly because of lower defense appropriation requests—but it provided for a $3.6 billion increase in expenditures. Receipts were estimated at $3.2 billion above the actual total in 1953.

Promptly after taking office, the Eisenhower administration began preparation of its own budget recommendations with the objective being a substantial reduction in the level of Federal spending. The Republican 83d Congress gave its full support to this economy effort and was able to effect considerable additional budget reductions beyond those made by the new administration.

The final results, including actions taken during the second half of the 1954 fiscal year, reflected reductions from the Truman proposals of $9.4 billion in new obligational authority and $10.1 billion in expenditures. Receipts turned out to be $3.3 billion less than the Truman budget estimate, but the $9.9 billion Truman deficit was reduced to $3.1 billion for a net improvement of $6.8 billion in the final budget results.

Comparisons of final results with the budget figures for 1954 and subsequent years are shown in tabular form on page 12 of this analysis.

FISCAL YEAR 1955

President Eisenhower submitted his first budget to Congress in January 1954. It covered his fiscal program for the 1955 fiscal year. The budget provided for new obligational authority of $56.3 billion and expenditures of $65.6 billion. These amounts represented reductions of $6.5 billion in obligational authority and $2.2 billion in expenditures from the final results for 1954. Receipts were estimated at $62.7 billion, or $2 billion less than in 1954, after allowing for substantial tax reductions recommended in the budget. A deficit of $2.9 billion was expected.

The Republican Congress made relatively modest net changes in the budget proposals. Obligational authority was increased by $0.8 billion, principally by provision of $500 million new Treasury borrowing authority each to the Export-Import Bank and to FNMA. This total of $1 billion was not provided for in the original budget document. On the other hand, the Congress effected enough appropriation reductions in current expenditure items to help lower the final expenditure total to $64.6 billion, or $1 billion less than the original budget estimate.

Actual receipts were $60.4 billion, or $2.3 billion less than estimated. A part of the lowering of receipts was accounted for by a $1 billion reduction in excise taxes, effective April 1, 1954, which was not recommended in the budget. Other tax reductions which became effective in calendar year 1954 and were effective for the full fiscal year 1955 amounted to $6.4 billion on an annual basis. Thus, the total tax reductions were $7.4 billion. The deficit was $4.2 billion, or $1.3 billion more than the budget estimate.

FISCAL YEAR 1956

In his fiscal 1956 budget President Eisenhower proposed new obligational authority of $58.6 billion for an increase of $1.5 billion over 1955. Estimated expenditures, however, were down to $62.4 billion from $64.6 billion in 1955, and receipts were estimated at $60 billion, or slightly lower than in 1955. A deficit of $2.4 billion was anticipated.

The final results showed substantial changes from the original budget totals. New obligational authority and expenditures were increased $4.6 billion and $4.1 billion, respectively, and receipts rose $8.1 billion above the original budget estimate. Over half the increase in new obligational authority was for agricultural programs. Interest and housing programs rose about $0.5 billion each. The housing legislation was not recommended by the President. The first year's authorization for the interstate highway system accounted for $1.2 billion of the increase in obligational authority.

It was not included in the original budget because bond financing was contemplated by the administration.

The sharp rise in economic activity in 1955 and 1956—from $363 billion GNP in 1954 to $398 billion in 1955 and $419 billion in 1956—caused a rise in receipts from the budget estimate of $60 billion to an actual total of $68.1 billion. It is more than coincidence that this rise in economic activity and revenues followed the $7.4 billion tax reductions effected in calendar 1954. The final budget results showed a surplus of $1.6 billion for an improvement of $4 billion over the originally estimated deficit of $2.4 billion.

FISCAL YEAR 1957

The 1957 budget called for new obligational authority of $66.3 billion, and expenditures and receipts were estimated at $65.9 billion and $66.3 billion, respectively. Thus, a surplus of $0.4 billion was anticipated.

Obligational authority and expenditures in the final results showed increases of $3.9 billion and $3.5 billion, respectively, above the budget estimates. These increases were largely accounted for by rising costs of agricultural programs and defense. New spending authority was increased $2.9 billion for farm programs and $1.4 billion for defense. Foreign aid authorizations were cut $1.1 billion. The rise above budgeted expenditures included increases of $2.9 billion in defense and $1.3 billion in farm programs. Foreign aid expenditures were $0.4 billion less than the budget estimate.

Receipts continued to rise with further gains in economic activity and totaled $4.7 billion above the budget estimate of $66.3 billion. The surplus came to $1.6 billion, the same as in fiscal 1956, and was $1.2 billion above the original estimate.

FISCAL YEAR 1958

Estimates in the 1958 budget anticipated a continuation of the rise in spending and receipts which had been experienced in the 2 previous years. Proposed new obligational authority totaled $73.3 billion and expenditures were estimated at $71.8 billion.

These amounts were $3.1 billion and $2.4 billion higher, respectively, than actual obligational authority and expenditures in 1957. Receipts were estimated at $73.6 billion—$2.6 billion above 1957—and a surplus of $1.8 billion was indicated.

The Nation was in an economy mood during the 1957 congressional session. The President himself reduced his new fund requests by $1.2 billion and Congress made additional sharp reductions in appropriations with the result that it approved only $67.7 billion of new obligational authority, or $5.6 billion less than originally proposed in the budget. Reductions effected by the President and Congress included $3.2 billion in defense and $1.6 billion in foreign aid. In addition, the President vetoed Federal civilian pay increase bills and a veterans home loan bill which would have added $1.1 billion in 1958 spending.

Early in the 1958 session, however, some large additional authorizations were approved for fiscal 1958. They included $2.0 billion for Export-Import Bank, $1.6 billion for farm programs, $0.4 billion for VA programs, $1.6 billion for housing programs, $1.4 billion for defense, $0.3 billion for HEW, and $0.7 billion for Labor (temporary Federal unemployment compensation). As a result of these second session increases new obligational authority approved for 1958 was $3 billion above the original budget in spite of the heavy budget cutting in the first session. Expenditures in 1958 rose only $0.1 billion above the budget.

The economic recession which became quite apparent in the fall of 1957 affected fiscal 1958 receipts adversely, in the second half particularly, and they fell $4.5 billion below the budget estimate to $69.1 billion. The result was a deficit of $2.8 billion instead of the $1.8 billion surplus projected in the budget.

FISCAL YEAR 1959

The fiscal 1959 budget estimates were prepared without adequate recognition of the impact of the 1957–58 recession on revenues, particularly corporate taxes. The spending spree of Congress in the 1958 session could not, of course, have been foreseen. Proposed new obligational authority totaled $72.5 billion and the expenditures estimate was $73.9 billion. Receipts were estimated at $74.4 billion, and a surplus of $0.5 billion was anticipated.

Two factors existent at the time the 1959 budget came up for consideration had a very large impact on the final results. The primary factor was the recession, but the Russian sputniks also had an important effect on spending. Even before Congress actually began to consider the budget, the President increased his request for defense funds by $1.5 billion.

Final results showed a rise in new obligational authority of $8.9 billion above the original 1959 budget. This increase included the additional requests of $1.5 billion defense funds proposed by the President, a $3.2 billion subscription to the World Bank, and a $1.4 billion subscription to the International Monetary Fund. These latter two items were proposed in the fiscal 1960 budget message as supplementals for 1959. The remaining $2.8 billion of increase in obligational authority was largely due to decisions of Congress contrary to recommendations of the President.

Actual expenditures in fiscal 1959 also rose sharply from the original budget estimate of $73.9 billion to $80.7 billion for an increase of $6.8 billion. Of this total increase, $1.4 billion was the payment to the International Monetary Fund and the remaining $5.4 billion was for regular budget purposes. The larger increases in expenditures were $1.5 billion in defense, $0.3 billion in VA programs, $0.3 billion in Export-Import Bank activities, $0.7 billion in housing programs, $2.1 billion in farm program costs, $0.2 billion in HEW programs, and $0.6 billion in Department of Labor programs.

Budget receipts came to only $68.3 billion, or $6.1 billion less than the original 1959 budget estimate. Corporate income taxes fell $3.1 billion below the estimate and individual income taxes were short by $1.8 billion. All other revenues except customs duties also failed to reach expectations. The increase of $6.8 billion in expenditures and the revenue decrease of $6.1 billion from budget estimates combined to wipe out the anticipated surplus of $0.5 billion and produce a deficit of $12.4 billion.

FISCAL YEAR 1960

When President Eisenhower submitted his fiscal 1960 budget to Congress in January 1959, economic recovery was well underway. The expected level of receipts was placed at $77.1 billion against which expenditures of $77 billion were budgeted. Proposed new obligational authority amounted to $76.8 billion, a decline of $4.6 billion from the amount actually provided in fiscal 1959.

The ink on the 1960 budget had barely a chance to dry before several committees, particularly in the Senate, began to consider a number of new spending measures providing for expenditures far in excess of budget recommendations. The Senate quickly passed three of these bills—housing, civilian airports, and area redevelopment. But then budget-busting actions were slowed up considerably, mainly because of the strong stand taken by President Eisenhower on holding expenditures down to the budget level. Through vetoes and implied threats of vetoes, enactment of most of the bigger spending measures under consideration was forestalled.

The final results show that expenditures were held in line in spite of a $1.3 billion rise above the original budget estimate for interest costs. Total expenditures were $76.5 billion, or $0.5 billion less than the budget. On the other hand, receipts at $77.7 billion were $0.6 billion more than anticipated, with the result being an actual surplus of $1.2 billion instead of the original budget surplus of $0.1 billion. New obligational authority, however, came to $79.6 billion, or $2.8 billion above the budget. Principal factors accounting for this increase were the rise in interest costs, a doubling of the President's $0.4 billion request for housing programs, failure to enact proposed postal rate increases of $0.4 billion, and a $0.3 billion increase in HEW programs.

FISCAL YEAR 1961

In January 1960 the budget estimates for the ensuing fiscal year anticipated a continuing rise in economic activity through the calendar year 1960. Receipts and expenditures for fiscal year 1961 were estimated at $84 billion and $79.8 billion, respectively, and a surplus of $4.2 billion was indicated. Proposed new obligational authority totaled $79.4 billion.

Congress approved three major spending measures which were not proposed in the budget, and actively considered several others which failed of enactment because of Presidential vetoes or by being blocked in the House Rules Committee. The three that were enacted—Federal pay raises, veterans' housing loans, and medical services for the aged—added about $0.9 billion to the budget. Expenditures were also increased by the failure of Congress to approve $0.6 billion proposed postal rate increases.

Estimates for fiscal 1961 in the budget document for fiscal 1962 were revised materially from the original 1961 estimates. New obligational authority was increased to $82.1 billion from $79.4 billion, in part because of increases previously effected by Congress above budget recommendations and in part on the initiation of the President. An example of the latter was a $0.5 billion supplemental for the new Inter-American social and economic cooperation program. The effect of the business decline in calendar 1960 on fiscal 1961 receipts was evident in the new estimate which was down $5 billion from the original estimate of $84 billion. Expenditures were also revised downward by $0.9 billion to $78.9 billion, and a surplus of $0.1 billion in 1961 was indicated instead of the $4.2 billion surplus originally budgeted.

On March 24, 1961 President Kennedy submitted to Congress revisions of the budget for 1961 and 1962. The 1961 revisions included a $0.5 billion reduction in receipts and a $1.7 billion increase in expenditures. These changes put the 1961 budget into a $2.2 billion deficit position instead of the $0.1 billion surplus position in the January 1961 estimates. In addition, proposed new obligational authority for 1961 was increased from $82.1 billion to $87.1 billion.

The President stated in his March 24 message that $0.4 billion of the $1.7 billion expenditure increase for 1961 was due to reestimates of budgeted programs and $1.3 billion was the result of his administration's program changes and administrative actions. Of this latter amount approximately 20 percent was for defense and 80 percent for nondefense programs.

Virtually all of the proposed $5 billion increase in new obligational authority was for nondefense purposes, with only $63 million being for defense. The larger nondefense increases included $0.4 billion for foreign economic assistance, $0.7 billion for housing programs, $2.5 billion for CCC programs, $1 billion for temporary extended unemployment compensation, and $0.2 billion for the special milk program.

The final results for fiscal 1961 show that approved new obligational authority totaled $86.6 billion, or only $0.5 billion less than Mr. Kennedy proposed. Expenditures at $81.5 billion were $0.8 billion above the President's March 24 estimates and receipts at $77.6 billion were $0.9 billion below March 24 estimates. Thus, the deficit for 1961 was $3.9 billion as compared to the March 24 estimated deficit of $2.1 billion. The adverse change from President Eisenhower's January 1961 surplus estimate of $0.1 billion to an actual deficit of $3.9 billion was due to a $1.4 billion decline in receipts and a $2.6 billion increase in expenditures.

FISCAL YEAR 1962

The last Eisenhower budget (for fiscal 1962) proposed new obligational authority of $80.9 billion and estimated expenditures of the same amount. Receipts were placed at $82.3 billion and a surplus of $1.4 billion was indicated.

While budget revisions were sent to Congress throughout the last session, major revisions with revised overall budget totals were submitted by the Kennedy administration in three stages. The first was the March 24 and 28 revisions of nondefense and defense programs, respectively. The second was on May 25 and the third was on July 25.

The March revisions increased new obligational authority for 1962 $5.1 billion above the Eisenhower budget, increased expenditures $3.4 billion, and lowered receipts $0.9 billion. The revisions in expenditures and receipts shifted the 1962 budget from a $1.4 billion surplus to a $2.8 billion deficit. Of the $3.4 billion expenditure increase, $0.8 billion was in major national security programs, and $2.6 billion was for other purposes.

The $5.1 billion increase in obligational authority included $1.8 billion for national security and $3.3 billion for other purposes.

On the basis of the May 25 revisions, proposed new obligational authority was increased an additional $1.6 billion to $87.6 billion and expenditures were revised upward to $85.1 billion. At that time there was no change in the estimate for receipts, but rising expenditures boosted the deficit estimate to $3.7 billion.

Following the July 25 revisions, proposed new obligational authority stood at $91.1 billion, or $10.2 billion more than the Eisenhower budget total. Estimated expenditures of $87.7 billion were $6.8 billion above the budget, and receipts at $82.4 billion were slightly above the budget. The deficit then stood at $5.3 billion.

The next official budget estimates appeared in the 1962 Budget Review of October 29. These estimates took into account the changes made by Congress in acting on the fiscal program for 1962 and included more up-to-date estimates on expenditures and receipts. Major decisions of Congress reducing spending were the 1962 foreign aid appropriations cut of almost $0.9 billion and refusal to approve the general school aid bill. Congressional actions increasing spending authority and expenditures in 1962 were its refusal to approve $0.7 billion postal rate increases and its voting $0.5 billion more in appropriations and reappropriations for defense than President Kennedy requested.

The October 29 Budget Review indicates that Congress approved $91.9 billion of new obligational authority for 1962 and that $1.4 billion supplemental requests for 1962 will be submitted to Congress. These supplementals include $600 million for CCC programs, $300 million for military functions, $140 million for public assistance, and lesser amounts for several other purposes. With the supplementals included, the total of new obligational authority in 1962 is $93.3 billion. This is $12.4 billion more than was proposed for 1962 by President Eisenhower. The expenditures estimate is $89 billion, or $8.1 billion more than in the Eisenhower budget.

The increases of $12.4 billion in new obligational authority and $8.1 billion in expenditures are broken down as follows:

[In billions]

	New obligational authority	Expenditures
Major national security	+$6.1	+$3.7
International affairs and finance	+.3	+.3
Commerce, housing, and space technology	+2.0	+1.7
Agriculture and agricultural resources	+2.2	+1.2
Natural resources	+.1	
Health, labor, welfare, and education	+1.1	+.8
Veterans' services and benefits		
Interest	+.4	+.4
General government	+.1	+.1
Total	+12.4	+8.1

Receipts are estimated at $82.1 billion in the October 29 Budget Review. With expenditures estimated at $89 billion, a deficit of $6.9 billion is anticipated. This represents an adverse change of $8.3 billion from the surplus of $1.4 billion planned in the Eisenhower budget.

THE 1963 BUDGET

It is now generally expected that the fiscal 1963 budget to be submitted by President Kennedy will be in balance at about $92 billion. To arrive at budget balance at that level it will be assumed that receipts in 1963 will rise about $10 billion above the October estimate for 1962 and that postal rate increases of about $600 million will be enacted.

Military expenditures will probably be close to $49 billion, or $2 billion more than the current estimate for 1962. A total of $780 million voted by Congress for three projects in 1962 has been withheld by the administration from availability for obligation. The total includes $514 million for additional B–52's, $180 million for the B–70 program, and $86 million for the Dynasoar. These funds will be applied to reduction of appropriations being requested for 1963. Reportedly, the budget will include no funds for the railroad-based Minuteman ICBM missile program or for production of parts for the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile.

[In billions]

	New obligational authority	Expenditures	Receipts	Surplus or deficit
Fiscal year 1954:				
Truman budget	$72.2	$77.9	$68.0	−$9.9
Final results	62.8	67.8	64.7	−3.1
Difference	−9.4	−10.1	−3.3	+6.8
Fiscal year 1955:				
Budget document	56.3	65.6	62.7	−2.9
Final results	57.1	64.6	60.4	−4.2
Difference	+.8	−1.0	−2.3	−1.3
Fiscal year 1956:				
Budget document	58.6	62.4	60.0	−2.4
Final results	63.2	66.5	68.1	+1.6
Difference	+4.6	+4.1	+8.1	+4.0
Fiscal year 1957:				
Budget document	66.3	65.9	66.3	+.4
Final results	70.2	69.4	71.0	+1.6
Difference	+3.9	+3.5	+4.7	+1.2
Fiscal year 1958:				
Budget document	73.3	71.8	73.6	+1.8
Final results	76.3	71.9	69.1	−2.8
Difference	+3.0	+.1	−4.5	−4.6
Fiscal year 1959:				
Budget document	$72.5	$73.9	$74.4	+$.5
Final results	81.4	80.7	68.3	−12.4
Difference	+8.9	+6.8	−6.1	−12.9
Fiscal year 1960:				
Budget document	76.8	77.0	77.1	+1
Final results	79.6	76.5	77.7	+1.2
Difference	+2.8	−.5	+.6	+1.1
Fiscal year 1961:				
Budget document	79.4	79.8	84.0	+4.2
January 1961 estimates	82.1	78.9	79.0	+.1
Kennedy revisions	87.1	80.7	78.5	−2.2
Final results	86.6	81.5	77.6	−3.9
Difference between January 1961 estimates and final results	+4.5	+2.6	−1.4	−4.0
Fiscal year 1962:				
Eisenhower budget	80.9	80.9	82.3	+1.4
Kennedy revisions, Mar. 28	86.0	84.3	81.4	−2.8
Kennedy revisions, May 25	87.6	85.1	81.4	−3.7
Kennedy revisions, July 25	91.1	87.7	82.4	−5.3
October 1961 estimates	[1] 93.3	89.0	82.1	−6.9
Difference between Eisenhower budget and October 1961 estimates	+12.4	+8.1	−.2	−8.3

[1] Includes amounts enacted plus anticipated supplementals of $1.4 billion.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE OF SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it is my understanding that yesterday Arizona celebrated its 50th anniversary of statehood. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that next Monday, February 19, will mark the 50th anniversary of the assumption of office, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN of Arizona.

U.S. APPROACH TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of February 14, 1962, there appeared an article by Virginia Prewett, a highly informed correspondent on Latin American affairs. Miss Prewett touches on a significant and dangerous tendency in our approach to Latin America—our tendency to become obsessed with the sensational, the dramatic, and the extreme, and to overlook the steady and progressive forces that also are at work in Latin America. Miss Prewett describes a land-reform movement and its leader in the nation of Peru which she categorizes as such a force. So far as I am aware, this is the first time it has been brought to the attention of the people of the United States. In noting this development, Miss Prewett has reminded us of the need for a balanced understanding of the Latin American situation, and has thereby performed a distinguished journalistic service.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

ANTI-RED LEADER OF PEASANTS

(By Virginia Prewett)

Francisco Juliao, the self-avowed Communist peasant leader who has been built up as an international threat in Brazil's northeast, has visted Cuba and Mexico with great international fanfare.

But has anybody ever heard of Rafael Avalos?

Rafael Avalos is a Latin-American anti-Communist peasant leader whose national federation, quietly at work in Peru, has beaten the brains out of opposing Communist leagues that have tried to organize peasants living in ultrafeudal conditions.

Juliao burst into prominence as result of discovery by the U.S. press, just as Fidel Castro did. This writer, who met Sr. Avalos in Lima last March, has deliberately waited nearly a year to see if Sr. Avalos would ever be similarly discovered.

The Avalos case would indicate that we're a lot quicker to build up our opposition in Latin America than recognize those leaders who share our democratic aims.

Rafael Avalos is an intense, earnest young man, a leader of the Federacion Nacional de Campesinos del Peru (Fencap), which is allied with the world free trade union movement. Fencap is old, but had fallen into inactivity. Under the auspices of the anti-Communist Peruvian Labor Confederation, Sr. Avalos and his group prepared carefully through 1958 and 1959 to do battle with the Communists. The latter were then creating "ghost" organizations among the peasants.

LANGUAGE

In 1960, the Fencap called 350 local leaders from all over Peru to a national meeting. Peru has 6 million peasants, who represent 72 percent of the labor force. Three-fourths of the peasants speak only Indian tongues. Fencap's first task was training enough Indian-speaking organizers.

Fencap launched a program to help, protect, educate, and train the campesinos for landownership and membership in cooperatives, as opposed to the communistic tactic of promoting revolutionary strikes and urging peasants to seize land. Meanwhile, Fencap presses for land reform.

In 2 years of rugged infighting, Fencap has routed most of the pro-Communist leagues, while gaining a solid peasant membership of more than 40,000. One hundred and sixty locals have been formed in Indian villages. (Juliao's peasant league is reported to have no more than 4,000 members.)

The Communist attempt to thrust totally unprepared peasants onto land plots as members of politically controlled cooperatives is no more than a device to shift domination of the peasants from landowners to the Communist Party. Peru's peasants can grasp this and they chose to follow Fencap as the prodemocratic way gives them an alternative.

FIRST MEETING OF PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on December 14, 1961, President Kennedy issued an Executive order creating the

President's Commission on the Status of Women.

That Commission has now been organized and has held a 2-day meeting in Washington presided over by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whom Secretary Goldberg described in his opening words to the Commission as "the finest person we could get in the country and in the world."

This is a Commission made up of both men and women members, representing industry, labor, the Congress, editors, church groups, lawyers, sociologists, club women, and academicians. In addition, six members of the Cabinet and the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission are active members.

In his remarks at the time of the establishment of the Commission, the President said:

It is my hope that the Commission's report will indicate what remains to be done to demolish prejudices and outmoded customs which act as barriers to the full partnership of women in our democracy.

This is the goal which the Commission is now embarked to attain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of Mrs. Roosevelt, Secretary Goldberg and the President be made a part of my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The President's Commission was established to examine the needs and rights of American women and to make recommendations for the elimination of barriers that result in waste, injustice, and frustration.

We live in a world of rapid economic and social change. Women have much to gain from tremendous new productive possibilities. Their burdens may be further lightened, their lives enriched, and their skills utilized as homemakers or, if they wish, as workers outside the family circle.

But to translate the promises into reality we must assure rapid expansion of essential services and industries. Otherwise automation means unemployment and bitter competition for jobs.

Within a rapidly growing economy, with appropriate manpower planning, all Americans will have a better chance to develop their individual capacities, to earn a good livelihood, and to strengthen family life.

Because I anticipate success in achieving full employment and full use of America's magnificent potential, I feel confident that in the years ahead many of the remaining outmoded barriers to women's aspirations will disappear.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women can contribute notably to this accomplishment and thus bring significant longrun benefits to the entire Nation and to the cause of democracy throughout the world.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR GOLDBERG, FIRST MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The President's Commission on the Status of Women has a mandate from the President to tackle a wide range of problems in a field vital to every home in America. The welfare of our children, the functioning of our public and private institutions, the very social life we live is wrapped up in questions involving the status of women in our Nation and the world.

In the Department of Labor we have had a Women's Bureau for many years. The assigned task of this Bureau is to foster and promote the welfare of working women, to improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

Now the President has established a special Commission to crystallize the countless expressions of opinion regarding the status of women in our Nation and combine these views with hard facts. The Commission will cover a much broader field of study than that covered by the Women's Bureau. It will study the great contributions of women in all modes of life.

The Commission has as one of its major purposes the strengthening of family relationships through seeking means to provide for women, especially those who work, a more equitable chance to enjoy the fruits of our social, political, and economic life.

Under the able direction of Mrs. Roosevelt, the Commission will move ahead quickly, and I feel sure that its findings will lead to great, forward steps in the months ahead.

It has been estimated that 9 out of 10 women are gainfully employed at some period in their lives. It is important that during these periods of employment, women are treated in an equitable fashion.

Today their earnings are typically lower than those of men. Several million women, in fact, earn less than a dollar an hour.

Since hearings on a House-sponsored equal pay bill are scheduled for next month, it seems to me that the gathering and presentation of all facts regarding job discrimination because of sex is a first order of business.

Women have labored under the term "weaker sex" for so long that it has become a stigma when they go out seeking employment or move into public life. It is time we evaluated women on merit and fitness alone when they apply for jobs.

I urge every American who is concerned with the problems of women who work to consider also the many other social, political and civil problems of women which the Commission will investigate. Only by an all-inclusive approach to the problem will we achieve the Commission's assigned purpose.

Today the Nation commemorates the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. In a letter to Horace Greeley, Lincoln stated what I think should be the guideline of the work of the Commission or of any governmental body.

Lincoln wrote: "I shall try to correct errors where shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views as fast as they shall appear to be true views."

By adopting this approach to its work this Commission cannot fail but to make a great contribution to our Nation.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE FIRST MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my thanks to all of you for an important assignment. We have established this Commission for two reasons. One is for my own self-protection. (Laughter). Every 2 or 3 weeks Mrs. May Craig asks me what I am doing for women.

The other reason is because this is a matter of great national importance—and of international importance. One-third of our working force are women. They have a primary obligation to their families and to their homes but they also—their work makes it possible to maintain that home and that family in many cases. We want to make sure that they are able to move ahead and perform their functions without any discrimination by law or by implication and we want that in the Government and stimulus through Mrs. Peterson and the Secretary and the Civil Service Commission we have attempted to make it possible for every woman to receive compensation and receive a response from her work completely in accord and with the work which she does. We want that to be true legally. We think that this Commission could usefully examine laws across the country which may adversely affect the rights of women. We want to examine this question of their compensation and whether they are receiving compensation in accordance with the service they render, whether they are being protected in their promotion rights and all the rest. The Commission should examine the things that are right and things that are wrong. So they are very interdependent. Mrs. Roosevelt has once again offered to serve the country in this important job and I am glad that all of you here who are leaders in this country have been willing to give your time to it. I can't imagine any more important assignment—not merely for women, but for Members of Congress, organized labor, women's organizations themselves, religious groups and all the rest. I think that this is a job that we ought to do. So we look forward very eagerly to your results and I promise you that we are strongly behind you in all your work.

RESOLUTION BY WASHINGTON COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL SUPPORTS HIGHER POSTAL RATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Washington County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, representing organized labor in one of the major counties of my State, has in a recent meeting strongly endorsed legislation to increase postal rates.

More and more people are realizing that the postal deficit should be paid by the mail users rather than through higher taxes collected from the general public or through deficit financing.

As the Washington County Labor Council points out, legislation which has already passed the House of Representatives provides substantial increases in second- and third-class mail rates. These increases amount to more than $200 million annually in additional revenue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Purnell Sisk, president of the Washington County Labor Council, together with an accompanying resolution adopted by the council January 24, 1962, supporting postal rate legislation.

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

WASHINGTON COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL,
Forest Grove, Oreg., January 27, 1962.

Hon. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
The U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Enclosed you will find a resolution passed by the Washington County Labor Council at our last regular meeting, January 24, 1962.

Sincerely yours,

PURNELL SISK,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE WASHINGTON COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL

Whereas the House of Representatives has passed legislation increasing postal rates by $690 million; and

Whereas this increase will materially help to balance the budget; and

Whereas appreciable percentage of this increase will be collected from the highly subsidized users of the second- and third-class mail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Washington County Labor Council respectfully request the Senators from Oregon to vote for and work for the passage of this legislation in the U.S. Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Senators WAYNE MORSE and MAURINE NEUBERGER, and to the press in Washington County.

WHERE THE MISSILE GAP WENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the February 15 issue of the Reporter, my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] writes on "Where the Missile Gap Went."

In a most enlightening article on the subject, Senator SYMINGTON raises some disturbing questions about the manner in which we have estimated Soviet missile strength. He concludes by pointing out that the questions as to which estimates are correct must be adequately answered "before we take to dancing in the streets to celebrate the disappearance of the missile gap."

Senator SYMINGTON states the case of the missile gap with great clarity. The article is well worth the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE THE MISSILE GAP WENT

(By Senator STUART SYMINGTON)

The term "missile gap," so far as I know, was coined by a well-known newspaperman several years ago. It meant that the Russians were ahead of us in developing and building intercontinental ballistic missiles, which they would have in significant numbers before we did. It was thought that this situation would continue for a long time because this country had failed to put enough effort into developing long-range ballistic missiles. But the missile gap, from the day it became a matter of public concern, had an unaccountable way of narrowing, closing, and occasionally vanishing altogether.

Sometimes this was accomplished simply by official pronouncements. Sometimes, as in 1959, it was accomplished by adding unmanned bombers to our predicted stockpile of ICBM's while making no compensating addition to the predicted Soviet stockpile. Needless to say, the missile gap could not be so easily disposed of. Former Vice President Nixon's assurance in 1959 that the gap was narrowing was followed by former CIA Director Allen Dulles' testimony in 1960 that the Soviets were widening their lead.

In recent months, however, the missile gap appears to have been done away with once and for all. Not only is there no gap, we are informed by the press, but there never was one, and those who said there was were guilty at best of hallucination and at worst of something like bad faith. Consigning the missile gap to the "limbo of synthetic issues where it always belonged," a New York Times editorial not long ago declared, "The same forces and the same congressional and journalistic mouthpieces who manufactured an alleged bomber gap in the 1950's sponsored, and indeed invented, the alleged missile gap in the 1960's." A somewhat unusual rewriting of history was provided by William Stringer in the Christian Science Monitor: "The old missile gap never existed except in speculation—and in politics," he wrote, reinforcing this claim with the information that Presidential Candidate Kennedy, "with an eye to accuracy, referred very sparingly to the missile gap. What he mainly discussed, in his campaign speech to the American Legion convention at Miami Beach, October 18, 1960, and elsewhere, was what might be termed the vulnerability gap." By my count, Mr. Kennedy warned of the missile gap in no less than nine campaign speeches just among those which have been reprinted. To the American Legion convention in Miami Beach, he in fact quoted Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's statement, "We are now threatened with a missile gap that leaves us in a position of potentially grave danger."

Whether or not there was a missile gap, it is clear that President Kennedy believed there was. So for that matter did former Secretaries of Defense McElroy and Gates and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, among others. Relying on authoritative sources, so did I. That a possible Soviet missile lead in the early 1960's was a legitimate matter of concern was also acknowledged by the New York Times. "Are we doing all that we can do or should do to assure that the missile gap specter never becomes reality?" an editorial asked in 1959. "This is obviously a key question of our times. There can be little doubt that it will be the obligation of the new Congress to explore this question thoroughly."

Surely the question we should be asking ourselves now is why so many of those who believed there was a missile gap have changed their minds.

MOVING THE GOALPOSTS

The missile gap was not invented by columnists and politicians. It was invented—if that is the word—by comparing our national intelligence estimates of Soviet missile strength with the programs of the United States. By the same token, if the gap has been eliminated, it has been largely a result of a downward revision of our estimates of the Soviet Union's missile strength.

In late July of 1958, acting on information that had come to me—including some from the CIA itself—I took up the matter with Allen Dulles. His analysis showed that there was to be a substantial and growing missile gap. The facts available to me, however, suggested that he had underrated Soviet missile development, and I so reported to President Eisenhower. Nonetheless, in December of that year, the national intelligence estimates were reduced. Then early in 1960 Defense Secretary Gates informed Congress that new ground rules were to be used for interpreting intelligence data regarding the Soviet Union's ICBM's. "Heretofore, we have been giving you intelligence figures that dealt with the theoretical Soviet capability," he said. "This is the first time that we have had an intelligence estimate that says, 'This is what the Soviet Union probably will do.'" Just by changing the basis of evaluation from capability to probability, we immediately made an immense and costless advance in the missile race—without actually moving.

The chart reproduced here gives the long-range missile capacity our national intelligence estimated in December 1959, that the Soviet Union would have by July 1, 1961. For security reasons, this estimate, like others on the chart, is presented in percentages, with the mid-1961 Soviet ICBM capacity as it was predicted in December 1959, given as 100 percent. In February 1960, as a result of the change in methods of formulating intelligence estimates, the long-range missile strength the Soviets would have by July 1961 was reduced 66 percent from what it had been 2 months before. Even after that reduction, however, the new estimate of what the Soviets would have by mid-1961 was many times what we were to have at that date; and therefore, as of February 1960, a large missile gap was expected in mid-1961. But in August 1960, a further reduction was made. As the chart shows, the national intelligence estimate of mid-1961 Soviet ICBM strength was again revised downward, this time to only 30 percent of what we had predicted a few months previously. In comparison with the plans of the United States, there was still a large gap in favor of the Soviet Union.

Less than a year later, in June 1961, the national intelligence estimate of Soviet ICBM capacity for the next month—July 1961—was reduced to a mere 15 percent of the figure that had been projected 18 months previously. In September 1961, the estimate went down once more. At that time, it was estimated that Soviet ICBM strength was exactly 3.5 percent of the original 1959 estimate—a reduction of 96.5 percent in less than 2 years. Thus the missile gap vanished.

THE DANGERS OF GUESSING INTENT

One of the most important factors in determining our national military strength is the estimate of the enemy's military capability. Not long ago, Secretary McNamara told the Senate Armed Services Committee that "the latest intelligence data on the capabilities of the Soviet Union and its satellites" was one of three criteria by which he had judged service proposals for the 1963 defense budget. Congressional committees also examine the state of our Nation's defenses in the light of this estimate in preparing to make their recommendations to Congress, which must authorize and appropriate funds for the Department of Defense. The contradictory and confusing estimates of Soviet ICBM strength we have received in the past 2 years raise serious questions about the accuracy and effectiveness of our intelligence apparatus. To realize the infinite possibilities for miscalculations, one need only consider the labyrinthine route by which the first estimates are reached through a welter of Government agencies and subagencies—ACSI, AEC, AFCIN, BNE, CIA, CS, DCI, EIC, FBI, GMAIC, IRA, J-2, JAEIC, NSA, NSC, OCI, ONI, OO, ORR, OSI, OSO, SIC, USIB, and WATCH are the initials of some of the organizations that participate.

Given the tentativeness at best of our intelligence estimates, the wisdom of basing them on Soviet intent rather than capability (particularly at a time when the Soviet Union has shifted from a policy of persuasion to one of intimidation) is open to question. Military history testifies to the danger of basing one's own preparedness on an enemy's probable intentions, which can readily be altered or faked. Before the new system was adopted, Secretary McElroy had described it as "very dangerous," adding, "I think we should assume that they [meaning the opponent] will have these numbers [of missiles] in being when the national intelligence estimate says that they could have it." Further, there is the testimony of Khrushchev himself discussing the Soviet lead in missile launching in 1957. The capitalist countries, he said, "may, sooner or later, draw even with us. But it would be naive to think we are meanwhile going to sit with our arms folded." Still, according to our new estimates of the Soviets' ICBM strength, that is what we assume they have been doing.

An example of the discrepancies that can exist between what the Soviets are doing and what we think they are doing may be seen in the field of bomber production. In 1958, as the second chart shows, our national intelligence revised its previous estimates of Soviet heavy-bomber production sharply downward. At the time, one of the chief reasons given for the reduction was increasing evidence

that the Soviets were accelerating their long-range missile program. Khrushchev, it was said, had leapfrogged bomber production to concentrate on the production of missiles. Estimates of potential Soviet heavy-bomber strength by mid-1961, as the chart shows, were lowered 75 percent between August 1956 and December 1958, and 81 percent by February of 1960.

The 1961 Soviet military airshow, however, raised considerable doubt whether we really knew what they were doing in this field, although we had been told in 1958, 1959, and 1960 that there would be no future manned-bomber threat. It was difficult to believe that the Soviets had not continued their bomber development and production in very substantial fashion, given the development of such planes as the new supersonic bomber larger than any aircraft we now make except the subsonic B–52. The new Russian bomber was flown at the air show in formation numbers, indicating early operational capability. Last summer we were told by defense authorities that several other planes were presented in that airshow that we had previously known nothing about.

BEFORE WE CELEBRATE

It should not be necessary to point out the dangers of underestimating the Soviet Union's ICBM strength. Fortunately, there is no reason to believe that President Kennedy has underestimated it. In accordance with his campaign statements, he has ordered a 50-percent increase in the Polaris submarine force to be achieved by the end of 1964, a 50-percent increase in the portion of the strategic bomber force on 15-minute ground alert, and a 100-percent increase in our capacity to produce the Minuteman solid-fuel missile. If the missile gap has closed, however, it has not been as a result of these necessary measures but as a result of our downgrading Soviet strength.

Clearly if the previous estimates were right, the revised estimates are terribly wrong. Which estimates are correct? These are the questions that must be asked by Senators and Representatives who must appropriate defense funds and for politicians and responsible journalists. How was it possible to be 96.5-percent off in either direction? Is probable intent a satisfactory basis for judging Soviet strength? Is our machinery for formulating national intelligence estimates adequate? All these questions must be asked—and, it is to be hoped, adequately answered—before we take to dancing in the streets to celebrate the disappearance of the missile gap.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH NAKAMURA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today I should like to pay tribute to my administrative assistant, Kenneth Nakamura, who after 2½ years of outstanding service on my staff is returning to Hawaii to engage in private law practice and to take the post of house minority attorney in the State legislature.

An attorney, Ken Nakamura was one of the members of my original staff who came to Washington with me after the 1959 statehood elections in Hawaii. He was instrumental in setting up what I consider a most efficient and effective office operation.

Ken Nakamura was born in Lihue on the island of Kauai, Hawaii's lovely garden island to the northwest of Oahu. While he was still a teenager, his family moved to Honolulu where he studied as a junior and senior at McKinley High School. I am proud to say Ken and I are both alumni of McKinley High, although I must confess I graduated some several years before he did.

He then attended the University of Hawaii, receiving a bachelor of science degree. At this point, his schooling was interrupted by service in the U.S. Army from 1951 to 1953, where he earned the rank of first lieutenant. He was a member of the Congressional Command Operations Group, serving as captain in the U.S. Army Reserve, which commission he still holds.

On leaving the Army, Ken Nakamura resumed his formal education at the University of Wisconsin Law School, graduating in June 1956 with the coveted LL.B. degree. In the same year he was admitted to practice law in Hawaii and in 1960, to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court.

On his return to Hawaii in 1956, he became credit manager of Pacific Lumber Co. in Honolulu. Following this, he briefly practiced law until he was selected as deputy prosecuting attorney of the city and county of Honolulu. He served ably in this post from May 1958 to August 1959, when he journeyed to Washington to become my legislative assistant.

In a sense, my staff and I were pioneers plowing new ground, for this was the first time in history Hawaii had representation in the Senate. That we were able to accomplish so much so soon was due in large part to the ability, diligence, and resourcefulness of Ken Nakamura. The solid groundwork he helped to provide will make the task of his successor much easier.

Ken Nakamura is now returning to Hawaii where, in addition to the practice of law and his legislative work, he plans to run for a seat in the State legislature. I am confident he will serve Hawaii with the utmost distinction and integrity. To whatever Ken undertakes, I know he will apply abundant intelligence and perseverance and will reap in return good will and good fortune.

I would be remiss to let this occasion go by without expressing my gratitude and appreciation for his fine efforts in my behalf and in behalf of the people of Hawaii. His wife Jane and his family may be justly proud of his achievements.

Ken will be sorely missed by me and by all the members of my staff as well. We all join in hoping the blessings of health, happiness, and success will be his without limit. Godspeed and aloha.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MAMIE NORRIS TILLMAN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State of South Carolina suffered a great loss in the death on February 1, 1962, of a noble woman, Mrs. Mamie Norris Tillman, of Edgefield, at the age of 86 years. The State, Columbia, S.C., of February 2 carried an obituary entitled "Mrs. James H. Tillman, of Edgefield, dies at 86," that was worthy of a great statesman or a person of national renown, covering her full life of service to her day and generation. The Edgefield Advertiser, Edgefield, S.C., of February 7 carried a similar obituary and also an editorial entitled, "Mrs. Tillman." I ask unanimous consent that the obituary which appeared in the State and the Edgefield Advertiser and the editorial of the Edgefield Advertiser be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mrs. Tillman was a woman of lofty ideals and represented the best in Christian womanhood. The beauty of her face was matched by the beauty of her character. The broad scope of her mind envisioned the best for her county and State, and even reached out to the uttermost parts of the world. Her heart beat warmly for the woes of the world and she did not cease from her labors to make it better until ill health laid its hand upon her. Hers was an ennobling influence that reached into every nook and corner of Edgefield. Through her church and temperance organizations she influenced the lives of many.

She typified the spirit of Edgefield that has given to the State of South Carolina and to the Nation some of their greatest statesmen and religious leaders. The Halls of both branches of Congress have rung with the voices of her kinsmen, Senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman and Congressman George D. Tillman. From Runnymede to World War II and Korea members of her family have served their generation in war for the preservation of human freedoms. They have sat in the gubernatorial chair. They have proclaimed the truths of Holy Writ from pulpits of rural churches.

The great of the Nation who knocked at her door found a gracious welcome. The humblest person who came was received with a warmth that dispelled any doubt as to her interest and friendship. She was an inspiration especially to young people who came to her for advice, and many today have attained high positions of trust because of her helpful guidance.

As president for over 20 years of the Edgefield County Historical Society she led in the erection of a number of monuments to commemorate the great heroes of Edgefield. But she herself will ever be commemorated in the hearts of hundreds who knew and loved her.

Mrs. Mamie Norris Tillman was a wonderful woman and dedicated to the best interest of her community, State and Nation. She was kind, gentle and helpful to her family and friends. She was a gracious example of Christian womanhood at its finest.

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

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, Feb. 7, 1962]

MRS. TILLMAN

Mrs. Tillman's life was such an active one that accounts of her life and deeds have been written often, but it is hoped that historians will in time be led to record more fully the golden period in which Mrs. Tillman lived and present it and its great personalities in the light of the goodness, the righteous zeal, the sincerity, love, and unselfishness that, through them, lifted the South to a pinnacle of culture based on high ideals.

Her age was the golden age of the South, the South that had overcome the era of slavery and was reaching upward for the perfect life.

On the basis of a provident aristocracy of the land and a people of matchless generosity that spilled over into every field of

endeavor, and a spirituality that reached its noblest form in the obedience and grace of religious fundamentalism, was a confluence that drew the line against every form of evil, without compromise, and, gaining momentum, it reached its highest point in the national crusade against strong drink, that resulted in the noble experiment.

So perfectly clear in this great era of the South was the fact that a way of life is reflected and becomes ascendant in great personalities.

Edgefield, where Mrs. Tillman was born and spent her entire life, except the years of her higher education, was bursting with the zeal of inspired people such as Dr. John Lake, who became world famous for his prodigious work in China.

The names of religious leaders of that period are still mentioned with veneration and almost awe, for their remarkable gifts of personality and the significant unity and harmony with which they challenged their times.

Mrs. Tillman's contemporaries were also giants in the area of public representation in every government—National, State, and local; and as Governor Evans used to say, Edgefield influenced even the staid and far-off New Englanders.

With every personal charm, Mrs. Tillman's life was a flowering of spiritual love and enlightment, and those in public life, or private, who wanted to know the conscienceful right direction in public or private matters knew that she was ever a teacher of truth and right.

Mrs. Tillman's life centered around her church, the Edgefield Baptist. She was present at every church gathering, perhaps leading a program of constructive community effort, or she might be playing the piano or organ, for she was a gifted musician.

She spent much of her life working with the people in the rural churches.

Her presence was inspiring, and often the reason for success of a good cause. In later life she devoted most of her time honoring, through the Edgefield Historical Society, those who had made significant contributions to the civilization that had taken its stand what it believed in and had acquitted itself with honor.

Thus was Mrs. Tillman a leader in an age of American ascendancy.

"The great of the earth, having lived and died, now live again and forever through their undying thoughts. Thus living though their footfalls are heard no more, their voices are louder than the thunder and unceasing as the flow of tides or air. The prophets seem almost useless in their time. But when you look at the life they have lived since you shall find they have been the pilots. What archer could hit them now? They ask no leave of elector or emperor, but are the monarchs of thought and the noblest defenders of the faith to the end of time."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Feb. 2, 1962]

MRS. JAMES H. TILLMAN OF EDGEFIELD, DIES AT 86

EDGEFIELD.—Mrs. Mamie Norris Tillman, 86, died Thursday afternoon at Self Memorial Hospital at Greenwood after a long illness.

Mrs. Tillman was born August 2, 1875, in the same home she has occupied her entire life. She was the only child of Alfred J. Norris, lawyer and banker of Edgefield, and Mrs. Mary J. Norris.

Their handsome home of colonial design was the center of social activity during their lifetime and Mrs. Tillman continued to maintain it in a spirit of gracious southern hospitality.

It is now headquarters of the Edgefield County Historical Society of which Mrs. Tillman was president 21 years. It was a tribute to her life of service that the Kendall Co., owners of the property for some years, deeded it to the society in 1959. The most recent meeting was held at the home on her 86th birthday when Mrs. Tillman gave a report of the society's activities for the year and extended cordial greetings to all.

During her younger years she studied under local tutors. She attended Hollins College in Virginia and College for Women in South Carolina from which she was graduated with honors.

For more than 60 years Mrs. Tillman's influence was felt in the religious and cultural life of Edgefield. She united with the First Baptist Church at the age of 12. For years she was director of the Sunbeams, a children's organization, in her church and in the Edgefield Baptist Association. She was president of the local Woman's Missionary Society and superintendent of the Edgefield Associational WMU for many years.

She was active in temperance work, being president of the Edgefield WCTU and vice president of the State organization for some years.

For a number of years she was teacher of the TEL Sunday school class, and continued her interest in Sunday school, training union, and missionary society until ill health prevented.

Her musical gifts found expression in serving as church organist for 17 years, as teacher of piano, and directing an orchestra of young men.

She was an inspiration to the young people of Edgefield and through her help some gained a new concept of life and were enabled to obtain a higher education.

She was twice regent of Old 96 District chapter, DAR, and was at one time vice regent of the State society. She was on the State executive boards in other years of the DAR, UDC, and more recently the Colonial Dames of the XVIIth Century. She was a member of the Daughters of the Knights of Runnymead; the University Caroliniana Society; and the South Carolina Historical Society.

Under the leadership of Mrs. Tillman the DAR and the Historical Society sponsored erection of markers to Edgefield County's 10 Governors and 5 Lieutenant Governors; the dead of World War I; the Martins of Martintown; the birthplace of Confederate Gen. James Longstreet; to John Thurmond of the Revolution, and to Cols. LeRoy and Samuel Hammond of the Revolution. Last year she participated in commemorating Pvt. Sidney Weeks, first Confederate casualty from this section.

With continued love for her church she carried out programs honoring Dr. William B. Johnson, first president of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Dr. John Lake, missionary to China. On those occasions portraits of the two and other leaders were placed in the prayer chapel of the church, and markers were placed in the nearby cemetery.

Other patriots whose graves were marked by the society in the same cemetery were F. H. Wardlaw, author of the "Ordinance of Secession," and members of the family of Pierce Mason Butler, former Governor and colonel of the Palmetto Regiment in the Mexican War.

Mrs. Tillman was active formerly in the Civic League and helped establish the D. A. Tompkins Memorial Library. When the sale of the old Martin W. Gary place, Oakley Park, was pending, she enlisted the interest of former Gov. John Gary Evans in having it preserved as a memorial to General Gary and others who redeemed South Carolina from carpetbag rule in 1876.

Hers was a life rich and full in service to her day and generation, and she was known and beloved far beyond the bounds of her local community.

She was the widow of James H. Tillman, a Lieutenant Governor of the State.

Surviving are one daughter, Mrs. Taylor Stanley, of Cincinnati; two grandchildren, Mrs. John S. Nicholson, of Columbia, and Ethan Bates Stanley II, of Darlington, and two grandchildren, Mary Norris Nicholson and Helen Nicholson, of Columbia.

Funeral services will be held from the First Baptist Church of Edgefield, with her pastor, Dr. J. Graydon Dukes, in charge, at 3 p.m. Saturday. Interment will follow in nearby Willowbrook Cemetery.

Active pallbearers will be Walton Mims, Senator J. Strom Thurmond, Manley Timmons, John Felthan, John Bocker, and Raymond Folk.

GOV. EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN PRESENTS A BALANCED BUDGET TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, of California, faces the electorate this November with a record of solid achievement.

To meet the people's needs the Brown administration has developed constructive programs in many fields—education, water resources, social welfare, civil rights, air pollution control, narcotics control, electoral revision, and many other areas.

That so much has been done in his first term is the more remarkable in face of the fact that Governor Brown has presented to the legislature four consecutive balanced budgets, the last three requiring no new taxes.

In his budget message to the Senate and assembly on February 5, 1962, the Governor set forth in eloquent terms the State's fiscal requirements for 1962–63. Because it shows what a great State is doing and is prepared to do to meet its complex problems—because it demonstrates that State government in California is a vital, dynamic institution—I commend the message to my colleagues and others.

I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BUDGET MESSAGE BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN

(The 1962–63 budget transmitted to the California Legislature, Monday, February 5, 1962)

To the Senate and Assembly of the Legislature of California:

I present to you a $2,885,523,247 budget for the 1962–63 fiscal year.

It is the fourth consecutive soundly balanced budget transmitted to you by this administration.

It is the third consecutive budget requiring no new taxes.

It recognizes in size and scope that this is the year when California takes its destined place as the first State in the Union, as the leader in population, in government, in education, and in dedication to the principles of equal opportunity.

It contemplates no major new expenditure programs.

It includes increases in existing programs only where they are required by growth and quality, the two traditional hallmarks of life and government in California.

It is once more based on an allocations system which guarantees that the State government will live within its resources without impairment of that level of services which has made California the most attractive State in the Union—to its citizens, to

new population, and to new industry and commerce.

It adheres to strict standards of austerity and economy.

Expenditure increases were limited to those areas in which direct services to people were involved. New administrative workload and overhead costs were pared from departmental budgets, even when formulas and ratios justified the requests involved. The only major exceptions were in our revenue-collecting agencies where added staff costs demonstrably would produce even more added revenue.

I renew my annual invitation to the legislature to produce even more economies to reduce this budget wherever possible without stunting the State's growth or reducing the quality of its essential services.

I also renew my pledge to economize in the administration of this budget.

I believe the record of the past 3 years reveals that both the invitation and the pledge are sincere.

As evidence, I offer the fact that this administration has averaged $27 million a year for the last 3 years in savings from legislative appropriations. In the 10 years prior to my election, two preceding administrations averaged $15 million and $14 million respectively.

This last year we have also held thousands of authorized positions vacant for long periods of time in order to achieve greater productivity and slow the expansion of the work force.

Together, in these 3 years, you and I have restored California's fiscal responsibility, returned its bonds to an envied status in the national financial marketplace and turned a $68 million deficit into a $20 million surplus.

At the same time, we have kept faith with the future of this great State.

This budget is founded not alone on principle of investment—investment in the edu- that we must meet both the needs of the present and the challenges of the future.

The major cost increases in this massive budget testify to our adherence to the principle of investment—investment in the education of our youth, investment in the development of water and the other great natural resources, and investment in people and programs designed to make California a better place to live and work.

Consider education, the area in which the largest growth is taking place and in which the most significant new investments are being made.

Local school districts will have 212,000 more students next year, bringing the total to 3,775,000 students in the elementary and secondary grades through junior college. The districts will receive $58 million more in operating and debt service costs. The total proposed expenditure is $863 million.

The rapidly expanding State college system will have 8,500 more students in 1962–63, bringing the total enrollment to 86,440. The trustees, the 16 present campuses and the 2 new ones will receive $19 million more in State funds for operation and construction purposes. The total proposed expenditure is $149 million.

The great University of California, destined to double in size in this decade, will admit 5,128 more students in 1962–63, increasing total enrollment to 57,203. The proposed State-supported budget for the university calls for an increase of $16 million. The total proposed State contribution is $197 million.

Next in importance among the few major increases are those resulting from 1961 legislation to improve health care for the aged and meet other deficiencies in the State's programs for the aged, the blind, and the disabled. The forecast last year was for a $70 million increase in these items in 1962–63, the first full year of operation. The estimate now is for $54 million.

Another major cost factor is the first general pay increase for State employees in 2 years, a 5-percent raise to be retroactive to January 1 of this year on the urgent recommendation of the State personnel board, the official factfinding agency on proper State salary levels. That will cost $39.8 million in 1962–63.

State employees themselves have helped to finance this raise with increased productivity. Their efforts in work improvement plans and their money-saving suggestions submitted through the merit award system have also helped give impetus to the formulation of new standards of efficiency and economy in many departments.

If you examine the budget in another way, a different kind of increase factor stands out. Of the entire budget, $1,514,200,000, or some 55 percent, is in local assistance, an increase of $145.6 million in school, welfare, health, and flood control programs administered at the local level where the burden would otherwise fall on the property taxpayer.

California continues to have the largest local assistance program of any State.

Fortunately, this budget was prepared at a time of growing prosperity in California and the Nation.

The revenue estimates on which it is predicated reflect the same steadfast confidence and faith in California's future that I expressed in less auspicious circumstances just 1 year ago.

Our determination then to press forward with antirecession measures in partnership with the Federal Government has been more than justified by events.

In almost every category of economic activity, California is at record highs and is continuing its steady upward climb.

Having doubled personal income in California in the last decade, we should see another increase of 8.6 percent in 1962. The Nation's income will go up only 6.8 percent.

The employment situation, already better, will continue to improve. As the State's population increases another 600,000, requiring 245,000 new jobs for proper support, we actually anticipate the creation of 288,000 new jobs. That would permit a welcome and substantial reduction in unemployment.

This splendid economic climate in California is not an accident. Government and industry and labor have worked hard to create and sustain it.

Recent comprehensive national surveys show that California is the leading choice of business executives for new and expanded plant capacity, not only because of our large and growing market, but because of the high level of publicly financed education here, a level essential to the advanced technology of most modern industry.

This is especially true of the Nation's burgeoning new business giant, the interrelated electronics and space exploration industries. It is in such areas that California's unique investment in higher education is paying dividends not only in culture and civilization, but in new levels of personal income and prosperity.

This budget, just as the other budgets I have transmitted to you, has other contributions to make to a thriving economy.

There is an accelerated thrust in the California water program as it surges toward peak construction activity at Oroville and at the San Luis Reservoir, and the Nation's finest highway program is progressing ahead of schedule.

We are also continuing our assault on the ills of our society with some marked successes.

Despite our huge growth in population, a splendid treatment program has reduced the number of mentally ill in our State institutions to the lowest point in 8 years.

The prisoner conservation camp program has a record number of adult and juvenile offenders doing useful and self-rehabilitating work in our forest and wilderness areas. Without their firefighting efforts in the last 2 years, untold thousands of acres more of California forests would have gone up in smoke.

The comprehensive narcotics program begun last year is still gathering momentum, but has already swept hundreds of addicts off the streets and out of the contagious centers of infection. This is a costly program, but one worth every dollar we have to pay to rid ourselves of this sordid traffic in human misery and degradation.

These and other comparable expenditures, are largely in the pattern pioneered in previous years of this administration.

In one area, however, I am supporting a drastic new approach to a task at which the State has long been laboring with only partial success.

I feel that our recreation programs have not kept pace with our needs.

Despite the greatest fiscal and planning effort of any administration in the State's history, we still have not met the challenge fully. Lands which should be held for public use have slipped away into private hands because of inadequate funds for acquisition. The costs of other available and desirable lands is moving swiftly out of the range of the limited public purse, and within 10 years will be completely beyond our resources.

Moreover, much property now held is not adequately developed to meet immediate public demand for recreational facilities.

Therefore, with this budget, I plan to submit a $100 million bond issue proposal to finance an immediate 5-year program of acquisition of land for beach, park, and other recreational purposes.

At the same time, I am earmarking the general fund money heretofore used for acquisition to accelerate the pace of our development program from $4 to $6 million a year.

I will ask that the legislature place the new recreation bond issue on the general election ballot.

If it is approved, as I confidently expect, then I would ask that the legislature work out, at the 1963 session, a method and program of acquisition which would take into account not only the needs of the State as a whole, but those of individual communities, counties, and regions.

The 1962–63 budget contemplates other bond financing but with only one other basic variation from the traditional pattern of use of long-term capital outlay bonds in California. That one is of critical importance, however.

To the category of institutions for which proper expenditures from State construction bonds can be made legally, now including the University of California, the State college system, mental hospitals, prisons, government buildings, and other purely State institutions, I propose we add the State's junior colleges.

Because the master plan for higher education adopted in 1960 calls upon the junior colleges to assume a major new role in meeting added statewide responsibilities in the field of higher education, a beginning capital outlay appropriation of $5 million was authorized by the legislature last year.

It was agreed by all concerned, however, that no permanently satisfactory solution to the shared responsibility of the State and junior college districts was achieved at that time.

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education is now hard at work on this matter, and I am confident that the 1963 session of the legislature, acting after it has had the benefit of the council's study and advice, will be able to write adequate legislation covering the very complex problem of financing new junior college facilities cooperatively.

It will be important that there be funds available immediately to implement that

decision next year, and I am therefore asking that the new State construction bond issue be so written as to permit the legislature to use construction bond funds for junior college facilities.

As of the beginning of the new fiscal year, only $52 million of the State construction bonds authorized in 1958 will be available to meet the capital outlay needs of $141 million dollars projected in this budget.

I therefore ask this session of the legislature to place a new bond issue of $270 million dollars on the June primary ballot to meet the remaining needs for 1962–63 and the probable needs in 1963–64.

Building at the new campuses of the University of California and the State college system will be at its highest level for the next few years as the 5-year building plan submitted with this budget discloses. In addition, as indicated above, junior college assistance, perhaps as much as $20 million, may be required in the 1963–64 budget.

Thus, more than 80 percent of the total $270 million bond issue will be devoted to meeting the drastic needs of our institutions of higher education as they absorb the first full impact of the postwar population boom.

The increased use of bonds in these two areas is more than offset by decreased use in two other areas.

The declining volume of new bond sales required to sustain the self-liquidating California veterans' farm and home loan program will permit drastic reduction in the renewed bond authority sought and the amount to be offered.

Instead of the $400 million issue required 2 years ago, I am recommending that the new issue be limited to $250 million for the next 2 years without making any changes or restrictions in the loan program. Ample funds on hand will permit the issue to wait to go on the general election ballot in November.

The bond program for assistance in local school construction has done its job well in reducing drastically the number of double sessions in the State. There is now for the first time in years no backlog of requests waiting on a priority basis.

The slackening of demand makes it possible for me to recommend that we reduce the 2-year school construction bond issue from the $300 million level authorized 2 years ago to $200 million for the next 2 years.

I would further recommend that this issue be placed on the primary ballot in June with the $270 million State construction bond issue.

The net effect of these four proposals will be to reduce rather than to increase the number of general obligation bond sales in California during the next fiscal year while shifting the focus of long-term financing to the areas of greatest need.

California has already sold more than $500 million in bonds this year, and, because of steadily increasing confidence in California's fiscal soundness, it has sold them at the lowest rates of interest since the State surpluses of the postwar years disappeared in the prior administration.

Yet, next year, we will be able to make a $50 million sale of water bonds if necessary and still hold the total to little more than $400 million.

To any among you with lingering doubts as to California's fiscal health, I would cite two remarkable facts.

California has the lowest net bond debt among nine comparable industrial States and ranks 37th in the Nation.

California ranks 27th among the States in tax rate per $100 of personal income.

In the last 10 years, the tax rate per $100 of personal income in all States has gone up an average of 20 percent and in such industrial States as New York and Pennsylvania has gone up 36 percent and 50 percent respectively. California's rate is up just 5 percent.

The fiscal moral is clear. Together you and I have kept economic faith with the people of California and with their future.

I submit this budget to you with the utmost respect, and with confidence that your ultimate judgment will not stem from narrow partisanship, but will reflect your traditionally broad outlook on what is required to keep California in the position which she is just achieving, that of first among equals in this great Union.

SUMMARY

In summary, this budget totals $2,885 million, including $141 million of bond financing of essential State building needs. It represents an increase of almost $199 million, or 6.7 percent over current year requirements. Total revenues will reach $2,653 million, a corresponding increase of 8 percent.

Of particular importance are the general fund obligations of $1,917 million contained in this total, up 10 percent over current requirements. General fund income for this budget is anticipated at $1,883 million, a comparable increase of 10 percent over the present year.

A summary of the condition of the general fund is presented below:

General fund condition

[In millions of dollars]

	1960–61	1961–62	1962–63
Beginning surplus and reserves, July 1	$131.8	$58.3	$38.7
Income: Revenue and transfers	1,613.0	1,723.9	1,882.7
Expenditures:			
State operations	547.3	623.8	687.4
Capital outlay	117.8	36.4	16.1
Capital outlay—bonds	(12.6)	(110.6)	(141.1)
Local assistance	1,018.9	1,083.3	1,213.1
Total expenditures	1,684.0	1,743.5	1,916.6
Committed reserves	20.3	19.3	[1] 2.7
Ending surplus, June 30	38.0	19.4	2.1

[1] This amount has been reserved by the 1961 legislature from county school service fund surpluses for future educational needs.

In conformity with section 34, article IV of the constitution, I submit to you the budget for the State of California for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1963.

Respectfully submitted.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor.

FEBRUARY 5, 1962.

PADRE ISLAND SEASHORE PROPOSAL GAINS INCREASED SUPPORT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in recent weeks, the proposal to create a national seashore recreational area on Padre Island on the Texas gulf coast has received editorial support from newspapers from a wide area including a newspaper in southeast Texas, another in west Texas, and another in New York City. These three are all well written, including one from the New York Times, and two from a group of the more progressive members of the Texas press.

This growing interest and support is evidence of the far-reaching importance attached to our urgent national need for the preservation of areas for the enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

The bill which I have introduced to establish an 88.5-mile park on Padre Island, S. 4, will help all of the area around Padre Island become a magnificent resort center that will benefit hundreds of thousands of new tourists.

Texas and other States with a coastline well know the price of waiting to preserve coastal recreation areas.

The cost of available land reaches up to the heavens; the new fences reach out past the waterline and into the waves.

The importance of immediate action to preserve recreation areas for the American people cannot be overemphasized.

Action is urgently needed at this session.

From a standpoint of recreation elbow room, the time is approaching when a little strip of sand and speck of sunshine will take on a striking similarity to gold in its value.

The population is increasing at explosion rate, the national trend is toward city living and weekend or vacation-time search for wide open spaces.

The sweeping reaches of Padre Island offer the finest remaining available source in the United States for preservation for the use of all the people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following editorials:

"Friend of Padre Island," from the Beaumont Journal, January 30, 1962.

"Needed: New National Parks," from the New York Times, January 2, 1962.

"Texans Should Support Padre Seashore Project," from the Abilene Reporter-News, February 4, 1962.

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

[From the Beaumont Journal, Jan. 30, 1962]

FRIEND OF PADRE ISLAND

Proponents of a national seashore park on Padre Island in Texas have a powerful friend in New York City.

An editorial in a recent edition of the New York Times has this to say about it:

"Congress made a start toward expanding the system [national park system] last year when it added the Cape Cod National Seashore, but this is only a start. In the 1962 session Congress should move promptly to complete action on the pending bills to establish national seashores at Port Reyes in California and Padre Island in Texas."

People in New York City may be more conscious of the need for national parks than people in Texas. They should be, for Gothamites lack, and long for, the elbow room and wide open spaces most Texans take for granted. But the fact is that public property everywhere is diminishing as the population grows and commercial interests corral new ground. The Lone Star State has much to offer the national park system. Much to gain from it, too.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 2, 1962]

NEEDED: NEW NATIONAL PARKS

The national park system of the United States is an example for the world of how a great nation can set aside outstanding areas of its land, not for commercial or industrial exploitation but for the inspiration, esthetic enjoyment and physical refreshment of its people. It is an example that gives the lie to the accusation, frequently leveled by its critics and enemies, that this Nation is governed by gross materialism and devotion to the dollar.

But our existing national parks, besieged by the recreational hungers of an exploding population, are proving inadequate to the purpose. In this, the first of two editorials on the parks, we call attention to the major park proposals which should be enacted in the near future; tomorrow we will discuss briefly some of the principal problems involved in carrying out such a program.

Congress made a start toward expanding the system last year when it added the Cape Cod National Seashore, but this is only a start. In the 1962 session Congress should move promptly to complete action on the pending bills to establish national seashores at Point Reyes in California and Padre Island in Texas. Also needed, to insure the preservation of the best of our fast-dwindling, unspoiled shorelines, is passage of pending legislation affecting the outstanding Oregon Dunes area on the Pacific coast and both the Indiana Dunes and the Sleeping Bear Dunes on Lake Michigan.

Fortunately there still remain a few inland scenic and relatively unspoiled areas in the East and Midwest that would be worthwhile additions to the system. The historic and unique C. & O. Canal area along the Potomac River, now partially protected as a national monument, deserves to be enlarged into a national park. Other interesting proposals, in various stages of advancement, are for an Allagash national recreation area in the unspoiled forest and river country of Maine, a Robert Frost National Park in the Green Mountains of Vermont, an Ozark Rivers National Monument along the famous Current and Elevenpoint Rivers in Missouri, and a Prairie National Park to save the last of the virgin grasslands of the Great Plains.

Western areas of special scenic and wilderness values include the North Cascade Mountains of Washington, the Oregon Cascades, the Wheeler Peak region in Nevada, and a wild, sweeping expanse of canyon and desert in southeastern Utah where Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has proposed the creation of a Canyon Lands National Park.

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, Feb. 4, 1962]

TEXANS SHOULD SUPPORT PADRE SEASHORE PROJECT

Away down on the lower Texas coast, a national seashore on Padre Island was proposed 5 years ago.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH introduced a bill to establish it in 1957. Since then it has struck numerous hurdles.

The most recent and least needed blow was landed last August 31 when Land Commissioner Jerry Sadler called upon the State government to make a State park on Padre Island.

The absurdity of this is apparent to those who know that because of niggardly legislative appropriations, the State has not been able to develop adequately the parks it already has.

How it would muster the money to buy the Padre Island land, much less develop it, is a prime question.

Though the suggested project is from 400 to 500 miles away from west Texas, we, as well as Texans all over the State, have a stake in this proposal.

Texas is trying to develop its tourist industry. The Padre Island National Seashore would prove a major tourist attraction.

That of course is not sufficient justification for establishing the seashore. The national seashore would preserve a vast stretch of land in a more or less primitive state for the enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

Commercial development of the better areas eventually will wipe out such priceless natural landscapes.

Texans should join in support of the seashore project in this session of Congress, ere it is too late.

One necessary step is for all the State's delegation in Congress to get together and agree on a bill.

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with Boy Scout Week arriving in February, it gives me an excellent opportunity to offer a salute to the Boy Scouts of America as it celebrates its 52d birthday. I know that each of you share my pride in the fine job that scouting does for the youth of America. Over 30 million boys, I understand, have participated in this virile movement since it was founded in our Nation's Capital more than 50 years ago.

Let us not forget that this outstanding organization, which today numbers more than 5 million active Scouts and volunteer leaders, performs a tremendous service in helping build both the character and physical fitness of our leaders of tomorrow—and let us not forget, too, that it does this superb job without asking for or receiving one cent of Federal moneys.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE PROGRAM FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall briefly present to the Senate a review of the program for forestry research, the program which has been completed, and the program for the future.

Mr. President, again, as in the past 2 years, I call attention to the forestry research program of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. This has been one of the most productive programs of the Federal Government—a program of developing the Nation's extensive forest resources through systematic and aggressive research. It is not only a program of research required to put a sound scientific basis under the protection, management, and utilization of our valued national forests, but also provides a sound foundation for the entire forestry resources of the country.

Last year I referred particularly to the forestry research program submitted to the Congress the previous year by the Department of Agriculture. I pointed out that the amount of money in the plan for the forestry research work, plus the research construction program, was 13 times the amount we were providing at the time the report was presented. That figure, I again submit, graphically illustrates the neglect, from year to year and from decade to decade, of one of our greatest natural resources.

During the last 2 or 3 years we have made a good start rectifying past neglect. I take great pride in the constructive attitude of this body when I review recent action on matters of forestry research. We have had before us a research plan prepared by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

The Senate recognized the soundness of this plan. We have joined in providing additional funds for this important work. I am sure each Member of the Senate believes—as I firmly do—that we must continue to make substantial, orderly progress in the further expansion of forestry research. And we must do this during the years immediately ahead. We have made a beginning only. Each year, for the next several years, this important activity must continue to grow. It must meet the requirements of a truly essential forestry research program—a truly national program that unfortunately has been neglected far too long.

I have before me the budget estimates for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture that have been recommended to the Congress for fiscal year 1963. The budget proposal for forestry research is a great disappointment to me. Instead of an increase of funds for the program, the recommendation is for a decrease. The budget recommends that only $23,150,000 be allowed to cover all of forestry research nationwide, including the construction of research facilities. This amount is $3,218,000 below that appropriated for the same purpose by the Congress for fiscal year 1962. Eliminated almost entirely is the vital program dealing with construction of research facilities. This budget cut is difficult for me to understand because research construction is of key importance in the forestry research plan.

I do not think this country can afford to allow a step backward in this forestry research program. As has been my custom over the years, I have spent considerable time obtaining from informed people in various parts of the country an an appraisal of where we are heading in forestry research and what we need to do. I have systematically visited the forests of this country, making trips into the forests of my own State and of other States, to see the problems first hand and the progress being made in forestry and in research. I cannot agree with the budget recommendation. It calls for much too slow a pace in reaching reasonable and essential research goals. It would put a halt to the construction of research facilities that are desperately needed to implement and make more effective the research work that is now underway. It would likewise interrupt with serious consequences the orderly construction of the research buildings sorely needed for the expansion of research work. This expansion must come in the near future if we are to meet the requirements of the carefully planned forestry program of the Department during the next 10 years.

For these reasons, I am again this year proposing that the budget estimates for fiscal year 1963 be increased for the research work of the Forest Service. I propose an increase of $10,555,000 over the 1962 appropriation. This increase over 1962 would be divided: $6 million for acceleration of research work and $4,555,000 for construction of research facilities. I have a table that shows where we stand in fiscal year 1962 with respect to financing the forestry research program, the budget recommendation for fiscal year 1963, and my proposal of the funds required for fiscal year 1963 to maintain reasonable and essential progress in this very important program. I ask unanimous consent that the table showing these relative positions be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection of the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Forestry research—Budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 and proposed increases required for planned progress

[In thousands of dollars]

Research items	Appropriated, fiscal year 1962	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1963	Budget estimate, increase or decrease over fiscal year 1962	Funds required for planned progress	
				Increase over fiscal year 1962	Total fiscal year 1963
Forest and range management	$9,737	$10,214	$477	$1,950	$11,687
Forest protection	4,344	4,729	385	2,450	6,794
Forest products and engineering	4,477	4,717	240	1,200	5,677
Forest resource, economics and products marketing	2,615	2,740	125	400	3,015
Subtotal, research investigations	21,173	22,400	1,227	6,000	27,173
Construction of research facilities	5,195	750	−4,445	4,555	9,750
Total for forest research	26,368	23,150	−3,218	10,555	36,923

LABORATORY FACILITIES NEEDED

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I also have a table which shows the individual research construction projects that would be undertaken with the additional funds my proposal would provide. Preceding this list, I show the projects—mostly scientific equipment to complete buildings now under construction—and the amounts that are provided for them in the 1963 budget estimate. I fully endorse the completion of these projects, as well as propose the 12 additional ones.

The 12 additional construction projects that I propose are in a high priority category. I developed these projects from the forestry plan that we have had before us and from discussions and correspondence I have had with the scientists and others involved. I requested and received review by the Forest Service of the estimated cost of a number of projects and those that I have included are believed by me to represent especially worthy cases and to be feasible for undertaking now.

This entire list was prepared strictly from nationwide needs. It relates to the basis of the forestry program throughout the Nation, and the State in which a laboratory or facility may be located is purely incidental.

It so happens that in the proposals of this year there are none for my State. That circumstance is due solely to the fact that Mississippi did not rate one on the list of priority needs. I hope that in the near future some special needs that exist in my State will be reached on a priority list.

My position is that the problem is a national one, and that the proposed projects must be undertaken. The needs must be met. I am entirely willing, as are other Senators, to let the projects be developed on a priority scale. The list of projects which I have presented is realistic and contains up-to-date cost estimates. I strongly recommend and will vigorously support the position that those projects should be included in the fiscal year 1963 funds to the Forest Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the table on research construction to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Forestry research construction

CONSTRUCTION INCLUDED IN BUDGET

Location	Research facilities	Estimated cost
1. Athens, Ga.	Scientific equipment and auxiliary facilities	$250,000
2. Princeton, W. Va.	do	150,000
3. Stoneville, Miss.	do	45,000
4. Durham-Raleigh, N.C. (research triangle).	do	126,000
5. Corvallis, Oreg.	do	80,000
6. Delaware, Ohio	do	64,000
7. Olustee, Fla.	do	35,000
Total for projects now in budget.		750,000

ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSED

1. Parsons, W. Va.	Forest watershed management laboratory	$150,000
2. Alexandria, La.	Forest utilization, protection, and forestation laboratory	900,000
3. Warren, Pa.	Forest recreation and wildlife habitat management laboratory	450,000
4. Sewanee, Tenn.	Forest soil and silviculture laboratory	200,000
5. Madison, Wis.	Forest Products Laboratory—addition for wood chemistry and pulp and paper research.	4,000,000
6. Olympia, Wash.	Timber management and animal damage prevention laboratory	300,000
7. Ames, Iowa	Hardwood silviculture laboratory	200,000
8. Tempe, Ariz.	Forest watershed, range and wildlife habitat management laboratory	900,000
9. Fort Myers, Fla.	Forest and range management laboratory	150,000
10. Houghton, Mich.	Forest engineering laboratory	400,000
11. Logan, Utah	Forest watershed management laboratory	900,000
12. Redding, Calif.	Timber management and utilization laboratory	450,000
Total for additional construction.		9,000,000

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will my distinguished colleague yield for a question and an observation?

Mr. STENNIS. I gladly yield to the Senator from California. I know of his interest in this subject and his continued support of the proposed projects.

Mr. ENGLE. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the leadership and the effort that he has given to this very important subject.

I observe that the table that he has asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD includes 7 projects which are in the budget and includes 12 additional ones which have, as he stated, a high priority rating.

One of those proposed 12 projects is for a timber management and utilization laboratory at Redding, Calif. In order not to transgress upon the time of the Senator from Mississippi, or to intrude within the continuity of his remarks, I intend, following his statement, to comment on that particular subject as well as upon other problems affecting California. But I do wish to take this opportunity to say to my distinguished friend that he will have my wholehearted and vigorous support for the program on which he has shown such great knowledge and experience. I believe him to be correct in every particular. I believe that he has been careful and meticulous in selecting the projects on the list. I observe that there are no projects proposed for his own State. He has been perfectly willing to accept the projects on the basis of a priority arrangement in the Forest Service. The Senator from Mississippi will have my vigorous support; and I hope that at some time that he can get the laboratory that he has in mind included in a priority list. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from California. His support of the proposed projects will certainly be valuable. The project at Redding, Calif., is very timely indeed. That project is a laboratory for timber management and utilization. It would cost only $450,000. As research laboratories go, that amount of money is relatively small. The facility would not be expensive, and would be one at which scientists and technicians who do this important work would have a reasonable opportunity to do their best work. I do not think we could possibly find a better investment anywhere in a plan for the present or the future than the proposed small investment in these laboratories. We find in them some of the finest scientists in the Nation laboring faithfully with present problems and future planning.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the distinguished Senator from California in commending the Senator from Mississippi on his statement of an expanded program for forestry research. I would have expected the Senator from Mississippi to do what he has done because of his continuing championship and

support of sensible, prudent, and I think, productive agricultural research programs. The Senator knows that time after time, as he has taken the floor to uphold programs in the field of research and agriculture, it has been my privilege at least to commend him, and I think I have always supported him.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator has been very active, diligent, and consistent in his vigorous support in committee and on the floor of programs of the kind proposed. I highly commend him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I want him to know that as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations I shall do all I can to forward the program that the Senator from Mississippi has advanced here today.

I believe that it needs to be underscored that such programs as proposed actually produce revenue. When I was at home during the past weekend I was met by some of our leading scientists from the University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, which is one of the land-grant colleges. We are very proud of this great university and its agriculture program. These scientists pointed out to me that by research, not only in forestry projects but in what we call land crops—such as wheat, corn, feed grains, cotton, and many other crops, by crossbreeding and by processes of biochemistry—we are able to make what are known as food products available for industrial and commercial uses, so that instead of a farmer leaving his land idle, he is able to utilize the land, taking what was once called a food product and moving it into the chemical industry for new types of processed commodities that meet the needs of modern American industry, such as homebuilding, and the many other needs of our fellow citizens. What I have said is also true of wood products and forest products.

We, in Minnesota, with 22 million acres of forest land, are vitally concerned about this subject.

Yesterday afternoon I had a call from Ely, Minn., in reference to the improvement of a forest products laboratory in that area. The laboratory has been a going concern. It could mean much in terms of employment. We are saddled with a shocking and tragic problem of unemployment in northeastern Minnesota. The proposal of the Senator from Mississippi would help in every part of the Nation, not only to stimulate greater research for the sake of research, but, more importantly, to stimulate research to aid the producer, to aid the consumer, and to build a stronger economy.

I thank the Senator. I will support him wholeheartedly.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. His support is valuable. The proposal which the Senator from Minnesota mentioned with regard to further utilization of agricultural and forest products is one of the key points in this program.

Of the 12 additional projects that I propose for fiscal year 1963, the first 5 listed were ones I endorsed a year ago but were not provided for in the 1962 appropriation. They are even more badly needed now than last year.

One of them deserves special comment. The $4 million listed for the addition to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., would be the first stage of a construction program that will when completed cost $10 million. Other stages could follow within the next few years. As was developed in hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee on this point last year, it is feasible to construct these Forest Products Laboratory facilities in two or three stages. The first stage is for the work on wood chemistry and pulp and paper. I have recently checked this point with officials of the Forest Service and they have confirmed that the Madison project could be efficiently constructed in stages if the full amount could not be made available at once.

The present laboratory building at Madison is overcrowded and ill adapted to the modern scientific and experimental equipment needed for the forest products research program. I have looked into this and know that additional laboratory space there is needed. It is the same story here as at many other forestry research locations: a need now for more space and better and more modern facilities for research.

Madam President, that is the story in so many words. New facilities have been developed, new processes, new ways of doing old things better and proposals for doing new things well. But the buildings that are available to house the necessary facilities in order to use them properly are simply not available.

These additions are necessary to be made to the old laboratories. Wherever they do not now exist, they must be started, and these buildings must be constructed.

The other 7 projects in the list of 12 additional I propose are for locations where going programs are underway and where their need, because of lack of space and modern experimental facilities, seems especially urgent to me. As I have said many times before, we cannot have a modern, efficient forestry research program without good laboratories and the scientific equipment and other facilities that scientists need to do productive research. The techniques and methods used today in scientific work have advanced at rates typical of the missile age. But these techniques require new equipment to capitalize on the speed and refinements they bring to the research job.

Several years ago I visited one of the laboratories, and there I found highly paid and efficient scientists, who ranked at the very top in their particular field, sitting on nail kegs and using boxes for desks, and old microscopes and equipment of that kind, in carrying on this high level work. Obviously they could not do their very best work. Obviously they did not have the tools of their trade. There now is a better laboratory at that location. Naturally these men are now doing finer work. All this illustrates one of our great resources, namely better growth and better forests and better and more products, through the utilization of new methods in connection with these related matters, which constitute one of our most vital problems for the future and which is one of the most neglected at the present time.

The planned research construction by the Forest Service would cost over the next several years an estimated sum of about $50 million. I base this estimate on the plan presented by the Department 2 years ago. My cost estimate may be too low. This previous plan, we are given to understand, has been revised by the Department and made more complete and up to date as to cost, and will be presented to the Congress at an early date. The revised forestry research plan has been made available to the Appropriations Committee in broad outline. The construction of research facilities would be planned for completion prior to fiscal year 1972. I urge that we must maintain a steady pace with a substantial yearly allowance for forestry research construction so that it can be completed during the planned period. My proposed $4,555,000 increase over the appropriated amount for research construction in 1962 would give the Forest Service $9,750,000 for fiscal year 1963 for this purpose.

This is an area that has long been neglected. It is a sound plan. We do not propose that we should try to do all this at once. We should stretch it out over the years. However, if we miss these years in between, we will create a great waste, in addition to lagging behind as we do now, and throwing the entire plan out of balance. Therefore, we must get along with this work.

RESEARCH PROGRAM INCREASES ALSO NEEDED

In addition to an increase for research construction, I am recommending an increase for research work for fiscal year 1963; that is, $6 million—$4,773 000 over the budget estimate—to provide for a more aggressive research attack on high priority problems. Accelerated research is especially needed on forest fire, insect, and disease-protection problems; on improvement of watershed management; and on forest products utilization and marketing problems.

Members of the Senate will recall vividly the newspaper, radio, and television accounts of forest fire disasters of the past year. In California, 2 recent fires destroyed 450 high-priced homes in 48 hours. Millions of dollars of damage was done to precious watersheds and further destruction of resources and property resulted from an aftermath of floods and erosion coming from the burned-over mountainside.

This is a graphic illustration of the burnt dwelling houses being just the beginning of the destruction. The erosion and destruction of the potential growth and the destruction of the watersheds, which mean so much to these areas, are the big values that are involved.

But as black as this picture appears, the relatively small research program

available to the Forest Service is making some progress in solving critical fire problems. A recently developed thick water combined with a fire suppressant chemical offers new hope for firefighters. In fact, many chemicals are being evaluated and new aerial techniques evolved to make control effective. Progress such as this would be greatly speeded up by increased research on forest fire control.

Anyone who wants to get a thrill out of a group of fine young Americans who operate in this field should visit these fine young men whom the Forest Service calls fire jumpers. I did not go up with them in their planes. It is said that they are the only ones who are happy when they get a call to jump in fighting these fires.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I should like again to interrupt the Senator from Mississippi to compliment him anew in again nitting the nail right on the head. He has referred to the disastrous fires of California and he has called attention to the fact that these fires have a double-barreled effect. They burn down property of immense value, and leave the land eroded. Then when the torrential floods come, the hillsides are washed down into the gullies, and in that way more property is ruined.

The Senator has clearly illustrated that situation, when he said that the key to the problem is to develop some kind of fire-resistant material, such as he has referred to, and thick water, and other means. I have urged some research in that area.

We held hearings on the subject in California in 1958, and we urged that that be done at that time. We have a research center in San Bernardino County.

I observe that my colleague from Mississippi has advocated some additional funds for research in this area. I propose shortly, following the distinguished Senator's speech, to elaborate on this subject somewhat and urge an expenditure of an additional $500,000 in California for this purpose. I again compliment most highly the excellent speech of the Senator from Mississippi and the fine work that he has done, and also to assure him of my support.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. METCALF. I hope that at the conclusion of the Senator's fine speech I shall be able to say something about some of these activities in Montana. At this point I cannot refrain from joining the Senator from California and the Senator from Minnesota in offering my compliments to the Senator from Mississippi on his great leadership in advocating the expenditure of more funds for forest research construction and more research activities. He has been a leader in this field. The money that has been spent in this activity has returned dividends many times over compared with the cost.

I interrupted the Senator's speech at this point in order to call attention to the activities of the smokejumper center at Missoula, Mont., to which the Senator has referred and which the Senator helped us to maintain.

These men at the smokejump center have worked all over the West. Some of them have been killed in their activity. They have saved millions of acres of timber and millions of dollars because they have been able to apply the new facilities which have been developed as a result of the research activities in the laboratory. They have been able to apply these special chemicals to forest fires at the earliest possible moment, and in that way have brought about tremendous savings of money and timber. The activity of the smokejumpers alone, along with the development of new fire-fighting techniques, has more than paid for the cost of the laboratories and the production of research facilities which the Federal Government has established in these activities. I hope I may have further comments to make at the conclusion of the Senator's speech. However, at this point I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his most gracious remarks. I am aware that he knows his subject and is vitally interested in the problem.

I should like to make one more comment about the smokejumpers. It is a good tonic for any American to go out and talk to the men who fight fire with parachutes from the air. It is a thrill to go to where they are stationed with their planes and to observe their fine spirit of willingness. I understand they have to be trained for only about 90 days before they become proficient in the use of parachutes, as well as in fire-fighting. I think the record is that a man has never been lost by falling or jumping, but that lives have been lost because men have been cut off behind the fire and have been burned to death.

I asked the men how they avoided landing in the trees. They said they were trained and tried to land in the trees; that this is a good way to get safely to the ground.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to join with other Senators in paying tribute to the Senator from Mississippi, who has been the leader in this field. Only a few days ago I said to the Senate that I was surprised to learn that $900,000 which we requested to construct a utilization research laboratory in Louisiana, particularly to solve the problem of increased uses of southern pine, and this item was not approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It was my privilege to visit, last winter, a number of towns in Louisiana that are dependent on the southern pine industry. The people there are very much disturbed because, although Louisiana is becoming green with timber again, no effort is being made to find ways and means to utilize the timber which is now being grown. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi knows that in his State and my State—in fact, in quite a few of the States of the South—large areas of hardwood are being destroyed to make way for pastureland.

Imagine the good that would come from a program of finding ways and means to grow and utilize hardwoods on land which is now being used for pasture. I hope that we may continue the fight which is being led by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, and that Congress will provide sufficient funds with which to construct the laboratory.

In my judgment, the creation of this laboratory in Louisiana will not in any way detract from or duplicate work prepared in Madison, Wis. The laboratory there was established when the lumber people in that area were in trouble. It grew from a small start to the point where it is now the leading laboratory of the country in this field. However its work must be augmented and aided by other regional laboratories.

It seems to me that we are in great need of additional research in this field. I hope that the Congress will approve this appropriation of $900,000 to establish a needed laboratory in Alexandria, La., to find ways and means to increase utilization not only of hardwoods but also of the thousands of southern pine trees which are being planted in all parts of the South.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. No one has a better knowledge of the research and needs than does he. No one does more work in this field in a very constructive role because of his alertness to the need in his own area.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. All the laboratories listed here, except one which operates on a large scale, cost a modest amount, relatively speaking. They begin at $150,000; another cost $200,000; another cost $900,000; another cost $300,000. One of the lowest in price is only $150,000. Another one is $400,000; there is one for $900,000; and the last one is for $450,000. They are not expensive; they do not involve costly programs. The program is operated more or less on an austerity basis for a highly essential work.

This is a case, too, if I may suggest it, in which the thinking of the legislative branch of the Government and its leadership is running ahead of that of the executive branch and the Budget Bureau. I think the reason is that the Members of both Houses are closer to the problem and realize the potential of these new means to further utilization. Progress such as this would be greatly speeded up by research in many fields, of which forest fire control is one of the most important.

Other major forest protection problems are the heavy losses suffered from insect and disease depredations. These pests cost Federal, State, and private agencies millions of dollars every year for control measures.

Think of that. The destruction each year through insects and disease in the

forest is roughly equal to the amount of wood that is used in a year. That includes the national forests and the great areas of forest land which are privately owned.

It is hard to put a real value on the damage these pests cause, although we know they destroy or eliminate growth of timber roughly equal to the total wood we use. So, it is encouraging to know that real progress is being made on some pests. For example, painstaking research on chemical formulations and methods of application have resulted in control methods that cost but a fraction of earlier ones. In the West, control of a pine needle insect in one area was achieved at a savings of $100,000 over the cost of the old method. An antibiotic has been found and proved effective in controlling the white pine blister rust disease in Idaho. This significant discovery will bring back into production 1 million acres of the valuable white pine.

Madam President, there is a practical illustration of white pine blister rust which has taken out of production something like a million acres. This discovery, which cost a small amount of money, will bring that wood back to production.

This brief list of achievements of forestry research scientists could easily be expanded. But even these few examples will show how research is paying off in better forestry. I am confident that a speedup in research on fire, insect, and disease problems will return the cost many times over in forest resources saved and in reduced expenditures for forest protection control measures.

This is no theory of mine. As we walk through the forests, many times we see the effects of disease upon the leaves and the limbs. There are innumerable instances, as one passes from one acre to another. That shows the need for the search for remedies and the application of those remedies. It is obvious what the payoff would be.

Another important field of research that needs additional strengthening is watershed management. America's forests and related rangelands are our major water-producing lands. Their maintenance in a productive condition, free of erosion, is a complex technical job because these same lands must also produce timber, forage, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

I marvel at the skill and ingenuity of the research men who probe into the secrets of better watershed management. In one high-mountain study in Colorado, they have found out how to increase the yield of water produced from the snowpack by 20 percent. Here is a source of additional water for irrigation, domestic supply, and industrial use in an area where water is the key to future domestic and industrial expansion. Research results of these kinds are returning many times over the small cost of the research programs.

A few years ago, I visited a large Marine Corps installation in California, where I was greeted by the commanding officer, a general. The first thing he said was: "I want you to know that since I have been in command here we have not wasted one barrel of water."

I come from a part of the country where we sometimes have excessive rainfall. I was impressed with his statement and did not understand his emphasis. However, after spending a couple of days with him on that fine reservation, I realized just how important it was to conserve every barrel of water. I joined with him then in his evaluation. I think that it should go in his record that he, the commanding officer of the vast installation, could achieve so fine a record of conserving water. It illustrates the problem with which our western friends, as well as our friends from other parts of the country, are confronted. That problem is tied directly into our forestry program and the research in connection with it.

This is true in the eastern as well as in the western forests. In North Carolina, on the well-known Coweeta Experimental Forest, scientists have developed methods for logging timber in keeping with good soil and water conservation. Many of these research results are being applied today.

But we need far more intensive effort on still unanswered problems in many regions. In New England, the Lake States, the Southwest, and the Deep South—in all parts of the Nation—we have forest watershed problems. We must get on with the forest water and soils program of research that is so sorely needed.

Certainly forest-products research deserves the special attention which we urge be given to it.

I am told that about three-fourths of all the precipitation that falls on the United States, actually falls on forest land. It is in the forests that water and soil problems can and do start, and research can help solve them. Forest watershed research must be stepped up now if we are going to get the answers in time to point the way to better erosion control, more effective flood abatement, and better water yields for the irrigated agriculture and the industrial developments that so heavily depend upon water from these watersheds.

Forest-products research deserves our special attention. The pulp and paper research of the Forest Products Laboratory, for example, has led directly to methods that open up markets for species of trees heretofore unsuited for certain paper products. That work has been particularly valuable in many areas of the Nation. New knowledge from basic research on fiber bonding is speeding the papermaking process and is reducing unit costs to a point where marginal sizes and heretofore little-used species of trees can now be profitably harvested and marketed. In my State—in fact, all over the South—the pulp and paper industry is our very lifeblood. It provides thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars of income every year. New knowledge such as I describe keeps an abundant raw material base for this industry. The landowners benefit by having a market for their lower quality timber, as well as for the more readily marketable high-quality trees.

Madam President, a few years ago I made an all-day visit in and around Natchez, Miss., which was the first cotton empire to develop following Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin, which made cotton a fiber with wide uses. Although in that area the cotton is almost gone, I found that on the edge of that city the International Paper Co. had established a large unit which was producing from pulpwood a very high quality rayon which also is used in the manufacture of some of the modern fibers and clothing. That shows how close to the economy, as a practical matter, these programs are.

The need for strengthening research on forest products utilization and marketing is especially essential in the Nation's areas of chronic underemployment. Almost all these areas are characterized by abundant forest land. The forests represent their principal raw material. There is a great deal of forest land in these difficult areas, but much of the timber is of small size and of poor quality for traditional uses. Research is needed to develop new uses and markets for it. Better marketing systems need to be developed, so that a more efficient flow of a broad variety of products gets into industrial channels, with reasonable profits all along the line. All this will mean new jobs, more abundant wood products, and flourishing wood industries. All our people, and especially those in these underdeveloped forest-industry areas, would benefit.

One example will demonstrate how wood utilization and marketing research pays off. I am told that in recent years more than 60 sawmills have either shut down or operated at a loss in the State of Maine. The problem was the low quality of the white pine logs on which these mills had to depend. These mills produced such knotty lumber that a profit could not be realized. Just a few months ago, a team of forestry research experts found a way to organize the conversion of lumber from these operations, so that major defects in the low-quality lumber would be cut out and the small, clear pieces would be glued into high-grade boards that bring a premium price. A new processing plant now being planned by industry will provide a market outlet for the products of small sawmills. This new market should enable most of the shutdown mills to resume operations and to employ hundreds of workers once more.

In addition to the various programs I have cited as in need of an accelerated attack, there are other essential ones. These include research on the problems of reforestation, forest genetics, timber growing, range management, improvement of wildlife habitat, and forest recreation. Our forestry research program should move ahead in a balanced way, since many of the forestry problems are interrelated, and their solutions cannot be found in a lopsided or uncoordinated hit-or-miss fashion.

In concluding, let me say this: America's future and our system of life are

based on a philosophy of abundance. We are richly blessed with natural resources. But we must manage these resources wisely and we must utilize them intelligently. The increases I am proposing for forestry research are an insignificant price to pay for the benefits that will flow from a rich and varied base of wood, water, forage, wildlife, and recreation. Let us keep America's scientific knowledge moving ahead on every front, and particularly on the front of research in connection with our forests, which, as I have said, constitute America's prime reproducible natural resource.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Again I wish to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for his splendid speech on the need for forest research and forest-research laboratory construction. As I looked at the list of additional laboratories proposed, I observed that not one would be located in my State. Yet, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, these forestry-research programs are interrelated; and laboratories established in Minnesota or at Madison, Wis., are vitally related to the best utilization of the forest in Mississippi or Montana.

One year ago a new forestry-research laboratory was authorized for Bozeman, Mont. This project is now under construction, and will be ready to be occupied 1 year hence. We need to push vigorously ahead now with implementation of the research program for this important station in the northern Rocky Mountains. The proposal of the Senator from Mississippi to strengthen forestry research on utilization and engineering is therefore timely.

The research at Bozeman emphasizes the forest engineering aspects of timber harvesting with at least two highly important objectives: First, more profitable systems of harvesting, transporting, and handling the small-sized but abundant lodgepole pine timber; and second, safe methods of logging in mountain areas where slopes are steep and soils highly erodible. Prior to this research activity, the lodgepole pine was regarded as a weed tree, something to get rid of, something that handicapped forestry operations. But now it has been found to be a valuable forest product which, if properly utilized, is an important additional resource. Both of these problems require new and unique engineering systems. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has proposed that these research programs be speeded up and strengthened. The work at Bozeman by the Forest Service research scientists is in cooperation with Montana State College engineers. The arrangement is working well and is highly productive. It needs greater support now for a harder attack on these pressing problems.

A proposal to strengthen forest-fire research also has much merit.

I have already referred to the fact that at Missoula, Mont., we have a good start, in the new laboratory there, on solving many troublesome fire-control problems. Promising early results of lightning-storm modification suggest that intensified efforts will pay big dividends in future fire prevention. Studies of how to control fires by new aerial methods, chemicals, and a whole new technology are needed if we are to cut the high cost of control and if we are to reduce excessive damage to our forest resources. The laboratory at Missoula is well equipped to handle an accelerated fire research program; and we need to speed up the development of the new techniques for the handling of these problems.

Again I congratulate the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for his outstanding leadership in calling this matter to the attention of the Senate and for the fine statement he has made in support of this program.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Montana very much.

I may say that last year the Members of both Houses who are interested in the program made much progress. This year, additional progress in this field will be more difficult, for we shall have to justify fully any increases outside of the budget. But by working together and pushing vigorously, I am sure we can make some headway.

Madam President, before I conclude, I wish to say that the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is, in my opinion, one of the truly great services in the Federal Government; and it includes the management at the scientific level and the direction of the workers in the field, including the smoke jumpers and other groups which I have found to be highly effective. Those who are engaging in this work are devoted to their missions and are very much interested in obtaining results. I think they personify the Government service at its very best, and I am glad to commend them highly. They are gradually bringing into being finer and finer forests, which constitute one of our Nation's great resources; and unnumbered generations ahead of us will benefit from their very fine work. So I am very glad to commend them.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a statement prepared by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], who could not be on the floor today.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS

First of all, may I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS, for his efforts to increase Forest Service research activities, and offer him my full support. Nothing is more important than sound resource development of our public domain, and adequate research is the basis for such development.

The watershed research laboratory proposed for establishment at the Utah State University at Logan in northern Utah would facilitate research in watershed management in the high mountain areas of the Intermountain West. It would serve not only Utah, but Idaho, Montana, western Wyoming, and Nevada, as a research arm of the U.S. Forest Service regional office which is located at Ogden, Utah.

The estimated cost of the laboratory is $900,000, with $600,000 needed for the basic structure. I sincerely hope the full amount can be written into the fiscal year 1963 appropriations, and I shall take all proper steps to see that this is done.

Water is extremely important in the entire Intermountain area to agriculture, industry, and livestock production. The amount of water produced on high watersheds, and the timing of the yield, all contribute to whether there is enough water in some years, and at certain times in every year, to sustain the industries, animals, and individuals depending on that water. The proper management of wildlife, timber growing, and grazing are all part of the problem.

The uncertain water supply situation of the Intermountain area is at least partly due to unsatisfactory soil and vegetative cover conditions on many of the forest and range watersheds. There have been some serious and destructive floods in the Great Basin area in Utah. Almost all of these floors have been traced to heavy rainstorms falling on watershed areas having poor vegetation cover and subject to much soil erosion. These are unusual and difficult soil areas, where growing vegetation requires special attention; yet they are critical areas to control excess runoff and erosion and flooding.

The Logan laboratory will facilitate the study of soils, their erodibility, and their suitability for growing vegetation for rehabilitating the unsatisfactory watersheds. It will also help to develop types of vegetation suitable to such harsh conditions for establishment and growth.

The hydraulic behavior of water in steep mountain streams will also be a subject for study at the laboratory. These stream channels are unstable for the most part, and every spring when the snow is melting and in the summer when heavy storms strike, large quantities of soil and rock are carried into the storage reservoirs and irrigation systems. It is costly and time consuming to clean this material from the storage areas and ditches in the valleys.

The laboratory will permit studies with models of how water behaves in stream channels of this kind and the types of small structures and other streambank improvements that may be helpful in stabilizing mountain stream channels. In this regard, this facility will serve a large part of the steep mountain areas of the Western United States.

In conclusion, I again reiterate my support of the Senator from Mississippi in his efforts to increase construction funds in the fiscal year 1963 budget for Forest Service research facilities, and especially for the construction of a Forest Watershed Management Laboratory in Utah.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, again I wish to say for the RECORD that I sincerely compliment the Senator from Mississippi on the great speech he has made today with reference to a subject matter which is vital not only to the area from which he comes, but to the Far West.

A CRASH PROGRAM OF FOREST FIRE RESEARCH

A few months ago people everywhere across the Nation were once more made keenly aware of the critical forest fire problem we have in California. They read of it in the newspapers, heard it on the radio. Many persons saw television broadcasts of fires sweeping through

southern California mountains. They saw expensive homes being consumed by the flames. In one short 48-hour period, more than 450 homes were destroyed in the Los Angeles area.

As the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, some of these floods were directly related to last year's destructive brushfires.

I asked the Forest Service to prepare a memorandum on the results of damage from burned areas in southern California, and I ask unanimous consent that that memorandum be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

FOREST SERVICE,
Pasadena, Calif., February 12, 1962.

DIRECTORS, P.S.W.F. & R.E.S.
(Attention of Walt Hopkins, T. D. Robertson, Assistant Forest Supervisor, by Information Services (watershed)):

Regarding your telephone request this morning for information for Herbert Storey, of the Washington office, and Senator CLARE ENGLE, on the flood conditions after the recent southern California rainstorm. The following information has been obtained from a personal survey by Supervisor Jarvi, our flood control engineers, and information from the Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

Before listing individual canyon totals, in the Angeles National Forest and the condition as of today: the recent 5-day storm totaled a maximum 22.85 inches of rain at the Cogswell Dam, inside the forest on the West Fork of the San Gabriel River. This brings the season's total to date to 38 inches at this location in the forest. A normal seasonal total is 33 inches, so we are far ahead of our normal at this point.

Running from west to east, along the front country of the forest, the following observations were made from these surveys:

Pacoima Dam: Watershed unburned north of San Fernando. Twenty-five percent capacity, releasing some water for water conservation and spreading basins. No flood problems in this area. Average runoff. Debris production minimum.

Little Tujunga Canyon: Portions of the watershed burned in 1960 and 1961 north of San Fernando. No extensive flooding problems. Drainage directly into Hansen Dam in Los Angeles City. Extensive highway damage due to washouts and slides in the burned area. Estimate 2 days to reopen. Some scattered ranch homes isolated due to swollen streams. Debris problems in large dam.

Big Tujunga Canyon: Partially burned watershed in 1959. Extensive highway slides and washouts. Estimate 1 to 2 days to reopen. Debris production heavy.

Big Tujunga Dam: No burned area above dam. No problems, not much debris. Four thousand cubic feet per second over spillway. One hundred percent retention at lower Hansen Dam for water conservation. Scattered ranches and homes stranded by road washouts, but no severe hardships.

Arroyo Seco Canyon: Completely burned watershed in 1959. Heavy silt production into Devil's Gate Dam. Cooperative channel clearing project by Forest Service personnel financed by Los Angeles County Flood Control District and Pasadena Water Department, prevented blocking of channel by trees and other debris.

Devil's Gate Dam: Average discharge. Dam filled to 80-percent capacity. Releases being made.

Eaton Canyon Dam: No burned watershed. No debris problems. Average streamflow. One hundred percent retention for water conservation.

Santa Anita Canyon, north of Arcadia: Santa Anita Dam, 1,600 cubic feet per second over spillway. Retention of majority for water conservation and spreading basins. No debris movement due to effectiveness of stabilization dams upstream built by Forest Service under Los Angeles River program. Same conditions for Sawpit Canyon.

Hastings Canyon: Completely burned watershed in 1961. Emergency channel diversion dam operating efficiently preventing flooding of many expensive homes in lower subdivisions. This was a cooperatively financed project by U.S. Forest Service and Los Angeles County Flood Control District immediately after the Sierra fire. Immediately to the east a small watershed extensively damaged two expensive homes. Lower debris dam extensive filling with mud, rocks, and other debris.

Sierra Madre: Some localized flooding and washouts directly below the denuded area. Several homes damaged.

San Gabriel Canyon: Burned watershed of 1960 and 1961. Extensive highway slides closing all roads. Estimate 2 to 3 days to reopen. Highway inundated and washed out in places. Extensive runoff into San Gabriel dam No. 1. Considerable silt and debris production.

San Dimas Canyon eastward: No additional problems reported. Heavy damage occurred during previous storms.

This generally is the picture with regard to the Angeles National Forest and foothill areas. With relation to the Bel-Air-Los Angeles City area, extensive flooding and backyard mudflows were experienced in the Roscoemare Road area. In the entire Hollywood Hills section, bordered by Ventura Boulevard on the north, Sunset Boulevard on the south, Beachwood Drive on the east, and in the vicinty of Sepulveda on the west, land slippage occurred on many hillside areas as well as debris production and improvement damage due to the Bel-Air fire.

In Sherman Oaks a fatality did occur to a child when a slide moved into the rear of a house and into the bedroom suffocating the victim. Another fatality occurred in the Monterey Park hills east of Los Angeles when the same type of land slippage problem occurred at a home in a new development. Neither of these two fatalities had relation to burned areas. Most of the newspaper accounts relate to the low-lying south portion of Los Angeles.

In general, from the surveys it was noted that chaparral watershed in good condition flowed freely with clear water, no problems in erosion or in flooding were noted. In those watersheds where fire had recently occurred extensive damage was noted. Undoubtedly the damage would have been more extensive had the rainfall not have been spread over 5 days and been of low intensities which varied from 0.20 to 0.40 inches per hour. Extensive damage has been experienced in the forest from washouts and slides to forest fire roads (truck trails).

Soil conditions were such that low intensities were absorbed without heavy runoff.

At this writing, both the private weather consultants to the Los Angeles County Flood Control District as well as the U.S. Weather Bureau, are predicting another storm of the same type as we have just experienced, to hit southern California some time Wednesday and to last through Saturday. With watersheds in their present saturated condition a new storm would spell disaster.

DON K. PORTER.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, the State of California had 3,300 forest and brush fires in 1961. This was a record number. They burned 315,000 acres. Besides the tremendous damage to valuable timber stands and watersheds, they inflicted the greatest loss of improved property in suburban areas that the State has ever experienced. Damages will run into the millions of dollars. Although the final total has not yet been determined, we know the losses are staggering, and there is no way to put a dollar value on human lives lost.

This is not the first time that the seriousness of the forest fire problem has been recognized. In October of 1957 I was chairman of a special subcommittee and held hearings in southern California. It was obvious then, as it is now, that forest fire problems in this area are more acute than anywhere else in the country. Since 1957, fire problems statewide have worsened. Weather has continued to be critical. We have hundreds of thousands more people using the forests and increasing the risk of fire. Values at stake have mounted rapidly as urban and industrial developments have mushroomed into forest areas.

In spite of increased effort by county, State, Federal, and private agencies, fire losses and fire control costs continue to rise. Some progress has been made in getting better firefighting equipment. Fire control forces have done a herculean job. Increased funds have been made available. Last year almost one-third of the total emergency fire funds used in the 155 national forests and 18 national grasslands were expended on the 4 southern California national forests. But the plain fact is, brute strength has not and will not solve the problem.

A NEW TECHNOLOGY IS NEEDED

As laudable as present fire control efforts are and as necessary as it may be to continue to maintain them, something new must be added. In 1957 our subcommittee recognized this. It recommended a strong research program that would show the way to a new technology—a fresh approach to old problems.

I firmly believe that our only hope of solving the forest fire problem is through a crash program of fire research. I do not mean a one-shot program. I do mean a total and sustained research effort with all the stops pulled out—one that is daring, farsighted, and imaginative. It is reasonable to believe that fire control technology can be advanced.

In this respect I propose to support vigorously and wholeheartedly the 12-point program advocated by the Senator from Mississippi.

The trouble is we have been too timid and too modest in what we have tried. Scientists have been limited by lack of strong financial support, working with hundreds of dollars while millions were being poured into control programs. It is time we got started on a thorough, imaginative, and speedup program of research.

CONTENTS OF A NEW RESEARCH PROGRAM

At least three major phases of the overall fire problem should be vigorously attacked in a speedup fire research program: First, fuel hazard reduction; second, prevention of man-caused fires; and

third, improvement of firefighting with chemicals.

Other new ideas and leads may open up as research on these three important problems move ahead.

Fuel hazard reduction research is needed to find a way to break up the large brush fields in California which often extend, without material interruption, for miles. Under severe burning conditions, no present method of firefighting can stop a fire until it runs out of fuel. We need to know how these large brush fields can be strategically and effectively broken into strips or blocks and separated by greenbelts or areas with low-growing, less-flammable vegetation. Here is a real challenge for research to bring skill and ingenuity to a difficult program.

The added risk created by thousands of people requires new and positive advances in fire prevention. We must find effective methods of keeping fires from starting, especially under critical conditions. Maybe this can be achieved through research on better methods of getting the message across to people. Maybe it will require new methods to fireproof roadside, campgrounds, or other critical areas. I am convinced we need a new and thorough research job done on how better to prevent man-caused fires.

Now, with respect to better firefighting chemicals and methods to use them in fire control: In the last few years the use of fire retardants has grown by leaps and bounds, and with good results. Last year, I am told, 8 million gallons were cascaded on fires on the national forests. But this is expensive business. Results are not as good as they could be. Research has advanced in this field, but not far enough or fast enough. Not only are better chemicals needed, but aerial techniques can be improved. One estimate I have suggests that $1.5 million could be saved in 1 year just through the development of more effective and precise methods of delivering retardants by air.

FUNDS NEEDED FOR CRASH PROGRAM

To attack the foregoing three problems aggressively in California would require an increase of $500,000 per year.

The Senator from Mississippi advocated an increase of the budget in these areas of $4 million, and I hope we can get into that program and use a part of that money for this purpose.

I strongly urge that this amount be added to the Forest Service fire research appropriation estimate in the fiscal year 1963 budget as submitted to the Congress. While this research is badly needed in California, it would also benefit the rest of the country where forest fire problems occur.

The distinguished junior Senator from Montana mentioned that point just a few minutes ago. Certainly, anything we do in California with respect to fire research will be helpful in any part of the country.

The cost of this acceleration in fire research would be more than offset by preventing only one major conflagration. I do not know what the total fire fighting bill may have been in California in 1961, but I dare say we could support the kind of a speedup research program I am talking about—10 to 20 years—on just 1 year's direct outlay for fire control.

It would be poor economy to go longer without an all-out effort to create a new fire control technology. The potential savings in resources, human lives, and direct dollar outlay make this one of the best investments of our time. I strongly recommend and urge that an additional $500,000 be made available for forest fire research in the Southwest.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT AND UTILIZATION LABORATORY, REDDING, CALIF.

A timber management and utilization laboratory at Redding, Calif., costing an estimated $450,000, is badly needed to provide the research scientists already working in Redding with the facilities they now lack.

The Senator from Mississippi has included this item among the ones he mentioned.

The proposed laboratory would house the research being done on reforesting the 2 million acres of brush fields that now occupy much productive land in northern California.

It would speed research on insect pests that threaten billions of board feet of valuable timber. And the new laboratory would provide for research on wood utilization problems peculiar to the large and varied timber industry of the State.

Again, Madam President, I concur with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] with respect to the need for more research on better wood utilization.

A great deal of fine research has been accomplished in northern California. We have seen new hybrid trees developed that are now ready for large-scale use. But additional problems such as conversion of brush fields to plantable conditions, must be solved. The program needs additional emphasis and the proposed laboratory at Redding will supply the equipment and other facilities needed for this work.

PEST CONTROL

Madam President, pest control has gone forward for many years, but we have not had enough of it. I say that the "Insect Logging Co." cuts more timber than any commercial operation in the United States. I hope we can cut down the productive activities of the "Insect Logging Co." and preserve those trees for the kinds of use we should be making of them.

Finally, Madam President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a study made on forest fire control in southern California by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives in the 85th Congress, 1st session. The hearings were held in Los Angeles, Calif., and in the adjacent area. They were attended by me, as chairman of the subcommittee; Representative James A. Haley, of Florida; Representative George A. Shuford, of North Carolina; Representative B. F. Sisk, of California; Representative Stewart L. Udall, of Arizona, who is now the Secretary of the Interior; Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania; Representative Craig Hosmer, of California; and Representative John J. Rhodes, of Arizona.

These hearings developed a definitive analysis of the special type of fire control problem we have in southern California, where our forests are mainly brushlands and where, in the past fall, there were devastating floods which led to the disastrous sweep of the torrential rains in recent weeks in southern California. These cut, we might say, like a double-bitted ax, well known in the lumber industry. The ax of fire cuts one way, as it burns down the timber and denudes the hillsides; and then the ax of rain comes along, sweeping the soil from the hillsides down into the gulleys and valleys, ruining valuable property.

In conclusion, Madam President, I wish to say I hope that the program the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has advocated will go forward with speed. It will have my enthusiastic support. I feel that nothing is more important than broadening our knowledge with reference to the utilization and the conservation of the basic resources of this Nation.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the excellent presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] on the need for adequate funds for forestry research. His factual statement on the Nation's needs should be fully persuasive.

In particular I support the inclusion, among the priority items for construction, of the forest engineering laboratory at Houghton, Mich. The purpose of this laboratory, to be constructed at an estimated cost of $400,000, will be to solve engineering problems associated with forest management and utilization peculiar to the hardwood forests of Northern and Eastern United States. It will provide the facilities urgently needed for research in mechanization of operations for converting deteriorated northern timber stands and deforested areas to improved species and culture, including removal of brush and large cull trees and transport of forest products to primary plants.

Even at the current rate, the harvesting of forest products in the Lake States is a materials handling job of major proportions—approximately 15 million tons per year. By the time this material is handled and re-handled by present inefficient methods the total annual tonnage is estimated to exceed 120 million tons. Vastly improved systems are needed.

The laboratory will be located adjacent to the planned expanded campus of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology, an outstanding engineering, educational, and research institution with which the Forest Service now has and expects to continue cooperative projects in forest products and engineering research. Much specialized skill and equipment necessary in a program of forest engineering research are available on a cooperative basis at the college and will not be duplicated in the proposed laboratory.

I hope the Congress will see fit to allow us to move forward on these projects—which, as the Senator from Mississippi noted, will mean new jobs, more abundant wood products, and flourishing wood industries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana subsequently said: Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not able to be here when the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] spoke earlier today on the forestry research program proposed by the administration for fiscal 1963. However, I wish to associate myself with him in his remarks, and I want to express my appreciation to him for drawing attention to the fact that altogether too little is being done in the important area of forestry research.

As Senator STENNIS pointed out, the 1963 budget calls for an appropriation of $23,150,000, which is $3,218,000 below the 1962 budget. And the reason that the 1963 budget is below that of 1962 is because there is a $4½ million decrease in the all-important item of construction of facilities for forestry research. As a matter of fact, there is no money in the proposed budget for construction of new facilities for forestry research. Only the adding on to existing laboratories would be permitted.

Now, certainly, there is a need for expansion of some of the present forestry research stations; but there is just as great a need for the establishment of new facilities to handle the particular problems peculiar to certain areas, if not more.

Such a new facility is urgently needed at Alexandria, La. The forest utilization, protection, and forestation laboratory which has been talked of for Alexandria is high on the priority list of new research stations to be built. Senator STENNIS ranked it second of 12 additional construction projects which he thinks should be put in the 1963 forestry research program, and he estimated its cost at $900,000.

The present needs for the Alexandria laboratory are several. There is no market for 30 percent of the trees now being grown in the South. Forest growth has doubled, but lumber production has dropped 40 percent in the past 20 years in the South. There is a rapidly declining market for trees reaching maturity, causing a great hardship on the small growers, who had been encouraged by the U.S. Forest Service to get into tree farming.

The poor conditions prevailing in the tree-growing industry of the South will soon mean that there will be a decline in the growth of trees in that section or that there will have to be a costly Federal subsidy given to landowners to grow trees which cannot be sold. We all know the undesirability of such a subsidy, but it may not be realized that a decline in the growth of trees cannot be permitted to happen either. The Forest Service has indicated that, rather than decline, the South's forest productivity must double its present level in order to meet national wood requirements in 40 years and to take up the slack when the forestry resources of the West are exhausted.

So, the problem is that while there is no abundance of market for southern-grown timber now, there will become a great need for such timber in as few as 13 years, and, at the outside, 40 years. A tree planted in the South today will barely be large enough to cut for pulpwood in 1975, and will not produce sawlogs until the year 2000. So, we must keep the trees growing. But in order to do that and still keep the growers interested, we must make it profitable.

This is where such a facility as the research laboratory, at Alexandria, comes in. It can lead the way in developing new products from wood, in developing new and better methods of manufacturing and in developing new and better markets for wood.

Therefore, I strongly urge Congress to adopt Senator STENNIS' proposal to increase the 1963 budget for forestry research by $10,555,000, bringing the figure up to $36,923,000. And especially do I recommend that the 1963 budget figure of the research facilities construction program be increased by the approximately $9 million necessary to take care of the cost of the 12 new laboratories outlined by Senator STENNIS.

NEW FRONTIER CORRECTS ITS FANCY BOOKKEEPING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, last Monday I called attention to some fancy bookkeeping on the New Frontier wherein the Department of Agriculture was issuing reports showing $1½ billion reduction in the Government's investment in inventories of surplus agriculture commodities as compared with the previous year, when in reality on practically every commodity except cotton there had been increases in inventory. I pointed out that the November 1961 report indicated that there had been a $1,400 million reduction in the inventories of three commodities—wheat, corn, and grain sorghums—when in reality there had been increases in all three.

The Department of Agriculture has just issued another report dated February 13, 1962, and I am glad to note that they correct this discrepancy. In their new report, February 13, 1962, they have retroactively readjusted the December 31, 1960, valuation of inventories from the old method of computation to the new method. This had the result of reducing the amount which had previously been reported from $9,228,604,000 to $7,908,135,000 as of the same date. This lower figure for December 31, 1960, results from the New Frontier style of valuation.

Thus, in their new report for February 13, 1962, they recognize and correct a discrepancy as compared with the previous accounting system of $1,320,469,000.

By using the same formula for evaluating the inventories last year as presently being applied, the Department of Agriculture now shows a reduction in overall inventories in surplus agriculture commodities of only $222,209,000.

I accept this latter figure as accurate, and I hope that in future releases no further reference will be made by any of the administration officials trying to claim the fictitious $1½ billion reduction.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD first the report issued by the Department of Agriculture under date of January 12, 1962, wherein the new style of valuation is compared with the old method, thus indicating a $1½ billion reduction in value of agriculture inventories. Next I ask to have printed in the RECORD their report of February 13, 1962, showing both December 31, 1960, and December 31, 1961, adjusted on a comparable basis with the result that they now claim only a $222 million reduction. This represents a correction of $1,320,469,000 in their previous claim.

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

CCC OPERATING RESULTS AND STATUS OF CCC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1961

PRICE-SUPPORT LOANS AND INVENTORIES

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of December 31 the total investment of Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support loans and inventories amounted to $7,685,946,000. This total investment includes loans outstanding of $2,437,470,000 (lending agencies financed $895,220,000 of these loans) and inventories amounting to $5,248,476,000.

The December 31 estimate of the loss which will be realized upon ultimate disposition of price-support inventories amounted to $1,655,306,000, comprised of $174,734,000 estimated loss on commodities under loan and $1,480,572,000 estimated loss on inventories. These amounts of estimated losses are reflected as reserves for losses in the December 31 financial statements of the Corporation.

A comparison of total investment, the reserves for losses, and the net book value as of December 31, 1961 and 1960, follows:

	Investment	Reserve for losses	Net book value
Dec. 31, 1961:			
Loans	$2,437,470,000	$174,734,000	$2,262,736,000
Inventories	5,248,476,000	1,480,572,000	3,767,904,000
Total	7,685,946,000	1,655,306,000	6,030,640,000
Dec. 31, 1960:			
Loans	1,829,051,000	179,269,000	1,649,782,000
Inventories (revised)	6,079,084,000	1,805,607,000	4,273,477,000
Total	7,908,135,000	1,984,876,000	5,923,259,000

NOTE.—In order to facilitate comparisons with amounts reported for Dec. 31, 1961, and the current fiscal year, designated amounts in this press release which relate to dates or periods prior to June 30, 1961, have been revised in accordance with the changes in accounting policy adopted by Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1961. (See press release USDA 3157-61, dated Sept. 28, 1961, for explanation of the accounting policy changes.)

CCC OPERATING RESULTS AND STATUS OF CCC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1961

PRICE-SUPPORT LOANS AND INVENTORIES

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of November 30 the total investment of Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support loans and inventories amounted to $7,647,236,000. This total investment includes loans outstanding of $2,206,223,000 (lending agencies financed $716,758,000 of these loans) and inventories amounting to $5,441,013,000.

The November 30 estimate of the loss which will be realized upon ultimate disposition of price-support inventories amounted to $1,530,503,000, comprised of $165,401,000 estimated loss on commodities under loan and $1,365,102,000 estimated loss on inventories. These amounts of estimated losses are reflected as reserves for losses in the November 30 financial statements of the Corporation.

A comparison of total investment, the reserves for losses, and the net book value as of November 30, 1961, and 1960, follows:

	Investment	Reserve for losses	Net book value
Nov. 30, 1961:			
Loans	$2,206,223,000	$165,401,000	$2,040,822,000
Inventories	5,441,013,000	1,365,102,000	4,075,911,000
Total	7,647,236,000	1,530,503,000	6,116,733,000
Nov. 30, 1960:			
Loans	1,636,232,000	185,966,000	1,450,266,000
Inventories [1]	7,513,855,000	3,213,301,000	4,300,554,000
Total	9,150,087,000	3,399,267,000	5,750,820,000

[1] Investment in inventories as of Nov. 30, 1960, included storage, handling and transportation costs, incurred subsequent to acquisition; costs of storing on farms certain grain commodities while under extended loans prior to acquisition; and certain loan financing expenses. Such costs were removed from inventory accounts as of June 30, 1961, and similar costs incurred thereafter are recorded as operating expenses. Exclusion of such costs from investment value of inventories has the effect of reducing the reserve for losses; therefore, net book value of inventories is not affected.

OVERCHARGE TO GOVERNMENT UNDER NEGOTIATED CONTRACT FOR SPARE PARTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, today I call attention to a recent report—January 31, 1962—of the Comptroller General wherein he outlines another instance whereby under a negotiated $3 million contract for spare parts—stage units and tuned circuits—the Government was overcharged by 33⅓ percent.

The Comptroller General in this report points out that the Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., obtained this $1 million overpayment by failing to show the Government the true production costs of the parts being purchased.

Magnavox failed to reveal the fact that at the time of the negotiations they already had offers from subcontractors to build these parts far below those prices which were quoted; for instance, one part of the contract called for 22,960 ARC-34 stage units and tuned circuits. They presented to the Government a production cost of $27.52 per unit, but they already had in their possession a bid from a subcontractor, Forbes & Wagner, Inc., Silver Creek, N.Y., offering to build this identical unit for $24.82. Thus, on this portion of the contract there was an overestimate of $62,000.

In another part of the contract Magnavox charged the Government $2,717,100 for certain types of stage units which the Comptroller General said should have been only $1,936,200, thus representing an overcharge of $780,900.

On other parts of the contract approximately $200,000 was padded to production costs. The result was that altogether this $3 million spare parts contract Magnavox was overpriced to the Government by $1,055,000. This overcharge is over and above the amount which should have accrued to it as legitimate profits.

I am not placing the sole responsibility for this overcharge on Magnavox although certainly they cannot be excused, but the major responsibility rests upon the Air Force which uses such irresponsible business practices as negotiating these contracts when these same parts could just as well have been bought after solicitation of competitive bids.

Had competitive bids been solicited on these standard parts Forbes & Wagner and others could have submitted their lower bids direct to the Government. It is absurd that a subcontractor who had been building these parts should have his price negotiated to a close profit by a prime contractor who was padding his own price to the Government by an excessive 33⅓ percent.

It is these million-dollar wasteful items resulting from the irresponsible buying practices of the Defense Department which represent some of the excessive billions in our national budget.

Again, I urge congressional action on the bill which I have been introducing for the past several years, the purpose of which is to make it mandatory that all agencies of the Federal Government solicit competitive bids on all contracts except only in those instances where for security reasons such open solicitations would not be feasible, such as in the production of new and untried weapons of the atomic and missile age.

I congratulate the Comptroller General again upon a well-detailed report and note that he is referring copies to the appropriate Government agencies with the recommendation that action be taken to obtain recovery of these overcharges from the contractor. He has also called this to the attention of the Secretary of Defense with the suggestion that the procurement officers of that Department be more careful in the future.

MILITARY ANTI-COMMUNIST SPEECH DELETIONS

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Senate and received unanimous consent to have printed in connection with his remarks certain materials, which will appear hereafter in the RECORD.

LEWIS AND CLARK HIGHWAY

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, in 1805 the Lewis and Clark Expedition, searching for a pass through the Rockies, turned west from the Bitterroot Valley in Montana and traversed an Indian trail through Lolo Pass, one of the most difficult parts of the long trip, exploring the territory acquired in the Louisiana Purchase.

The following article is an account of the obstacles that have been overcome in following the Lewis and Clark trail over this rugged terrain. Capt. John Mullan, who built the famous Mullan Road, another East-West route, summed up the difficulties when he said the Lolo Trail "is the most difficult, rugged, severe and broken of any I have seen in my explorations of the Pacific Northwest."

Yet on August 19 of this year there is going to be a ribbon cutting at Parker's Meadows, about 10 miles west of the Montana-Idaho line, commemorating the opening of the Lewis and Clark Highway over the Lolo Trail and opening a new and shorter route to areas in the Pacific Northwest.

Chief credit for this achievement must go to two of our colleagues: to Senator FRANK CHURCH, who has made the completion of the Lewis and Clark Highway almost a crusade in his work in Congress, and to Senator ALBERT GORE, who held hearings in Idaho and Montana and worked out the formula for Federal-State assistance that made this road possible.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an article written by Del Klaus, public information director of the Idaho Highway Commission, describing the history of this scenic and historic route.

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

LEWIS AND CLARK HIGHWAY GETS THROUGH PRIMITIVE AREA

The Lewis-Clark Highway, crossing a rugged primitive area in northern Idaho, is now a reality. Completion of this historic route opens up a vast area of untouched scenic Idaho. No other State in the Nation can boast of such an accomplishment in the progress of modern ways for transportation.

It all started more than a century and a half ago. The great northwestern part of our United States was an unexplored no man's land. In 1803, U.S. President Thomas Jefferson, took action toward expanding our western boundaries to the Pacific Ocean. In a secret message to Congress, he requested authority for the first transcontinental exploration sponsored by the U.S. Government's Congress, thereupon approving an appropriation of $2,500 to investigate new frontiers for "the external commerce of the United States."

Meriwether Lewis, 28, private secretary to President Jefferson, was chosen to lead the

military expedition. He selected his boyhood Virginia companion, an experienced frontiersman, William Clark, age 32, as his associate commander. They were to explore the territory acquired by the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains, and east into the Oregon Territory. Lewis and Clark were to report among other things, "as to the practicability of constructing a roadway across the mountains, and the possibility of the country for agriculture and settlement."

The new venture started in the spring of 1804. Lewis and Clark and their expedition party used three canoe-type boats to make their way up the Missouri River for 1,600 miles. They made their winter headquarters at Ford Mandan, just north of Bismarck, N. Dak. Here, Sacajawea, a Shoshone Indian girl, and her French-trader husband, Touissant Charboaneau, were enlisted as interpreters and guides.

Favored by spring weather on April 7, 1805, the explorers resumed the boat journey up the Missouri River. Beyond the headwaters horses were obtained through Sacajawea's brother for the 300-mile land crossing of the Continental Divide to the headwaters of the Clearwater River.

The only available passage through this rugged area was the Lolo Pass, an Indian trail used by the Nez Perce Tribe in their treks in search for buffalo. This was the route followed by Lewis and Clark.

Nearly 50 years later, the first official interest was shown in this route when the War Department authorized funds for exploration and survey to locate the most feasible routing for a railroad connecting the Mississippi River with the Pacific Ocean. Capt. John Mullan made this investigation and said of the Lolo Trail, "It is the most difficult, rugged, severe and broken of any I have seen in my explorations of the Pacific Northwest." In 1858 he completed the famous Military Road or Mullan Road some 100 miles to the north.

The necessity of opening a more direct route between Virginia City, Mont., and Lewiston, Idaho, than was afforded by the Mullan Road, prompted the Government in 1866 to make an appropriation of $50,000 for that purpose. A Mr. A. W. Tinkham undertook this task and found there was little he could do except improve the Lolo Trail to permit the passage of heavier pack trains. The record indicates that the bulk of the appropriation was spent in this manner. Very little, if any, highway was constructed.

About 1900, this route again became prominent when a survey was undertaken by the Clearwater Short Line Railway Co. for a railroad between Missoula, Mont., and Kooskia, Idaho. Although the railroad was never completed, as an adjunct to this work, serviceable wagon roads were constructed which gave limited access to sections of the route both in Idaho and in Montana. Part of the first forest highway funds expended on this route were used for extension of these wagon roads.

Construction of the Lewis and Clark Highway was stimulated in large measure by activities of the U.S. Forest Service. Early in its program, the Forest Service established ranger stations at Powell and Lochsa for administrative purposes and fire protection. For years these stations along the Lochsa River were accessible by trail only. The proper management of the area required better access to these stations and prompted the initial programing of Federal funds for roads. Construction with forest highway funds was initiated on the Idaho portion of the route in 1918. This first project provided for 23.1 miles of grading to a top width of 9 feet. Cost of the project was $235,740.

In 1935 approximately 150 Federal prisoners from Leavenworth, Kans., were assigned to projects on the Lewis and Clark Highway. These prisoners were retained on construction until the spring of 1941, at which time they were returned to Leavenworth and replaced by Japanese detainees from the coastal area. Work on a WPA project was also started during this period.

Total estimated construction costs for the 101-mile Idaho section from Kooskia to the Montana line is estimated at $13.3 million. This covers the period since 1918 to date, which includes money now available for construction to bring the Idaho portion to a bituminous surface standard.

Following is a breakdown of Federal and State funds expended and programed for completion of this historic route:

From 1918 to completion—expended and under construction:	
Emergency relief funds	$30,323
Forest highway funds	4,946,063
Forest road development funds	406,924
Forest road emergency funds	92,869
Federal lands funds	3,770,229
WPA funds	281,563
Federal-aid primary funds	1,276,179
Total Federal	10,804,150
State of Idaho	1,064,126
Total	11,868,276
Additional appropriations:	
Forest highway funds	1,000,000
Federal lands funds	275,000
Federal aid primary and secondary funds	169,000
Total	13,312,276

This summer construction work has been in progress on three projects on the Lewis-Clark Highway in Idaho. The total length of these projects is 74 miles. Cost of the projects are included in the above subtotal of $11,868,276.

Two of the above-mentioned projects were recently completed: The grading and bridge construction work on 12.6 miles between Powell and the Montana line, and bituminous surfacing of 22.5 miles extending east from Lowell. The third contract involving 38.9 miles of base and surfacing construction between Fish Creek and Wendover Creek is still underway. Bids will be opened September 29, 1961, for a project to provide 38.6 miles plantmix paving between Lost Creek and the Montana line (includes 3.4 miles of grading and 16 miles of basework).

The figure of $13.3 million is the estimated cost to bring the Idaho portion to a bituminous surface standard. This bituminous surfacing for the first 62 miles east of Kooskia is only a surface treatment. This complete section will be scheduled for bituminous paving at a later date with Federal aid, forest highway or other funds as they are made available. Cost for completion of this final project is estimated at $1,104,000. This estimate would bring the total investment, over the period of years since 1918, in the Lewis and Clark Highway to $14.4 million. Only $2 million of this total was spent between the years 1918 and 1946.

In addition to this, planning is now underway for a 1.4 mile relocation to provide a bypass at the village of Kooskia. The new location here would leave the present highway at a point approximately 0.2 mile north of the north city limits and would stay on the north side of the Clearwater River and connect to the Lewis and Clark Highway just east of Kooskia. The estimated cost of the bypass is $250,000.

The 101-mile section of the Lewis and Clark Highway in Idaho follows a water grade throughout, except for about 6 miles of 6-percent grade needed to cross Lolo Pass (elevation 5,233 feet) at the Idaho-Montana border.

The route (from east to west) follows the Lochsa River to Lowell, Idaho, where the stream connects with the Selway River to form the Middle Fork of the Clearwater River, which continues to Kooskia and meets with the South Fork of the Clearwater River.

Opening of the Lewis and Clark Highway will provide arterial access to more than 1,500 million board feet of timber tributary thereto. This main route will serve the many miles of existing access roads not in use and will promote the construction of a network of new access necessary to market the available timber reserves.

Travelers from central and southern Idaho, southeastern Washington and eastern Oregon to destinations east of Missoula, Mont., will be saved up to 220 miles by this scenic shortcut. A few examples are listed below:

From Kooskia, Idaho to Missoula, Mont., saving 220 miles.

From Lewiston, Idaho to Missoula, Mont., saving 82 miles.

From Boise, Idaho to Missoula, Mont., saving 101 miles.

From Portland, Oreg. to Missoula, Mont., saving 12 miles.

The forest lands adjacent to this highway provide shelter for some of the finest elk herds in the United States. Thousands of hunters pack into the area each fall. Those from Idaho have been forced to travel hundreds of extra miles to reach destinations near the Montana-Idaho borders. Unfortunately, there have been devastating forest fires in years past which have ruined thousands of acres of natural cover. The proposed route traversed some 30 miles of burned area. New growth has started, however, and is making good progress. One of the foremost attractions in the area is the Bitterroot-Selway Wilderness area. The Lochsa River and the highway bound this area on the north for approximately 50 miles. Good access will be thus afforded to the northern sector of this 3,000 square mile area, our largest and best established wilderness.

What will this new highway mean to Idaho's economy? Briefly, it is not expected that new industries and business will spring up overnight because it has been built; but it can definitely be considered as a contributing factor to the rapidly developing potential that is moving the Northwest and Idaho into a period of increased economic growth.

Also, when the value of this highway is weighed in connection with the development of slack-water navigation on the Columbia-Snake River Waterway to Lewiston, the growth of the immediate area seems a near certainty. However, to do justice to each major industry this new route will touch, it would be pertinent to consider individual benefits to the agriculture, mining, forest and tourist industries of the region.

The consensus of opinion seems to be that the greatest impact the road will bring will be felt by the timber industry. Forest products are the chief output of the region surrounding the Lewis and Clark Highway, both in volume and dollar value. Although the annual timber cut in this region is less than the annual growth much of this timber is cut from the growing stock. This has been due to problems of accessibility. Much of the mature sawtimber is in Clearwater and Idaho Counties, and completion of the highway will make it possible to harvest large tracts of mature virgin timber and thus reduce the cut of immature stock.

Completion of this highway will also provide an improved avenue to areas that have been heavily burned in the past because of inaccessability by firefighting equipment. This factor alone should save in useable

timber enough to pay for the cost of the entire highway.

Transportation being a high-cost production factor has had a diverse effect upon the manufacturing and selling of products made from the region's wood supply. It is felt that competitive freight rates will be a real assist to the growth of secondary wood industries. In addition, new advances in wood utilization research at universities and colleges in the Northwest give every indication that the growth and consumption of new products made chiefly from wood and wood byproducts will increase faster than present production. There is little doubt that with the proper stimulation the region's timber resources can be combined with low transportation costs, power and skilled labor to build north Idaho as the center of a growing timber industry for years to come.

Although there will be some immediate effects felt by the agricultural industry most of the benefits will show up 4 or 5 years in the future when secondary processors will find it profitable to manufacture food and nonfood products from the region's ample wheat and other grain supplies.

Five years ago southern Idaho wasn't the center of the potato processing industry but the right combination of research, business know-how and available production factors have made that dream a reality. It seems reasonable to believe that the right combination for further development of northern Idaho agriculture will be found in the traffic that the Lewis and Clark Highway will channel to barge transportation at Lewiston. In effect, reduced transportation costs will also spur the growth of associate service and trade business in the area. The result will be that agriculture products will be afforded not only cheaper cost in transportation to market (something many farmers have been working on for years) but will find some markets close to home.

In addition, it has been estimated that by 1970 Montana alone will export westerly close to 4 million tons of commerce suitable for water transportation. At least one quarter of this total is expected to move along the Lewis and Clark Highway on its way to river transportation.

Other benefits will come simply because the road opens a little known area for general exploration. Mining, which has been an empire builder in the past has also been hampered by distance to market, high transportation costs and Federal import policies. The new highway will provide access to regions which have been heretofore neglected by exploration surveys, or geological studies. However, increasing demands by the national defense and space programs will undoubtedly bring some attention to the strategic metals and nonmetals in the surrounding areas. There is a great need for rare metals such as columbium, beryllium, cesium, tantalum, cobalt, thorium, titanium, and zirconium. The discovery of one or more of these metals in workable quantities would greatly fortify the mining economy of the 10 northern counties and would again prove the Lewis and Clark Highway a very definite asset to the area's overall business climate.

Every year Idaho is visited by about 1½ million tourists who enter the State by an eastern route. Of this amount about 20 percent are coming to vacation in Idaho. The rest are passing through on their way to other vacation areas. If properly advertised, many of these people and countless numbers of their friends will want to travel over the historical trail that bears the names of the men whose adventures have been written in the history books of every schoolchild in the United States since the advent of public education.

This highway also opens up new vistas to the sportsman. Fish and game abound in an area where there are countless lakes and boundless forests which have never felt the ceaseless plod of man. This is truly a virgin wilderness for many areas within its boundaries have never been explored by humans. The first people to see this land will see it much as God made it, clean, and with a freshness unsurpassed.

JAY N. DARLING

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, with the passing of Jay N. Darling, Monday, at the age of 85, America is a poorer place than it was before. But he enriched the Nation so greatly during his lifetime that the net gain has been enormous. Although he was known and loved by millions of Americans for his devastatingly incisive cartoons in the fields of politics and social reform, he will be missed especially by the conservationists, among whom he ranked with the leaders.

He was a firm champion of natural resource conservation from his earliest days to his last. One of his first nationally famous cartoons dealt with the plight of waterfowl in 1916 when the Migratory Bird Treaty Act was being debated. This and subsequent cartoons in the Des Moines, Iowa, Register launched him at the age of 40 into a career as a syndicated cartoonist, from which he retired in 1949.

Mr. Darling probably took more personal pride in his achievements in the field of conservation than he did in his chosen professional field. His contributions to conservation were tremendous. Named to the Special Committee To Investigate Waterfowl Refuge Needs by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Darling was instrumental in obtaining the enactment of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934, and designed the first duck stamp. Proceeds from duck stamp sales are used to acquire wetlands as recommended by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, on which I serve. Elevated to the position of Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey under the Roosevelt administration, although he was a Republican by persuasion, Darling proved himself an able administrator, dealing with flagrant abuses of the Federal hunting regulations with a vigor that sent poachers and market hunters scurrying for cover.

Although he was an avid duck hunter himself, he clamped down in the face of depleted waterfowl flights with the tightest waterfowl hunting regulations that America has ever known almost as soon as he entered Washington, and he stuck to his guns in spite of political and sometimes physical threats. In accepting the appointment, which carried the salary of $8,000 per year, he temporarily abandoned a career that was bringing him $100,000 annually. He was responsible during his year and a half as an administrator of the Bureau of Biological Survey for obtaining $6 million for launching the national waterfowl refuge system. During this period, he also launched the National Wildlife Federation, organized the first North American Wildlife Conference, and was responsible for reorganizing the American Game Protective Association into the North American Wildlife Foundation and the American Wildlife Institute, forerunner of the present Wildlife Management Institute. He established the cooperative wildlife research unit program which, since 1935, has produced many of our foremost trained wildlife workers.

"Ding" Darling will be missed, but he leaves behind him monuments to his own greatness, as a cartoonist, and as an editor, and as a conservationist. Few men enjoyed life more, and even fewer have lived it more fully and usefully.

THE KENNEDY FARM PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I have been pleased for the most part with the editorial comment on this administration's farm program. The tribute being accorded proposals set forth in President Kennedy's recent farm message speak highly for the President and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

It should be noted that the other day, when the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, he was greeted by a standing ovation from the members of the committee. This indicates to me the sincere appreciation Members of Congress have for the diligence and intelligence of the efforts and the program of the Secretary of Agriculture.

These words of commendation for a job well done also should be a source of self-satisfaction to the many unsung heroes whose contribution to this program can never be measured. These are the producers and representatives of commodity organizations who served on advisory committees, countless individuals whose suggestions were incorporated into the program, and members and leadership of all the farm organizations.

Madam President, the Des Moines Register is located in the heart of the Corn Belt. It serves farmers and it knows farmers. This paper is as familiar to most Iowa farmers—and, incidentally, to many in the States which border Iowa, including my own State of Minnesota—as is the land they plow. It is because of this close association with the family farmer that I was especially pleased to see the Register's February 1, 1962, editorial entitled "Hard Farm Choices." It is a good editorial and it is a thoughtful editorial. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

HARD FARM CHOICES

The farm policy proposals just submitted to Congress by the Kennedy administration are a considerable improvement over the rather hasty recommendations made last spring. Congress rejected at that time the sweeping enabling legislation which would have permitted commodity groups to develop supply control programs with marketing quotas.

Now Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is coming back to Congress with a more

carefully worked out long-range adjustment plan. The emphasis in the new proposals is on land retirement to limit production of wheat and feed grains in order to indirectly limit output of livestock.

This is the same basic farm program that has been in effect for nearly 30 years. However, Freeman wants a stronger effort to tighten up the acreage control programs, to make them more effective. For example, farmers would be given an opportunity to vote mandatory controls on themselves for feed grains, for the first time in history.

Freeman also wants stricter production control in the dairy industry. Instead of relying on Federal milk market orders, under which supplies are controlled in many milksheds, a national quota system would be established. Farmers would choose in a referendum between the present program with considerably lower price supports and a new program with quotas and higher price supports.

The proposals are realistic in posing the right questions to farmers and to the general public.

The administration is saying, in effect, that, if farm income is to be maintained at its present level, the choice is between continuation of the present high level of subsidies or production controls. If farmers don't want to subject themselves to production controls, they cannot expect to continue receiving the present level of price supports.

The Kennedy administration proposals also are realistic in recognizing the need for further adjustment in number of farms and farmers. The administration wants a pilot program to start a long-range transfer of many millions of acres of cropland to other uses.

This is the soil bank on a much larger scale and extending for 20 years ahead. The program also would emphasize education of farm people and other aids to smooth transition to nonfarm jobs. It puts into a practical program ideas that have been floating around in agricultural circles for many years. We like it because it would start small and build on the basis of practical experience.

The Freeman proposals do not put forward an extravagant and unrealistic goal of farm income, as did the famous Brannan plan a few years back.

In fact, Freeman already has been criticized by the Farmers Union for setting his sights too low on farm income. The program calls for maintaining the 1961 level of national net farm income, about $13 billion per year to 1965. Farm income per person and per farm would rise over the next several years, as the number of farmers and farms decline.

The Nation is long overdue on facing up, in a practical way, to the hard choices in agricultural policy.

In the past there has been too much dream world philosophy in agricultural affairs. Political proposals often have suggested that everything would be rosy if farm price supports were abandoned and if the Government would get out of agriculture.

But analysis by at least three responsible research agencies shows beyond doubt that farm income would fall by about one-third if supports were abandoned.

There also has been a lack of political realism about maintaining a high level of farm subsidy without any effort on the part of farmers to control production and keep it in line with the Nation's needs.

In the Freeman proposals, those who want to cut farm subsidies but also want to maintain farm income are told what must be done to accomplish this.

If these production control programs are rejected and Congress continues to appropriate the money for a high level of farm subsidies, then the responsibility will be on Congress. The administration is showing a way out of the dead end of high farm subsidy costs and surpluses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that other editorial comment on the Kennedy farm program, from the Des Moines Register, the Christian Science Monitor, the Denver Post, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Post and Times Herald, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the Springfield, Mo., Leader and Press be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

"The Nation is long overdue on facing up, in a practical way, to the hard choices in agricultural policy.

"In the past there has been too much dream world philosophy in agricultural affairs. Political proposals often have suggested that everything would be rosy if farm price supports were abandoned and if the Government would get out of agriculture.

"But analysis by at least three responsible research agencies shows beyond doubt that farm income would fall by about one-third if supports were abandoned.

"The administration is showing a way out of the dead end of high farm subsidy costs and surpluses."—The Des Moines Register.

"If producers of a given commodity wish the Government to pay them a guaranteed price, they cannot reasonably ask that the guarantee extend to an unlimited output. This is the dilemma which the President's message puts before farmers, big and little, in the United States.

"The signs of a turn are here, and the Kennedy message, if followed, would make it a sharp one."—Christian Science Monitor.

"President Kennedy has proposed a strong and comprehensive farm program. At heart it is a workable program.

"Either the farmer should accept the hazards of a free market—which the congressional farm bloc seems to oppose—or he should be prepared to accept controls which will prevent overproduction."—Denver Post.

"The goals set forth in President Kennedy's farm message are sound and should meet with general approval, but the methods the President recommends for achieving them appear to differ more in degree than in kind from the unsuccessful programs of the past.

"The broad purposes of the program are to increase farm income, reduce costly surpluses and cut down the agricultural burden on taxpayers. Further exposition of ways in which this is expected to be accomplished will be developed in congressional and public debate. There is certain to be plenty of that."—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"As an analysis of the plight of agriculture, and as a statement of farm policy objectives, surely there is much to applaud and very little to criticize. There is a proper acknowledgment of agriculture's great efficiency, of its role in the Nation's growth, of its disproportionate share of national income. Urban critics of farm programs frequently have exhibited an almost indecent disregard of the fact that they get more and better food for less money than any other consumers on earth. They quite as often stand aghast at the recorded subsidy to agriculture while they exhibit a complete obliviousness to the less conspicuous subsidies that national policy has heaped upon other industry. The tone and temper of the message is good."—Washington Post.

"The problems of abundance * * * are far pleasanter and more manageable than Khrushchev's problem of scarcity.

"Opponents will no doubt stress the socialistic features of this program, though it differs only in degree and extensiveness of coverage from earlier arrangements under both Republican and Democratic administrations."—New York Times.

"History presents no evidence that efforts of government to manage scarcity—as in the case of the OPA—have ended in anything other than confusion or worse. Nothing in the present chaotic farm controls suggests that much stiffer controls would manage abundance any better."—Wall Street Journal.

"President Kennedy gave American agriculture a blunt take-it-or-leave-it ultimatum yesterday as he presented his long-awaited farm program to Congress. Either farmers can take rigid production controls, the President said, or they can give up any expectation of much further Federal aid in the way of subsidies.

"A year ago, we would have protested angrily. Other businesses and other industries have been, and are being subsidized, why exclude farming? Two or three events of the past year, however, have sharply altered our thinking in the matter. One, the fiasco in the broiler industry; another, the dairy industry's leap from a nearly balanced production pattern into a veritable binge of overproduction; still a third, recognition that there is no limit to the meteoric climb of subsidy costs, unless production curbs are imposed, and that conversely, with power curbs, there will be little or no need for subsidies.

"The individual always thinks it can't happen to him, but it has happened to thousands of dairymen in recent years, and one can predict with mathematical certainty that uncontrolled production will convert a certain percentage of those who are still making it today to marginal milk producers next year and to ex-dairymen in 2 years."—Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, recently in St. Louis, Mo., a conference of farm leaders of the Midwest farm organizations and groups was held, and a joint statement was made by the farm organization officials attending that farm leaders conference in St. Louis, Mo. Secretary Freeman addressed that conference and was enthusiastically received.

I ask unanimous consent that the farm leaders' statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FARM LEADERS' STATEMENT

We sincerely appreciate the firm and aggressive efforts of the Kennedy administration, and particularly those of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, to raise farm income and to improve public understanding of the farmer's problem. These efforts have resulted in materially improved farm income in 1961 and firm prospects for the maintenance thereof in 1962.

We recognize, however, that these improvements have been accomplished primarily through the use of emergency programs and measures. It is essential that a new dynamic, long-range, permanent farm program, dealing with the problems of agriculture, be adopted now in 1962. We have the blessing of great abundance, but it is essential to the well-being of our agricultural community and is in the public interest that such be a managed abundance. We need a program to meet the problem of low incomes and underemployment in our farm population; to strike at the problem of inadequate diets, both at home and abroad,

and to insure proper use of our agricultural resources.

We specifically endorse the positive goals of President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman to achieve proper use of our agricultural abundance; to achieve balance by providing a means of adjustment of production of commodities now in serious oversupply; to encourage conservation and achieve better land uses, and to upgrade the living standards of rural people by the development of new opportunities on the land through rural renewal programs, all of which will be achieved at a reduced cost to Government.

We emphasize the immediate need for these programs and unanimously pledge our full support to the attainment of these goals.

FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that a report from the Department of Agriculture relating to the activities, growth, development, and services of the farm cooperatives be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1962.

For nearly a century now, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been interested in the progress of farmer cooperatives. This year's statistical report shows the volume of farmer cooperative business up almost 3 percent over the previous year, while numbers of memberships and associations were down slightly.

This information comes from statistics just released by USDA's Farmer Cooperative Service on the business of marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives.

Since the early report of the Department back in 1863 on farmer cooperatives—a report that dealt with the development of cooperative cheese factories begun 10 years earlier in New York—these farmer cooperatives have come a long way.

The FCS figures, covering the period July 1, 1959, through June 30, 1960, give a broad picture of the extent of cooperative progress. They show:

1. Dollar volume: Gross business volume of a little more than $15.6 billion, representing an increase of 2.7 percent over the previous year's $15.2 billion. Total net business—after adjusting for business done between cooperatives—amounted to a little more than $12 billion, up 2.4 percent over the $11.7 billion a year earlier.

2. Number of memberships: A total of almost 7.3 million memberships, representing a decrease of about 4 percent from the previous year's nearly 7.6 million. This is in line with the decrease in number of farmers in the United States. This membership figure contains duplications since many farmers are members of more than one cooperative and are counted twice or more times.

3. Number of cooperatives: Total number of associations was 9,345 compared with 9,658 the previous year, or a decrease of 3 percent. Much of this decrease was the result of continued mergers, consolidations, and acquisitions among cooperatives—a trend reflected in these annual statistics for a number of years.

Other highlights of this annual statistical report—issued regularly each year since 1928—are given here in net figures from which interassociation business has been excluded:

Marketing volume of $9.3 billion was up 2.5 percent over the previous year. This represented 77.4 percent of the total cooperative business.

Farm supply volume of more than $2.4 billion was up 1.6 percent over the previous year. This supply business represented 20.1 percent of the total cooperative volume.

Related services amounted to more than $298 million, up 9 percent over the previous year. They accounted for 2.5 percent of the total business of cooperatives.

Dairy products continued to rank first in total marketing volume.

Feed continued in first place in volume among farm production supplies.

Seventy-seven percent of the 9,345 cooperatives handled one or more farm supplies.

Seventy-one percent of them did some marketing.

Minnesota continued to hold first place in number of associations and memberships.

California continued to rank first in total dollar volume of business.

Increases in the dollar volume reported for cotton products, dairy products, fruits and vegetables, grain, rice, and tobacco largely contributed to the increase in total volume reported for 1959–60.

Dairy products had a net value of more than $3 billion, about a third of the net value of all farm products marketed by cooperatives and up 2.8 percent over the previous year. Grain remained in second place with a net value of $1.93 billion, accounting for a little more than a fifth of the total net value and up 1.8 percent over the previous year. Livestock stayed in third place, despite lower hog prices, with a net value of $1.47 billion, a decrease of 4 percent from the previous year.

Feed accounted for almost 37 percent of the supply business, and showed a net value of almost $886 million, down 1 percent from the previous year.

Petroleum products continued in second place among farm supplies with a net value of more than $596 million, up almost 2.8 percent over the previous year. They accounted for almost 25 percent of the total farm production supplies handled by cooperatives.

Fertilizer, in third place, had a net value of $334 million, up more than 6 percent from the previous year. It accounted for almost 14 percent of the total supply business of cooperatives.

Nearly three-fifths of all cooperatives reporting did some kind of service for their patrons that related to marketing and farm supply operations. These services included trucking, storage, ginning, drying, grinding, and spraying. Total receipts for these services continued to increase, as they have each year since FCS began to compile statistics on this segment of business by cooperatives.

This steady upward trend in service receipts reflects the increasing diversification of cooperatives to better serve the needs of farmer patrons.

Minnesota held first place in number of cooperatives with its 1,189 associations, Wisconsin was second with 707, and Iowa retained third place with 636.

Second place to Minnesota's memberships of 584,540 was Illinois with 484,140. Iowa moved up to third with 430,655.

California held its first place in net value of combined volume of business with $1.29 billion, almost 11 percent of the total net business volume of all cooperatives. Minnesota remained in second place with $842 million, or 7 percent. And Iowa moved into third place with more than $684 million, or almost 6 percent of the total.

California also led in value of farm products marketed with its $1.16 billion; Minnesota stayed in second place with almost $672 million; and Illinois continued in third place with almost $513 million.

Cooperatives voluntarily furnished current figures for the survey, with 95 percent of all those contacted supplying the information needed.

Estimated business in specified commodity and service groups of marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives, 1959–60 [1]

Item	Number of cooperatives handling	Gross business (includes intercooperative business)	Net business (excludes intercooperative business)
		Thousands	*Thousands*
Products marketed for patrons:			
Beans and peas (dry edible)	63	$41,598	$28,849
Cotton and cotton products	562	668,747	607,390
Dairy products	1,669	3,679,523	3,055,521
Fruits and vegetables	723	1,285,441	905,829
Grain, soybeans, soybean meal, and oil	2,649	2,944,798	1,929,114
Livestock and livestock products	549	1,613,026	1,471,069
Nuts	122	136,854	114,533
Poultry products	613	464,730	390,488
Rice	59	167,680	145,018
Sugar products	67	336,952	336,952
Tobacco	32	241,287	241,287
Wool and mohair	282	23,291	22,527
Miscellaneous	215	48,500	45,355
Total, farm products	[2] 6,643	11,652,427	9,293,932

Item	Number of cooperatives handling	Gross business (includes intercooperative business)	Net business (excludes intercooperative business)
		Thousands	*Thousands*
Supplies purchased for patrons:			
Building materials	1,699	$138,814	$91,114
Containers	1,088	59,970	27,725
Farm machinery and equipment	1,898	110,081	76,472
Feed	4,489	1,198,680	885,924
Fertilizer	4,338	583,628	334,404
Meats and groceries	905	63,767	52,753
Petroleum products	2,803	965,184	596,180
Seed	3,961	141,446	101,635
Sprays and dusts (farm chemicals)	2,906	78,639	53,202
Other supplies	4,650	319,760	188,748
Total, farm supplies	[2] 7,162	3,659,969	2,408,157
Receipts for services: Trucking, cotton ginning, storage, grinding, locker plants, miscellaneous	[2] 5,564	[3] 298,177	[3] 298,177
Total business	[2] 9,345	15,610,573	12,000,266

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Adjusted for duplication arising from multiple activities performed by many cooperatives.
[3] Charges for services in which no duplication occurs.

Estimated number of cooperatives, memberships, and business of marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives, by States, 1959–60 [1]

State	Number of cooperatives with headquarters in State	Number of memberships in State	Net business (excludes intercooperative business)
			Thousands
Maine	19	20,525	$41,104
New Hampshire	9	7,110	22,819
Vermont	28	18,445	87,243
Massachusetts	36	22,510	65,584
Rhode Island	2	2,870	8,576
Connecticut	25	11,895	45,758
New England	119	83,355	271,084
New York	402	148,415	565,305
New Jersey	69	31,695	106,716
Pennsylvania	184	170,120	355,729
Middle Atlantic	655	350,230	1,027,750
Ohio	272	375,795	566,282
Indiana	139	421,705	401,825
Illinois	459	484,140	668,886
Michigan	209	184,650	358,417
Wisconsin	707	390,305	640,580
East north central	1,786	1,856,595	2,635,990
Minnesota	1,189	584,540	841,846
Iowa	636	430,655	684,396
Missouri	223	401,070	303,350
North Dakota	507	251,070	323,062
South Dakota	299	186,225	183,357
Nebraska	387	256,120	324,194
Kansas	346	193,410	379,100
West north central	3,587	2,303,090	3,039,305
Delaware	17	27,455	31,687
Maryland	61	95,475	98,663
Virginia	155	247,710	193,664
West Virginia	77	74,360	42,630
North Carolina	116	302,875	169,970
South Carolina	35	65,475	40,841
Georgia	75	154,325	$126,545
Florida	107	39,495	276,173
South Atlantic	643	1,007,170	980,173
Kentucky	97	211,945	188,685
Tennessee	141	139,690	89,616
Alabama	48	90,965	67,264
Mississippi	142	133,640	190,202
East south central	428	576,240	535,767
Arkansas	112	87,105	136,352
Louisiana	54	24,960	61,289
Oklahoma	172	173,200	232,900
Texas	511	178,310	560,290
West south central	849	463,575	990,831
Montana	177	74,185	131,338
Idaho	97	59,385	106,707
Wyoming	23	10,885	22,098
Colorado	113	63,670	175,359
New Mexico	35	12,170	53,134
Arizona	14	67,435	62,779
Utah	70	29,760	95,736
Nevada	4	265	2,997
Mountain	533	317,755	650,148
Washington	185	111,115	347,649
Oregon	114	70,645	215,438
California	425	132,070	[2] 1,290,109
Pacific	724	313,830	1,853,196
Total (48 States)	9,324	7,271,840	11,984,244
Alaska	2	90	7,415
Hawaii	19	1,525	[2] 8,607
United States	9,345	7,273,455	12,000,266

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Volume of a sugar cooperative with headquarters in California whose business originated in Hawaii was included in California.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the report indicates that the farm cooperative business has expanded during the past year by approximately 3 percent. It also indicates something which is of particular significance to the State of Minnesota and to those who are privileged to represent that State in the Congress. I quote from the report:

Minnesota held first place in number of cooperatives with its 1,189 associations, Wisconsin was second with 707, and Iowa retained third place with 636.

Second place to Minnesota's memberships of 584,540 was Illinois with 484,140. Iowa moved up to third with 430,655.

Madam President, it is significant that in the State of Minnesota over a half million individuals belong to farm cooperatives, including producers' cooperatives, distribution cooperatives, consumers' cooperatives, electric cooperatives, and supply cooperatives. I feel that that is one of the reasons that the State I am privileged to represent in part has had a stable and growing economy, and has had a rise in its per capita income and in the general welfare and well-being of the people of that State.

The report should be good reading, not only for the people of the United States, but also those in the embassies of other nations located in Washington, D.C., because it offers to their agricultural attachés, economists, and program planners an opportunity to see what can be done in agriculture, in family farm agriculture, and in individual ownership agriculture through the farm cooperative movement. I commend that movement for its outstanding success and growth and for its great contributions to the welfare and the economic prosperity of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that an advertisement that is being published in a number of newspapers in the United States by the farm cooperatives, particularly the dairy cooperatives, relating to our dairy products, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT KENNEDY TELLS THE NATION: "MILK IS OUR MOST NOURISHING FOOD, AND AN IMPORTANT AID TO OUR GOOD HEALTH"

The President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman this week delivered messages of vital importance to all Americans, young and old.

These messages—presented before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition in Washington—were concerned with our health, as individuals and our physical fitness as a nation.

In addressing this national conference, President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman did not deal in platitudes or generalities. They faced some serious and controversial problems involving our diet; and they spoke some basic truths, in plain, everyday language, which have needed telling for a long, long time.

They spoke on our Nation's declining milk consumption.

They spoke on the scare over radioactive fallout contamination of milk.

They spoke on the relationship between milk and weight control.

They spoke on the relationship between milk and cholesterol levels.

And, they spoke on milk's importance to a balanced diet.

We applaud President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman for speaking out squarely on these important problems * * * for underscoring with plain facts the national significance of these problems around which in the past too much fiction, too much hysteria have been woven.

Because of the importance of these facts to all of us, we present as a public service the following highlights of the addresses by President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman:

1. Is the overall decline of milk consumption in America serious?

President Kennedy: "This is a serious matter for us all * * * a matter of concern because it implies poor nutrition and a less balanced diet."

Secretary Freeman: "This development has implications far beyond the immediate economic effect on agriculture. * * * Its most serious implication may well be in the long-term effect it can have on the health and vigor of the people and the Nation."

2. How severe is the effect of radioactive fallout upon our food supply?

President Kennedy: "Most of the discussion (concerning fallout contamination of food) has unfortunately used milk as an

example of food products that might be contaminated.

"I should like to correct any misunderstandings that may exist about this. * * * It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure. The milk supply offers no hazards. On the contrary, it remains one of the best sources of nutrition for our children and for adults."

3. Is there a relationship between milk and weight control?

Secretary Freeman: "We have become extremely weight conscious in this country in recent years. If the drop in milk consumption is related to this question, we ought to be greatly concerned. Weight control involves the extent to which we use our muscles as well as the amount of food we eat. Food alone should not be expected to carry the entire burden.

"Insofar as we reduce calorie intake, it should be of foods important chiefly for calories—not of foods that carry indispensable proteins, minerals, and vitamins. The American people should not make wrong changes in their dietary habits to prevent or cure obesity."

4. Is there relationship between milk and cholesterol levels?

President Kennedy: "The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded, after intensive research, that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to an increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element, except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems."

5. How important is milk in a balanced diet for young and old?

President Kennedy: "If we are to be a vigorous and vital nation, as we all desire, then of course we must depend upon the consumption of a balanced diet, and milk must be a part of it.

"In the past 50 years our children have grown more vigorous and sturdy because of better diet and better health. Our young adults are now about 2 inches taller than they were half a century ago. I should like—and I am sure all of us would like—to see this trend continue. A large proportion of our people now attain a physical condition once attained by a very few, but nutritionists tell us that 10 percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies, I am told, are in the very minerals and vitamins, such as calcium and vitamin A, most prevalent in milk. I am sure all of us would like to see this nutritional gap narrowed.

"Those who are familiar with the needs and the problems of our older citizens, also tell us that older people need more calcium than they now get. Again, milk offers the best and most economical source of this vital mineral."

Secretary Freeman: "Unquestionably, there are many people who, on competent medical advice, must certainly follow special diets. But there are countless others—both young and old—who now do not receive adequate nutrition, particularly those essential building blocks of life for which milk is the best and most convenient source. Infants and growing children especially need milk and dairy products in their diet because of the large amounts of calcium and high-quality protein required to keep up with the growth needs.

"Milk contains three important nutrients—calcium, riboflavin and protein, in addition to other essential food elements—which people get to little of for their best nutritional health, and usually because they do not get enough milk.

"In fact, milk makes it easy to get the calcium and riboflavin we need. In this Nation's food supplies, milk provides about two-thirds of all the calcium, nearly half of the riboflavin, and a fourth of the protein.

"Another reason that milk is a necessary food source is that it contains many different nutrients in highly beneficial balance which meet one of the basic requirements of good health. The nutrients work together efficiently to meet the body's needs."

Thus did our President and our Secretary of Agriculture face up to five critical questions directly affecting the lives and well-being of all Americans * * * serious questions concerning milk to which they gave the American public straightforward, factual, reliable answers.

The key question, of course, that so many Americans—confused by the myriad anti-milk claims of health and diet faddists—ask:

Just how important to our health is milk—is it harmful, or is it nature's most nearly perfect food?

President Kennedy said: "I have long been convinced that milk is an important aid to good health. This has led me to direct that milk be served at every White House meal from now on—and I expect that all of us will benefit from it * * *."

We say, "Thank you, Mr. President, thank you, Secretary Freeman, for your service to the vital cause of better health and sounder nutrition for all Americans."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The advertisement relates to what President Kennedy told the Nation about milk as a nourishing food. The headline of the copy reads as follows: "Milk Is Our Most Nourishing Food and an Important Aid to Our Good Health."

The President of the United States, as we know, has worked closely with the Secretary of Agriculture in a sincere and, I hope, successful effort to promote the greater consumption of dairy products. Last year the drop in consumption of dairy products was the main reason for the large carryover of dairy products in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. There have been those of us who have asked that the confusion relating to certain health aspects of dairy products be investigated by appropriate scientific and medical personnel. The Representative from Milwaukee, Mr. REUSS, has taken the lead on this subject and has addressed a communication to the Secretary of Agriculture and to other officers of our Government urging that there be accurate factual and objective medical information relating to the qualities of dairy products and their effect upon our health.

There are those of us who know and believe what President Kennedy said on this subject, namely, that milk is our most nourishing food and an important aid to our good health. But last year consumption of dairy products went down substantially. I do not believe that circumstance is good for the Nation, and it surely is not good for the agriculture economy.

Therefore, I respectfully urge that the questions relating to what are known as cholesterol and the so-called health effects of milk and dairy products be looked into at once, and that as much scientific and factual information as possible be given to the public. I think we all recognize that throughout the centuries good wholesome milk has been looked upon as the source of good health, energy, and good feeling for many millions of people.

IDEALISM IN ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond entitled "Idealism in Action" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IDEALISM IN ACTION—PEACE CORPS SUCCEEDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

If you thought that the Peace Corps was going to be a political boondoggle, a joyride for the volunteers and likely to alienate foreign friends—the facts are proving to be quite different.

I certainly had my own reservations at the beginning. I thought the Peace Corps was a good idea likely to go wrong in operation.

It has gone right.

When its 1962–63 budget comes before Congress for approval, the Peace Corps will find that it has won many new supporters in both parties.

On the basis of its efficient management and first-year achievements, the Peace Corps clearly deserves the increasing—even enthusiastic—acceptance it is getting on Capitol Hill.

Director Sargent Shriver, Jr., is giving the Peace Corps a drive and dedication which are reflected throughout its operation.

Thus far there are 802 Peace Corps volunteers working in 14 countries in Africa, the Near East and south Asia, the Far East, and Latin America.

These young, well-motivated and college-trained volunteers are working about 18 hours a day teaching students and teaching teachers, mapping roads, improving health and sanitation, improving methods of farming. The Peace Corpsmen received tourist travel and living expenses (some of it paid by the host countries) and $75 a month deposited to their credit in the United States.

The only practical basis for judging the Peace Corps at this time is whether the countries in which it is serving are satisfied. On this point the facts are these:

Every one of the 14 countries wants the work continued.

But this might be a wish not to offend. It is more than that because every one of these governments—from Ghana to Thailand, from Tanganyika to Chile—is asking for more Peace Corps help.

Furthermore, 13 other countries are asking the Peace Corps for volunteers. How have the Peace Corps volunteers themselves shown up under stressful conditions? Out of 802 volunteers working in remote parts of relatively underdeveloped countries, only one has quit and another has been ordered home.

At headquarters, Mr. Shriver has attracted—and the Peace Corps ideal itself attracted—outstanding, able people from business, from academic life, and from other Government agencies. The Peace Corps is a spartan operation in the field and it is being spartanly but firmly managed in Washington.

What is life and work like for the Peace Corps? Here is a typical report from a volunteer in Ghana:

"Real privations have been at a minimum. My house, a 2-mile walk from the school, is without electricity, refrigeration, and transportation; but it is compensatingly located on the beautiful, grassy, warm, wind-swept plains of Winneba and faces the distant and lovely Mount Mankoadze.

"In order to reach school for the morning service and the first class at 7, I rise each day at 5:30. Classes are completed at 2, at which time I return home for lunch except when I remain on duty until 9, or for student meetings which last the afternoon. My teaching, 28 hours a

week of English language, French language, English literature, and British history, demands many extra hours of preparation.

"I usually cannot retire before 10 or 10:30. Extra activities include additional classes for the upper forms in English and history (often for students not officially in my classes), and being a form master, the entertainments master, and the debating union master. When we move to our new location, I hope to do some coaching of wrestling, tennis, and basketball.

"It has been interesting to give a few Saturday night lectures to the school * * *. I was pleased to discover how much an objective, unbiased American point of view (on Berlin) can be appreciated by one uniformed but eagerly curious group of students."

The Peace Corps hopes to expand its volunteers working abroad from 800 to about 6,700 in the next 18 months.

Here is a New Frontier enterprise which is really creating a new frontier for practical American idealism in action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the most successful and heartening programs of the New Frontier has been the Peace Corps. As an early advocate and sponsor of legislation to establish the Peace Corps, I was certain it would be a great success, and the record of the Corps to date—I am pleased to say—bears out my confidence.

I may say to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], that only the other day a number of recruits for the Peace Corps were with us in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room as they were getting ready to go to Brazil on a new project of the Peace Corps. The late and beloved husband of the Presiding Officer and our fine and wonderful colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, would have been delighted and pleased to see those young men and women, because he was one of the first to speak up in this body and in this Nation for the Peace Corps. It is a living tribute to his idealism and to the idealism of the American people.

I invite Senators attention to the column by Mr. Drummond and the fine record of the Peace Corps. Mr. Drummond refers to it as "a new frontier for practical American idealism in action."

We can all be proud as Americans in the work of the Peace Corps.

They teach. They educate. They act. I think that is in the best tradition of our country. The Peace Corps is doing an outstanding job; and its Director, Mr. Shriver, is proving what a fine sense of administrative ability he has in setting the program in action. It is doing an outstanding job in helping others to help themselves and to bring to people of others lands a positive, constructive, and hopeful image of our country. We are indebted to the dedicated, selfless, and constructive work of the Peace Corps volunteers and staff.

AMERICAN PEOPLE BACK THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, in recent weeks I have been receiving, as I am sure my colleagues have been receiving, a good deal of mail expressing opposition to the United Nations. This mail drive has been in large measure the result of a stepped-up campaign of extreme rightwing elements in the country to destroy the United Nations.

They get themselves in a rather peculiar position, however. They find themselves mouthing the same phrases that come out of the Kremlin—phrases like, "Get the U.S. out of the U.N.," which is exactly what the spokesmen and the propaganda artists of the Kremlin have been saying.

We also hear the phrase, "Get the U.N. out of the U.S.," which is again what the propaganda machine of the Kremlin has been saying. However, the American people do not feel that way, thank goodness. I have not been too concerned about that flow of mail because of my confidence that it does not reflect the views of the vast majority of the American people. Furthermore, most of the mail comes first class and carries a 4-cent stamp. The Post Office Department can make a little money through such mail. There is a very serious deficit in the Post Office Department. So I suggest to all the "aginners," particularly the "aginners" of the U.N. and the "aginners" of the Peace Corps and those who are the "aginners" on foreign trade, and all the other professional "aginners" that use first-class mail, that we can find some way to relieve some of the postal deficit.

But in a much more serious vein, I was reassured that the views of the vast majority of the American people were not being properly represented by the mail drive that tends to inundate our offices.

A Gallup poll of February 4 shows this to be the case. Those polled were asked: "How important do you think it is that we try to make the United Nations a success—very important, fairly important, or not so important?"

Eighty-three percent answered that it is "very important" to make the United Nations a success. Another 9 percent said it was "fairly important." Only 4 percent answered "not so important."

It must be most frustrating to the extremists who are out to destroy confidence in the United Nations to see their efforts bear so little fruit. But I have no doubt that it will not discourage them. As a matter of fact their sound and fury will probably increase as support for their position dwindles. But their outpourings of hate and suspicion will not frighten the American people; they will not convince anyone who thinks for himself that we should reject the United Nations.

There may be those who have honest differences of opinion as to the best way to finance the activities of the United Nations. For these people I have the highest regard. There can be an honest difference of opinion as to whether the bond issue should be the manner in which the activities of the U.N. should be financed in part.

However, most of the noise and sound and fury at this time is heard because the United Nations bond issue has given a wonderful opportunity to these opponents of the United Nations to lash out at that Organization.

The United Nations is vital to our country, and is vital to our search for peace. As President Kennedy so aptly said in his speech before the United Nations last September, it is vital in the peace race. He urged the world to forgo the arms race and to enter upon the peace race.

That peace race must be conducted within the framework of the United Nations. All of us should feel encouraged by the good sense of the American people when 83 percent of them in a public opinion poll say they feel the success of the United Nations is very important, and only 4 percent say it is not important. It appears that people have a better understanding of the need for the United Nations than do some of their spokesmen. It is one of the most heartening developments in recent days on the subject of American foreign policy.

In conclusion, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this Gallup poll to which I refer be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

EIGHTY-THREE PERCENT STRONGLY SUPPORT U.N. AS BEST VEHICLE FOR PEACE

PRINCETON, N.J.—Racked by crisis, and under fire from many quarters, the United Nations nonetheless remains the best hope for peace in the world today in the eyes of the American people.

Recent events in the U.N.—causing some observers to fear its impending demise—have done little to shake the belief of an overwhelming majority of the public that it is very important to make the U.N. a success.

One year ago—before Soviet demands for a troika, the death of Dag Hammarskjold, and the Indian invasion of Goa confronted the U.N. with some of its gravest problems—83 percent of persons interviewed by the Gallup poll said it was very important for the United States to work toward making the world body a success.

FORUM FOR PEACE

In a just completed repeat of that survey, 83 percent again said the same thing.

To Americans, the U.N.—no matter what its shortcomings—continues to offer one forum where international tensions can be talked over rather than fought over.

The sentiment of many people is typified in the remarks of a miner's wife from Grindstone (population 1,094) in southwestern Pennsylvania:

"If the United Nations fails, there's no chance remaining for peace."

The question: "How important do you think it is that we try to make the United Nations a success—very important, fairly important, or not so important?"

The vote:	*Percent*
Very important	83
Fairly important	9
Not so important	4
No opinion	4

The current vote of confidence cuts across partisan differences and regional boundaries.

Big majorities of Republicans, Democrats, and independents in all sections of the country feel that assuring the U.N.'s success is highly important.

STRONG SUPPORT

In November 1952, with U.N. forces engaged in the then unpopular Korean war, 77 percent of Americans still felt it was important for the United States to work for the success of the United Nations.

Four years later, with the U.N. trying to effect a peace in the Suez crisis, but blocked

by Russian veto from a similar effort in Hungary, 85 percent expressed similar hopes.

From its birth, 17 years ago, in fact, the United Nations has had strong support from the American people.

A TRADE POLICY TO MEET THE CHALLENGES OF OUR TIME

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that out of order, it may be referred at this time, a bill which I call the National Trade Policy Act of 1962; also I ask unanimous consent to be inserted at the end of my remarks, an analysis of the bill, showing the differences between my bill and the administration bill; also a supplementary statement showing a comparison between the tax relief provisions in the adjustment assistance sections of H.R. 9900, the administration bill, and my bill.

Madam President, the bill is a very inclusive bill, as Members of the Senate will note when they peruse it. It is an alternative to the President's program. I consider it to be a feasible and a more effective alternative, which, it seems to me, is better calculated to realize the trade expansion objectives of the President. Certainly it should be considered, so that those who favor the President's program can formulate the best means of implementing it.

Others are working on this program in the same spirit. For example, a Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Atlantic Community of the CED, under the chairmanship of Dr. Emilio Collado, is just now considering this question and their ideas should be most sympathetically received.

The administration, with its great resources of factual material, has been emphasizing to the Congress and to the people of the United States the great stake we all have in international trade. I should like to point out that it is important not only to the Nation as a whole, but is vitally important also to the individual States. For example, my own State of New York exports nearly $1.5 billion worth of goods annually, leading the Nation in the export of manufactures. It also should be borne in mind that some 20 million American workers depend for their livelihood on our ability to export and import; about 15 million of them on the importation of products which are processed by our industrial machine. Thousands of businesses count on our $20 billion annual exports to provide the margin of profit for their operations. All of our 185 million potential consumers must look to imports which are earned through exports for help in getting, through competition which imports engender, a greater choice in price and quality of the goods they need.

Furthermore, the $35 billion of our annual trade furnish the toughest, strongest ties, economic and political, we as a nation have with the rest of the free world. As the free world economy expands, these ties must grow accordingly, lest they lose their ability to bind us together in carrying out the common purposes of freedom.

It is highly significant that during the past decade, while trade in the free world more than doubled, U.S. trade increased by only 75 percent—a weakening of our participation in the expansion of the free world's economy which was accompanied during the last years by sizable balance-of-payments deficits and a potentially serious drain on our gold reserves. Continued operation of our economy on the increasingly false assumption that there is no strong competition for our products in the world has contributed to a U.S. rate of productivity growth about one-half as high as the growth rates of our strongest competitors—though we remain far ahead in total production. And, since 1954, we have seen a threefold increase of trade between the Communist bloc and the newly developing nations of the free world, while our trade with these free world nations has hardly grown at all.

The nature of the challenges and the opportunities is being presented to the Nation. We are properly engaged in a great debate on how best to meet these challenges and opportunities in the national interest and in the interest of our ideals of freedom. I stand firm in the conviction that we must meet them through a major expansion in trade.

I join the President in his determination to bring about the implementation of this idea. However, I believe that some of the major provisions of the administration's trade bill are misdirected. I should like to present, for the consideration of the Congress, my approach.

First. We must not be solely confined to the item-by-item or commodity concept of world trade.

Although the President does attempt this in his general approach, he ties himself to current levels of commodity trade in negotiations with the European Economic Community; and he encumbers his bill with item-by-item consideration of proposed trade concessions and with intricate exceptions for agricultural and for tropical commodities. Furthermore, he runs the danger of excluding some of our best trading partners, including Canada, Australia, and other developed nations, which take some $4 billion of our exports annually, from the full benefits of large-scale trade negotiations, to be conducted only with the EEC, the present members of which took comparatively less—$3.5 billion—of our exports last year.

I believe that we must also deal with the basic and long-range problems of world trade which reside in the relative productivity of nations. Reliance on current commodity prices to provide the basis for a trade policy for the future, exposes the free world to the possibility of sudden, discriminatory reversals in trade liberalization. Complete removal of trade barriers on categories of items like electronic components, which would include radio apparatus and parts; on chemicals, which would include fertilizers; and on other categories, which would include rubber footwear, certain glass, clay, steel mill, aluminum, paper, and textile products, could induce the developing nations to concentrate their limited capital resources in such lines of production. Even the developing nations have the capacity to produce efficiently and with low wage costs items in some of the lines which I have cited. In the expectation of earning foreign exchange they could seriously affect the markets of developed nations on a small but concentrated number of items, perhaps forcing the reimposition of import restrictions and effecting a setback in the economic development prospects of the developing nations. It is therefore my view that while we should seek to engage in the fullest possible competition with nations having economies complementary to our own, we must also seek to provide stable and expanding markets for the developing free world economies so that they may raise their earning power and begin to close the productivity gap. My bill proposes to accomplish this purpose by directing the President to use his negotiating authority with the developed nations to open up their markets on an equitable basis to the products of the newly developing and of the low-cost producing industrialized areas: Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, south and southeast Asia, Japan, Hong Kong, and others. This would result in a greater contribution by the fully developed nations of Europe to the economic development of newly developed nations through trade, and spread the trade of low-cost producing industrialized nations, thereby relieving the United States of a part of the heavy responsibility it has carried since the end of World War II.

Second. The Congress must participate in the broad direction of foreign trade policy and must be able to make its will effective.

Although the President's bill would provide for reports and messages on the trade agreements program to keep the Congress informed, neither effective direction nor control by the Congress is envisaged, after the basic authority is granted.

I cannot see any avoiding of the congressional retention of a veto power over the results of negotiations, as well as a veto power on what is done with the other specific authorities given to the President.

My bill would provide for congressional policy directions in the utilization of Presidential negotiating authority and for congressional veto power over the most important phases of the exercise of Presidential authority: (a) trade agreements, (b) national security proclamations, (c) escape clause actions, and (d) adjustment assistance administration.

A veto power is now contained in the Reciprocal Trade Act, which will expire in June. I propose that Congress extend it to the other major grants of authority to the President in the trade program.

The third item which requires attention, the third reason for introducing alternative legislation, is that the United States must take the leadership in forging a unified free-world trading policy toward the Soviet bloc.

Madam President, I have returned fairly recently from the Soviet Union and have also made a report on this subject in the Senate. One of the marked things which stand out is the Soviet

success in playing off major industrial nations against one another. It is anomalous that the Communist bloc does hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of business with the German Federal Republic and the United Kingdom, and others of our allies, but far less than $100 million worth of business a year with the United States. That is because we exercise an infinitely greater amount of self-restraint in our dealings. It may very well mean that we or they must escalate down and they up. But certainly the time has come for a unified policy with our allies on such trade. I believe the authority for increased trade negotiations with our allies gives us the best opportunity to shape such a policy. Hence I include in my bill a directive to the President to that effect.

Although the President's bill proposes to continue the exclusion of Communist dominated nations from unconditional most favored nation treatment, it does not provide for positive leadership action.

I do not believe that a negative policy is enough to counter the divisive and politically oriented economic strategy of the Communists. My bill expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to negotiate with our allies for the formulation of a treaty which would unify our trading policies with the Communist bloc. Adherence to such a treaty should be open to other free world nations. Such a treaty should provide for effective multilateral and bilateral controls on the shipment of strategic goods and on the extension of export credits. It should open up alternative marketing and purchasing opportunities for free world nations injured by Communist bloc economic policies. It should contain contingency plans and measures, and common proposals for and means to enforce specific rules of behavior in trade with the Communist bloc.

These are the three broad areas in which my bill differs from that of the administration, and offers what I call a feasible alternative.

I repeat that this is not a matter of antagonism to the President's purposes on trade. I fully intend to join with the President in the trade expansion purpose.

My bill is an effort to give us, perhaps, a better way in which the purposes may be realized, with special attention being paid to other critical items which I have described, one being the need to open European markets—far more than is now the case—to the products of newly developing areas, as well as the products of industrialized low-cost producing areas.

Second, participation by Congress in trade policy through the exercise of specific directions and the right to exercise veto power.

Third, the need for a unified policy on free world trade with the Communist bloc. All of these items are contained in my bill.

In summary, I believe the United States must have the power to take truly new measures in the field of trade; that the President must have the negotiating authority to carry out such measures; and that Congress must share as an effective partner in the direction and control over such measures. In this way, the Nation can meet the historic challenges and opportunities of our time.

I have introduced my bill with that in mind. During the coming weeks, I expect to address the Senate on the various issues involved in these two different approaches—mine and the administration's—to the goal of trade expansion. I have already summarized the principal features of the approach of my bill.

For the study of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a comparison of the major portions of the administration bill with mine, and a supplementary comparison of certain tax relief provisions in both bills.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I conclude by saying that I think the idea of presenting a feasible alternative to Congress is a very desirable one, certainly from our side of the aisle, as carrying out some of the approaches which we have in mind and as giving an opportunity and a rallying point for those who may agree with the fundamental objectives of the trade program, but who may have differences in method which may be resolved. I have offered my bill in that spirit.

I think it is well known that if trade legislation is to become law at this session of Congress, it will be necessary to get votes from both sides of the aisle in order to accomplish it. I hope very much that those votes may be obtainable, and I shall do my best to help bring that about; but that can only happen if the views of those on both sides of the aisle who are fighting for the same objectives find some reflection in the ultimate legislative package which goes to the President for his signature.

The analysis and supplemental statement presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS IN PROPOSED TRADE LEGISLATION

Javits bill	*Administration bill*
Title	
National Trade Policy Act of 1962 (S. 2840).	Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (H.R. 9900, introduced by Mr. MILLS).
Purpose	
To provide trade negotiating authority for the President, under the control and direction of the Congress; to meet the challenges of the economic forces sweeping the world—such as the growth of regional trading groups, the requirements of the newly developing free world nations, and the Soviet bloc potential for economic penetration.	To lower trade barriers through mutually beneficial trade agreements, in order to stimulate U.S. economic growth, enlarge foreign markets for U.S. products, benefit the U.S. consumer, strengthen U.S. ties with the European Economic Community and foreign countries through nondiscriminatory free world trade, assist newly developing free world nations, and counter Communist economic penetration.
To provide assistance to business enterprises, individuals and communities in adjusting to changed economic conditions resulting from increased U.S. participation in world trade.	To provide assistance to enterprises, workers and farmers in adjusting to new conditions resulting from increased trade with the European Economic Community and foreign countries.
Advisory Committee on Trade Policy	
Shall be composed of nine members, appointed by the President, and shall be broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, and consumer interests. One of the members shall be a member of the National Export Expansion Committee which was established in 1960. The advisory committee shall meet one or more times a year, on the call of the President, for consultation on the administration of this act.	NOTE.—See below: "Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board."
PART I. PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY IN TRADE AGREEMENTS, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO	
Extent of and Limitations on Presidential Authority	
In agreements with low-cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas, duties may be reduced by 50 percent, or reduced to a rate of 30 percent—whichever is lower. In agreements with fully developed nations or areas, duties may be reduced by 100 percent.	Duties may be reduced by 50 percent except that agreements with the European Economic Community can exceed this limitation on all articles within any category (three-digit group of the Standard International Trade Classification) in which the United States and the European Economic Community account for 80 percent or more of the world export value.
NOTE.—The bill defines fully developing nations or areas as having a substantial manufacturing output and a productivity rate at least one-third that of the United States. Other free-world nations or areas are low-cost producing industrialized or developing.	
Not more than one-half of the maximum authorized decrease shall become effective in any one year.	Duty reductions shall take effect in five annual installments.

PART I. PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY IN TRADE AGREEMENTS, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—continued

In agreements with low-cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas, items may be transferred from the dutiable to the free list, if such items are not produced in the United States in significant quantities or if the duty on such items does not exceed 3 percent. (This limitation does not apply to agreements with fully developed nations or areas.)

NOTE.—The specific authority on agricultural trade with the EEC, and on tropical agricultural and forestry commodities, contained in the administration bill, can be exercised under the broad authority of the Javits bill (see above)—except as such authority in the administration bill refers to "other import restrictions" on tropical commodities.

Unconditional Most-Favored Nation Treatment

Shall apply to all fully developed nations or areas; and may be extended to other free world nations or areas—so that the President may be able to act according to the extent to which such treatment is extended by the fully developed to the other free world nations or areas.

Expiration of Negotiating Authority

June 30, 1965.

Trade With Communist Dominated Nations

The above authority does not apply to trade with Communist-dominated nations or areas.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to negotiate with our allies for a treaty which would unify our trading policies relative to the Communist-dominated nations or areas. Adherence to such a treaty should be open to other non-Communist-dominated nations or areas. Such a treaty should provide for effective and unified controls on the shipment of strategic goods and the extension of export credits; alternative marketing and purchasing opportunities for free world nations experiencing or threatened with serious economic injury as the result of Communist economic policies; contingency plans and measures; and common proposals for and means to enforce specific rules in trade with the Communist-dominated nations or areas.

Further Presidential Authority and Congressional Directions

Duties may be raised up to 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934. (See below: "Escape Clause.")

The President shall utilize his authority to assure expanding markets and nondiscriminatory treatment for U.S. products, and provide for special arrangements—such as tariff quotas, and marketing and servicing assistance—in order to provide stable and expanding markets for the products of low cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas in the economies of the fully developed nations or areas. Consideration shall be given to the effect of the importation of such products on the United States and other fully developed nations' economies.

The President shall utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to provide adequate protection for holders of U.S. patents and copyrights.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to negotiate an agreement with all contracting parties to GATT, and with other nations

Items may be transferred from the dutiable to the free list, if the duty on such items does not exceed 5 percent. (This limitation applies to all agreements.)

In agreements with the European Economic Community, relating to agricultural commodities, duty reductions may exceed the 50-percent limitation even if the United States and the European Economic Community do not account for 80 percent or more of the world export value.

Duties or other important restrictions on tropical agricultural and forestry commodities may be removed, if the European Economic Community makes comparable concessions and if such commodities are not produced in significant quantities in the United States.

Shall be carried out in all agreements.

June 30, 1967.

The above authority does not apply to trade with Communist-dominated nations or areas.

The reduction or elimination of any duty or other import restriction under any trade agreement may be suspended, if the President determines that a foreign nation discriminates against U.S. commerce or engages in other practices contrary to the purposes of this act. (See below: "Escape Clause.")

NOTE.—The specific authority on tropical commodities, contained in the administration bill (see above), provides for certain marketing opportunities for developing nations or areas.

PART I. PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY IN TRADE

whereby they would report annually to GATT on the progress achieved in raising living standards and improving working conditions.

National Security

No action shall be taken under the above authority to decrease the duty on any article, if the President finds that such a reduction would threaten to impair the national security.

Whenever the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning believes that the imports of any article are threatening to impair the national security, and the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall institute an immediate investigation. On the basis of such an investigation, he shall proclaim such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such an article to a level which will not threaten to impair the national security. Such a proclamation shall be submitted to the Congress.

Impact of imports on the domestic economy—the former peril-point provisions

The President shall utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements with due consideration of the effect of resulting imports on the domestic economy. Before entering into such an agreement, he shall consult with the Tariff Commission.

Congressional veto of trade agreements and proclamations under the national security clause

The President is required to submit to the Congress any trade agreement, or any proclamation under the national security clause, immediately after it is entered into or issued.

Any such agreement or proclamation is subject to veto by the Congress through a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses by a two-thirds vote, within 60 days after such an agreement or proclamation has been submitted to the Congress.

Furthermore, any trade agreement calling for concessions greater than the kind specifically authorized with low cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas is subject to veto through a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses by majority vote. (This would affect agreements with fully developed nations.)

PART II. THE TARIFF COMMISSION, ADJUSTMENT

The Tariff Commission

Shall be prepared at all times to advise the President with respect to conditions of competition prevailing between imported products and domestic production. It shall keep up to date and publish the "Summaries of Tariff Information." (Powers previously granted to the Tariff Commission remain in effect, unless specifically changed in this act.)

AGREEMENTS, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—CON.

No action shall be taken under the above authority, if the President determines that such action would threaten to impair the national security.

Upon request of the head of any agency, upon application of any interested party, or upon his own motion, the President shall institute an immediate investigation to determine the effects on national security of the imports of any article. On the basis of such an investigation he shall adjust the imports of such an article so that such imports will not threaten to impair the national security, as he deems necessary.

Among other things, the President shall give consideration to the capacity of domestic industry to meet projected national defense requirements, and the existence of supplies and services essential to the national defense. The President shall further recognize the close relation of the economic welfare of the Nation to our national security.

A report shall be made and published by the President upon the disposition of each request, application, or motion on this matter.

Before entering into trade agreements, the President shall utilize the advice of the Tariff Commission. In preparing such advice, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings and afford opportunity for interested parties to be heard, and shall take into consideration the probability of the idling of facilities in industries affected by such trade agreements, the inability of firms to operate at a profit, and the probability of the unemployment or underemployment of workers.

After entering into any trade agreement, the President shall submit it to the Congress, stating, in the light of the advice of the Tariff Commission and of other relevant considerations, his reasons for entering into the agreement.

ASSISTANCE, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO

Shall at all times keep informed concerning the operation and effect of the provisions of trade agreements, and may conduct preliminary investigations and exercise other powers previously granted to it, in order to perform its functions under this act.

PART II. THE TARIFF COMMISSION, ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—continued

Eligibility for Adjustment Assistance (and the Escape Clause

Any business enterprise, community, industrial development corporation, individual or organization representing individuals, may apply to the President for a certificate of eligibility for assistance. To be eligible, a business enterprise or individual must first be found by the Tariff Commission, under existing escape clause procedure, to be suffering or threatened with serious injury from increased imports resulting from a trade agreement. A community must be suffering or threatened with such injury as the result of reductions in personnel by business enterprises cited above. An industrial development corporation must be operated for the purpose of improving the economic situation of a community cited above.

Furthermore, a business enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation must also submit satisfactory proposals for programs of economic adjustment. For the purpose of preparing such proposals, technical assistance shall be extended.

Adjustment Assistance and Tariff Relief for Industries (and the Escape Clause)

If the business enterprise or individual, found by the Tariff Commission to be suffering or threatened with injury from imports, represents, singly, or in combination with other similarly injured or threatened parties, a substantial part of any industry, the Tariff Commission may recommend to the President the raising of duties or the imposition of other import restrictions on the article being imported—in addition to or in the place of adjustment assistance. (The President may give adjustment assistance in addition to or in the place of the rise in duties or imposition of other import restrictions recommended by the Tariff Commission.)

The President may not raise duties to a rate more than 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934 (see above). The President may provide that increases in duties or the imposition of other import restrictions shall be effective on a gradually reducing basis over a period of not more than 7 years.

Congressional Veto of Presidential Acts

If the President does not take the action recommended by the Tariff Commission, he shall submit a report to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, stating his reasons. Within 60 days after the submittal of such a report, the Congress may cause the Tariff Commission recommendations to go into effect, through a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses by a two-thirds vote.

The Congress may provide through a concurrent resolution, passed by both Houses by majority vote, that the President's authority to issue certificates of eligibility for adjustment assistance shall terminate—but this shall not affect the eligibility for assistance of those already holding such certificates.

Expiration of Certificates of Eligibility

Certificates shall be good for up to 18 months. They may be renewed by the President for not more than four successive periods.

Presidential Delegation of Authority

The President may delegate any power or authority in the extension of adjustment assistance, and congressional veto

Any firm, worker, or representative of a firm or worker may file a petition with the President for a determination of eligibility to apply for assistance. The President shall transmit such a petition to the Tariff Commission for advice on the extent to which import competition has increased. A firm shall be eligible to apply for assistance with an administering agency designated by the President, if the President determines that increased imports are causing or are immediately threatening to cause serious economic injury, as defined in the bill, to the firm or its workers. A worker shall be eligible to apply for assistance with an administering agency designated by the President, if the President determines that increased imports are causing or are immediately threatening to cause significant unemployment or underemployment among workers in the worker's firm.

Furthermore, a firm must present to the administering agency adjustment proposals which are calculated to contribute to the firm's economic adjustment, give consideration to the interests of its workers, and demonstrate that the firm will make all reasonable efforts to use its own resources for economic adjustment.

An industry must file a petition for assistance with the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission shall advise the President. An industry shall be eligible for assistance, if the President determines that increased imports are causing or are immediately threatening to cause serious economic injury on a widespread basis in the industry, reasonable efforts in the industry to adjust have been made, and the assistance given to firms and workers under this act have not sufficed to mitigate the serious economic injury. Furthermore, if the President determines that an industry is eligible for assistance, he shall proclaim such raising of duties or imposition of other import restrictions as he may determine to be in the national interest.

The President may not raise duties to a rate more than 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934. Any increase in duty or imposition of other import restrictions shall expire not more than 4 years after going into effect, unless the President determines that the national interest requires a longer period, and is subject to change within that 4-year period at the discretion of the President.

The President shall assure that the functions in the extension of adjustment assist-

PART II. THE TARIFF COMMISSION, ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—continued

sistance to such departments, agencies, or offices of the Government as he deems appropriate.

Advisory Board

Any department, agency, or office performing the functions in extending adjustment assistance, shall consult with the other parts of the Government which are concerned with domestic and foreign trade policies and operations.

NOTE.—See above: "Advisory Committee on Trade Policy."

Substantive Adjustment Assistance Provisions

Both bills contain basically similar provisions for minimum standards for unemployment compensation to be paid to workers adversely affected by increased imports, as well as for retraining programs and relocation allowances for such workers. The only substantial difference is that the Javits bill also provides for early retirement payments to such workers choosing to obtain them after the age of 60.

Both bills contain basically similar provisions for loans, tax incentives and technical assistance to firms adversely affected by increased imports. The only substantial difference is that the Javits bill also makes applicable provisions available to communities.

ance are carried out through existing agencies and programs of the executive branch.

An Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board, consisting of the Secretary of Commerce, as Chairman, and the Secretaries of Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, Interior, and HEW, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and such other officers as the President deems appropriate, is created to advise him and the administering agencies on the development of coordinated programs of adjustment assistance. The Chairman may appoint an industry committee, representing employers, workers, and the public, for the purpose of advising the Board.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMPARISON OF THE TAX RELIEF PROVISIONS IN THE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE SECTIONS OF H.R. 9900 (REPRESENTATIVE MILLS) AND THE BILL OF SENATOR JAVITS

Essentially, the difference between section 317 of H.R. 9900 and section 207 of Senator JAVITS' bill is the difference between liberalizing the application of existing tax law (sec. 317 of H.R. 9900) and revising the annual amount of tax relief that would be available to a company adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States.

Section 317 of H.R. 9900 revises the formula for the application of the loss carryback and carryover provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by enlarging from 8 years to 10 the permissible period for the inclusion, as tax deductions of net operating loss carrybacks and carryovers in the case of companies adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States. At present, title 26, United States Code, section 172(b)(1) provides a net operating loss carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year of such loss, and a net operating loss carryover to each of the 5 taxable years following the taxable year of such loss. Section 317(d) of H.R. 9900 would add a new provision to section 1721(b)(1) to allow a net operating loss carryback to each of 5 taxable years preceding the taxable year of such loss for companies adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies. Section 317 also amends other sections of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 6501(h), and 6511(d)(2)(A)) dealing respectively with limitations on assessment and collection in the case of net operating loss carrybacks, and with the special period of limitation on claims for credit or refund with respect to net operating loss carrybacks, to conform with the proposed change in section 1721(b)(1).

Section 207 of Senator JAVITS' bill would effect two things: (1) in section 207(a) it would provide a special, increased depreciation deduction (including a 5-year carryback) on property which is used in its trade or business, on the date the depreciation deduction is granted, by a company adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies, a special 5-year amortization deduction for so-called conversion facilities, i.e., any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, the construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which was completed after the date of enactment of the bill, by a company adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies and which has been determined to be necessary to enable the business concern either (a) to develop new or different lines of production, or (b) to renovate its productive facilities. Such an amortization deduction would generally be in lieu of the depreciation deduction provided under section 167 of title 26, United States Code, the business depreciation deduction section of the Internal Revenue Code and the section that would be amended by the increased depreciation provision in Senator JAVITS' bill.

The rapid amortization provision which would add a new section 181 to title 26, United States Code, is similar in concept but not identical in substance to the provision in the code (26 U.S.C. 168) permitting a special rapid amortization procedure for defense emergency facilities.

Section 167 of title 26, the proposed section 181 (both of which are in Senator JAVITS' bill) and section 172 (revised in section 317 of H.R. 9900), are (or would be) all parts of part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 161–180), relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations. Section 172, relating to net operating loss deduction defines "net operating loss" in subsection (s) thereof as "the excess of the deductions allowed by this chapter over the gross income." The deductions allowed by this chapter include section 167 (business depreciation deduction), and would include the proposed section 181 (rapid amortization).

Subsections (2) and (3) of section 207(a) of Senator JAVITS' bill provide that the special depreciation deduction would be applicable "only for the taxable year in which the certificate (of eligibility for assistance) is issued (under section 201(a) of the bill) and for the 4 taxable years succeeding such taxable year."

Section 201(a) of the bill provides that the effective life of certificates of eligibility issued thereunder shall not be more than 18 months, with successive renewals for periods of 18 months or less upon a showing of necessity.

Subsections 317 (a) and (b) of H.R. 9900 permit tax relief under the net operating loss carryback and carryover provisions of the code to such companies as are certified under section 311 of the bill to be eligible for assistance. An eligible company may apply for such assistance within 2 years after the close of any taxable year in which a net operating lass was sustained.

Section 311(d) of H.R. 9900 does not set a statutory maximum for the in-force period of duration of certificates of eligibility issued thereunder. It provides that they shall remain in force "only for such period as the administering agency may prescribe by regulations."

Section 207(b) of Senator JAVITS' bill which deals with the deduction for rapid amortization of conversion facilities, grants the privilege to business concerns which have secured certificates of eligibility under section 201(a) of the bill. The 5-year rapid amortization period "shall begin as to any facility, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year."

BUSINESSES ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 317 OF H.R. 9900 AND SECTION 207 OF SENATOR JAVITS' PROPOSED BILL

Section 317(a) of H.R. 9900 reads, "the administering agency may provide to a firm certified under section 311 of this act, adjustment assistance in the form of tax relief as provided in this section, if it determines that such assistance will materially contribute to the economic adjustment of the firm."

The term "firm" is defined in section 407(c) of the bill to include "an individual proprietorship, partnership, joint venture, association, corporation (including a development corporation), business trust, cooperative, trustees in bankruptcy, and receivers under decree of any court."

Section 311 provides that a firm eligible for adjustment assistance as a result of a determination made under section 302 of the bill may file an application with such agency as the President may designate as the administrative agency, for adjustment assistance in accordance with the bill; and, within a reasonable time after filing its application, the firm shall present a proposal for its economic adjustment.

The administering agency must certify that the firm's adjustment proposal (1) is reasonably calculated materially to contribute to the economic adjustment of the firm, (2) gives adequate consideration to the interests of its workers adversely affected by actions taken in carrying out trade agreements, and (3) demonstrates that the firm will make all reasonable efforts to use its own resources for economic adjustment.

If tax relief is to be provided, the administering agency must determine that it is necessary to carry out a certified adjustment proposal.

Section 302 of the bill provides that a firm shall be eligible for adjustment assistance "if the President determines that, as a result of continuance, reduction, or elimination of a duty or other import restriction, or continuance of duty-free or excise treatment under a trade agreement, an article like or directly competitive with an article produced by the firm is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or immediately threaten to cause (1) significant idling of the productive facilities of the firm, (2) prolonged and persistent inability of the firm to operate at a profit, or (3) unemployment or underem-

ployment of a significant number of the workers of the firm."

Finally, the last condition is set forth in section 317(b) of the bill which provides that tax relief is to be granted (1) if a net operating loss (within the meaning of 26 U.S.C. 172) was sustained by a firm with respect to any taxable year, (2) if the administering agency shall determine that such loss arose substantially out of the carrying on of a trade or business affected as specified in section 302 of the bill, and (3) if the administering agency shall further determine that such tax relief is appropriate.

Upon the occurrence of all of these findings, a certificate of such determination shall be issued to the firm. This certification shall entitle the firm to treat such net operating loss as provided in title 26, United States Code, section 172, as amended by H.R. 9900, if the firm files with the Secretary of the Treasury a notice of its application for tax relief and, after its issuance, a copy of such certification (sec. 317(i), H.R. 9900).

Subsections 207 (a) and (b) of Senator JAVITS' bill provide that tax relief is available in accordance with its provisions, to a business concern adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States, only if a certificate of eligibility has been issued to such concern under section 201 of the bill.

Section 207(b) provides that the rapid amortization deduction may be claimed by an "individual who owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States," as well as by a corporation which has been adversely affected.

Senator JAVITS' bill is at some variance with H.R. 9900, however, in the administrative determination for extending tax relief to a firm, in that it rests such authority primarily in the Tariff Commission rather than an undesignated agency, and it sets forth more detailed conditions for the granting of such relief. It also provides for congressional action to effectuate a Tariff Commission recommendation for adjustment relief if such is disapproved by the President. These provisions are found in sections 201 and 202 of Senator JAVITS' bill.

This variance in procedures does not affect the ultimate result anticipated under either bill, however; i.e., the issuance of a certificate making a business concern eligible for adjustment assistance in the nature of tax relief.

One other area of the need for possible clarification between the two bills as respects tax relief is discussed in the following paragraphs.

ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS OF THE RAPID AMORTIZATION DEDUCTION IN 207(b) OF SENATOR JAVITS' BILL AND TAX RELIEF IN SECTION 317 OF H.R. 9900

Section 207(b) of Senator JAVITS' bill provides that a rapid amortization deduction in respect to conversion facilities can be claimed by "an individual who owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States."

While section 172 of title 26, United States Code, permits the net operating loss carryback and carryover deduction to be claimed both by individuals (including partners) and corporations, section 317(a) of H.R. 9900 grants the proposed special net operating loss deduction provision only to "firms" adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies.

The term "firm" in section 407(c) of H.R. 9900 includes partnership, joint venture, association, business trust and cooperative, all of which are unincorporated business units involving individual proprietary interests. No provision seems to be made, however, for the specific owner-member interests in these units.

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

The bill (S. 2840) to provide authority for the President, under the control and direction of the Congress, to make such necessary adjustments in the trade policies of the United States as may be necessary to meet the complex and rapidly changing economic and political conditions prevailing in the world, and to provide the means for assisting domestic enterprises, communities, and individuals to adjust their productive activities to changed economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2840

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 "National Trade Policy Act of 1962".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress—

(1) affirms its primary responsibility for the trade policies of the United States and its power to exercise final control and direction over those trade policies in all of their aspects;

(2) recognizes the nature and magnitude of the economic and political forces sweeping the world, as exemplified by the growth of the European Common Market, by the other regional economic arrangements emerging in Latin America and elsewhere, by the expanding export-import needs of low-cost producing industrialized nations and areas of the free world, by the economic development requirements of the developing nations and areas of the free world, and by the Communist potential for market disruption and other economic penetration of the free world;

(3) further recognizes that the United States, in order to preserve and enhance its domestic prosperity, must maintain its economic leadership within the free world, acting as the major participant in international economic affairs, and must utilize the full extent of its great resources to this end, while (A) assuring that all of its citizens derive the greatest and fullest benefits from such a course of action, and where necessary, are assisted to derive such benefits, and (B) taking into consideration the requirements of national security; and

(4) finds that the President, who is responsible for the day to day participation of the United States in international affairs, must be given sufficient authority within the field of foreign trade policy to negotiate, subject to the control and direction of the Congress, in the best interests of the United States and to meet the short term and the long term exigencies of international economic affairs.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to give the President for a limited time authority to negotiate trade agreements in the interests of the United States on a long-term basis, to assure that such authority is used under the control and direction of the Congress, to direct that such authority is used to meet specifically the different trading problems encountered in various regions and areas of the world, and to provide that such authority include the means for assisting business enterprises, individuals, and communities so that they may make the necessary adjustments in their productive activities required by changed economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Free world nation or area" means any nation or area which is not dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

(2) "Fully developed nation or area" means (A) any free world nation or area in which the output per worker engaged in manufacturing is at least 33⅓ per centum of the output per worker engaged in manufacturing in the United States, or (B) a group of such nations or areas operating as a customs union or free trade association in which the average output per worker engaged in manufacturing is at least 33⅓ per centum of the output per worker engaged in manufacturing in the United States, which nation, area, or group of nations or areas is determined by the President to be engaged substantially in manufacturing.

Advisory Committee on Trade Policy

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Committee on Trade Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), which shall be composed of nine members, appointed by the President, who shall be broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, and consumer interests. One of the members of the committee shall be a member of the National Export Expansion Committee, established by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the message of the President to the Congress on March 17, 1960.

(b) The committee shall meet one or more times each year, on the call of the President, for the purpose of consultation in connection with the administration of the provisions of this Act.

(c) Members of the Committee shall be paid a per diem allowance of $75 for each day spent away from their homes or regular places of business, for the purpose of attendance at meetings of the Committee, and in necessary travel, and while so engaged they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed $16 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

Conditions of competition prevailing between imported products and domestic production

SEC. 5. (a) The United States Tariff Commission shall be prepared at all times to advise the President with respect to conditions of competition prevailing between imported products and domestic production.

(b) The Commission shall bring up to date and publish, at intervals not to exceed five years, the "Summaries of Tariff Information."

Congressional veto of action taken by President

SEC. 6. (a) Any foreign trade agreement entered into under section 101(a), and any proclamation issued under section 2(b) of the Act of July 1, 1954 (19 U.S.C. 1352a(b)), as amended by section 103 of this Act, shall take effect in accordance with the terms thereof, unless within sixty calendar days after the submittal of a copy of such agreement or proclamation in accordance with section 101(d) of this Act, Congress, by a concurrent resolution duly passed by a two-thirds vote of the Members of each House (or a majority vote if the total amount of the decrease in duty under such agreement exceeds the maxima specified in paragraph (1)(B) of section 104(a)), declares its disapproval thereof.

(b) For the purposes of this section, in the computation of any period of sixty calendar days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment of

the Congress sine die; except that if a concurrent resolution under this section has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no such exclusion shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

Rules governing congressional consideration of concurrent resolutions of disapproval

SEC. 7. (a) The following subsections of this section are enacted by the Congress:

(1) As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in subsection (b)); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) As used in this section, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which conforms to one of the following:

(1) "That the Senate and House of Representatives do not approve the foreign trade agreement (or the modification of the foreign trade agreement), entitled ------, submitted by the President to the Congress on ------, 19--, pursuant to section 101(d) of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962", or

(2) "That the Senate and House of Representatives do not approve the proclamation of the President, dated ------, 19--, and submitted by the President to the Congress on ------, 19--, pursuant to section 101(d) of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962"; the blank spaces being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one foreign trade agreement (or modification), or proclamation, as the case may be.

(c) A resolution shall be referred to the Committee on Finance of the Senate or to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(d)(1) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to the same subject matter which has been referred to the committee.

(2) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same subject matter), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(3) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same subject matter.

(e)(1) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(f)(1) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(2) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution shall be decided without debate.

(g) If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a foreign trade agreement (or modification thereof), or proclamation, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same subject matter, then—

(1) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same subject matter may be reported or (despite the provisions of subsection (d)(1)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(2) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation has been referred to committee—

(A) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation had been received; but

(B) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation the resolution from the other House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Reports

SEC. 8. The President shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive annual report on the administration of this Act. Such report shall include (1) an evaluation of the success with which the negotiating powers conferred pursuant to title I of this Act have been applied to the reduction of trade barriers and the elimination of discrimination (A) against United States exports, and (B) with respect to those trading partners which are fully developed nations or areas, against the exports of other free world nations or areas, (2) a detailed statement on trade and trade policy with the Communist-dominated nations, and (3) a detailed statement on the adjustment assistance provided under title II of this Act to business enterprises, communities, industrial development corporations, and individuals, and an analysis of the effectiveness of such assistance in bringing about an adjustment to the economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade.

Termination of authority

SEC. 9. All authority conferred upon the President by section 101(a)(1) of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1965.

Authorization for appropriation

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TITLE I. TRADE NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT

Authority to enter into foreign trade agreements

SEC. 101. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the President is authorized from time to time, during the period commencing on July 1, 1962, and ending at the close of June 30, 1965, to—

(1) enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

(2) proclaim such modification of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article or class of articles covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder.

The President may at any time terminate, in whole or in part, any proclamation made pursuant to this section. As used in this section, the term "duties and other import restrictions" includes (i) rate and form of import duties and classification of articles, and (ii) limitations, prohibitions, charges, and exactions other than duties, imposed on importation or imposed for the regulation of imports.

(b) The authority conferred by subsection (a) shall, subject to sections 102, 103, and 104, be utilized by the President—

(1) in trade agreements with fully developed nations or areas so as—

(A) to extend to such nations or areas, according to the principle of unconditional most favored nation treatment, any concession made by the United States in any trade agreement with any free world nation or area,

(B) to make the more substantial concessions on products of United States industries having (i) the greatest demonstrated capacity and potential for export expansion, and (ii) the greatest growth potential and highest productivity, and

(C) to base any concession made by the United States to the fully developed nations or areas substantially on the effectiveness of such a concession in obtaining (i) free access to the markets of such nations or areas for the products of United States agriculture and industry, including elimination of discriminatory restrictions, whether direct or indirect, applied against such products in such markets, and (ii) extension of any concession made by such nations or areas to the United States to all other free world nations or areas;

(2) in trade agreements with other free world nations or areas so as—

(A) to extend to such nations or areas, according to the principle of unconditional most favored nation treatment, any concession made by the United States in any trade agreement with any free world nation or area, except that at the discretion of the President such treatment may be extended to such nations or areas upon condition that such treatment is extended to such nations or areas, by the fully developed nations or areas, and

(B) to establish special arrangements, including tariff quotas and marketing and servicing assistance, to aid in the development of stable and growing markets in fully

developed nations or areas for the products of such other free world nations or areas, with a minimum of economic dislocation and a maximum of economic benefit to such markets; and

(3) in trade agreements with any free world nation or area so as—

(A) to develop stable and growing markets for the products of United States agriculture and industry, and

(B) to protect the holders of United States patents and copyrights.

(c) Immediately after (1) any trade agreement (including any modification thereof) is entered into under section 101 (a), or (2) any proclamation is issued under section 2(b) of the Act of July 1, 1954 (19 U.S.C. 1352a (b)), as amended by section 103 of this Act, the President shall transmit to both Houses of the Congress a copy of such agreement or proclamation.

(d) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize the authority conferred by this section to negotiate an agreement under which all nations receiving trade concessions pursuant to trade agreements hereafter entered into, and all contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, report annually to the appropriate organ established pursuant to said General Agreement on the progress achieved in (1) improving working conditions in those industries the products of which have been subject to such concessions, and (2) raising living standards in those nations or areas which are dependent on such industries.

(e) It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should, in the exercise of the authority conferred by this section and the authority conferred on him by the Constitution, carry on negotiations with all nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments to formulate by treaty, executive agreement, or both, a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by the non-Communist-dominated nations or areas in their dealings with the Communist-dominated nations. Adherence to any such treaty or agreement should be open to any non-Communist-dominated nation or area on conditions to be determined in the treaty or agreement, and any such treaty or agreement should provide—

(1) Effective multilateral or bilateral controls on the shipment of strategic goods and the extension of export credits to any or all Communist-dominated nations;

(2) Alternative marketing and purchasing opportunities (including preemptive buying and stockpiling) for non-Communist-dominated nations or areas threatened by or experiencing serious economic injury as the result of the economic policies of any or all Communist-dominated nations;

(3) Contingency plans and measures to place additional restraints on, or to eliminate or increase trade with, any or all Communist-dominated nations; and

(4) Common proposals for, and means to enforce, a unified agreement with any or all Communist-dominated nations governing the basic and specific rules of commercial and trading relations between non-Communist-dominated nations or areas and any or all of the Communist-dominated nations.

Impact on domestic economy

SEC. 102. The authority conferred by section 101(a) shall be exercised by the President giving due consideration to the effect of resulting imports on the domestic economy. The President shall, not less than 180 days prior to entering into negotiations under such authority, furnish the United States Tariff Commission with a list of all articles to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions. Within 90 days after the receipt of such list, the Commission shall consult with and report to the President with regard to the potential impact on domestic industries and employment of any such modification of duties and other import restrictions.

National security

SEC. 103. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended", approved July 1, 1954, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1352a), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) No action shall be taken pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1351), or title I of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten to impair the national security.

"(b) In order to further the policies and purposes of this Act, whenever the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and, if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such an investigation and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security."

Limitations on authority

SEC. 104. (a)(1) No proclamation pursuant to section 101(a)(2) of this title shall be made, in order to carry out a foreign trade agreement entered into by the President during the period July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1965, decreasing any rate of duty below the lowest of the following rates:

(A) In the case of any proclamation made to carry out any such agreement with fully developed nations or areas, the rate which would result from decreasing the rate existing on June 30, 1962, by 100 per centum of such rate.

(B) In the case of a proclamation made to carry out any such agreement with other free world nations or areas (i) the rate which would result from decreasing the rate existing on June 30, 1962, by 50 per centum of such rate, or (ii) the rate 30 per centum ad valorem or, if the article is subject to a specific rate of duty or to a combination of rates including a specific rate, any rate (or combination of rates), however stated, the ad valorem equivalent of which has been determined as 30 per centum ad valorem. The provisions of paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of this subsection shall, in the case of any article subject to a combination of ad valorem rates of duty, apply to the aggregate of such rates; and, in the case of any article subject to a specific rate of duty or to a combination of rates including a specific rate, such provisions shall apply on the basis of the ad valorem equivalent of such rate or rates, during a representative period (whether or not such period includes July 1, 1962), determined in the same manner as the ad valorem equivalent of rates not stated wholly in ad valorem terms is determined for the purpose of section 350(a)(2)(D)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

(2) In the case of any decrease in duty to which paragraph (1) of this subsection relates, not more than one-half of the maximum authorized decrease shall become effective in any one year.

(3) Except as authorized by clause (A) of paragraph (1) of this subsection, no such proclamation shall be made to transfer any article from the dutiable to the free list, if such article is of a type produced in significant quantities in the United States, and the rate of duty on such article existing on June 30, 1962, exceeded 3 per centum.

(b) No proclamation pursuant to section 101(a)(2) of this title shall be made increasing by more than 50 per centum any rate of duty existing on July 1, 1934; except that a specific rate of duty existing on July 1, 1934, may be converted to its ad valorem equivalent based on the value of imports of the article concerned during the calendar year 1934 (determined in the same manner as provided in section 350(a)(2)(D)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended), and the proclamation may provide an ad valorem rate of duty not in excess of 50 per centum above such ad valorem equivalent.

(c) As used in this section, the terms "existing on July 1, 1934", and "existing on June 30, 1962" refer to rates of duty (however established, and even though temporarily suspended by Act of Congress or otherwise) existing on the dates specified, except rates in effect by reason of action taken pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

TITLE II. DOMESTIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Eligibility for assistance

SEC. 201. (a) The President shall determine, upon application by any business enterprise, community, industrial development corporation, individual, or organization representing individuals, whether the applicant is eligible, or, in the case of an organization, represents individuals who are eligible, to receive assistance under this title. If the President determines that any business enterprise, community, industrial development corporation, or individual is eligible for such assistance, he shall issue a certificate describing such enterprise, community, corporation, or individual or individuals, and such certificate shall conclusively establish for a period of not more than eighteen months the eligibility of the entity, individual or individuals described for assistance under this title. Upon application, the President may renew any certificate of eligibility for not more than four successive periods of eighteen months, or less, upon a showing that such renewal is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

(b) The following may be determined by the President to be eligible for assistance under this title:

(1) Any business enterprise or individual which has been found by the United States Tariff Commission, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended by section 202 of this Act, to be suffering serious injury or threatened with such injury from increased imports resulting from trade agreements entered into by the President under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, or section 101 of this Act.

(2) Any community (including an incorporated or unincorporated town, or other political subdivision of a State) which is suffering serious injury or is threatened with such injury as a result of reductions in personnel by one or more business enterprises described in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(3) Any industrial development corporation which is organized and operated for the purpose of aiding in the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or in the diversification of production in a community described in paragraph (2) of this subsection through industrial development, training and retraining of employees, or through any other means.

(c) Upon application of any business enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation for a certificate of eligibility under this section, the President shall consider, in addition to the criteria stated

in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b), whether such enterprise, community, or corporation has developed satisfactory proposals for programs of economic adjustment consonant with the purposes of this Act.

(d)(1) The authority of the President to issue certificates under this section shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1966, and the authority of the President to renew any such certificate shall terminate at the close of December 31, 1970.

(2) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Congress may provide by concurrent resolution that the authority referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall terminate prior to the termination otherwise provided therefor.

(3) The termination of the authority of the President to issue or renew certificates, as hereinabove provided, shall not affect the eligibility of holders of outstanding and unexpired certificates for assistance under any section of this title.

Investigations by Tariff Commission

SEC. 202. (a) Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either House of Congress, upon resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party (including any organization or group of employees), the United States Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation and make a report thereon not later than six months after the application is made to determine whether any product upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic business enterprise or individual producing like or directly competitive products.

"In the course of any such investigation, whenever it finds evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury or whenever so directed by resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings giving reasonable public notice thereof and shall afford reasonable opportunity for interested parties to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that a product on which a concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic business enterprise or individual, producing like or directly competitive products, it shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or modification of the concession, its suspension in whole or in part, the establishment of import quotas, and/or the extension of adjustment assistance authorized under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, to the extent and for the time necessary to prevent or remedy such injury: *Provided*, That the Commission shall not recommend the withdrawal or modification of a concession, its suspension, in whole or in part, or the establishment of import quotas upon a finding that any domestic business enterprise or individual is suffering or threatened with serious injury, unless such enterprise or individual represents, singly or in combination with other similarly injured or threatened parties, a substantial part of an industry. The Tariff Commission shall immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations, and shall cause a summary thereof to be published in the Federal Register.

"(b) In arriving at a determination in the foregoing procedure the Tariff Commission, without excluding other factors, shall take into consideration a downward trend of production, employment, prices, profits, or wages in the domestic business enterprise concerned, or a decline in sales, an increase in imports, either actual or relative to domestic production, a higher or growing inventory, or a decline in the proportion of the domestic market supplied by domestic producers. With respect to an individual who is unemployed or without regular employment, the Tariff Commission shall take into consideration whether his last regular employment of substantial duration was in such a business enterprise.

"Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to any domestic business enterprise or individual producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed subtantially toward causing or threatening serious injury to such business enterprise or individual.

"(c)(1) Upon receipt of the Tariff Commission's report of its investigation and hearings, the President may (A) make, in whole or in part, such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, make such other modifications, and extend such adjustment assistance as is authorized under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, as are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the affected domestic business enterprise or individual, or (B) if the report of the Commission recommends only relief by way of duty or quota adjustments or modification, make available adjustment assistance to the injured or threatened business enterprise or individual in lieu of taking the action recommended by the Commission. If the President does not take the action recommended by the Commission in whole within sixty days, he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating the reasons therefor, and if the President has taken or proposes to take any action recommended by the Commission but in the manner prescribed in paragraph (4) of this subsection, he shall include in such report the reasons therefor.

"(2) The action so found and reported by the Commission to be necessary shall take effect in whole (as provided in the first sentence of paragraph (1) or in paragraph (3), as the case may be)—

"(A) if approved by the President, or

"(B) if disapproved by the President in whole or in part, upon the adoption by both Houses of the Congress (within the 60-day period following the date of the report referred to in the second sentence of paragraph (1) is submitted to such committees), by the yeas and nays by a two-thirds vote of each House, of a concurrent resolution stating in effect that the Senate and House of Representatives approve the action so found and reported by the Commission to be necessary.

For the purposes of subparagraph (B), in the computation of the 60-day period, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die.

"(3) In any case in which the contingency set forth in paragraph (2)(B) occurs, the President shall (within 15 days after the adoption of such resolution) take such action as may be necessary to make the adjustments, impose the quotas, make such other modifications, or extend the adjustment aids under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, as were found and reported by the Commission to be necessary.

"(4) In any case in which the President takes any action found and reported to be necessary by the Commission, he may provide that the adjustments in the rates of duty, the imposition of quotas, or other modifications (1) shall be effective during a period of not to exceed seven years, and (2) during such period shall be effective on a gradually reducing basis, as specified by the President in a proclamation duly made by him to effect the action so found and reported to be necessary.

"(d) When in the judgment of the Tariff Commission no sufficient reason exists for a recommendation to the President that a concession should be withdrawn or modified, or a quota established, or for the extension of adjustment assistance authorized under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, it shall make and publish a report stating its findings and conclusions."

(b) Sections 6 and 11 of such Act are hereby repealed.

Delegation of powers

SEC. 203. (a) The President may delegate any power or authority conferred on him by this title (except section 202) to such departments, agencies, or offices of the Government as he deems appropriate.

(b) Any department, agency, or office performing the duties and functions conferred on the President by section 201 of this title shall in the performance thereof advise and consult with the several departments and agencies of the Government which are concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign trade policies and operations.

Administrative powers

SEC. 204. (a) In administering the provisions of section 201 of this Act, the President is authorized to—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he deems advisable;

(2) secure directly from any department, agency, or office of the Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out his functions under section 201; and each such department, agency, or office is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics upon request;

(3) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; administer oaths, take testimony, have printing and binding done; and make such expenditures as is deemed advisable within the amount appropriated therefore; and

(4) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as may be appropriate to carry out the provisions of such section.

(b) The President is authorized to exercise any of the powers conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 21 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to witnesses at any hearing held under this section.

Loans

SEC. 205. (a) The President is authorized to make loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) to any business enterprise (other than an enterprise eligible for assistance under section 7(b)(4) of the Small Business Act), any incorporated or unincorporated town, or other political subdivision of a State, or any industrial development corporation, which

has been certified under section 201 as eligible for assistance under this title.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the President determines, subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to assist the applicant to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policy of the United States;

(2) Assistance under this section shall not be extended if the assistance applied for is otherwise available to the applicant from private sources on reasonable terms, or pursuant to any other Act of Congress;

(3) No loans (including renewals and extensions thereof) shall be made for a period or periods exceeding twenty years, or bear interest, on the Government's share of the loan, at a rate in excess of the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (B) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the loan and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum; and

(4) In any agreement to participate in a loan on a deferred basis under this section, such participation by the Government shall not be in excess of 90 per centum of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of disbursement.

(c) The President is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States for the provision of financial assistance under this section. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed $100,000,000 are authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the President from the revolving fund when requested. The President shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the net amount of the cash disbursements from such advances at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall not be in excess of the rate of interest on the Government's share of loans made under this section, less one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum.

(d) In the performance of his functions under this section, the President shall—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program subject to the provisions of sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 847–849); and

(2) determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of the law specifically applicable to corporations of the United States.

(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the President shall have the powers set forth in section 5(b), except paragraph 8, of the Small Business Act.

Amendments to Small Business Act

SEC. 206. (a) Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate to enable any small business concern which has been certified as eligible for assistance, under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policy of the United States."

(b) Section 4(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$1,125,000,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,175,000,000"; and

(2) by striking out the sixth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed an aggregate of $200,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 7(b), of which amount not less than $50,000,000 shall be available for the purposes set forth in paragraph (4)."

Amendments to Internal Revenue Code of 1954

SEC. 207. (a) Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deduction for depreciation) is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as (i), and by inse ting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

"(h) BUSINESS CONCERNS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY UNITED STATES FOREIGN TRADE POLICY.—

"(1) Special rule.—In the case of property described in paragraph (4) used in a trade or business by a business concern which, within the meaning of paragraph (2), has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States, the reasonable allowance under subsection (a) shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be—

"(A) an amount equal to twice the amount computed under the method of dep eciation used in respect of such property for the taxable year preceding the first taxable year in which this subsection applies to such property, or

"(B) an amount computed under the method of depreciation described in subsection (b)(1) and computed, with respect to the adjusted basis of such property on the first day of the first taxable year in which this subsection applies to such property, as if (i) such property had been acquired on such first day, and (ii) such property had a useful life of five years.

Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit or reduce an allowance otherwise allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) Business concerns adversely affected by United States foreign trade policy.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a business concern shall be considered to be adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States only if a certificate of eligibility has been issued to such concern under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962.

"(3) Taxable years to which applicable.—Subject to the provisions of paragraph (5), paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any property used in a trade or business by a business concern only for the taxable year in which the certificate, referred to in paragraph (2), is issued to such concern, and for the four taxable years succeeding such taxable year.

"(4) Property to which applicable.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to property which is—

"(A) used in its trade or business by a business concern on the date on which the certificate referred to in paragraph (2) was issued to such concern; and

"(B) used in an industry described in section 201(b)(1) of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962 and in respect of which such certificate is issued.

"(5) ELECTION.—

"(A) When and how made.—An election to compute the allowance allowed as a deduction by subsection (a) with reference to this subsection shall be made, with respect to any property used in a trade or business by a business concern, at the time of filing the return for the taxable year in which the certificate referred to in paragraph (2) is issued to such concern. Such election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe. At the time of making such election, the taxpayer shall select the method provided in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) to be used in computing such allowance with respect to such property.

"(B) EFFECT.—An election under subparagraph (A) shall be effective for the taxable year for which the return in connection with which the election is made is filed and, unless sooner terminated as provided in subparagraph (C), for the four taxable years succeeding such taxable year.

"(C) REVOCATION.—An election under subparagraph (A) may be revoked by the taxpayer at the time of filing his return for any of the four taxable years succeeding the taxable year for which the election was made. Such revocation shall be effective for the taxable year for which such return is filed and for succeeding taxable years. Such revocation shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe."

(b) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 181. AMORTIZATION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES OF BUSINESSES ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY FOREIGN TRADE POLICIES.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—

"(1) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTIONS.—In the case of—

"(A) a corporation which is a business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States, or

"(B) an individual who owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States,

there shall be allowed, at the election of the taxpayer, a deduction with respect to the amortization of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of any conversion facility (as defined in subsection (d)) based on a period of 60 months. The 60-month period shall begin as to any facility, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"(2) AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION.—The amortization deduction provided in paragraph (1) shall be an amount, with respect to each month of the amortization period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month, divided by the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the depreciation deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 167.

"(b) ELECTION OF AMORTIZATION.—The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a) to take the amortization deduction and to begin the sixty-month period with the month following the month in which the facility was completed shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a) to take the amortization deduction and to begin such period with the taxable year succeeding such year shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for such succeeding taxable year. Notwithstanding the preceding two sentences, the election of the taxpayer under subsection (a) may be made, under such

regulations as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe, before the time prescribed in the applicable sentence.

"(c) TERMINATION OF AMORTIZATION DEDUCTION.—A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may, at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deduction with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Secretary or his delegate before the beginning of such month. The depreciation deduction provided under section 167 shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction does not apply, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deduction with respect to such facility.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) CONVERSION FACILITY.—The term 'conversion facility' means any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, the construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which was completed after the date of the enactment of this section, and with respect to which a determination under subsection (e) has been made. In no event shall an amortization deduction be allowed in respect of any conversion facility for any taxable year unless a certificate in respect thereof under this paragraph shall have been made before the filing of the taxpayer's return for such taxable year.

"(2) BUSINESS CONCERNS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THE FOREIGN TRADE POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES.—A business concern shall be considered to be adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States only if a certificate of eligibility has been issued to such concern under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962.

"(e) DETERMINATION OF ADJUSTED BASIS OF CONVERSION FACILITY.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of subsection (a), in determining the adjusted basis of a conversion facility there shall be included only so much of the amount of the adjusted basis of such facility (computed without regard to this section) as is properly attributable to such construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition after the date of the enactment of this section as the President, or his designee under section 202 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, has determined to be necessary to enable the business concern either (A) to develop new or different lines of production, or (B) to renovate its productive facilities, and only such portion of such amount as the President, or such designee, has determined is attributable to the need of the business concern to develop new or different lines of production, or to renovate its productive facilities, because of the foreign trade policies of the United States. Such determination shall be under such regulations as may be prescribed from time to time by the President or such designee. Any such determination shall be made only upon application filed at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the President, or such designee, under such regulations, but in no event shall such determination have any effect unless an application therefor is filed before the expiration of six months after the beginning of such construction, reconstruction, erection, or installation, or the date of such acquisition.

"(2) SEPARATE FACILITIES; SPECIAL RULE.—After the completion or acquisition of any conversion facility with respect to which a determination under paragraph (1) has been made, any expenditure (attributable to such facility and to the period after such completion or acquisition) which does not represent construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition include in such a determination, but with respect to which a separate determination is made, shall not be applied in adjustment of the basis of such facility, but a separate basis shall be computed therefor pursuant to paragraph (1), as if it were a new and separate conversion facility.

"(f) DEPRECIATION DEDUCTION.—If the adjusted basis of the conversion facility (computed without regard to subsection (e)) exceeds the adjusted basis computed under subsection (e), the depreciation deduction provided by section 167 shall, despite the provisions of subsection (a)(2) of this section, be allowed with respect to such conversion facility as if the adjusted basis for the purpose of such deduction were an amount equal to the amount of such excess.

"(g) LIFE TENANT AND REMAINDERMAN.—In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowed to the life tenant.

"(h) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For special rule with respect to gain derived from the sale or exchange of property, the adjusted basis of which is determined with regard to this section, see section 1238."

(c) The table of sections for such part is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Sec. 181. Amortization of certain facilities of businesses adversely affected by foreign trade policies."

(d) Section 1238 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amortization in excess of depreciation) is amended by inserting after "section 168 (relating to amortization deduction of emergency facilities)" the following: "or section 181 (relating to amortization deduction of certain facilities of businesses adversely affected by foreign trade policies)".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply only to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Technical assistance

SEC. 208. (a) The President is authorized, whenever he determines such action is necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this Act, to provide technical and managerial aid to any business enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation, described in subsection (b) of section 201, in the development of programs of economic adjustment consonant with the purposes of this Act. Such aid may include (1) consultation and advice concerning policies, principles, and practices of good management, particularly with respect to the conversion of old lines of production to new lines of production, increasing productivity, or the making of other economic adjustments consonant with the purposes of this Act, (2) consultation and advice with respect to the availability of assistance under this Act, or any other Act of Congress, and in the preparation of the necessary applications to qualify therefor, (3) cooperating and advising with voluntary business, professional, educational, and other nonprofit organizations, associations, and institutions, and with other Federal or State agencies, and (4) such other activities as are deemed appropriate by the President.

(b) Nothing contained in the Small Business Act with respect to the types of enterprises which are eligible for assistance thereunder shall be construed to prohibit the exercise by the Small Business Administration of any function under this section which may be conferred upon it by the President under the authority contained in section 203 of this title.

Unemployment compensation

SEC. 209. (a)(1) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into an agreement with any State in which is located an enterprise or community, with respect to which a certificate of eligibility has been issued under section 201 of this title, under which the State, as agent of the United States, will make supplementary payments of compensation to unemployed individuals in the State as provided for in this section, and will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of compensation under this section.

(2) Supplementary payments of unemployment compensation under this section shall be made only to individuals within the class of individuals determined by the President to be eligible to receive assistance under this title.

(3) If the amount of unemployment compensation payable to an individual under the law of the State in which he is eligible to receive unemployment compensation is less than 70 per centum of (i) his average weekly wage, as determined under such law, or (ii) the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, whichever is the lesser, then the amount of the supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual under this section for a week of total unemployment shall be an amount equal to the amount by which 70 per centum of such individual's average weekly wage, or the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, whichever is the lesser, exceeds the amount paid to the individual under the unemployment compensation law of the State (including payments made by reason of dependents). For the purposes of this section, the average weekly wage earned by employees within any State shall be computed by the State agency, designated in the agreement entered into under this section, on the first day of the first calendar month commencing after the date on which any such agreement is entered into, and on July 1 of each succeeding year, on the basis of wages paid during the last full year for which necessary figures are available.

(4) In any case where an unemployed individual who is eligible for assistance under this title is no longer entitled to payment of compensation under the unemployment compensation laws of the State solely by reason of the expiration of the period for which such compensation is payable under such laws, there shall be paid to such individual, out of amounts paid to such State by the United States for such purpose and without cost to such State, compensation in an amount equal to 70 per centum of (i) his average weekly wage, as determined under such law, or (ii) the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, whichever is the lesser. The period during which an unemployed individual may receive assistance under this paragraph shall be equal to one-half the maximum period which, under the laws of such State, any individual may receive unemployment compensation, or three months, whichever is less: *Provided*, That if the period during which an individual may receive unemployment compensation under State law is less than four months, he may receive, irrespective of other provisions of this sentence, assistance under this paragraph for a period equal to six months less the period during which he may receive unemployment compensation under State law.

(5) In order to remain eligible for compensation under this section, an individual must comply with the provisions of State law with respect to ability and availability for work, and with respect to the acceptance of offers of suitable work, and failure to so comply shall result in immediate cessation of payment to such individual under this section.

(6) The amount of the Federal supplementary payment of unemployment com-

pensation to an individual for (i) any week of partial unemployment, or (ii) any week (not exceeding twelve weeks in the aggregate) during which such individual is receiving on-the-job or inplant training on a full- or part-time basis under a vocational training or retraining program approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 210 of this title, shall be the amount necessary to provide such individual with a weekly benefit equal to the aggregate he would have received under paragraph (3) of this subsection for a week of total unemployment, less his earnings for such week in excess of the partial earnings allowance, if any, permitted by the unemployment compensation law of the State.

(7) Any agreement under this section shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement. No agreement under this section for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on January 1, 1962.

(b) Payments shall be made under this section to any such individual only with respect to weeks of unemployment occurring during a period covered by an unrevoked certificate of eligibility issued under section 201 of this title in respect to such individual.

(c) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this section which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

(d) In making payments pursuant to this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical sampling, or other method, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

(e) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payments to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(f) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this section, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this section may be made.

(g) An agreement under this section may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section.

(h) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this section.

(i) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided by this section.

(j) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

(k) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State with respect to which an agreement is entered into under this section shall furnish the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this section, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act.

(l) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this section or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(m) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreement under this section.

Retirement

SEC. 210. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Labor shall determine that any individual sixty years of age or older, who is eligible for assistance under this title, is unable to find employment because of his advanced age, the Secretary shall issue a certificate containing such a finding.

(b) Section 216 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting immediately before subsection (b) thereof the following new subsection:

"Persons deemed to be age 62

"(a) Any individual who—

"(1) has attained 60 years of age but has not attained 62 years of age,

"(2) is eligible for assistance under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, and

"(3) is certified by the Secretary of Labor as unable to find employment because of advanced age,

shall be deemed for purposes of section 202(a) of this Act to have attained age 62."

(c) The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months beginning more than one month after the date this Act is enacted.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to reimburse the fund for additional benefits paid out under the provisions of this section.

Vocational training

SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe and provide suitable training for individuals, eligible for assistance under this title, who are in need of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation. For that purpose the Secretary may utilize and extend all existing Federal governmental facilities, and utilize the facilities of any other governmental agency maintained by joint Federal and State contributions, and by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be deemed necessary.

(b) The Secretary shall have the power and the duty to cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such Federal, State, and local agencies.

Relocation payments

SEC. 212. Whenever the Secretary of Labor shall determine that—

(1) no job opportunity for an individual, certified as eligible for assistance under this title, exists within such individual's current labor market area,

(2) a job opportunity for such individual, comparable to his last regular employment of substantial duration, is available at a place in the United States outside his current labor market area, and

(3) such individual agrees to take such job opportunity, he is authorized, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, to make relocation payments to such individual in an amount which shall not exceed the reasonable and necessary moving expenses to be incurred by such individual (including the dependent members of his family, if any) in order to accept such new job opportunity.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, there are very few men in the Senate who are as knowledgeable on foreign trade as my distinguished colleague. I take this opportunity to commend him for the important spadework which he has done in developing the bill which he is introducing today.

He has made a very eloquent statement on the challenge facing our Nation in the field of foreign trade. He has put forth a number of important ideas as to how our country must meet this challenge.

I am particularly delighted that the Senator has included in his trade bill provisions for a congressional trade veto of trade agreements and modifications of agreements. This is an area in which I am very much interested. On several occasions I have addressed the Senate urging that we restore some semblance of balance whereby both the Congress and the President will have a say as to what is being done in the field of foreign trade.

The Constitution clearly gives the Congress responsibility for trade matters. In this complex and fast-moving era in which we live, there is no question that the actual day-to-day implementation of trade policy must be handed over to the executive branch. However, and I want to make this very emphatic, Congress must retain a broad oversight as to whether the President in implementing the trade policy is carrying out the basic intent of the Congress.

It is my feeling that the Congress not only should include a congressional trade veto in the 1962 Trade Extension Act, but beyond this, I do not believe that there is sufficient support in the

Congress to pass a trade bill unless we include it. I am confident the Congress will not delegate broad new trade negotiating powers, without at the same time seeing to it that some procedure is provided so that we can make certain that these powers are used in the best interest of our country and in the manner in which the Congress intended.

Madam President, I again commend my distinguished colleague for the significant work which he has done in this field and for the brilliant way in which he has expounded his views.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not realize my colleague was referring to me. I am very grateful to him. I might say that, considering the extent of business interests in New York, it will take at least the two of us to do that which needs to be done in the interests of both our State and the Nation. I am grateful to the Senator for his gracious remarks, but, even more, for our working as brothers in arms in this effort, as we have before.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague. I am sure he is correct in saying it will take both of us, and many others, in order to fashion the kind of trade program which will have the support of Congress and which is in the best interests of our country.

DANGERS OF CRITICAL UNEMPLOYMENT ON LONG ISLAND—DEFENSE ORDERS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, last week I protested the action of the Defense Department in cutting back the current production of the F–105, an all-weather fighter bomber produced by the Republic Aviation Corp. on Long Island—an action that will result in the immediate layoff of 1,500 persons and by 1963 may result in a total layoff of 13,000 people.

Yesterday, the President commented on this serious problem at his news conference. I ask unanimous consent to have the question and answer printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Question. Mr. President, going back to the question of unemployment, some 13,000 workers in 1 plant on Long Island are facing layoffs as a result of the Defense Department's decision to phase out one type of aircraft. Do you see any need for new steps to offset the economic impact of changing defense requirements such as cases like this?

President KENNEDY. I think that the figures of the possible layoffs are not—are overstated in your question, because to the best of my information, they'd be substantially—very substantially—less than the figure that you gave, and that would be our—it is a matter of considerable concern, however, that anyone will be laid off at that particular factory, and we are concerned about it.

In fact, I think that your publisher wrote me about the matter last week. We even heard from the Congressman and we are concerned about seeing if we can maintain employment at the highest possible level at that plant. The difficulty, of course, comes because the particular plane that they are manufacturing has not been—is not being—continued and that presents us with a difficult decision at a number of areas.

But we are very conscious of the problem that's faced at that plant, and we are going to try to see if we can maintain employment as high as it's possible for us to do so, even though some cut—but of a much less figure than you mentioned—will, perhaps, inevitably come.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, it is gratifying to know that the President is aware of the problem that is so vital to the Long Island economy.

But his answer does not deal with the crucial questions: What were the reasons behind the Defense Department decision to curtail production of the F–105D fighter-bomber in favor of the F–4H fighter? And were there not alternatives to this drastic action which the Defense Department could have taken to prevent the critical dislocation to the Long Island economy?

The President's promise that an attempt will be made to maintain employment on as high a level as possible may refer to suggestions that subcontracts will be earmarked for Republic.

For example, today I was informed by the Office of Economic Utilization Policy in the Department of Defense that the contract for the F–110 with the McDonnell Aviation Corp., in St. Louis will be based on the assurance that a substantial part of the contract will be subcontracted to Republic on Long Island.

While this represents a new emphasis in procurement policy, it remains to be seen how much effect it could have on preventing a serious economic dislocation on Long Island. It is a matter which the New York congressional delegation will study carefully in the days ahead to determine whether such a move would have any satisfactory effect.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report on the problem by Justin Ostro, president of Republic Lodge No. 1987, International Association of Machinists, as well as articles from Newsday, which has played such an outstanding role in bringing the facts to the attention of public officials and the Long Island people.

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

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Melville, Long Island, N.Y., February 8, 1962.

Memo to New York congressional delegation.
From Justin Ostro, president of Republic Lodge No. 1987, International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO.

Pursuant to your request, I have noted below the important facts surrounding the proposed action of the Department of Defense in cutting back the current production of the F–105, an all-weather fighter-bomber produced by the Republic Aviation Corp., in favor of the F–4H produced by the McDonnell Aircraft Co., St. Louis, Mo.

THE PROBLEM

On or about January 22, 1962, the Department of Defense announced that the planned procurement of the F–105 would be reduced from 13 wings to 7 wings, and that the remaining wings would be procured from McDonnell Aircraft Co. Republic Aviation Corp., the producer of the F–105, is located at Farmingdale, Long Island, and employs 15,500 people. Of this number, 13,500 reside in Nassau and Suffolk Counties and the remainder are from Kings, Queens, and New York Counties. If the Department of Defense finalizes this curtailment in the production of the F–105, employment will be reduced by 1,500 immediately; further reductions in employment during 1962 and 1963 will reduce the work force to a low of 2,500 by December 1963, resulting in a total layoff of 13,000 people.

The current annual payroll at Republic is over $125 million and an additional $28 million (at an annual rate) is paid to subcontractors performing work for Republic—primarily in the immediate vicinity of the Long Island plant. The total amount of work subcontracted in the State of New York is in excess of $500 million.

Should the Department of Defense cut back the production of the F–105, it is estimated that the rate of unemployment in the Long Island area would reach 6.1 percent by December 1962 and 7.75 percent by December 1963. Long Island would again be declared a depressed area. Because of our prior experience in matters of this nature, it is not necessary to emphasize and elaborate the extreme hardships and difficulties which the people of this area would again experience. Needless to say, the economy of this area to a great extent is based upon the production of aircraft and if this source of employment is discontinued, the entire life blood of the community will be stopped.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF THE F–105 AND F–4H

The Department of Defense, when announcing the cutback in F–105 production, proclaimed that the F–4H was a superior aircraft. As laymen, we are not competent to challenge the findings of the Department of Defense, primarily because their evaluation is considered classified information, and further, we are not fully acquainted with the standards used. Of necessity, we must rely upon the testimony of representatives of the Air Force when questioned before congressional committees approximately 1 year ago. Expert testimony (see attachment) revealed that both aircraft exceed one another in performance, depending upon the nature of the mission prescribed in the testing. While the F–4H was shown to be faster at higher altitudes and had a shorter takeoff and landing capability (since it is carrier based), the F–105 was shown to be faster at lower altitudes (the F–105 had a load factor of 8.76 g.'s compared to 4.2 g.'s for the F–4H) and could carry a heavier load of bombs.

According to evaluations performed by Republic, the F–105 excelled in 17 out of 22 functions. While the company was not at liberty to disclose those specific areas in which the F–105 was proven a superior aircraft, their experience as producers of fighter aircraft assured them that the Department of Defense could not challenge their findings.

Without attempting to detail all specifications of each aircraft, one can reasonably conclude from the testimony given that the difference between the performance of both ships was extremely small and of minor importance. Further, testimony revealed that the F–105 costs approximately $400,000 less than the F–4H (Navy version). The Department of Defense has not announced what the actual cost difference will be when the F–4H is modified to meet the Air Force specifications, but one can correctly assume that it will be far in excess of the $400,000 noted in earlier releases.

The action of the Department of Defense in now contemplating the cutting of the procurement of the F–105 raises certain questions as to the reasoning motivating this action. It must be pointed out that the initial contracts for the F–105 and the F–4H

were let at approximately the same time. If it is now the decision of the Department of Defense that the F–4H is a superior aircraft, why were the initial contracts for the procurement of the F-105 let? Why didn't the Department of Defense—at that time—disqualify the F–105? What has occurred since the initial letting of these contracts to change the minds of the technical personnel of the Department of Defense?

While I can only speculate on this matter, I believe it reasonable to assume that this action is consistent with the pronounced assertions of the Secretary of Defense to standardize all defense hardware and weapons systems between the three services. As a taxpayer and an individual who is vitally concerned with the urgency and tremendous costs of defending the free world, I would not differ with this policy as it is applied to weapons systems presently in development or systems about to be let on contract. That is to say, I would not differ with the fundamental soundness of this philosophy as it is applied prospectively. I would, however, strongly differ with any attempt to apply this policy on a retroactive basis—particularly where it cannot be shown that it would result in tremendous savings or tremendous advantages in protecting the security of the free world. The Department of Defense cannot show or prove their assertions and, as is evident from statements in the trade journals, advocates of the F–105 in the Air Force have, because of limited patience and pressures from other sources, refused to challenge the authority and this decision of the Secretary of Defense.

This action of the Secretary of Defense raises a serious question as to whether the Secretary's office is presently in a position to tell each service what their needs are and procure what they consider to be the best weapons systems for their respective missions.

In this regard, it is important to note that it is the intention of the Department of Defense to use the F–4H as both an Air Force fighter and reconnaissance plane. The presently designed F–4H used exclusively by the Navy, will have to be modified to Air Force specifications, and it will be necessary to establish two additional production lines at the McDonnell plant to produce the Air Force F–4H fighter and the Air Force F–4H reconnaissance plane. In view of the production lag which will occur, and further, since it is very probable that each of these ships will be obsolete within 4 years, it is highly questionable whether the proposed action would be in the best interests of our defense posture.

It is our strong belief that the Republic Aviation Corp. can produce the needed fighter and reconnaissance aircraft (F–105 and RF–105) for the Air Force to meet our defense needs in a far shorter period of time than if the responsibility were given to the McDonnell Aircraft Co. in producing the F–4H and reconnaissance F–4H. This we believe to be the most important reason for continuing the present production of the F–105 and the proposed RF–105.

VALIDITY OF PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Numerous individuals have proposed that if the Department of Defense carries through with the cutback of the F–105, the Republic Aviation Corp. be awarded other defense contracts and subcontracts to maintain the present employment in this community. Further, it has been suggested that the effective date of the cutback be delayed 6 months in order to forestall the inevitable.

First, there is a serious question whether it is at all possible to award sufficient subcontracts to maintain a work force of over 15,500 people having a weekly payroll in excess of $2 million. While Republic could perform many of the current subcontracts being let, it is necessary that we consider the present plans of the company.

Republic has invested over $35 million—in both buildings, facilities, machinery and personnel—in research and development. Unlike most firms in the aircraft and missile industry, Republic stockholders own all of the plant and machinery. On the other hand, the average for the industry is approximately 36 percent. The company is very much aware of the prospective limited market for manned fighter aircraft and is doing its utmost to diversify its sales. Notable achievements have been made in perfecting a target drone and also in certain phases of electronics. However, it is acknowledged that the degree of diversification at the present time is not sufficient to utilize its entire work force, or even one-tenth of its present work force. Additional time is required to avert a serious recession in the area if we were to rely on production of diversified products. Should the current procurement of the F–105 be completed as originally planned (13 wings) in 4 more years of production, the company would be in a far better position to absorb its present work force in other diversified fields in which it is now performing research. Essentially, permitting Republic to complete the production of the 13 wings of the F–105 would place them in a far better position to maintain the economic lifeblood of the Long Island community when the manned fighter aircraft become obsolete, than if procurement, as presently proposed, is curtailed in 2 years and then discontinued.

Additional time is a necessity. While there was some hope that Republic would be chosen to produce the currently planned triservice fighter (TFX), word has been received that they have been disqualified. Had this contract been secured, the impact of cutting back the F–105 would have been lessened, and sufficient time would have been available to intensify diversification. In view of this, the full 4 years of production is desperately needed.

CONCLUSION

I am attaching hereto a supplement from the Newsday of this date which very aptly reveals the concern of all residents of Long Island to this proposed action by the Secretary of Defense. This is not only a concern of the corporation and the employees—but a concern of the 2 million people of Long Island who would be directly and indirectly affected by this action.

In view of the fact that both the F–105 and the F–4H will become obsolete in approximately 4 years when the plane of the future, the TFX, is put into production, and when we take into consideration the question of whether in fact one plane is superior to the other, then the question can properly be raised as to whether the relative benefits of this action would be enough to offset the economic dislocation which would occur in our Long Island community. In addition to all of the foregoing, there is great concern over the injury which would be done to our defense posture if this very adequate defense facility and its reservoir of skilled personnel were to be lost to our Nation.

In conclusion, I can only urge that you use all of your resources in preventing this injury to our defense effort and to the economic well-being of our Long Island community.

Respectfully submitted.

JUSTIN OSTRO,
President.

[From Aviation Daily, Jan. 22, 1962]

ROLE OF NAVY FIGHTER IN AIR FORCE PLANS IS GIVEN

In outlining his general purpose program package in the fiscal year 1963 defense budget before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Secretary McNamara noted that Navy's F–4H will be procured in quantity by both the Navy and the Air Force. Air Force F–4H's will be designated the F–110 tactical fighter. As more F–110's become available for purchase, production of the F–105 now being used in the category will be tapered off. More F–110's than F–105's are programed in fiscal year 1963 and larger numbers of F–110's will be purchased in future fiscal years by the Air Force.

No purchase of F–110's is contemplated in fiscal year 1963 for Air Force interceptor missions in the Air Defense Command. But the F–4H has been declared the preferred type for the mission in the Air Force report on Project Highspeed—a competition betwen the F–4H and the F–106. Now that the Air Force is committed to carrying spares and maintenance equipment for the F–4H, it has its "foot in the door" and future prejudices against its use instead of Air Force-developed fighters are expected to diminish. The Air Force is also purchasing a reconnaissance version of the F–110.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE H. MAHON, CHAIRMAN

Mr. MAHON. Does the Air Force think well of the Navy plane and does the Air Force have a plane which the Air Force thinks is quite excellent in this area?

General WHITE. The F–4H is a current model aircraft. It is the newest, I believe, in the Navy and corresponds almost exactly to the Air Force's F–105, which is our newest tactical fighter. As a matter of fact, about a year ago, we had a Board look into whether or not we should shift from the F–105 to some other type aircraft. We considered very carefully the F–4H, equated it against the F–105 and came up with a continuation of the F–105 simply because it was cheaper. The performance differences between the F–4H and the F–105 are negligible.

Mr. RILEY. General White, what do you consider the most advanced fighter plane available at this time or in the immediate future?

General WHITE. Tactical fighter?

Mr. RILEY. Yes, sir.

General WHITE. Now I would class the F–105 and the F–4H as the newest and I can put what I have here in the records as a comparison: The maximum speed of both the F–4H and F–105 is [delete]. The combat ceiling of the F–4H is roughly [delete] feet higher than the F–105. The cost of the F–4H is $2.3 million and of the F–105 $1.9 million. The takeoff distance of the F–4H is [delete] and the F–105 [delete]. The F–105 will carry [delete] pounds of ordnance and the F–4H [delete] pounds. One will have a slight superiority in one respect over the other and vice versa, so I would say they are just about even.

Mr. MINSHALL. Would you give the comparative costs of the plane again, General?

General WHITE. For the F–4H, $2.3 million, and $1.9 million for the F–105.

Mr. MINSHALL. There is $400,000 difference on an airplane, with approximately the same flight characteristics, same ability, and so forth. Why is there such a spread?

General WHITE. I do not know, sir. Possibly we are further down the production line curve in the F–4H.

General BRADLEY. I would say we have bought more and are further down the line on the production curve on the F–4H.

Mr. MINSHALL. Was the F–4H beefed up more because of its carrier ability?

General BRADLEY. No, sir. It has two engines and the F–105 only has one engine. This runs into a little extra cost, quite a bit, as a matter of fact.

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you think it will come down? Will the graph get down to the cost of the F–105 eventually when they get into production?

General BRADLEY. Probably not all the way down because of the two engines but they

both will come down on the curve as you build more airplanes. I would guess offhand we have built twice as many F–105's as they have.

EXCERPT FROM THE HEARINGS BEFORE SAME COMMITTEE BY LT. GEN. BRUCE HOLLOWAY (THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPED DURING COMMITTEE QUESTIONING RELATIVE TO A TRISERVICE FIGHTER)

Mr. MAHON. How does this plane relate to the so-called triservice fighter?

General HOLLOWAY. It relates principally with respect to time. The triservice fighter which we think is so necessary would feed into the inventory beyond 1965. The original goal was [delete]. It is now [delete] for the first airplane. The main difference qualitatively which would fulfill the shortcomings of the F–105 woud be in the ability to operate from small fields and there is a much up-graded low-level penetration capability. Also we have the ability to deploy anywhere in the world without tankers. We would like to summarize this as freedom from concrete, freedom from tankers, and performance versatility that will allow operation out of soft, short fields. The F–105 does not do this.

Mr. MAHON. The Navy is very enthusiastic about the F–4H. It has indicated its desire that the Air Force adopt this plane with the hope this would increase the quantity of the buy and then reduce the overall cost. What is the position of the Air Force on that?

General HOLLOWAY. The F–4H, Mr. Chairman, in the words of the Navy, is the finest fighter in the inventory today. The Air Force, provided this is explained, would agree with this, certainly in certain respects. It does have performance superior to the F–105 in a couple of critical categories, namely takeoff and landing distances. It will get in and out of shorter fields. Its high speed is comparable, and its climb is better. It has two engines versus one in the F–105. It has two people versus one in the F–105, double the crew requirements. On the other side of the ledger, the F–105 is less expensive. It has a much better fire control system for delivering ordnance against ground targets, which is its primary mission orientation, and it is well programed into the Air Force inventory with all the ground support equipment that makes up the logistics support. I think this is about the rundown on it. They are both good airplanes. There are some advantages of the F–4H over the F–105. We ran a pretty good cost analysis on this. It shows the F–4H would cost appreciatively more than the F–105 with the required fire control equipment in them. I think it would run roughly one-half million dollars more per copy.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY BEFORE THE SENATE'S COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Senator RUSSELL. How about the F–4H fighter plane, General? What are the possibilities of that plane? Has the Air Force given any attention to it?

General LEMAY. We have given some thought to this. It is a very good airplane. It was designed originally as an air support fighter for the Navy. In such a role, it is probably as good as any in the world that we know of. It is expensive, however, and would require modification to use it in support of ground troops. This could be done and it would be a very good airplane. However, the bill would be much higher than for the F–105, but it can be done.

[From Newsday, Feb. 8, 1962]

REPUBLIC CRISIS THREATENS LONG ISLAND

(By John Cummings)

Long Island is threatened with economic disaster. Republic Aviation Corp., one of the mainstays of the island's industry, may be forced to lay off 13,000 of its 15,500 employees.

The loss of that many jobs and an annual payroll of about $90 million is a serious problem in itself. But the blow would not be felt by the Republic worker alone. Like any sudden loss of jobs, the problem would feed on itself. The Air Force decision to phase out production of Republic's F–105D fighter-bombers affects virtually every Long Islander.

Officials from government, labor, and management who are fearful of the impact have gone to Washington to ask the White House and the Pentagon to reverse the decision.

Immediately affected by the Republic layoffs, besides Republic employees, would be thousands of others who work for the 997 Long Island subcontractors and suppliers of the giant airplane firm. Their business with Republic amounts to $28 million annually. Nassau County Executive Nickerson estimated yesterday that a total of 60,000 jobs would be involved in the layoffs.

RETAIL STORES WOULD FEEL PINCH

In addition, predicts Charles J. (Chuck) Browne, president of the Long Island Federation of Labor, another 65,000 to 70,000 Long Islanders employed in the retail field will feel the pinch from loss of sales. All of this is what Representative OTIS G. PIKE, Democrat, of Riverhead, had in mind when he said last week that the layoffs at Republic would mean economic disaster for Long Island.

Until Justin Ostro, president of the 9,200-member Republic Lodge No. 1987, International Association of Machinists (AFL–CIO), addressed his membership Monday, many Republic workers did not realize the seriousness of the situation. Unemployment has always been a fact of life at Republic, which has experienced serious periodic layoffs since the end of World War II. What makes the problem critical is that the era of the manned military airplane is coming to an end.

FINDING JOBS A PROBLEM

For many Republic workers, and others ultimately affected, the loss of jobs would mean living for at least a while on a $50 weekly unemployment check. State labor officials say many of the jobless would be hard to place. And for those the unemployment check would be replaced later by a welfare check. This would be the personal disaster behind the business-industrial disaster.

In this special report, Newsday looks at what the layoffs could mean to the community, the economy and the individual worker without a job. In addition, there are comments from Congressmen and local and State officials and a study of the decision to phase out the F–105D.

MASS LAYOFFS ENDANGER LONG ISLAND ECONOMY

(By Harvey Aronson)

About $90 million in wages, the jobs of 13,000 persons, the profits of small businessmen, and food and fuel suppliers, approximately $28 million worth of business with other Long Island firms—these are some of the economic lifelines threatened by the mass layoffs facing Republic Aviation Corp.

The impact of the pending layoffs would spread far beyond the giant East Farmingdale defense plant. It would affect the lives and livelihoods of thousands, in a chain reaction starting with those who do business with Republic and its workers. The economic effect would be measured in millions of dollars by Main Street merchants. It would hit everyone from bakers to bartenders, from candlestick makers to car dealers. In the words of a labor leader, it would be "like there's no tomorrow." In the words of a chainstore executive, it would be "a tremendous burden on the community." In the words of a small businessman, it would be "rough all over."

A great many factors would combine to create economic suffering if the Federal Government went ahead with its plans to phase out production of Republic's F–105D fighter-bomber.

The aircraft company estimates that it will be forced to lay off as many as 13,000 of its 15,500 employees by the end of next year. As a result, these workers' annual payroll of about $90 million would be ripped out of the fabric of the metropolitan area's economy—the great bulk of the loss hitting Long Island. If these employees should remain in the area without finding new work, it is believed that most of them would qualify for maximum State unemployment insurance benefits of about $50 a week for as much as 26 weeks. This means they could draw a maximum of $16,900,000 in unemployment benefits. Some would undoubtedly find other jobs, reducing the benefits total. But in the past, defense employees have found it difficult to obtain new jobs—especially ones with comparable salaries.

WHAT'S GOOD FOR REPUBLIC

It is a dollars-and-cents reality that despite much industrial diversification on Long Island in the past few years, what is good for Republic is still good for many other Nassau and Suffolk enterprises. It is a fact that in 1961, Republic gave $28,192,000 worth of business to 997 subcontractors and suppliers on Long Island—buying thousands of items ranging from small screws to fuselage sections. During the year, for example Republic purchased about 2,800,000 pounds of aluminum, 87,000 pounds of rivets, and 4,340 miles of wiring.

It is also a fact that 12,681 Nassau and Suffolk residents earn their bread at Republic, making up a total payroll of $88 million. There are 2,385 of them living in Hempstead town alone, 2,319 in Oyster Bay Township, 2,180 in Babylon town, and 2,136 in Islip town. If these people lose their jobs and have to take emergency measures to make ends meet, they will have a difficult time paying the milkman and the oilman. They will cut down on their clothing and liquor expenditures; they will not be able to meet the payments on their cars and houses. And the people with whom they trade will, in turn, pass on their losses to others.

A small-picture view of this chain effect was visible yesterday in most of the businesses situated near the Republic plant and along Main Street, Farmingdale, a few miles away. "I still owe $2,000 because of what the Republic strike in 1956 did to me," said George Kapsopoulos, owner of a nearby restaurant. "These layoffs would put me out of business. And I have five employees here. What'll I do? I'll have to go look for work." Said Mrs. Adam Fiore, whose husband operates a gas station across the street from Republic, "Sure, we'll feel the layoffs. During the strike, my husband didn't bring home any money for 7 weeks."

On Main Street, Butcher Pat Marino remembered the strike and the closing of the Liberty Aircraft Co. within the last decade. Marino said, "We'll feel it up and down this street." Said furniture store proprietor, Louis Meyer, "Even the possibility of layoffs frightens people into not buying." Across the street, Sam Bernstein expounded amid the crowded counters of his Army and Navy store. "It will affect all of Long Island. Just the scare has had an effect."

A majority of merchants in the area were seriously worried about the future. "I've been through strikes and layoffs," said liquor store owner, Larry Rose, "I've felt it before: Layoffs like they're talking about would have to affect every business on Main Street." Frank F. Randazzo, manager of a men's shop, said that the Republic crisis is a topic of conversation among customers. "People

are afraid, now," he said. "They get scared and they're afraid to spend money. This will hurt the whole economy of Long Island."

MANY FEAR THE WORST

Labor and management spokesmen throughout the island were pessimistic. "If 9,000 workers get laid off at Republic," said Long Island Federation of Labor President Charles J. (Chuck) Browne, "it will affect 65,000 to 70,000 people. And small merchants in Farmingdale will be hit like there's no tomorrow." Said Stanley Fox, secretary of the Times Square Stores Corp., "The entire Long Island economy will be affected. Where do you get 13,000 jobs to replace these?"

There would be other effects—some of them ironic. For instance, not only would Republic workers have to cancel their pledge of $265,000 to the Long Island Fund—some of them might have to ask it for help.

A REPUBLIC WORKER ASKS: "WHERE DO I TURN NOW?"

(By Bernie Bookbinder)

Victor Bonventre, a stocky, balding man with a ready smile, has made a career of surviving aircraft industry layoffs. But this time, at 55, the Republic Aviation Corp. riveter fears he will not be able to get by.

He accepts as inevitable his dismissal by the company for which he has worked "on and off" during the past 27 years. He recognizes that at his age "I can no way whatsoever get a job any place else." Yet Bonventre smiles, because he is an eternal optimist and because "you gain nothing by crying."

Bonventre's job history has closely paralleled the growth of modern aviation. At 19, while with the Fairchild Airplane & Engine Co., he checked over Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis*. Planebuilding was in its infancy then, hardly an industry. But in some respects it hasn't changed. Within 3 years, Bonventre was laid off. Six times since, companies or jobs have vanished beneath him.

Despite the failure of others, Bonventre has kept faith with his family. He and his wife, Marie, have raised 8 children and now have 16 grandchildren. But one of his sons is on relief and another is employed by Republic. "We won't be much help to them now," Bonventre said.

The most crucial test Bonventre faced—and met—came in 1957. He was laid off by Republic in October and wasn't rehired until March.

"We had four or five children at home then," he recalled, "and I was getting about $45 a week in unemployment insurance. I tried, really tried, to get work with some of the small aircraft plants. But my age was against me. They said I could do the work but they wanted somebody younger."

FORCED TO BORROW MONEY

After a few weeks, the situation became critical. With a family of 10, the Bonventres had never been able to save. They borrowed some money from his parents, but pride and necessity placed a limit on such loans.

"I just got up in the morning and went from door to door," Bonventre said. "I asked, 'Do you have work, any work?' I told them I could do carpentry and lay sidewalks. Sometimes they found something for me."

The children's shoes almost wore out, he said, and then there would be a job and new shoes. Their dresses and trousers would be mended and remended. "We went from steak to chopped meat to frankfurters to bread and butter and then, once in a while, to only bread. But their bellies were always filled," Bonventre said proudly.

Somehow, the Bonventres managed to maintain mortgage payments on their home at 51 Fallwood Parkway, South Farmingdale. But it will be another 10 years before the mortgage is paid off. Through the desperate days of 1957 and 1958, Bonventre was sustained by the hope that the crisis was temporary, that he would be recalled. This time, he admitted, there would be no basis for such illusions.

"When my children asked me why they couldn't have their allowances, I told them that 'some people have everything and some have to struggle for it.' They seemed to understand. I hope I can." When he said that, Bonventre wasn't smiling.

OFFICIALS VOICE CONCERN, DEMAND ACTION

(By Francis Wood)

The crisis at the Republic Aviation Corp. drew reactions of grave concern this week in Washington, Albany, and the county seats of Nassau and Suffolk.

After Republic employees and local businessmen, public officials were the first to appreciate the seriousness of the problem. They got the first hurried calls for help, the pleas for quick action to stave off a potential disaster. In capsule form this is how they felt about the prospect of the layoffs at Republic:

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York: "These (layoffs) pose a critical problem for Long Island. I have conferred with management and the union and have assured them we'll do everything possible to alleviate this serious situation."

JAVITS deplored the "whole business of layoffs" and said alternate solutions must be found "that don't place such a strain on the economy."

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, called the threatened layoff a "shocking situation." He said he planned to see Defense Secretary McNamara himself to "try to attempt" a reconsideration of the Pentagon decision to phase out Republic's F–105D fighter-bomber. KEATING said New York State had suffered a 30 percent drop in defense contracts in the last 3 months, and added, "I intend to fight as long as I can to keep more work from being lost." Both KEATING and JAVITS said they would give "full support" to efforts by the "steering committee" of the bipartisan New York State congressional delegation to avert the Republic layoffs.

Representative STEVEN DEROUNIAN, Republican of Roslyn, was so stunned by the McNamara action, he said, that he was "starting my own investigation" of the Republic contract situation. "The State delegation will harness all support to avoid this potential blow to the island's economy," he said. DEROUNIAN believes the Defense Department must formulate a grace period system to ease the economic hardships of contract terminations.

Representative FRANK BECKER, Republican of Lynbrook, demanded a full review of the action from McNamara. In a letter to the Defense Secretary this week BECKER said he believed in the "superior qualities" of the Republic plane and requested specific figures on the proposed phaseout of the plane. He called it an unfortunate Pentagon decision and said the Secretary should reconsider the contract on the "merits of the plane."

Representative OTIS G. PIKE, Democrat, of Riverhead, credited with disclosing the impending Republic crisis, has said he made repeated attempts behind the scenes in recent months to win reversal of the Government position on the basis of the Republic product's quality. He is following up demands he made to McNamara for a review of the case, warning that the decision would bring economic disaster. Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said this week that PIKE had argued Republic's case with force and vigor.

Governor Rockefeller: The Governor's office said Rockefeller was directing his staff in tackling the Republic problem. A spokesman said the whole matter was brought to the attention of the Governor by Assembly Speaker Carlino and that appropriate action was underway in Albany and Washington.

Nassau County Executive Nickerson: "The employment of numerous persons is imperiled by the production cutback. The serious adverse effect will go far beyond Republic and the entire local economy will be seriously dislocated." Nickerson has pushed through a resolution in the county board of supervisors, requesting a reconsideration by the Pentagon. He also made a personal trip to Washington to try to persuade the White House to review the case.

Suffolk County Executive Dennison: "It would be a crippling economic blow to us." Disturbed by the outlook at Republic, Dennison has worked behind the scenes, too, to use his influence for a reconsideration of the contract. He also lent support to the Committee to Preserve Long Island's Economy, a bipartisan group formed last Saturday to coordinate efforts for a reversal of the Pentagon decision.

Assembly Speaker Carlino: "I have talked to union officials and they met with the governor," he said. Dr. William Ronan, the governor's secretary, has gone to work on the problem with a committee headed by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of Brooklyn. "Carlino said the State apparently was getting scuttled" in the allocation of negotiated contracts, such as research. "There is certainly room for improvement," he said.

Nassau County Democratic Leader Jack English: "This (Republic) cutback will have a cataclysmic effect on the economy of Long Island. Every concerted effort must be made by all concerned to preserve the present Republic program and work for the future security of their 15,000 employees."

Suffolk Republican Leader Arthur Cromarty: "I don't need to emphasize the effect this will have in our two counties. The Federal Government owes us a reconsideration of the Republic cutback. It was, after all, the defense operations that made our community grow the way it has. I'm hopeful that the committee (formed last Saturday) will remain in existence to work to prevent the recurrence of such panic situations."

Suffolk Democratic Leader Adrian Mason: "A tragic blow to our labor force and the economic well-being of Long Island. There will be enormous hardships for Republic workers, particularly those who have just bought homes in Suffolk. Something must be done now to stave off this tragedy."

CUTBACK CLIMAXES FEUD

(By Bob Greene)

The decision by the Department of Defense to scrap production of Republic Aviation Corp.'s F–105D fighter-bomber in favor of a modified version of the F–4H fighter-interceptor, which would be called the F–110, is the climax to a dispute that has been quietly simmering for several years behind the closed doors of the Pentagon and the House Armed Services Committee.

Part of the dispute is based on the relative advantages of each plane—one developed by the Air Force and the other by the Navy. Another point at issue is Defense Secretary McNamara's desire to have one basic plane as the workhorse of all three service branches, a move which he regards as an essential step toward service unification.

The F–105D Thunderchief, produced by Republic with Air Force cooperation after 10 years of research, has often been described as a man-controlled missile. It is an all-weather plane. It can take off at zero ceiling; it can fly any place in the world with midair refueling; it can drop bombs on its target and return to its base without the pilot ever having seen the ground. It is a tactical plane, extremely efficient at low-altitude troop support, with the speed, heavy

armament, and bomb load capacity necessary to make it also an excellent interceptor and bomber .

The F-4H, produced by McDonnell Aviation Corp. of St. Louis and designed to Navy specifications, is a different type of plane. Built as a fighter-interceptor, it operates at higher altitudes than the F-105D. It has two engines, is slightly faster, can take off from a shorter runway (it was designed to take off from a carrier deck as opposed to the F-105D, which needs a concrete runway), and can get off the ground faster. It carries less armament and a smaller bomb load than the F-105D. Air Force experts claim that the F-105D is perfectly designed for the job they want it to do. Navy experts claim the same for their plane. All agree the planes were designed for different jobs.

The ultimate aim of the Defense Department is to obtain a single plane designed to do all of these jobs equally well for all of the services—a triservice plane. This dream plane, known as the TFX, will not be operating until after 1965.

But recently McNamara has sought to substitute a temporary triservice plane until the TFX is operable. The Air Force, arguing that the F-105D was specifically developed to fit Air Force needs, has argued that it wants to keep the plane until the TFX is a reality. The Navy, arguing that the F-4H would cost far less if bought in bulk by all three services (the F-4H costs $2,300,000 as against $1,900,000 for the F-105D and also requires a two-man crew instead of one pilot needed to operate the F-105D), has urged that McNamara adopt the F-4H for all services. McNamara has agreed.

This, however, will require modifications of the F-4H to make it do the job of the F-105D—heavier armament, an all-weather control system and a greater bomb-load capacity.

The Defense Department is reluctant to predict how long this modification will take. Meanwhile, the F-105D will go out of production and as many as 13,000 Republic employees may lose their jobs. Many experts have criticized Republic for putting all its eggs into the F-105D basket instead of diversifying (Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. produces nine different planes). Republic has replied that its one-plane policy, in effect since before World War II, has made it one of Long Island's top employers for 20 years.

The Air Force would still like to keep the F-105D. "It's adapted to our specific needs," said a top Air Force official. "We don't see why we can't buy both of them." But McNamara thinks otherwise. He declared: "The F-4H is better suited for Air Force requirements."

F-105D

Range: 2,000 miles.
Speed: 1,400 miles per hour.
Thrust: 26,500 pounds.
Altitude: 55,000 feet.
Bomb load: 14,000 pounds.

F-4H (F-110)

Range: 1,600 miles.
Speed: 1,600 miles per hour.
Thrust: 30,000 pounds.
Altitude: 66,000 feet.
Bomb load: 10,000 pounds.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Republic Aviation Corp., one of our major industrial plants on Long Island, has been advised by the Department of Defense that the F-105D fighter-bomber is to be phased out and replaced by the F-110. Since the F-105D has been produced by Republic, and since the F-110 is to be manufactured by McDonnell Aviation Corp. in St. Louis, this will lead to the laying off of 13,000 Republic employees by the end of 1963. Such mass unemployment would be seriously damaging to the economy of Long Island. It seems to us the Government has an obligation to provide Republic with other contracts so that this disaster will not occur. We do not presume to argue the technical point, whether the F-105D will perform as well as the F-110. The manufacturers and the Air Force say it will. The Department of Defense—which, short of you as President, has the final word—says the new plane is more efficient and will replace the F-105D.

We also support the doctrine that national security is more important than any local economy. But in this case it should be recognized that since even before World War II, the Government has encouraged Republic and similar defense plants to expand to the point where all of them represent a crucially important source of employment. The Republic workers settled in good faith on Long Island. They are a part of our communities. They want to stay on Long Island, but obviously only a handful can do so if Republic cuts down, as planned, to a skeleton staff of 2,500.

Thus the Government, in the broadest sense, has a responsibility to these people that extends beyond emergency help. They represent a skilled force of craftsmen whose abilities should not be allowed to go to waste.

If Republic is no longer to produce the F-105D—and if, as seems likely, this country is nearing the end of its dependence on manned planes and is to turn to missiles—there certainly must be other contracts that can be carried out by Republic.

If retooling and revision of the plant is necessary to make this possible, it is no more than the Government has done in the past through tax incentives, building loans, and other forms of assistance.

It may perhaps be argued that defense contracts are a speculative thing; that both the owners and employees of any defense plant in a sense have to take a chance. This is the mechanistic point of view. We espouse the human point of view. We urge that the Defense Department reconsider and suspend for the time being its drastic decision. That will give an opportunity to consider what other defense purposes the Republic plant can be used for. In this effort the Government will have the active support of all our Long Island officials and all of our Long Island people. The county executive of Nassau has already made his appeal to the White House. Our congressional delegation is working hard. Cannot a more positive approach to this cutback be taken? Cannot a more careful search be made for alternative contracts for Republic?

Thirteen thousand men out of work, Mr. President. Thirteen thousand families, roughly. That's a lot of people.

Respectfully yours,

NEWSDAY.

THE FUTURE OF FEDERALISM—LECTURES BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the first two parts of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's lectures—the so-called Godkin lectures—at Harvard University, entitled "The Future of Federalism," published in the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times of February 10, 1962. I shall submit for the RECORD the text of the other lectures as they are given.

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

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Feb. 10, 1962]

FUTURE OF FEDERALISM

(By Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller)

LECTURE 1: FREEDOM AND FEDERALISM

In the ominous spring of 1939, a bright and sunny May 3 was a day marked by Adolf Hitler with another bellicose speech to the Reichstag calling for a showdown on Poland. On the same day, the League of Nations opened its "peace pavilion" at the World's Fair in New York City.

And also on this same day, which seems so remote from the present instant, there was published a vigorous critique of American political life by a visitor from abroad, famed in intellectual and academic circles, who had just delivered a series of lectures on the American Presidency.

The visitor was Harold J. Laski. And the obituary he wrote upon an historic American political doctrine bore the title: "The Obsolescence of Federalism."

How did Professor Laski conclude that the age of federalism was languishing near death?

He did concede that "federalism is the appropriate governmental technique for and expanding capitalism." But, he declaimed, "a contracting capitalism cannot afford the luxury of federalism."

Leaping from this premise, he insisted that the failure of the Federal idea was unmistakably plain not only in the United States but also elsewhere in the world—in Canada, Australia, Germany. And he explained this universal failure in these words:

"Whether we take the conditions of labor, the level of taxation, the standards of education, or the supply of amenities like housing and recreation, it has become clear that the true source of decision is no longer at the circumference, but at the center, of the site.

"For 48 separate units to seek to compete with the integrated power of giant capitalism is to invite defeat in almost every element of social life where approximate uniformity of condition is the test of the good life."

The two decades since have dealt a harsh retort to Professor Laski's pronouncement on federalism in the United States.

It has been proven wrong in economic, social and political terms.

In the first place, the American economy has not contracted, but has continued its dynamic expansion.

Private enterprise has become more vigorous, more creative—and better able to bring to the American workingman and woman the highest standard of living ever known by any nation, any time, anywhere in history.

The political power of the people over the functioning of this economy, all this while, has been maintained and even extended. A great array of political and economic devices—the income tax, inheritance laws, antitrust statutes, new and diversified mechanisms for capital accumulation, and the revolution in science—have assured that giant capitalism, far from becoming more integrated, has become more decentralized.

And the grim prognosis of 30 years ago has also been proven wrong in strictly political terms.

For federalism—its idea and its practice—has continued to show itself the adaptable and creative form of self-government that the Founding Fathers of this Nation conceived it to be.

And decisions vital to national well-being have increasingly been made at the circum-

ference—the State—as well as at the national center, of political power.

These lectures are dedicated to the conviction that these basic political, social and economic facts of life—and the lessons they carry for us—are crucial to the whole fate of freedom and of freemen everywhere in this mid-20th century.

I do not use the word "freedom" casually. For nothing less than the historic concept of the free individual's worth and dignity, defined and attested by the whole Judeo-Christian tradition, is at stake in our world.

Nor did I mention this Nation's Founding Fathers from mere historic sentimentalism. For the basic belief that these lectures will finally state is the urgent, historic necessity summoning Americans of this generation to match the founders of this Nation in their political creativity, boldness, and vision.

The Founding Fathers devised a structure of order for a nation within which freemen could work and prosper in peace.

We are required to help build such a framework for freedom not merely for a nation but for the free world of which we are an integral part. And we are called to do this with far greater speed, I believe, than many of us realize or admit.

Ultimately, the great part of our debt to the past may lie in this fact: The Federal idea, so basic to both personal freedom and national unity in the history of America, can now be extended and applied to bring order, strength and progress to the world of free peoples.

Let us look, first, at the Federal concept and its evolution in our Nation. Let us examine some of its practical applications on working levels of National, State and local government.

Let us observe its capacity for adaptation and change, over the decades. Let us see its critical relevance and relationship to a free economy—and a pluralistic society.

But let us always remember that the supreme issue before us through all the inquiry is this: How to make freedom itself work and endure in the world today.

I am sure you are not surprised that a Governor of a large State in our Federal Union elects to speak of the Federal idea of political life. The concept is associated in all our minds with the rights and powers of the individual States.

Yet my own political experience began in appointive posts at the national level under three different Presidents.

Like many members of the Harvard faculty who are not with us today, I went to Washington.

In my case, this was in 1940—more than two decades ago.

After mingled accomplishment and frustration in various appointive posts over a period of 16 years, I turned to elective public office on the State level—and ran for Governor of New York in 1958.

I made this choice on the basis of my recognition that the critical political decisions in government are, and must be, primarily shaped and made by elected officials, or, as my Latin American friends would say, by the authentic representatives of the people.

It is with this particular perspective on our democratic processes that I underline my deep personal conviction that the future of freedom lies in the Federal idea.

THE FEDERAL IDEA

The Federal idea: What does this mean?

Let me first make it clear that I do not speak of the Federal idea as merely a mechanical or technical or abstract formula for Government operations.

I refer to the Federal idea broadly as a concept of government by which a sovereign people, for their greater progress and protection, yield a portion of their sovereignty to a political system that has more than one center of sovereign power, energy, and creativity. No one of these centers or levels has the power to destroy another.

Under the Constitution, for example, there are two principal centers of governmental power—State and Federal. As a practical matter, local government, by delegation of State authority under the principle of home rule, is a third such key center of power.

The Federal idea, then, is above all an idea of a shared sovereignty at all times responsive to the needs and will of the people in whom sovereignty ultimately resides.

The Federal idea is complex and subtle. It involves a balance of strengths. It puts into play a sharing of powers not only among different levels of government but, on each level, a separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.

And it clearly signifies more than mere governmental structure. It demands faith in, and an environment for, the free play of individual initiative, private enterprise, social institutions, political organizations, and voluntary associations, all operating within a framework of laws and principles affirming the dignity and freedom of man.

A Federal system seeks stability without rigidity, security without inertia. It encourages innovation and inventiveness, governed by principle and guided by purpose.

It assures responsiveness more thoughtful than mere reflex—and liberty that does not lapse toward anarchy.

In short, it seeks to hold the delicately precarious balance between freedom and order upon which depend decisively the liberty, peace, and prosperity of the individual.

A definition of the Federal idea may be offered in the form of what I believe are four of the critical ways in which the Federal concept operates.

First. The Federal idea fosters diversity within unity.

In this land that reaches from ocean to ocean, the great social, economic, and political problems vary profoundly as they may appear, for example, before the people of Wyoming, the people of Louisiana, or the people of Massachusetts.

In meeting many of these problems, a sweeping generalized edict from the National Government might well be futile or even fatuous.

Yet, in our Federal concept, the National Government is called upon to work with the State government in ways encouraging the States more effectively to resolve their own problems in their own way.

The simplest technical illustration of this practice is the granting of Federal aid to the States, which has two key purposes:

It stimulates the States to action—and to higher standards of action—by offering matching funds on specific conditions.

It also strives to equalize opportunities for the citizens of States with unequal resources.

Thus, in terms of the Federal tax dollar, a State like New York pays out $3 for every $1 of Federal aid returned, while a State like Arkansas gives $1 and receives back more than $2.50.

By all such devices the Federal concept recognized diversity—and achieves unity.

Second. The Federal idea permits and encourages creativity, imagination, and innovation in meeting the needs of the people.

Those needs, if not met by private action, can be met at the local, the State, or the National level of Government.

By providing several sources of political strength and creativity, a Federal system invites inventive leadership—on all levels—to work toward genuine solutions to the problems of a diverse and complex society.

These problems—whether they concern civil rights or urban development, industrialization or automation, natural resources or transportation—never arise at the same instant and in the same way throughout a great nation.

A Federal system, however, allows these problems to be met at the time and in the area where they first arise. If local solutions are not forthcoming, it is still possible to bring to bear the influence, the power, and the leadership of either the State or the National Government.

Third: The Federal idea is a pluralistic idea. It gives scope to many energies, many beliefs, many initiatives, and enlists them for the welfare of the people.

It encourages diversity of thought, of culture, and of beliefs. It gives unparalleled opportunity for the development of private institutions—social, political, and economic.

Whereas a tightly centralized government tends, by its disproportionate weight and power, to stifle diversity and creativity in both the public and private sectors, a Federal system provides room for both infinite variety and creativity in all sectors of national life.

This is equally true for political organizations, philanthropic associations, social institutions, or economic enterprises.

Fourth: The Federal idea is characterized by a balance which prevents excesses and invites the full, free play of innovation and initiative.

This balance is essentially achieved by:

The division of powers between the National and State Governments.

The separation of legislative, executive, and judicial authority.

The absence of monolithic national parties.

The permissive encouragement given to local municipal governments to achieve a measure of home rule either in fact or in law.

The competitive action of commercial enterprise.

And, above all, the freedom of individual initiative, rooted in a basic and unwavering belief in the dignity of the human person.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Feb. 12, 1962]

FUTURE OF FEDERALISM

(By Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller)

LECTURE 1: PART TWO

Let me immediately meet here an obvious challenge about the balance in the American Federal system. This is the assertion that the most dynamic forces in our society—social and economic needs, technological evolution, national peril, and governmental complexity—all conspire to decree a pitiless growth in centralization of political authority, whether we wish it or not.

The massive pressures of the Great Depression and of World War II (so it has been argued) made this bloating of Central Government inevitable. And hence State and local governments supposedly must withdraw from the arenas of great political, economic, and social decision.

GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT

As the demands of society have increased, the National Government has, indeed, not only become larger but also has become more deeply involved in State and local affairs.

But the striking fact in our domestic political experience since World War II has not been the growth of Federal Government—but the far more rapid expansion of State and local government, to meet growing social needs.

With the Federal Government's resources and attention increasingly devoted to defense, foreign aid, and international relations, the rising pressures to meet domestic needs have been directed more and more to State and local government.

It is true that, from 1950 through 1960, total national expenditures moved from $40.3 billion to $77.2 billion, a 92-percent increase in a decade. We must note, however, that practically all of this increase was allotted directly to the Defense Department.

If we subtract the expenditures of the Defense Department, national expenditures increased only 24 percent—from $27.1 billion to $33.5 billion. And included in these figures are huge sums for activities clearly tied to the defense effort—the Atomic Energy Commission, veterans' affairs, and mutual security. Considering the increased cost of goods and services in the fifties, there was only a modest increase in nondefense expenditures at the national level during the decade.

In the same period, total State expenditures jumped from $13.2 billion to $32.5 billion—an increase of 146 percent. Allowing for large population increases, this meant a leap from $89 per capita in 1950 to $182 per capita in 1960. Expenditures at the local level are equally impressive. In cities over 25,000, for example, the outlay went from $4.9 billion in 1950 to $12.3 billion in 1960, a staggering jump of 150 percent.

If we recall again the dismal prognosis offered on the future of federalism more than 20 years ago, we are tempted to ask: If this be obsolescence, what, then, would be the size of growth?

IMPORTANCE OF THE STATES

I offer further proof by referring simply to the magnitude of certain programs of the government of the State of New York—and their comparative relation to matching efforts by the Government of the United States:

In education: State aid to elementary and secondary education in the State of New York totaled $753 million in the 1961–62 fiscal year, or $87 million more than the President requested of the Congress for the whole Nation in 1961 (and, as you know, what was requested on the national level far surpassed what was appropriated).

In civil defense: The $100 million for the New York program, made law in the special session of the State legislature of 1961, is approximately one-third the program enacted in Washington the same year for the entire Nation.

In power development: The State power authority of New York has built more hydroelectric generating capacity on the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers in the past 10 years with the funds of private bondholders than all the dams of the TVA system.

In housing: While the Federal housing program enacted by the Congress last year authorized the sum of $5 billion, I recently proposed a New York State housing program which for New York City alone would involve the identical sum of $5 billion—these funds to be supplied through the newly created State housing finance agency at no cost to the taxpayers.

I do not cite these facts and figures to imply that State and National Governments are pitted against one another—locked in some bizarre contest to surpass one another in size and expenditure.

Nothing could be further from the true relationship of complementing and cooperating that must mark a healthy federalism.

Yet these statistics do suggest that the role of the State, within American federalism is far from obsolete. It is as dynamic and promising as is the Federal idea itself.

Something more than arithmetic attests the unique role of the State. It is dramatized by the whole sweep of our modern social history. Erroneously, this history has come to be exclusively associated, in the mind of a generation, with the New Deal.

The historical fact is, of course, that the New Deal did face and meet deep crises in our society, did institute vital social reforms and economic regulations, and did take the force out of stresses that could have resulted in conflict and catastrophe for the Nation.

Yet, while the New Deal accomplished these major social advances and did much to restore the confidence of the people—its leaders did not display great comprehension of the nature and workings of our economic system.

They showed little or no awareness of the need to create a climate for growth to encourage an expanding American economy, vital to the achievement of full employment, social objectives, and the self-realization of the individual. For all the New Deal's conscientious concern for human values, it took the advent of World War II to dispose of the problems of depression and unemployment.

This experience brought home the fact that it does not suffice to understand social needs and aspirations—without also fully understanding the dynamics of our economic system.

ORIGINS OF SOCIAL REFORM

A still more striking—and overlooked—fact about the New Deal is that its major and most successful actions in social reform had been anticipated, by experiment and practice, on the State level or by private institutions.

The history of the years before 1932 tells this story plainly. Time and again, States like Massachusetts, Wisconsin, or New York had acted on their own initiative to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the individual, while guarding his rights and broadening his opportunities in the Nation's free economy.

This was true of factory inspection or limitation of hours of labor. It was true of child labor or women's labor. It was true of unemployment compensation and social security.

In all such cases, the ferment of ideas and innovations worked its way up through the Federal system—often from private initiative.

It is also important to note, too, that those elements of the New Deal which failed were largely in areas not tested by prior experience at State level.

These included such major economic regulatory actions as the National Recovery Administration, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and other actions based on an economy of scarcity and on restriction of competition and production.

These were examples of action by centralized government which proved counterproductive to the goal of full employment. They turned out to be deterrents to economic growth.

This parenthesis on the impact of the New Deal only serves to make still clearer the practical workings—and ultimate implications—of the Federal idea.

This idea deeply involves the whole political, cultural, social, and economic environment—just as it reflects a great part of our history as a nation.

And while this idea implies limits and checks against excessive power, its living purpose and intent are affirmative.

It is not a theoretical device to narrow or constrict political action. It is a way to amplify it.

It is not an excuse for keeping necessary things from being done.

It is almost the exact opposite—a flexible and imaginative device to open not one but many avenues of political action for economic and social progress.

The essential supremacy of the people, through their exercise of political power is, above all, vital to the life of the Federal idea.

So close to the people—so interwoven with their deepest beliefs and their daily lives—is the Federal concept that it is, in fact, conceivable and workable only as the people act as responsible individuals—as concerned citizens—and not merely as members of an economic class, ethnic group, religious faith, occupational calling, or private organization.

The working of the Federal idea, in short, depends upon the whole political environment—the full intellectual climate, the sum of the spirit and purposes of all citizenry, and their individual and collective sense of responsibility.

This responsibility, I deeply believe, means political participation—not merely in voting, but in active working for one's party and in standing for public office.

My decision to run for Governor in 1958 was firmly grounded on this belief. I promptly received much contrary advice.

"Don't get into politics," I was told repeatedly. "Politics is a dirty business."

My reply to those who gave me this advice was simply this:

"Politics is the lifeblood of democracy. To call politics dirty is to call democracy dirty."

The truth is that anyone in a democratic society who believes that his political environment has become dirty, but scornfully turns his back on it, has become, in effect, a political refugee in his own society.

Politics, of course, requires sweat, work, combat, and organization. But these should not be ugly words for any free people.

Organization in politics, for example, is not a sign of some sordid tyranny. It is what makes democracy itself function.

And its roots must strike far beneath the surfaces of National, State, or community government.

It must draw its strength and vitality from the people—through the ward leaders, the precinct chiefs, the block captains.

No concept of government, not even the lofty and rich promise of the Federal idea itself, can truly work except as dedicated men and women in these positions, men and women in the tens of thousands, make it work.

Grand ideas of government—lofty abstract principles, even the wisest constitutions and laws—depend for their very life and meaning on the willingness of citizens and leaders to apply them to improve them.

What factors, then, tend to impair—in political practice—the effectiveness of our Federal system in theory?

In the political environment of today, I would mark three pervasive attitudes or tendencies as plainly damaging to our processes of government.

The first is the scorn of skepticism toward practical, partisan politics that I have already mentioned.

The second is an addiction to political labels and slogans, along lines loosely called "liberal" and "conservative."

The third is a timidity of leadership that rarely glimpses the dawn of any new concepts—but passively awaits the high noon of crisis.

Let me say a few words on each of these dangers.

THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, the Conference for Africa and the Middle East on World Peace Through the Rule of Law was held in Lagos, Nigeria, in December 1961. Lawyers from African and Middle Eastern nations attended the Conference. These delegates, an unusually distinguished representation of the legal profession including past and present national bar association presidents, professors of law, and others with extensive diplomatic, judicial, cabinet, or ministerial experience, participated enthusiastically in the vigorous discussions and debates which took place throughout the meeting.

One other continental conference is scheduled for Rome, Italy, in April 1962. In early 1963 a world conference is planned. Through these conferences and the exchanges of ideas and information they generate, it is hoped that a realistic program will be developed to harness the manpower and brainpower of the legal profession to translate from ideal to reality the substitution of law for force as the controlling factor in world affairs.

At the conclusion of the Lagos Conference, the delegates produced and approved the "Consensus of Lagos," a document containing an outline of some of the general principles believed to be essential to a program for peace based upon law and a plan of action designed to strengthen the rule of law in the world community. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the "Consensus of Lagos," approved December 6, 1961, by the African and Middle East Conference, and on the same subject, the article by Charles S. Rhyne entitled "World's Lawyers Seek World Law," which appeared in War/Peace Report, February 1962.

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

CONSENSUS OF LAGOS

(Approved December 6, 1961)

We lawyers attending this conference of the nations of Africa and the Middle East, being aware of our professional responsibility to utilize and further develop international law and its institutions as the most effective means of justly resolving world tension and conflict, and recognizing the imperative need for positive and immediate action by the legal profession to fulfill its obligation to promote world peace through the rule of law, hereby declare the following as our consensus:

SPECIAL CALL FOR ACTION

Be it resolved, That the body of lawyers here assembled exhort the governments of all independent states in Africa and the Middle East to call conferences for the purpose of establishing a Permanent Organization of African States and a Permanent Organization of Middle East States for the promotion of the rule of law and amicable relations between these states, for the eradication of sources of conflict, and for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

This Organization for Africa should include an African Court of Justice for settlement of justifiable disputes and provision for arbitration, mediation and conciliation in appropriate cases.

In recognition of the fact that the Arab League has under consideration the establishment of an Arab Regional Court of Justice for member states, we strongly recommend that such a Court be formed as soon as possible in the interest of peace and for the promotion of the rule of law.

The Organizations should be related to the United Nations and the Courts to the International Court of Justice.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law we declare that:

I. International law must be the supreme law of the world community and no person or state is above the rule of law.

II. The rule of law in international affairs must be based upon the principle of equality of all states before the law.

III. Founded upon general consent, international law must embody fundamental concepts of justice and human dignity of societies and legal systems, and the generally accepted customs and agreements of nations and individuals throughout the world.

IV. International law in a dynamic world must constantly evolve in the light of new needs and the contributions of new states.

V. A fundamental principle of the international rule of law should be that of the right of self-determination of the peoples of the world.

VI. Individuals, juridical persons, states and international organizations should, in appropriate degree, all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

VII. All who are subject to international law should fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

VIII. All who are subject to international law should resolve their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, negotiation, or other peaceful procedures. The dispute settling method should be appropriate to the nature of the dispute. Generally, the legal aspects of disputes should be resolved by legal procedures and political aspects by political procedures.

IX. Judges on international tribunals must be professionally competent and free from political, national or other improper pressures.

X. International tribunals, although having no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of states, should have the normal power to determine according to applicable agreements and international law the scope of their jurisdiction.

XI. Decisions of international tribunals should be enforceable by appropriate and expeditious international community action. National legislation should be adopted for the enforcement of the decisions of international tribunals.

XII. Those subject to international law must, prior to the application of any judicially imposed sanctions, be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication.

XIII. Individuals must be entitled to effective legal protection of fundamental and inalienable human rights without distinction as to race, religion or belief.

XIV. The United Nations organization is the world's best hope for international peace under the rule of law and should be supported and strengthened by all possible means.

In order to effectuate and support the foregoing, this conference now therefore

RESOLUTIONS OF CONFERENCE

Resolves—

I. To participate to the fullest in the world peace through law program by working toward worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international affairs, and to that end

II. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law, and

III. To support the program of world peace through law by encouraging the formation and support of committees on world peace through law within associations of lawyers.

IV. To support the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and all preliminary action required for that conference.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions, and recognizing the need for immediate and specific action, this conference now therefore

PROGRAM FOR WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Recommends—

I. That a planning committee for the World Peace Through Law Institute proposed by the preceding conferences be estasblished and charged with the responsibility for preparation of a draft charter for preliminary organization to be submitted to the proposed World Conference of Lawyers, said charter including but not limited to the following functions and purposes:

A. To effectuate by every available means the decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the World Conference.

B. To harmonize activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the rule of law in international affairs, including arrangements for periodic conferences to promote international understanding and the rule of law.

C. To stimulate, conduct and coordinate a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during the proposed World Rule of Law Year.

D. To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach lawyers and citizens of all nations to make them aware that international law is an already living and constantly growing system of law which is practical and accepted; and to impress upon them the inescapable logic and vital necessity of fully establishing the rule of law in international affairs.

E. To create new and further develop existing systems for the continuous reporting and digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and research or other documents of international law in order to create a readily available source of information for further development of the rule of law in international affairs.

F. To make awards of honor to states, public or private organizations and individuals in recognition of outstanding contributions to the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs.

G. To study and make recommendations with respect to development of the rules, principles, and standards of international law defining and controlling use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare, political propaganda, and defining the right of self-defense and reprisals, international sanctions, and other lawful means of countering aggression in international affairs.

H. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

I. To further stimulate and help coordinate a global research program utilizing facilities of the Institute and existing national and international organizations to accomplish objectives including but not limited to the following:

1. Expansion of knowledge of the international law and its sources;

2. Identification of areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings;

3. Definition of general principles of law recognized by nations generally which can form the foundation for an improved international legal system and harmonization of different conceptions of international law;

4. Drafting of model codes and recommendations dealing with subjects of international concern, including:

(a) International investment, to safeguard adequately the interests of both the capital importing and the capital exporting nations;

(b) International trade, especially in commodities and raw materials, to protect the legitimate interests of both consumers and producers, and of both importing and exporting nations;

(c) Outer space, to assure its development in accordance with principles of the rule of law and removing it from international politics;

(d) Nuclear test suspension coupled with inspection, to adequately provide security against possible violations, while simultaneously assuring inspected countries that their internal security would in no way be violated;

(e) International arbitration, public or private, including a model clause compromissoire;

(f) International arms control and disarmament;

5. Work on unification and harmonization of law in fields such as commercial documents in which unification or harmonization is practicable and desirable;

6. Engaging in a comprehensive study of existing judicial and nonjudicial machinery for resolving international legal disputes, and of proposals for creation of regional and specialized international tribunals, taking into account varying and common legal, economic, cultural, and political interests of nations;

J. To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world aimed at creating and strengthening the legal system, and rules of law required to achieve and maintain world peace; seeking to include grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken or to be undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

K. To seek consultative status to the Economic and Social Council under article 71 of the United Nations Charter.

II. That special committees be constituted and charged with the task of preparing a draft Convention on Disarmament, a draft Convention to End Nuclear Testing, and a draft Convention on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, said drafts to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming World Conference of Lawyers.

III. That special committees be constituted for the purpose of drafting agreements and conventions for the facilitation of International Commerce and Economic Development to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming World Conference of Lawyers.

IV. That the lawyers of the world declare their support for and take action toward establishing a World Law Day.

V. That a World Conference of Lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations in the world invited to attend.

VI. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include the following:

A. Basic principles underlying the rule of law in international affairs;

B. International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes;

C. Arbitration, conciliation, mediation, good offices, and other means of peaceful settlement of international disputes;

D. The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the rule of law in international affairs;

E. Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law;

F. The role of lawyers in development of the rule of law in international affairs.

VII. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the rule of law in international affairs will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world peace through law program.

VIII. That there be established a global system of regional chambers of the International Court of Justice, from which appeals to the full court would be permissible.

IX. That there be established a Court of Justice for African Nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

X. That there be established a Court of Justice for Arab Nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

XI. That in international matters, individuals, judicial persons, nations, and international organizations be permitted to be parties in appropriate cases before international tribunals.

XII. That the membership of the International Court of Justice more accurately represent the areas and legal systems in the world which are not adequately represented on that body, notably African.

XIII. That efforts be made to establish a series of specialized international courts and tribunals to operate under agreements reached between nations having a common interest in matters specifically assigned to their jurisdiction. These matters could include among other things, trade in certain vital commodities or other items; international investment, public or private; water rights and related problems; and international economic activities, carried on through the United Nations and international organizations.

XIV. That international judicial and arbitration procedures be further developed; that more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought; that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards be encouraged.

XV. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation be resorted to when appropriate.

XVI. That all nations accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XVII. That the United Nations Charter be revised to take into consideration the fact that the new independent status of many nations of Asia and Africa has nearly doubled United Nations membership, and in particular, that the Security Council and Economic and Social Councils of the United Nations be enlarged to permit adequate representation of these new members.

XVIII. That a concerted effort be made to find ways of making maximum use of existing provisions of the United Nations Charter which can contribute to world peace and security under the rule of law, including the further development of a strong independent Secretariat, the courageous use where necessary by the General Assembly of its powers under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, and the continued development of effective United Nations Peace Forces.

XIX. That efforts be made to achieve uniformity of law, notably in the fields of negotiable instruments, international sales and international transportation; to obtain agreement on uniform rules in the field of conflict of laws for internationally important private law and to secure more effective judicial assistance and to obtain national legislation in harmony with these objectives.

XX. That the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly assume greater responsibility, in particular for assuring consideration of the legal aspects of matters brought before the General Assembly; and that the International Law Commission be strengthened and given more staff assistance, and that its sessions be lengthened.

XXI. That the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) should establish regional branches in different areas of Africa and the Middle East and thereby more effectively and rapidly aid economic development in the developing countries.

XXII. That a world community of legal scholars be developed through expanded programs of international exchanges; the community to include law students, practicing lawyers, judges and professors of law, and that universities be encouraged to establish programs devoted to studies concerned with world rule of law.

CONCLUSION

We delegates attending this Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, pledge our full support of the programs and principles set forth in this consensus, and the exertion of every effort to realize the ideal of the international rule of law as our contribution to the cause of world peace.

WORLD'S LAWYERS SEEK WORLD LAW

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

Are there practical ways in which international law and legal institutions may be strengthened to maintain peace and order between nations? This is the problem to which the lawyers of the world are addressing themselves in a movement which has been gaining momentum during the past year through a series of conferences sponsored by the American Bar Association.

During 1961 lawyers from 79 nations in Asia, Africa, and the Americas drafted blueprints for action on a plan which may mean as much to law as the International Geophysical Year meant to science. While the details of the blueprint for action are as complex as those of the IGY, the underlying idea is strikingly simple: that the rule of law can be instituted on a worldwide scale to facilitate peaceful relations and to replace force as the basis for settling international disputes.

COMMUNISTS TO PARTICIPATE

Already lawyers from nations in Asia, Africa, and the Americas have enthusiastically endorsed the idea of a worldwide effort to achieve this goal, and have created committees to implement this program. Next will be a conference of European lawyers to be held in Rome in April of this year. This will mark the first meeting in which Communist countries will participate, with representatives having been invited from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia. (Red China was not invited to the Asian conference since the criterion used for invitations is that the countries represented must be members of the U.N. or have participated in the General Convention on the Law of the Sea.) Following the Rome meeting, plans will be made for a world conference of lawyers, probably in 1963 at New Delhi, India.

When lawyers from over 100 nations exchange ideas and information, certain conclusions based on shared experience become inescapably clear. Lawyers know that within domestic societies peace is maintained through settling disputes according to law. In international society everyone knows that disputes are settled by force, either direct or indirect. Lawyers feel that the reason for this difference is the existence of a moral consensus among the members of a domestic society, and the lack of such a consensus in international society.

With this point clearly understood, the task of lawyers participating in this movement is clear. It is to develop understandings which can serve as the foundations for codes of international law. Existing codes in such fields as aviation, the high seas and international trade have demonstrated their value as positive steps toward maintaining peace. At the three continental meetings, the assembled lawyers urged treaties in other areas. The movement intends to accelerate this process through cooperating with governments in updating existing agreements, in seeking ratification of existing drafts and treaties, and in helping draw up new pacts. Thus will international law-

making be speeded up through utilization of the lawyer's unique capacity.

The consensuses which were approved at the three continental meetings in Costa Rica, Japan and Nigeria made significant progress in the direction of creating basic understandings on which new codes can be established. These three documents proclaim that, according to international law, nations must refrain from the unlawful use of armed force, political subversion, economic aggression and defamatory propaganda. A nation's obligation to protect human rights is stated, as is the requirement of a day in court before the imposition of international sanctions. Also, standards for judges on international judicial institutions are set.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS

The consensuses have, in addition, contained concrete suggestions for actions which may be taken now to advance the rule of law internationally. For example, at the recently concluded conference in Lagos, Nigeria, a call was made on governments of Africa and the Middle East to form permanent organizations of African states and of Middle Eastern states for promotion of the rule of law and settlement of disputes. The consensus of Lagos contained concrete recommendations that courts of justice for African nations and for Arab nations be established, with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern. Proof that such suggestions are practical is the court established by the six nations of Europe which are members of the Common Market. These moves demonstrate one very practical aspect of the program; the drive to advance wherever international agreements already exist.

As evidence that more than words may be expected from this movement to utilize the positive value of law, at the Lagos meeting last December recommendations were approved that special committees be set up to prepare draft treaties on disarmament, nuclear testing and peaceful uses of outer space, as well as draft conventions on international commerce and development. In order that the drafts will represent the best in scientific, technical, economic, and other fields of knowledge, the cooperation of other professions will be sought. The resultant drafts will be available for consideration by the delegates at the forthcoming world conference of lawyers.

The idea of inviting lawyers from all nations to participate in the preparation of a law for outer space is an example of a dramatic new step inspired by the peace through law program. For although only two nations at present have space capabilities, the effects of developments in the outer atmosphere are worldwide. Here, then, is a project which can bring power under the control not only of those possessing it, but also of those affected by it.

HIGH LEVEL PARTICIPANTS

Indicative of the support the movement has received in its early stages has been the caliber of its participants. Past and present presidents of national bar associations, teachers and deans of leading law schools, members and former members of cabinets, members of supreme courts, and others with extensive diplomatic experience as ambassadors or representatives to the United Nations have been active in the program. Of particular significance is the fact that all of these delegates exercise a tremendous influence on public affairs in their own countries.

Each of the continental meetings has been initiated by an inspiring address by the chief executive of the host government. The numerous messages of support for the rule of law internationally from heads of governments read at the beginning of the continental conferences have given added momentum to the program. Typical of these messages was that which President Kennedy sent to the San Jose Conference, containing the following statement:

"Where people have the hope of enjoying a free and peaceful world with justice for all, they will undoubtedly find encouragement in the series of continental conferences starting with the San Jose Conference, in order to help create a world community in which the international disputes will be handled not on the basis of brutal force but by the rule of law. * * * The bar associations meeting there now, and later working with their colleagues from other continents toward that great objective, constitute a model and an incentive for collective action regarding the tremendous problems of the present era."

Research, education, and action are the means by which this program expects to achieve its goals. Appropriate institutions through which these actions will be taken have been outlined. In addition to utilization of all existing organizations and institutions, such as law schools, a World Peace Through Law Institute and a World Peace Through Law Year are envisaged to further the program.

Lawyers confidently believe that intensive research into those international areas which are ripe for immediate progress can be undertaken fruitfully on a coordinated global scale. Similarly, a worldwide educational program on international law must be pursued. In this way the public can come to understand the potential of international law as a positive means for the development of international cooperation. Such understanding, in turn, can facilitate desirable political settlements. Finally, with a permanent institute established to advance programs which have been developed through intensive research and supported by an educated bar and public, global campaigns for action toward world rule of law will be feasible.

Today the ultimate arbiter in international affairs remains military force, as it has for millenia. This program now being formulated can so strengthen law as to make it the major factor that it must be in regulating the actions of nations and men in the world community. Thus we may enter a new era in the development of civilization.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the press of the country and at the President's press conference yesterday, questions have been raised relative to the situation in Vietnam, and how much or how little the American people have been informed, and how much or how little the leadership on both sides of the Congress have been informed, and how much or how little the Members themselves have been informed.

I did a little checking on this matter; and it appears to me, to judge from the figures which I have been able to obtain, that in 1961 and up to the present time there have been at least 50 meetings covering the question of Vietnam and our interest there. State Department officials have given a number of briefings to congressional committees. The Department of Defense has given a number of briefings to congressional committees. Some of those briefings have been several days in length. So I would say, to speak conservatively, that out of the 50 to which I have referred, there have been at least 40 meetings of various kinds between congressional committees and representatives of the Department of Defense and representatives of the Department of State; and last year and this year—for instance, on January 8, I believe—there have been leadership meetings at which the President has endeavored to keep us fully informed in regard to the delicate situation in Vietnam.

Mr. President, a most serious situation exists in Vietnam. It is a situation that is of proper concern to leaders of both parties in the Congress, and to the public. Since that is the case, it is a subject for proper discussion. But let me emphasize the word "proper." It is not a subject for political profiteering. It is not a subject for recrimination and scapegoating. Our security is involved in the Vietnamese situation; the lives of Americans and others are involved. Both have been involved for many years under administrations of both parties.

Any constructive advice from the Senate or any of its Members on how this situation may be ameliorated is to be welcomed. I am confident the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense would welcome it. I am confident that the people of the Nation would welcome it, too.

I am just as confident that the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, who is a great American before he is a party leader, feels the same way as I do in this matter.

I may have more to say on this matter later. For the moment, however, I want to stress that it borders on the irresponsible to suggest that Congress has not been well informed on this situation for many years. Countless congressional missions have visited Vietnam during the last half decade and have reported to their committees and to the Congress.

This administration has made a special point of keeping the Congress informed—as did its predecessor—on developments in Vietnam, because of the critical nature of the situation there and our deep involvement of many years' standing. On January 8 of this year—at the very beginning of the present session—the President raised and discussed the question at length with the congressional leaders.

Furthermore, the Senate will recall that in the spring of 1961 the Vice President went on a mission to southeast Asia. On his return he made an unprecedented report on Vietnam, not only to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to which all Members of the Senate were invited—and a great number attended; I believe the number was 57 Senators—but also to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other House. These reports by

the Vice President were full, candid, and very much to the point of the difficulties in Vietnam and our efforts to meet them.

Nor is that all, Mr. President. Time and again there have been discussions of Vietnam with committees and Members by the U.S. Ambassadors to Vietnam, by the pertinent officials of the Department of State and of the Department of Defense, including the Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, and by military officials under two administrations. Time and again this subject has come up in congressional proceedings. We have had, if anything, a surfeit of information on the situation in Vietnam and on our policies with respect thereto. The truth of the matter is that there has not been any reluctance on the part of responsible officials of the executive branch to provide significant information on this situation to any appropriate agent of the Congress. That is proper, and that is the way I hope it will continue. Indeed, it must continue.

But we have got to be very careful here, Mr. President, as to the constitutional line of demarcation between the prerogatives and responsibilities of the President and those of the Congress in connection with this matter. It is the President's responsibility to decide and to act. It is ours to advise as we are able in our individual and collective wisdom, and, to the extent that it is constitutionally required, to consent. I, for one, would welcome on the floor of the Senate, from Members of either party, any constructive comment on the course which our policies in Vietnam has followed for many years. Information is necessary for that purpose. It has been forthcoming from this administration, as it was from its predecessor, with respect to Vietnam. I hope that this effective collaboration and mutual accommodation will continue, because it is essential for the welfare of the Nation that they continue. But they are not likely to continue if the party headquarters become involved. They will not continue if partisans on one side insist that Congress has no concern in these matters or if partisans on the other insist that Congress should look over the President's shoulder 24 hours of a day and should tell him how to conduct the foreign policy of the United States. That is the President's responsibility. The President has the strength, the courage, and the wisdom to exercise it. It is in the Nation's interest that he be supported in exercising it. It will be a disservice to the Nation and, hence, to any party, to impede him, for whatever reason, in exercising it.

DECISIONS ON POWER ISSUES FACE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the economy of the Pacific Northwest is characterized by a lopsided pattern of industry, heavy seasonal fluctuations in employment, and acute sensitivity to cyclical trends.

Lumbering, farming, and tourism are our major industries; all are subject to the whims of weather. We are located long distances from major markets.

Growth in manufacturing employment in the last decade has been largely limited to the aircraft industry in the State of Washington; this industry is dependent upon expenditures for national defense and vulnerable to sharp drops in employment.

We need more stable year-round payrolls.

In the past, availability of an abundance of low-cost hydroelectric power has served as the competitive catalyst which stimulated economic development. The Eisenhower administration's "no-new-starts" policy plus its restriction of the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing and planning functions broke the pipeline of projects required to assure the region of low-cost firm power and eliminated a major industrial incentive.

Vast resources of hydroelectric power exist in the Northwest. Investment in Federal power projects in our region will all be repaid to the Treasury—with interest. Through multiple-purpose water development, flood damage has been reduced, navigation expanded, agriculture improved, and recreation enhanced. Tangible benefits have accrued to the Nation through strengthening of the total economy and increased tax revenues.

Whether or not the power potential of our region will continue to make the maximum contribution to the Northwest and the Nation will depend on decisions which must be made within the next few months. A. Robert Smith, Washington correspondent for a number of newspapers in the Northwest, recently summed up the problems we face in the field of power policies. In an article appearing in the Oregonian of January 11, 1962, he outlined the issues in cogent fashion. Because his comments so clearly describe the alternatives available, and because Congress will be called upon to decide many of the questions posed, I ask unanimous consent that A. Robert Smith's analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Oregonian, Jan. 11, 1962]

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FACES CROSSROADS ON POWER POLICIES

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Pacific Northwest is moving inexorably toward a compelling condition of either abundance or scarcity that will sharply influence its growth for a generation.

In 1962 decisions of vital significance to the future economic growth and industrial potential of the region will have to be made in Washington, in Ottawa, in Victoria, in Portland, and in the minds of political leaders and citizens in every corner of the great Northwest country.

These decisions will go far to determine the speed and extent to which the Northwest country, one of the most richly endowed regions of the North American Continent, develops the modern manufacturing centers which promise economic stability and growth the year around and from year to year.

These decisions will have a bearing on how fast Oregon, Washington, British Columbia and Alaska can shake off the economic instability and uncertainty which plague them because of Northwest dependence on seasonal industry, such as logging; its remoteness from great markets; its reliance on military payrolls, such as the bomber bases in Washington State and Alaska; and on defense contracts such as those of the Boeing Aircraft Co., which form so much of Seattle's economic base.

POWER IS KEY

The most striking consequence of these imminent decisions is that either the Northwest country will move boldly into the decades ahead on a policy of developing all of its cheap hydroelectric power; or it will move so cautiously, or even blindly backward, so to force the Northwest economy prematurely to turn to higher cost fuels that will inevitably hamper industrial growth.

Northwest hydropower is no panacea for all the region's economic shortcomings, but economists maintain that it is a major advantage which the Northwest cannot afford to toss aside if it is to pass completely out of the hewers of wood and drawers of water stage.

The decision between abundance and scarcity of this economic advantage will dictate to a great extent how vigorous or how sluggish the growth rate of the region will be the next few decades. The imminent possibility of scarcity underscores the gravity of the decisions facing the region in the year ahead.

The Northwest country has the greatest sources of hydroelectricity on the continent. While the creative magnificence of Grand Coulee has been realized in an earlier decade of daring decision, still other—and some greater—projects remain on the drawing boards. These include the proposed Rampart Canyon Dam on the Yukon River near Fairbanks, Alaska; the Taiya project on the Alaska-Canadian border; the Portage Mountain project on the Peace River in northern British Columbia; Mica Creek, Arrow Lakes, Duncan Lakes and Libby, the four major projects provided by the pending Columbia River treaty, and the complex of remaining dams in the middle Snake-Clearwater River area of the millions of kilowatts to satisfy the demands of growth in this vast region for a decade or more.

ERA MAY END

Or, if the Northwest suffers scarcity due to political shortsightedness in key places, the era of great dam building will soon end and the region's growth will have to be sustained by the same higher-cost fuels on which much of the rest of the continent is dependent. A Northwest advantage would thus be wasted.

The decisions which will determine the condition of abundance or scarcity are these:

1. Columbia River Treaty: If the Canadian Parliament follows the course of the U.S. Senate and ratifies this document, sharing of water storage and power benefits will add 2,600,000 kilowatts to the energy supply of the Northwest, whether it is all consumed in the United States or whether Canada uses its own half-share in British Columbia. An internal political squabble in Canada threatens this forward-looking step.

POWERLINES NOTED

The engineering feasibility of long-range transmission lines, as projected in the recent Interior Department task force report, makes possible the development of the most remote of these dam sites and the utilization of the energy in cities near and far where industries and residents choose to locate.

In short, here lies the potential for abundance.

2. Peace River: British Columbia Premier Bennett wants to build the 4,900,000 kilowatt Portage Mountain Dam to give his province a huge supply of cheap energy. But he says his depends on his getting U.S. dollars for

Canada's Columbia treaty entitlement, which in turn is challenged at Ottawa.

3. Alaskan power: Two huge projects in Alaska depend in large part upon Canada's cooperation. One is the Taiya project, a 2 million kilowatt dam in southwest Alaska near Skagway on the Canadian border utilizing diverted Canadian water from the Yukon River. The other is Rampart Canyon dam 100 miles northwest of Fairbanks, a 4,700,000 kilowatt project, which would rival Portage Mountain as the largest in North America if not the world.

LONG LINES VITAL

Long distance direct current transmission lines linking these projects with those in Canada and the Columbia Basin would permit early utilization of this vast reservoir of energy from California to the Arctic Circle. Without such interties, they may not be built for years, possibly never, due to their remoteness. Their development would foster the growth of Alaska which has the potential for becoming an American Scandinavia.

4. International power pool: Coordination of these great dams into an integrated system, crossing international borders as easily as State boundaries, would assure the minimum waste of these mammoth water resources and maximum utilization.

Such a pool could mitigate fears in Canada over the emotional issue of "export of power" from British Columbia to the United States which has delayed the ratification of the Columbia treaty.

As much or more American power from Alaska could be imported into Canada as Canadian power would be exported to the Northwest States.

TEAM BACKS POOL

A team of engineering consultants who last year studied the Peace and Columbia Rivers strongly recommended a Pacific International Power Pool embracing the projects of both rivers.

The recent Interior Department report on the intertie suggests that Alaska's Yukon projects could be added to this pool, based on principles developed for coordination of public and private dams in the Northwest.

5. The intertie bill: The intertie concept is threatened by some Northwest fears that it will lead to exporting cheap power to California. This is the same provincial view held by some Canadians. Some Alaskans would probably resist an intertie on similar grounds. But only power that is surplus to local needs would be consumed elsewhere; and the Northwest would likely gain more power from the North than it could send south to California.

The Interior Department plans to push legislation in 1962 to establish a Northwest priority on surplus Columbia power that is sold in California. Alaska could expect a similar protective clause. And U.S. officials recognize the same recapture rights would be extended to British Columbia under any contracts for buying Canadian power.

If fears dictate the decisions to be made in 1962, the Northwest and British Columbia and Alaska may realize none of these promising benefits. At stake here are projects capable of generating some 15 million kilowatts—or twice as much as all the Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest combined at present.

6. Snake River: Otherwise the Northwest would have only a handful of remaining economic power sites, mostly in the middle Snake River area, where the Army Engineers estimate that some 3 million kilowatts remain to be developed. Even here there is uncertainty. The dispute between private utility advocates of high Mountain Sheep Dam and public power seekers of Nez Perce Dam is far from being resolved. The Army Engineers recommended Mountain Sheep (but for Federal construction by the engineers), while the Interior Department wants a decision deferred several years pending more studies of fish passage problems at Nez Perce.

The Federal Power Commission must decide this one. Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs, opposed by conservationists, and other nearby projects will require congressional authorization.

7. Hanford atomic power: The administration wants to develop 800,000 kilowatts with a dual-purpose reactor at the Hanford works in Washington State. After the House declined last session to authorize it, the Atomic Energy Commission talked with local interests and is now reviewing a proposal from Washington Public Power Supply System for a partnership deal to achieve the same end. Either method, Federal or a partnership, would involve congressional sanction.

If the Hanford reactor is killed by private utility lobbying once again; if the FPC and the administration accede to public power wishes and delay the Snake River development; if Congress, under conservationist pressure, balks from authorizing Bruces Eddy, Penny Cliffs, and other dams recommended by the engineers; if provincialism prevents action on an intertie; if Rampart Dam looks like so much Eskimo pie in the Arctic sky to Congress; and if the Canadians can't resolve their dispute and the Columbia treaty lapses—if all of these gloomy possibilities materialize, the Northwest faces scarcity of cheap hydroelectricity within a few years.

One by one, taken individually, none of these decisions appears controlling. But like dominoes, a number of them stand or topple together. And collectively they will determine whether or not northwesterners will realize the promise which abundance holds out to the generation ahead.

ADMINISTRATION'S A–B–C–D FARM PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the administration recently sent us its A–B–C–D farm program, which we are told means "abundance, balance, conservation, and development." I have a different name for it. This is a burdensome program which might well be translated "authority, bureaucracy, controls, and deficits." I hope and believe the Congress will turn "thumbs down" on the administration's program for agriculture, just as the Congress turned a deaf ear to the President's 1961 do-it-yourself farm bill.

I am not speaking just for farmers. I am speaking for consumers too. If we control agriculture nail by nail, cow by cow, row by row, farms will be less productive, crops will be less abundant, and prices eventually will go up—rather than down. This is not the answer.

A very articulate constituent of mine wrote a letter to me a little while ago, and this is what she said:

> This morning, I heard on the news broadcast as I was dressing to come to work that the farmers of this country received aid to the tune of $2½ billion last year. While I do not begrudge the poor farmer a bit of assistance, it means that out of the miserable pittance ($67 a week) that I earn, it costs me close to $10 a week in income taxes to the Federal Government. Out of this miserable pittance must come rent, telephone, gas and electricity bills, food and clothes. After all, I also am claiming the right to be classified as a human being. I'd like being subsidized myself.
>
> I realize that $2½ billion must seem like small change to you by this time. When am I as a plain common ordinary citizen of this country going to get some aid? Honestly, Senator, I need it.

I would correct these sentiments only to say that the administration spent $4.7 billion on farm price supports last year, not $2.5 billion. This was $900 million more than Secretary Freeman's predecessor spent in 1960.

I would also remind my friend that we have been supporting agriculture like this for years. We have permitted price supports and our surpluses of commodities to get further and further out of hand. The time has come to call a stop.

I am willing to take some hard measures to cut down on these surpluses. But, we do not want to do it by Government fiat, by putting a Federal agent on the farm telling a farmer when to get up, when to go to bed, when to milk, when to plow, when to plant, and when to harvest. This is not the proper direction for progress on the farm.

The largest sector of the agricultural industry in New York State is dairy products. In 1959, the dairy industry contributed $500 million to the State's total income. New York ranks second in national production of milk and in the manufacture of ice cream and cheese.

Our dairying success is attributed mainly to a favorable combination of soil and climate, large quantities of hay and pasture grass, and proximity to key markets for fluid milk.

Last year, Secretary Freeman, in an incredible move, indicated departmental support for the so-called National Milk Sanitation Act. In my mind, this is just a vicious play to deliver eastern dairy markets to midwesterners. We, in New York State, cannot economically produce as many and as varied farm products as can Midwestern and Western States. Our dairy products are absolutely vital to agriculture in New York, and we are not going to stand aside and see them taken away from us on false pretenses through measures such as the Milk Sanitation Act.

The supply control program which the administration now recommends is not much different from the National Milk Sanitation Act. It has the same purpose. It is equally as objectionable to me and, I know, to many of my colleagues in the Northeast.

One very likely reason for overproduction of milk is that, because of the threat of national controls constantly emanating from the Agriculture Department, farmers have been raising their production at an unrealistic rate in order to make certain that their 1961 base year production will be high. It is the 1961 base year production that in the future would determine how much milk a farmer could produce under the administration's supply-management program.

A New York dairy farmer at a meeting in New York recently described this program as Khrushchev in reverse. Instead of forcing people to produce more, our Government is now going to force them, just as autocratically, to produce less.

I remind the Senate that milk and dairy products have long been produced and marketed on an orderly basis. Increases in the Government's stocks of dairy products have been limited. Dairy farmers operate as we know, under milk marketing orders. These orders are sensible regional arrangements to see to it that the price and production in a given area are kept in line. Farmers have considerable say as to how this is done; and I have heard very few complaints about this system. Although many farmers want to improve it, for many years these milk marketing orders have permitted farmers to get a decent return and have permitted consumers to get a fair price—all with a limited amount of Federal intervention and control.

In a pamphlet published in November of last year, the Agriculture Department proudly boasted that "milk orders do not control production, nor do they restrict the marketing of milk by farmers."

The President's dairy program would scrap this entire system. It would virtually mean national controls on dairying, which would render worthless and useless the present farmer-administered controls which have worked so well.

Mr. President, on January 23, 1962, the President and Secretary of Agriculture had a meeting for dairy farmers here in Washington. The farmers were told how important it is to get more people to drink milk. The President drank milk, the Secretary drank milk, Mr. Salinger drank milk to put the final stamp of approval on it. The President said:

> Ten percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies are calcium and vitamin A.

Pursuant to the President's comments, I point out that per capita consumption of milk in the New York area is around eight-tenths of a pint per person a day. This is materially below the minimum quantities recommended by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other recognized authorities. The suggested minimum, I am told, is two or more glasses per day for adults, three to four glasses per day for boys and girls, and four or more glasses for teenagers. It is obvious that if consumption could be raised to the minimum standards, there would be no surplus in dairy products.

Above all, steps need to be taken to correct the great amount of irresponsible public misinformation now reaching the consumer. This information concerns the diet-fat controversy, atomic fallout, and the importance of calcium and milk protein. Milk is a fine wholesome product, and I am fully convinced that there is no present danger of strontium 90.

So, according to the President, what is the solution? People need to drink more milk, so let us have less of it. This is no way to close the nutrition gap. Instead of getting the price structure back in line and developing an effective program to expand consumption, the President has in effect told us, "All right, people don't want to drink milk, so lets cut production." There is something very illogical about all of this.

Farmers in my State who produce large amounts of milk, vegetables, and fruit were very much disappointed with the President's farm message. Many Members of Congress are disappointed, too. The President's proposals for sweeping production controls as the major means of achieving his objectives are the product of a small brain trust in the Department of Agriculture. They are wrong, but they simply will not recognize that the achievement of across-the-board controls is not the best answer.

Mr. President, last year I urged that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry establish a bipartisan study commission for agriculture. I called it the Joint Congressional Study Commission on Farm Policy.

In view of the President's farm message of a few days ago, and particularly his one-sided proposals for dealing with the dairy situation, I think it is appropriate to repeat that request. I hope the Congress will this year seriously consider the establishment of such a bipartisan commission, composed of citizens representing all sectors of agriculture and the consuming public as well. The Commission would start with the President's recommendations. It would be expected to invite representatives of all of the major commodity groups to prepare analyses of these and alternative proposals.

The Joint Study Commission would be established by the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture. I would suggest that one-half of the members be appointed by the chairman of each committee with the consent of the ranking minority member.

I have no fixed views on the size of the Commission. However, I think that 18 to 24 carefully selected farm leaders should be able to adequately represent all the important commodity groups and geographic areas. At least four additional members should be included to represent the interests of consumers.

A Commission such as this must have a competent staff. The Commission and its staff would be given a program for study by the relevant committees and would be given a definite terminal date for reporting to the Congress with specific proposals for action.

I further propose that the life of the Commission be limited to 1 year, and that a preliminary report be submitted at the end of each 3-month period, with a final report due at the close of business in 1 year.

Mr. President, every time someone proposes a study commission, he is accused of evading the problem. In many cases this is true. Some problems are studied to death and never resolved. But Secretary Freeman's advisory committees which were consulted in the formulation of the administration's recommendations were not representative of their industries. They were made up of individuals who were known to agree with the Secretary and his brain trusters.

The administration has failed to come up with an acceptable answer for the Nation's farms. The responsibility for long-range farm planning, for the development of sound policy, is now up to us. We must move ahead in a way that will permit the maintenance of a free agricultural economy to the fullest extent possible.

It is my view that such a commission as I have recommended would go a long way toward helping to find the right answer to the problem.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have read with great interest the informative and perceptive article by Harrison Salisbury on the persecution of the Jewish people in Russia. Mr. Salisbury points out that although pogroms and massacres have stopped, anti-Semitism and religious discrimination are rife throughout the Soviet Union.

Undoubtedly the successful emergence of Israel as a prosperous and democratic state has increased the desire of Russian officialdom to persecute and harass Jews in the Soviet Union. To be interested in Israel is considered to be virtually treason. The kind of fanatic Russian nationalism which is behind this kind of treatment is not new, but it acquires new significance and new impact when combined with the rigid doctrines of Communist dictatorship.

Frankly, Mr. President, I would like to see the American people and American organizations, both Jewish and non-Jewish, take more of a stand on this issue. I would like to see our Government publicly air the facts of this situation before United Nations committees and the General Assembly. After all, the Russians do not hesitate to make propaganda use of racial incidents in America in every possible way. We should lose no opportunity to show that in this area, too, Communist promises are utterly hollow.

Mr. President, it has, in fact, already come to my attention that the Communists are disturbed by this kind of pressure and are trying to resort to countermeasures to prevent American Jewish organizations from playing an active role in support of their coreligionists in the Soviet Union. There is mounting evidence that the Communists are trying to block these well-justified protests by casting aspersions on the integrity of some of the organizations involved and even going so far as to hint that American-Jewish organizations are being used as pawns by the American State Department in cold war tactics.

Mr. President, nothing could be further from the truth. All Americans are shocked by Soviet persecution and discrimination and all Americans have the right—or, even stronger, I would say that all Americans have the obligation to express their indignation at this kind of tactics both within the Soviet Union and on the part of Communist groups throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the illuminating article by Harrison Salisbury, to which I refer, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FEAR RISES AMONG SOVIET JEWS AT RESURGENCE OF ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

The Jews of Russia, historically the victims of persecution and prejudice, are encountering another time of trouble.

It is milder than past oppressions. There are no pogroms. The old czarist slogan "Beat the Jews and Save Russia" may be muttered by some hooligans but it gets no official encouragement. Nor are Jews being executed or shipped off to Siberia as in Stalin's days.

Nonetheless, anti-Semitism—endemic in Russia—again has shown its ugly face, especially in rural areas of the Ukraine and in some parts of Byelorussia and the Moldavian Republic.

Its revival has been stimulated by aggressive official propaganda against the Jewish religion, often couched in terms that blur the boundary between antireligion and anti-Semitism.

Fear and suspicion, never long absent from the Jewish communities in the Soviet Union, again are on the increase. Jews in many places are reluctant to have contacts with foreigners or coreligionists because of the reprisals that may be visited upon them by the Government.

The same Young Communist League gangs that have been thrown into action by Soviet neo-Stalinists against the Russian Orthodox Church, against restive youth groups and against any manifestation of liberalism in Soviet life have been mobilized to intimidate and browbeat Jewish communities.

The same antiforeign ruffianism displayed by the neo-Stalinists in other contexts is invoked against Jews.

Among diplomats it is believed that the chief motivation in the drive against Jewish communities and Jewish religious centers is xenouphobic rather than antireligious.

The Jews, the diplomats feel, are feared by the regime. The fear stems from two sources. The first is the phobia that the Communist Party persistently displays toward any kind of non-Communist social group, regardless of its basis. The second is the fact that Jews have connections with their coreligionists abroad and have repeatedly demonstrated their sympathy for and interest in Israel.

The Soviet secret police equate an interest in Israel with "security risk" and Israeli representatives, particularly diplomats, are considered to be spies and agents of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

INTELLECTUALS CHALLENGING ANTI-SEMITIC CAMPAIGN

The revival of active measures against organized Jewish circles in the Soviet Union and the persistence of anti-Semitism have not, however, gone unchallenged in the present liberalized atmosphere of the country.

The Jews now have powerful and articulate allies within the Soviet intellectual community who are actively seeking to arouse Russians to a feeling of shame and anger at the anti-Semitic stain on the national conscience.

POET ASSAILS ANTI-SEMITISM

The most spectacular of these voices is that of the flamboyant young poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko, idol of Soviet youth and probably the most popular single figure in Soviet art and letters today.

Mr. Yevtushenko, a non-Jew, has a public platform for his views. His poetic denunciations of the continuance and quasi-official encouragement of anti-Semitism are published by the periodical press. He recites his poems to stormy audiences of students in clubs and assemblies all over Moscow.

When he declaimed his attacks on anti-Semitism last autumn on Poet's Day in Moscow's Mayakovsky Square the crowd of young people was so great that the police finally intervened.

When the youngsters refused to disperse at midnight, police vans were summoned. Dozens of youngsters were loaded into the vehicles and driven 20 miles outside town, dumped out and forced to find their way back to the city as best they might.

The youngsters demonstrated their contempt for the police by reassembling the next night. Again they refused to disperse and again they were carried out of town and dumped on the roadside.

Mr. Yevtushenko's participation in the fight of Russian liberals against anti-Semitism has been spectacular. But he is by no means alone. Another young writer, Vladimir Nekrasov, took a similar stand considerably earlier.

Among the older generations, Ilya Ehrenburg, himself of Jewish origin, has eloquently announced his determination to proclaim as long as anti-Semitism persists, "I am a Jew." Incidentally, Mr. Ehrenburg has long been a bitter opponent of Zionism and organized Jewish activity.

When the neo-Stalinist poet, Aleksei Markov, published a slanderous couplet characterizing Mr. Yevtushenko as a "pigmy" cosmopolitan, "a handwritten" poetic "answer to Markov" promptly began to circulate among the Moscow intelligentsia.

This compared the Soviet poet to a notorious anti-Semite of the czarist period known as "Markov the Second." The Soviet critic was promptly christened "Markov the Third."

The battlelines in the anti-Semitic controversy are almost identical with those on other issues dividing the two main tendencies in Soviet life today—the neo-Stalinists and the liberals.

However, despite criticism by liberals, the Government-sponsored anti-Jewish program continues.

ONE SYNAGOGUE SURVIVES IN JEWISH AREA OF KIEV

Its effect on the Jewish community can be clearly observed in such a center as Kiev, for example. Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, was once a great center of Jewish life and culture and had many synagogues.

Today a single synagogue survives in the heart of the old Podol, the poor Jewish quarter of the city. It is a small building, rundown and worn, on a neglected side street.

"Is this the only synagogue in Kiev?" a recent visitor asked in surprise.

"Oh, no, there are others," said the tough-visaged "administrator" of the congregation, probably a nominee of the state security apparatus.

A bearded ancient with a black skull cap shook his head sadly and muttered: "That is not true."

The other synagogues, it finally developed, were two meeting rooms—one on the second floor and the other to the rear in a kind of storage building. Unfortunately, the keys could not be found so that these "beautiful rooms," as the administrator described them, could not be shown.

"Have any synagogues been closed recently?" the administrator was asked.

He shrugged his shoulders and said he had not heard of any. It might be true. Perhaps there were not enough people to support a synagogue.

"We have complete freedom to worship or not to worship," he said belligerently. "Just as you have in America."

"How many members are there in the congregation?" he was asked.

"We keep no statistics," was the reply.

"How many Jews are there in Kiev?"

"Ask the city council. That is not our business."

The old man with the beard and the skull cap shook his head in resignation.

Kiev was the scene of one of the worst Nazi massacres of Jews in the Soviet Union. The site of this was a gully called Babi Yar on the outskirts of the city. About 75,000 Jews were taken there and shot. Each group of Jews had to spread earlier victims before being shot.

Kiev is not indifferent to the lives sacrificed during the war. High on the cliffs overlooking the Dnieper there is a monument to all those who died in wartime Kiev, and an eternal flame burns there in memory of the victims. Each day there are pilgrimages and guided tours to the spot.

GUIDES DECLINE TO SHOW BABI YAR TO TOURISTS

But there is no mention at the monument that any Jewish lives were lost in Kiev. And the tourist asks in vain to be taken to see Babi Yar. "It is beyond the city limits," the guides say. "You have to have special permission. There is nothing to see there. It is too difficult."

Actually, there is nothing to see. The place is a deserted gully. Part of it is used as a city dump. The municipal council has plans for filling in the gully and building a sports center on the spot.

Babi Yar is not a term that Soviet officials like to hear. When the Jewish massacre is mentioned they are quick to say that the Jews were not the only people killed by the Nazis. There were Ukrainian and Russian victims, too.

"Babi Yar," a poem dedicated by Mr. Yevtushenko to the Jewish victims, has been translated into Yiddish. Aaron Vergelis, editor of the new Yiddish language literary journal Sovietish Heimland, has said that the poem will appear in his publication. After 4 months, however, it still has not appeared.

The symptoms of fear and suspicion observable in the Kiev synagogue are typical of Jewish communities in the Soviet Union today.

A recent visitor to the Moscow synagogue asked about G. R. Pechorsky, head of the Jewish community who was tried in semi-secrecy in October on charges of contact with a foreign power, Israel. "We do not know anything about Pechorsky and we do not want to know anything about Pechorsky," was the response.

There have been administrative moves against the leaders of most of the more important Jewish communities in the Soviet Union in recent months. There have been arrests and trials in Moscow and Leningrad.

In other cities such as Riga, Kiev, Vilna, and Tashkent, the known and respected Jewish leaders have been compelled to resign and more pliable men have been put in their place.

In a number of cities there has been a calculated effort to create a public image of Jewish graft, corruption, and drunkenness. Propaganda stories have been published "exposing" scandals in synagogues and among Jewish communities.

There have been trials of speculators and absconders in which persons with Jewish names are prominently associated. In one such trial in Tiflis, some of the most respected families in the Jewish community were involved. One of the ringleaders was said to be a 94-year-old leader in the local synagogue. He received a death sentence.

The effort to blur the lines and smear the Jews by confusing them with criminal and antisocial elements in the population is identical with the tactics employed by the same coalition of police and young Communist agents in attacking nonconformist youths and liberal writers. It is obvious that it has the same source and is inspired by the same persons.

ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA CIRCULATED IN PROVINCES

Examination of anti-Jewish propaganda materials circulated in the provinces shows the same pattern. For example, an anti-Jewish pamphlet published for local use in Kishinev is filled with revelations about drunkenness and speculation by synagogue officials.

This work seeks to link the Jews to the Rumanian forces that occupied Moldavia in World War II. It even hints that the Jews were supporters of the czarist regime.

In Kishinev and other areas pressure has been brought upon members of the Jewish community to petition the authorities for permission to close the synagogues on the ground that they no longer are interested in maintaining them.

How many synagogues have been forced to close by such intimidation is not known, but the number is not insubstantial in the rural areas of the Ukraine and Moldavia. The same technique has been used against Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic congregations.

Most diplomats believe a prime factor in the creation of an atmosphere of permissive anti-Semitism is insensitivity on the Jewish question by Premier Khrushchev. The Soviet leader has frequently discussed Jewish questions and almost invariably has displayed traces, at least, of the anti-Semitic prejudices common to the borderland of the Ukraine where he grew up.

Another factor, in the opinion of many Moscow diplomats, is the hypersensitivity of the Soviet regime to the Zionist question. Soviet relations with Israel are poor at best. With a population of 3 million Jews the Soviet regime suffers from security qualms because of the sympathy of many Soviet Jews for Jews abroad.

In this situation the Soviet authorities are highly suspicious of any links or contacts between Israel diplomats and Jewish communities in the Soviet Union. In the last 2 or 3 years, with the general liberalization of the Soviet regime, such contacts have rapidly broadened and deepened.

ISRAEL DIPLOMATS GIVEN WARM JEWISH WELCOME

In many cities Soviet Jews have demonstratively welcomed Israel diplomats. In Leningrad, for example, during the celebration of Simhath Torah 3 years ago about 4,000 Jews turned out and serenaded an Israel diplomat. The next year 7,000 Jews appeared and last October between 8,000 and 12,000.

This kind of display alarms Soviet security officials. Many diplomats believe it is no coincidence that the secret trials of Jewish community leaders in Leningrad and Moscow quickly followed the Simhath Torah celebration of last fall.

The vigor and intensity of Israel diplomatic activity in the Soviet Union and its contacts with the Jewish communities are believed by Western diplomats to have stimulated the Soviet Union in its recent widespread reprisals against Jews. The most prominent Jewish victims have been persons who had social and cultural contacts with Israel diplomats.

There is no sign that any of the Israel activities were anything but perfectly legal. None of them would have caused the slightest reaction in any country but the Soviet Union.

However, these personal and cultural contacts have aroused the Soviet security apparatus and its propaganda affiliates to a fury of activity.

The Israel Embassy has been publicly charged with espionage and secret activity of a subversive nature. One Israel diplomat has been expelled and others threatened with expulsion. And, inevitably, they have been branded "agents of the CIA."

Despite all this, so-called administrative anti-Semitism—that is, dismissal of Jews from posts or exile and execution—is not occurring as it did in Stalin's day.

At least in Moscow and Leningrad, Jewish students appear to have less difficulty than previously in winning admission to higher educational institutions. Jewish scientists have played a leading role in space and rocket research and this fact has won grudging recognition in high Government circles.

For all that, anti-Semitism is still a blot on the Soviet scene.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during this lull period in the proceedings of the Senate, when many of our colleagues are out in various States and are expected to return within the next few days, I thought I should lay the foundation this afternoon for future debate by presenting some reference material on an issue we shall be considering in the Senate next week.

As one who is never going to lose his abiding faith that Senators will read, I wish to provide them with some reading material this afternoon for future reference on this very important issue.

I start out, Mr. President, by referring to an editorial which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning. I think it is a very sound and unanswerable editorial dealing with the subject matter of capital punishment.

There is now before the Senate a bill to deal with this subject matter. It is the unfinished business, H.R. 5143, the bill relating to amending a code of law for the District of Columbia.

The bill became the unfinished business before this "recess period" of the Senate. I notified the majority leader, at the time that the District of Columbia capital punishment bill was made the unfinished business, that I was very desirous of having a yea-and-nay vote on the subject matter when we finally reached a vote on it.

In his usual cooperative manner, the majority leader assured me that when it came time to vote on the question, I would have adequate opportunity to make my request for a yea and nay vote, and he was quite sure I would get it. He assured me that it was not contemplated that we would vote on the subject matter, in view of my request for a yea-and-nay vote, until Senators returned.

So this afternoon, in order to prepare the way for that debate, I shall give Senators some reading material to reflect upon when they return. I do not know any better reading material that I could give to them, because it is so concise, so succinctly stated and so unanswerably presented, than an editorial published in the Washington Post today entitled "Archaic Law." The editorial reads as follows:

ARCHAIC LAW

Deputy Attorney General Byron White has reminded the Senate that the District of Columbia is the sole remaining jurisdiction in the United States where the death penalty is mandatory for first degree murder. The law is archaic, he declared, and has effectively discouraged convictions in the District because of the reluctance of judges and juries to impose death sentences. Over a 10-year period, according to the Deputy Attorney General, only 28 of 276 persons indicted for first-degree murder were convicted of that charge.

The reluctance of judges and juries to condemn a man to death is not hard to understand in a civilized community. The punishment, imposed in first-degree murder convictions, follows the philosophy of exacting an eye for an eye and is barbaric. Imprisonment serves quite as well to protect the community from dangerous felons and does a great deal more to promote respect for the sanctity of human life. In addition, it affords a means of correcting a mistaken jury verdict.

This newspaper is in thorough agreement, therefore, with the amendment which Senator WAYNE MORSE has proposed to the pending bill, already passed by the House, which would make the penalty of death discretionary with judge and jury. Mr. MORSE would eliminate the death penalty altogether but permit the jury, in connection with certain crimes which now entail a death sentence, to impose a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole.

The Senate is scheduled to consider the death penalty bill early next week. We hope at the very least that it will follow the lead of the House and eliminate the mandatory imposition of the penalty, allowing a jury to impose life imprisonment by unanimous recommendation.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference—and will call it up in debate next week—my amendment to H.R. 5143, to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed and appropriately referred, and without objection, the amendment may be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 1380) to amend section 801 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, viz: On the first page, line 3, immediately after "That", insert "(a)".

On the first page, line 8, beginning with "death", strike out all through the period on line 4, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "life imprisonment."

On page 2, line 7, beginning with "be", strike out all through the period on line 9

and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not be eligible for parole.".

On page 2, beginning with line 14, strike out all through the period on line 9, page 3.

At the end of the bill add the following:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any person who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is sentenced or resentenced pursuant to a conviction of murder in the first degree.

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 808 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

Mr. MORSE. In essence, the amendment provides as follows:

SEC. 808. RAPE.—Whoever has carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will, or carnally knows and abuses a female child under sixteen years of age, shall be imprisoned for not more than thirty years: *Provided,* That in any case of rape the jury may add to their verdict, if it be guilty, the words "with life imprisonment", in which case the punishment shall be life imprisonment: *Provided further,* That if the jury fails to agree as to the punishment the verdict of guilty shall be received and the punishment shall be imprisonment for not more than thirty years as provided in this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person sentenced to life imprisonment under this section shall not be eligible for parole.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any person who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is sentenced or resentenced in the District of Columbia pursuant to a conviction of rape.

SEC. 3. (a) Any person who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, was convicted of murder in the first degree in the District of Columbia and sentenced to death and who, on such date, is awaiting the execution of that sentence shall be resentenced (by the court which imposed such death sentence) in accordance with the provisions of section 801 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189), as amended by this Act. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person so resentenced shall not be eligible for parole.

(b) Any person who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, was convicted of rape in the District of Columbia and sentenced to death and who, on such date, is awaiting the execution of that sentence shall be resentenced (by the court which imposed such death sentence) to life imprisonment. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person so resentenced shall not be eligible for parole.

The sections that I have read are in essence the substantive sections of my amendment. I wish to talk for a few moments about the philosophy of the amendment, for the amendment gives the Senate of the United States a long overdue opportunity to face up to the capital punishment issue. In 1956, late on a Friday afternoon, I spoke on the floor of the Senate when an attempt was made to get through the Senate by unanimous consent an amendment to a Narcotics Control Act an amendment which provided for the dealth penalty in the case of any person found guilty of selling narcotics to a person 18 years of age or younger. The parliamentary situation at the time was as follows: I was satisfied that a quorum of the Senate could not have been gathered within a 100-mile radius of Washington, D.C. The record will show that I informed the majority leader that I was, so far as I knew, in perfect health and good voice, and that I was sure a vote on the amendment would not be held until a quorum could be obtained, and I was sure that would mean the following Monday.

I think in reading that record Senators will find that there was a little good-natured repartee when I suggested I was sure my majority leader would not want to be the first majority leader in the history of the Senate to hold the Senate in session on Sunday.

So we worked out an understanding that I would make my speech for future reference of the Senate in opposition to capital punishment, and on Monday we would limit debate on the issue and vote on it on Tuesday.

We did that. The record is clear that the amendment, on Tuesday, was overwhelmingly defeated. The reaction of my colleagues in the Senate was very interesting when they had an opportunity to vote on this very limited phase of the capital punishment issue—limited, because the only issue then before them was whether or not they would vote for an amendment which would impose capital punishment on a person who sold drugs to anyone 18 years of age or under.

There was no disagreement among us that the selling of drugs to anyone 18 years of age or under, or to anyone else, is a heinous crime. It did raise the very definite moral issue as to whether or not in carrying out a system of government by law by self-governing people, a majority of whom claim to be Christian, and a majority of the rest devout religious people of other faiths, we could possibly justify on moral grounds playing God.

I have no right, as I said then, and as I repeat now, to impose my religious faith on my colleagues in the Senate. However, I have a trust to keep faith with my religious faith. I say now, as I said in 1956, that as a Christian I cannot support capital punishment. I believe that the prerogative of taking life is God's prerogative and not man's.

Oh, but it is said, "Mr. Senator, what about self-defense?" I have no problem with it. It has been recognized for all time, as far as the history of man is concerned, that man has the moral right to defend his own life in self-defense. In my judgment that principle of self-defense also runs through the argument in regard to war, where society as a whole is defending itself from an enemy that seeks to destroy the life of the members of society as a whole.

I have always taken the position, as a former teacher of criminal law, as one who for years worked in the field of criminal law administration, that there is no relevancy between the doctrine of self-defense on the part of an individual exercising it against an attacker and on the part of the people of a nation exercising it in war against an enemy of the country that seeks to destroy them on the one hand and an attempted justification of capital punishment as a penalty for crime.

The capital punishment issue deals with an act of volition on the part of the State, whereby the State, through statutory enactment, lays it down as public policy that it shall take human life by way of any one of the various forms of capital punishment, as a punitive measure, as a punishment—yes, as an act of revenge or an eye-for-an-eye and a tooth-for-a-tooth policy because of a criminal act by a wrongdoer.

In my judgment that places the State, and, through it, the citizenry of the State in a position in which I consider it transgresses upon the prerogative of the Almighty. As God gave life, and as God in His various ways imposes what we well recognize are divine penalties for transgressions of moral law, I hold to the belief that organized society has no moral right to play God and decide by legislative fiat that some act, no matter how heinous, can justify the State exercising the prerogative of God and take that life.

I wish to make perfectly clear that I am limiting my remarks today to a discussion of capital punshment as a penalty for crime imposed by law. For the reasons I have set forth again on moral grounds as a Christian I am opposed to the enactment of legislation which makes capital punishment a statutory penalty for so-called major offenses.

I wish to make clear that if such a statutory penalty exists in any State, no Governor sworn to enforce the laws of his State is deserving of any criticism if on the basis of the facts of a given case he decides that an imposed sentence of capital punishment should be carried out in accordance with the authority and power of the court under the law to render such a sentence.

Here again it is up to the individual Governor, in accordance with the facts of each individual case and in light of terms of the criminal statutes of each State, to determine what his executive action should be, case by case.

What I am directing my attention to today is a very simple issue as to whether or not we should vote in the Senate for H.R. 5143 which proposes to continue capital punishment but under certain restrictions in the District of Columbia as a punishment for certain major offenses. It is my position that H.R. 5143 should be rejected unless there is added to it my amendment which in effect abolishes capital punishment and substitutes therefore mandatory life imprisonment.

It should also be noted that my amendment does not deal at all with the pardon power of the President. My amendment limits itself to a restriction that makes life imprisonment a mandatory sentence and specifically provides that the convicted person shall never be eligible for parole.

It is my judgment that the pardon power of the President or a Governor should likewise be restricted to those cases in which it can subsequently be established that the convicted person did not, in fact, commit the offense for which he was sentenced to life imprisonment. However, my amendment limits itself to a legislative enactment which provides as a matter of law that no person sentenced to life imprisonment can ever be released on parole.

I have not covered the pardon issue in this statute because the pardon authority of the President of the United

States could not be modified except by constitutional amendment, and I am sure that would be found to be the case in most, if not all, the States for the reason that the pardon power granted to a Governor is a constitutional grant of power which cannot be changed except by constitutional amendment.

On the other hand, there is no constitutional problem involved in my amendment which simply provides that if a prisoner is sentenced to life imprisonment, he shall never be eligible for parole.

In an issue such as this, which involves, of course, much subjectivity, which involves—and one need only read my mail to see how much—deep emotional attitudes and patterns, and which deals with matters of conscience, I recognize that the presence of those elements in this controversial subject matter means that it is not to be expected that one who holds a contrary point of view is likely to be persuaded or convinced that he should change that point of view.

That fact, however, in no way removes the responsibility of the Senate to take a long, thorough look, and make a careful study of this subject matter, and take note of the second major reason that I lay down this afternoon in support of my position; namely, that we should face up to the capital punishment issue in the District of Columbia and abolish capital punishment. I do not want to leave the moral issue without making as clear as I can for the record that we should stop legislatively supporting such bills as are now pending before the Senate under which we will determine whether a human being shall live or die through the administration of our choice in criminal law penalties.

I do not ask for support for my position because of the fact that the cases are many in which, in the administration of capital punishment, after the passage of time, it was discovered that an innocent person was executed. Criminal trials without exceptions never have been infallible, and they never will be. There has always been occasional repetition of miscarriages of justice in capital cases in which an execution has been ordered, with all involved in the trial, on the prosecution and jury end, sincerely believing at the time that the person who was the defendant was, in fact, guilty of a capital offense, only to discover some time later—and sometimes not so long later—that a horrendous miscarriage of justice had taken place in the execution of an innocent party. I think that fact is really irrelevant to the moral issue I am discussing this afternoon.

But as a religious person—and I do not say that anyone who holds a contrary view to my own is any the less religious according to his sights and his faith and his religious precepts—but I do wish to say that on the basis of my religious training, my religious conditioning, my interpretation of the teaching of Christ, I could not in the U.S. Senate in the year 1962 reconcile a vote for capital punishment with my religious faith. To me, it is a moral issue, and all the arguments that we will hear next week to the effect that legislation must be a compromise; that a very unsatisfactory situation now existing in the District of Columbia must be modified, at least to some extent, by eliminating mandatory features of the present law, are arguments which, in my judgment, simply amount to clear expediency, to an evasion of the moral question as to whether, at this stage of civilization, we really have not yet reached a point of taking a position as a Congress that we will not exercise what I allude to as God's prerogative of taking human life as a form of punishment.

Let me make it very clear that the senior Senator from Oregon casts no reflection upon the sincerity and the religious dedication of any colleague who, from the standpoint of his religious faith, finds no moral conflict in this subject as does the Senator from Oregon.

But moving from the moral issue, I wish now to consider the question from the standpoint of what I believe is recognized on the part of most authorities in the field of criminology to be the modern, most scientific approach to the subject of punishment. I very quickly dismiss the argument that capital punishment is necessary as a deterrent by saying that the books are full, for those who will read, of indisputable evidence that capital punishment does not deter. I suppose the main reason why capital punishment does not deter is that most murders are crimes of violence; most murders are committed when the glandular system has blocked off the cortex. Oh, I know all about the law of premeditation; but the fact remains that the scientists in the field of criminology are quite uniform, based upon their legion of case studies, that it is a lot of wishful thinking to argue that capital punishment is a deterrent.

So I move to my next point: Does the senior Senator from Oregon believe that a soft approach should be made toward the murderer or the rapist or the traitor or anyone who commits a capital crime under present criminal law definition? Hear me through, Mr. President, if you think my approach is soft.

I am inclined to believe that one of the main reasons for the legislative difficulty which has confronted those who have urged the adoption of a humane and what they consider to be a moral approach to the punishment of the capital offender is what also the records show to be the final outcome of too many—in fact, probably a majority—of the cases in which capital punishment was not imposed, but only a prison sentence, and usually a sentence which on paper reads "life imprisonment." The undeniable fact is that, by and large, a life imprisonment sentence does not mean life imprisonment. The undeniable fact is that in jurisdiction after jurisdiction in the United States most so-called lifetermers do not serve out their lives in prison.

And those, like myself, who have opposed capital punishment have that thrown at them; it is thrown at us whenever we seek the enactment of legislation which would abolish capital punishment.

Mr. President, my position on this matter has been of years standing, long before I entered the Senate. It is the position which I took when I was in the U.S. Department of Justice, and served as director of the Attorney General's survey and research study, published in a five-volume work on "Pardon, Parole, Probation, and Prison Administration," including a digest of the criminal laws of the country. I have always taken the position that life imprisonment should mean life imprisonment. I have always taken the position that one who commits a capital crime, is found guilty of it, and is also found to be responsible for his acts, and is sentenced to life imprisonment, should be sentenced under a mandatory statute that denies him parole and denies him pardon, and would entitle him to release from prison only if subsequently it could be shown by judicial process that, in fact, he was not guilty. In other words, that his case was among the limited group to which I referred earlier in this speech when I mentioned cases in which the wrong persons were sentenced—in other words, only if such persons fell in the limited group of cases which, under present policy which prevails in many jurisdictions, sometimes result in the legal murder by the State of innocent persons who, in fact, did not commit the murder or rape or other capital offenses with which they were charged.

Mr. President, some persons who oppose my point of view from time to time have tried to argue that in some way, somehow, actual mandatory life imprisonment would be illegal and unconstitutional. Of course, I say most respectfully, that is legal nonsense. Inasmuch as the State has the legal power to provide for capital punishment—and I do not deny the power; I only deny the wisdom and the morality of exercising it—the State also has the power to provide for mandatory life imprisonment, and to deny any release by way of parole. Mr. President, is that "soft"? What is lenient or "soft" about a law which provides for a penalty, and says, in effect, "If you are found guilty of murder or some other capital offense, and if you are sentenced to life imprisonment, you will be put away for life. That 'will be it'; then you 'have had it.' "

Mr. President, I shall not argue that such a law would be a greater deterrent to the commission of capital offenses than is capital punishment; but I do argue that to whatever extent a heavy penalty is a deterrent, such a law would be as much a deterrent. In fact there are writings—and I think they have great cogency—in which it is argued that the present possibility of being able to "beat the rap," insofar as a capital punishment penalty is concerned, tends—to whatever extent the criminal gives any thought to the penalty, before he commits the crime—to cause him to be inclined to take a chance with the law. But I am satisfied that if we put on the statute books a law which provides that there will be mandatory life imprisonment, and that "will be it," and that there will be no pardon or no parole, then—to whatever extent the existence

of penalties acts as a deterrent—that mandatory capital punishment would be as much of a deterrent as would an immoral capital punishment provision—immoral in accordance with my religious sights.

Some interesting studies have been made of criminals, from the point of view of their views in regard to the capital punishment issue. This afternoon I do not present them by way of summary, except as a matter of interest. I am not suggesting that any Senator should vote for my bill because there is this reaction on the part of the criminal world; but I say it does have a bearing on the argument—so frequently made—that there must be capital punishment if capital offenses are to be stopped.

Mr. President, the interesting thing is that criminals of this type or class seem to hold the view that they would prefer to be executed, rather than spend the rest of their days in prison. But I wish to make clear that I am not suggesting that we adjust our criminal statutes to meet the preferences of the criminals. I only make this observation—because it is borne out by the studies—as part of my answer to what I consider to be the very unjustifiable charge, made by the proponents of capital punishment, that life imprisonment, mandatory in nature, would be a "soft" approach to the treatment of capital offenses.

To the contrary, it would be a tough approach.

I close this subject—although I have another one to talk about later—with my last point, Mr. President. I think one of the great needs in the world today, and I speak as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, is to emphasize the importance of human values; to take advantage of every opportunity on the part of this country to demonstrate to millions of people in the world, in those areas in which human values do not count to any such degree as they do in our country, that we mean it, believe it, and serve the ideal when we talk about the dignity of the individual.

"Oh," it may be said, "Mr. Senator, do you mean to imply that there is any dignity in the life of a criminal?" My answer is, "There is dignity in all life, for it is divine"; and the sinful and the wayward should be placed in a position of custody, so far as societal safety is concerned, so that the sinful and the criminal and the wayward are subjected to those penalties, those custodial, supervisional procedures, that organized society decides are necessary to prevent recurrences of their wrongful conduct. But that is as far as organized society, according to my sights, should consider it has a moral right to go or a legal duty to perform in the protection of society. I say that because the bar of ultimate judgment in regard to human conduct, the bar of judgment over the issue of life, is the bar of God's judgment, and not that of any court anywhere in America.

That is my thesis; and I think we would be an inspiring example around the world if, in this field of criminal law—and there are many other fields in which we must also manifest and prove our belief in the dignity of the individual—the Congress of the United States in 1962 stood up in support of the dignity of life. We should follow that course of legislative action even though the heartbeat is that of a criminal. By following that humane course of legislative action we would put the criminal away so that he could not continue to endanger other lives, but we would leave to God the judgment as to when his life would be called before the bar of God Almighty for final judgment, in accordance with what I happen to believe is the ultimate right of God, and not of man.

On the basis of the premises that I have presented this afternoon, Mr. President, I offer my amendment. I shall debate it next week. I shall ask for a yea and nay vote on it. I shall continue to pray and hope that the Senate of the United States will support my amendment and, by so doing, set an example, in my judgment, in support of the great ideal encompassed in what we so frequently refer to as our deep faith in the dignity of the individual. We thus can demonstrate to the peoples of the world that we practice our preachments of human and moral values.

ACCESS ROAD LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in December 1960, after an extended period of consultation with SBA and the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, a new program developed to assist small business. In essence, this program involved loans to small forest products processors to enable them to finance the construction of primary access roads, which were an integral part of a timber-sale contract.

The purpose of this program was to assist small business in retaining a competitive position in the purchase of Government timber sales. It is often necessary to build a fairly substantial road to harvest national forest timber in the Pacific Northwest, and this construction must be completed before any of the timber can be removed. This might mean that a small firm could have more than $100,000 of its working capital tied up before any timber was removed.

Last year, in connection with the cutting of national forest timber, allowances totaling $44 million were made in the prices of national forest timber for timber purchaser construction, and of this amount $21 million was in Oregon. Therefore, this loan program is of special interest to me.

In the first 6 months of the SBA-Forest Service program, four loans totaling approximately $650,000 were made in the Pacific Northwest. In the following 6 months, through December 31, 1961, 26 SBA–Forest Service loans were authorized to small concerns in the Pacific Northwest, for a total amount in excess of $2,800,000. Sixteen of these loans totaling $1,800,000 were authorized to small firms in Oregon who had purchased national forest timber. This is a commendable program and one which I am sure will expand and prove most beneficial.

This program would also be applicable to the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior and could be extremely beneficial in the State of Oregon where this agency has extensive timber holdings. The Bureau of Land Management and SBA are working out the terms of the agreement that they will sign and I trust that this will be done promptly.

The Forest Service and the SBA are to be commended for the vigor with which they have proceeded to place this program into effect.

RESOLUTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE COUNCIL OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. R. H. Wilcox, president of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, by letter dated January 24, has brought to my attention the position of that body with respect to the taxation of cooperatives and as well its position on foreign trade and tariffs.

The resolutions, which embody the expression of 40,000 members of the 64 farmer cooperatives in Oregon, were adopted on December 12, 1961, at the 40th annual membership meeting. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Wilcox, together with the resolutions, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE
COUNCIL OF OREGON,
Gresham, Oreg., January 24, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE LYMAN MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been instructed by the membership of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon to transmit the attached resolutions expressing the unanimous opinion of council membership.

The ACCO is a service organization, representing 64 farmer cooperatives and their 40,000 members, founded in 1921 to provide educational and service benefits to farmers and their business organizations. A list of our farmer cooperatives, which unanimously voted for these resolutions, is attached.

Farmer cooperatives contribute vitally to the economy of Oregon by increasing incomes of farmers, thereby making possible increased volumes of business for merchants. Increased incomes of farmers are also reflected in increased income taxes paid by farmers to the Treasury. Furthermore, farmer cooperatives make possible increased employment of permanent and season employees, as well as income for school children who harvest farm crops.

For these reasons, we encourage you to take all steps possible to bring to the attention of appropriate Members of Congress, the interests of farmer cooperatives from your district.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. WILCOX,
President.

RESOLUTION ON COOPERATIVE TAXATION

Whereas the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon believes that there exists considerable confusion and uncertainty concerning the taxability of patronage refunds and/or allocations of cooperatives; and

Whereas Congress made clear in the 1951 Revenue Act its intent that cooperatives should continue to treat patronage refunds, under whatever form issued, as treated at that time and a long time past; that is,

patronage refunds allocated to patrons pursuant to a pre-existing contract between patrons and the cooperative shall not be deemed to be income to the cooperative or be included in computing its net or gross income. If the net savings or retains were unallocated, then such earnings should be taxable to the cooperative, but if the retain funds are allocated to patrons, then each individual patron should be liable for the tax on his allocation for the year in which it is made; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, assembled this 12th day of December 1961, at its 40th annual membership meeting, recommend that appropriate legislation be adopted to clarify and make effective the intent of the 1951 Revenue Act to the effect that all patronage allocations of agricultural cooperatives distributed under a preexisting contract be included in the gross income of the recipient patron; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to each member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and to each member of the Senate Committee on Finance, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and other interested parties.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TRADE AND TARIFFS

Whereas the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon recognizes the need of maintaining a sound and healthy exchange in international trade of agricultural commodities produced in surplus by one country for which there is a demand by another country, it does at the same time recognize the right and necessity for the United States to protect the domestic market of its own agricultural producers against excessive and unduly competitive imports of agricultural commodities and products therefrom which already are being produced domestically in substantial quantities; and

Whereas a growing list of agricultural commodities grown in Oregon are being confronted and threatened with increasing imports in alarming quantities at prices which are ruinous and below the domestic producer's cost of production; and

Whereas Oregon farmers are already in a dilemma with rising costs and lowering returns disproportionate with all other branches of the economy; and

Whereas the loss of market outlet for one agricultural commodity due to cheap foreign competition of imports from low-wage countries throws the burden of surplus upon the remaining commodities when land usage is diverted to production of those commodities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, assembled this 12th day of December 1961, at its 40th annual membership meeting, do hereby recommend and urge that Congress give the particular problems of agricultural producers more attention in foreign economic policy by taking action to safeguard U.S. agricultural products against any further tariff reductions, and to retain and strengthen the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, if renewed, and further that "growers of any agricultural product used in the manufacture of a commodity involved in a peril-point or escape clause proceeding be considered a part of the domestic industry producing that commodity in such proceedings"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary to Oregon's congressional delegation, the Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, and other interested parties, including the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN LAWYERS IN A THERMONUCLEAR AGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 7, 1961, a very brilliant lawyer, at one time counsel to one of our committees in the Senate, Mr. Edward P. Morgan, delivered a speech to the Kansas City Bar Association on the subject of "The Challenge to American Lawyers in a Thermonuclear Age."

I do not introduce speeches into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without giving very careful thought to the question as to whether I believe the speech should be made a matter of historic record. I think there are two main reasons why material should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first is because we think the subject matter of the insertion will be of help to our colleagues in the Senate in connection with consideration of legislative proposals to come before the Senate in a given session. The other is because we think the matter we offer to insert merits being made part of the historic RECORD.

This speech meets that test, in my judgment, and so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN LAWYERS IN A THERMONUCLEAR AGE

(By Edward P. Morgan)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Edward P. Morgan, a native Missourian and a member of its bar, comes from three generations of Missouri lawyers. He is a practicing lawyer in Washington, D.C., a partner in the law firm of Welch, Mott & Morgan. Prior to his active practice, he was an inspector of the FBI and counsel to several committees of the U.S. Congress, notably the Joint Committee of Congress on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Disaster and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in its investigation of allegations of communism in the State Department. Over the past 15 years, Mr. Morgan has made hundreds of public addresses all over the United States, seeking to alert the American people to the menace of totalitarianism and Soviet imperialism and to suggest solutions to these imponderable problems of our generation.)

Twenty years ago today, the armed forces of Japan with deliberate and premeditated treachery attacked the American Pacific Fleet based at Pearl Harbor. We were at peace with the Empire of Japan and her ambassadors were in Washington in conversation with our Government looking forward to an amicable settlement of differences in the Pacific. One hour after Japanese air and naval forces had struck the Territory of Hawaii, the emissaries of Japan delivered to our Secretary of State a reply to a recent American diplomatic note, a reply containing no suggestion of attack by force upon the United States. With the benefit of information now available, it is known that the Government of Japan had planned for many weeks the barbarous act of December 7, 1941. The Pyrrhic victory of having executed the attack with surprise, cunning, and deceit belongs to the war lords of Japan who happily have been dispatched to an ignominious fate so richly deserved. The unprovoked attack upon the United States provides a saddening but signal truth for all people who would be free: Freedom may not be assumed; for it is a living, tender ideal that must be eternally nurtured and protected by the peace-loving nations of the earth.

Pearl Harbor presents one of the military enigmas of history. Our Government was breaking the Japanese code. We literally knew not only what the Japanese were saying, but what they were thinking as well. It was clear many months before Pearl Harbor that the Japanese program of aggression was immutable and that the United States, despite anything we might do, would be drawn into the conflict. We had war plans that contemplated in great particularity the exact type of attack which the Japanese executed on the morning of December 7, 1941. We knew that war was but a matter of hours away on December 6, and yet Hawaii was caught by the Japanese hopelessly undefended and the United States subjected to the greatest military and naval defeat in its history.

There are many considerations that enter into the question of responsibility for this disaster. But above and beyond all of the administrative shortcomings and other considerations, there was an overtone which to my mind constituted one of the real causes of Pearl Harbor. I refer to the fact that military and diplomatic officials of our Government realized we were not a united people. Accordingly, dispatches alerting outposts were qualified with the admonition not to take any step which would alarm the civilian population of Hawaii or be designed to be construed by Japan as an act of war. The result was a military non sequitur, which prejudiced the effectiveness of our military and naval effort and to my mind explains in some measure our national embarrassment on the morning of December 7, 1941.

The time must never again come in our history, particularly in an atomic age when an enemy may strike with paralyzing swiftness, that our own military forces are hamstrung by a consciousness that the people of the United States, whom they are charged with defending, do not have a singleness of purpose. This Nation must be resolved perennially to defend itself and there must always be a consciousness in the minds of our leaders, of whatever party they may be, that the American people essentially and fundamentally are determined as one to defend our heritage of freedom.

In another sense, Pearl Harbor epitomizes the last glorious spectacle of a great Nation, cherishing peace so consummately, that it would not first raise its hand to forestall an enemy aggressor poised to destroy it. On the night of December 6, 1941, as an intercepted and decoded Japanese diplomatic dispatch was being read by President Roosevelt in a quiet study of the White House, he sadly raised his head and said to Harry Hopkins: "This means war." Mr. Hopkins thereupon expressed the view that since war appeared inevitable and was undoubtedly going to come at the convenience of the Japanese, it was "too bad" that we could not strike the first blow and prevent any sort of surprise. The President sighed and said: "No, we can't do that. We are a democracy and a peaceful people—we have a good record."

History must record, however, that this was the last instance, however beautiful and symbolic, where a great peaceful democratic nation indulged the principle of permitting an enemy aggressor to strike the first blow.

For in a thermonuclear world the luxury of such indulgence is to be equated with national annihilation. Even in the setting of Pearl Harbor, two decades ago, our peacefull passivity almost spelled disaster. Vice President (then Senator) Alben W. Barkley told of the meeting called at the White House

of congressional leaders on Sunday evening, December 7, following the attack. He said:

"As we entered the White House, President Roosevelt sat pale and drawn. His first words I shall never forget: 'Gentlemen, the American Pacific Fleet in Hawaiian waters has been destroyed and we have no military effectives to prevent Japan's sailing into San Francisco Bay.'"

If such a result was precipitated in the "horse-and-buggy" days of Pearl Harbor with slow moving aircraft and explosives of puny potential in the modern sense, it requires little imagination to visualize the result as we sit here at this very moment only 15 minutes from eternity itself. For 15 minutes is the flight-target warning time of Russia's transpolar missiles.

But how does all of this have meaning for us as lawyers? In this regard, I must confess that for a period of time I experienced a sense of deep personal depression at the rise of a new so-called scientific-military elite. I viewed with wonder the penetration of outer space and the probing of God's divine order with an attendant capacity for the destruction of mankind. And I momentarily asked a question that seemed without answer: "As I sit here essentially consumed with the purely private legal interests of my clients, am I making or indeed capable of making any significant contribution to solving the distinctly new and imponderable problems of my generation?"

Then came the dawn—the certain realization that the only hope for mankind rests upon those trained to face and deal with facts, untinged by emotion, and to condition opinion and results based upon facts. This is essentially the task—indeed the life—of us lawyers. Reduced to its simplest analogy, our scientific-military elite had done little more than place in the hands of two neighborhood children, who didn't like one another in the first place, the infernal machines for their mutual destruction. Nothing could be more obvious and simple—the real contribution to civilization must come from those capable of inspiring restraint and a modus vivendi for living in those very "children" themselves.

I submit to you that never before in the long heritage of our profession has a greater, more meaningful challenge been posed for us as lawyers. It is ours to pioneer the way for law and order—peace with justice—in a thermonuclear age, which, after all, is the only hope for man's salvation. Most of all, however, we have a present impelling duty to assume a role of leadership and influence commensurate with the historic traditions of our profession. The American people are confused—and understandably so—what with a multiplicity of easy, pat answers from the John Birchers on the one hand, and on the other, that champion of surrender and his ilk, who said, "I'd rather be Red than dead." Most of all, however, we are plagued by a lurking recollection of the era of McCarthyism, which precipitated such profound consternation in our national political leaders that bold, decisive leadership was aborted for a safe status quo.

We must not forget that the threat of an external enemy is not the only menace to American free institutions. This I learned through bitter experience as counsel in 1950 to the so-called Tydings committee of the U.S. Senate inquiring into charges of disloyalty in our State Department made by the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin. I seriously doubt if anyone ever assumed a Government assignment with such feeling of deep responsibility and at the same time genuine pleasure as did I in the thought that it would be possible to make a real and meaningful contribution to the welfare of this country. My attitude was conditioned necessarily in the belief that Senator McCarthy had at length succeeded in piercing the veil of Washington departments and bureaus and had come up with new and startling information indicating a widespread plot by Communists and fellow travelers to control the foreign policy of this Nation.

My initial enthusiasm soon became utter and abject disillusionment. It became apparent that Senator McCarthy had raised a false issue and that his charges were founded in untruth. I thus found myself in the very anomalous position of one who had fought communism diligently and intensely over a period of 10 years (even during the time when it was highly unpopular to be strongly and openly condemning the purposes of Soviet Russia) being forced to expose the utter falsehood in the charges of one who had been built up in the popular mind as a great champion against and fighter of communism, which of course some segments of the press succeeded in doing in the case of Senator McCarthy.

I found shocking parallels between the methods employed to give the McCarthy charges ostensible verity and the very methods which have been used by the totalitarian dictators, both Communist and Fascist alike, in controlling and perverting the thinking of whole nations. I found charges of disloyalty to their country leveled against individuals on the basis of the most flimsy evidence and in several instances on the basis of alleged facts that did not actually exist. I found instances where the writings of an individual were quoted out of context and the actual language of those writings altered, all with a view to sustaining a charge of disloyalty.

I have seen an effort to establish guilt not merely by association but by accusation alone. By a mere allegation, shouted loudly and often repeated, an effort was made to place the most abhorent stigma known to Americans—that of disloyalty to country—upon many individuals. In the investigation, I saw a prostitution of the basic principles of our Bill of Rights, designed to guarantee security of the individual. If there is anything that distinguishes this free Nation from the peoples under the totalitarian yoke, it is the dignity of the individual, secure in the basic rights accorded him by law. When one sees these rights circumvented, undermined, and bypassed, he comes soon to realize that the great values that make America a nation worth fighting and dying for can indeed be compromised and destroyed by those who ostensibly would protect her. One cannot escape reflecting upon the fact that the great civilizations of history have invariably fallen—not at the hands of an aggressor from without but by reason of the fact that the people of those civilizations had lost the will and determination to protect inviolate the incidents of its existence which made it great.

Similarly, contemplation of the rise of the dictators of our generation—Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini and others—makes us realize that, under the guise of defending and protecting their peoples, they played upon current and existing prejudices and ultimately subverted dignity and self-expression of the peoples upon whom they foisted their influence and control.

Through an impartial analysis of the techniques and methods utilized to give the McCarthy charges weight, any one of you here today will find a pattern and, indeed, a prelude to totalitarianism. If we are to destroy communism and still preserve America, we must do so within the pattern, the framework, of our basic laws and institutions. The very minute we compromise any of the guarantees to the individual, we have taken a step which leads inexorably down the road that has brought so much sorrow, death, and degradation to mankind within the memory of us all. We must continue to be a government of laws and not of men. The very moment we permit our people to be accused promiscuously and convicted by methods and procedures not in conformity with our Bill of Rights, at that moment we have ceased to be the America which you and I cherish. I fervently pray that the time will not come when, seeking to destroy communism, we shall be inclined by demagogs and pseudo-patriots to embrace the incidents of any "ism" other than the constitutional Americanism you and I know and revere.

As lawyers, we must face these challenges—boldly, honestly, confidently—and, above all, objectively; for when we permit the prejudices and proclivities of our clientele to condition our principles and purposes we cease to be worthy of the name "lawyer."

We must interpret for the American people the distinctly different problems and solutions required by this brandnew thermonuclear world in which we live; and we must establish a bulwark of popular understanding and support from which our national leaders will find the courage to move forward with vision and decision.

In concluding my comments tonight, I would like to advance my own suggestion of a first step toward curing the ills of a sick and dying world. This projected solution may be called naive—controversial—even revolutionary—but I espouse it in the deep, honest, personal conviction that it provides the only hope for us and our children.

Having reviewed the emotional and sentimental manner in which we as a nation proceeded prior to and following the catastrophic attack upon Pearl Harbor, we need now to translate our thinking some 20 years later to the present moment—when we live in a world where wishful thinking, sentimentality, and emotional concepts of nationalism and sovereignty have either become the certain road to death by "fire and brimstone" or, hopefully, as dead as the proverbial dodo. Today we must face the facts, cold and inexorable, and our actions must be conditioned by reason of the world as it now exists and not as we in a dream world would like to see it. In order that any present meaningful solution can evolve from what is a hopeless stalemate, fraught with the omnipresent threat of nuclear destruction, we must face 10 hard, bitter facts and act in recognition of those facts:

Fact 1: We have a consummate distrust of the Soviet Union and her purposes—and with good reason.

Fact 2: The Soviet Union consummately distrusts us and our purposes—and from her standpoint, for good reason. We must, for example, recognize that it was the Allies who actually invaded Russia to suppress the Communist revolution at the end of World War I; and that we have effectively sought to ring the Soviet Union with bases, allies, and related strategically advantageous situations in the interest of our own security.

Fact 3: A nuclear war, whether we win or lose, means the destruction of everything we hold dear. Should we win (and this is only a relative evaluation of the extent of our destruction), millions upon millions of American lives will be lost, and only a dictatorship, with all of its abhorrent connotations, can hold a nation so devastated together. If we lose, then all hope of mankind for freedom is truly lost and we shall know the peace of extinction.

Fact 4: Within any reasonable and foreseeable time limits, there is little or no likelihood that the Soviet Union will curtail her nuclear arms, nor much less will she abandon them. For this reason, if for no other, we cannot curtail our own nuclear capability. Two world powers thus exist—capable of nuclear destruction, each of the other, and indeed of humanity.

Fact 5: There is no hope whatever for a complete defense against nuclear attack. Pearl Harbor taught us, even in the days of slow-moving aircraft, that no matter how good the defense barrier, some planes will always manage to get through and carry home the attack. Today it is missiles traveling far beyond the speed of sound, to say nothing of submarines, capable of launching more destructive forces than the combined weapons and explosives of all the wars of history.

Fact 6: We may not look to national consciences as a deterrent to war. The triggering of live nuclear warheads rests in the hands of a very, very few individuals, all giving rise to a daily threat of a war of human annihilation by miscalculation—by sheer accident.

Fact 7: If the instruments of total destruction must rest in the hands of two powers, perhaps the greatest restraint will be employed by those who presently have that ultimate capacity—the United States of America and, paradoxically, the Soviet Union. Such is true with respect to the Soviet Union by reason of the historically demonstrable fact that preservation of the geographical integrity of "Mother Russia" has always been a paramount consideration under czarist Russia and even more so under the Communists.

Every strategic move of the Soviet Union can be related to the manner in which those moves are consonant with preserving the geographical integrity of Russia as a bastion for world communism. Indeed, this truth is implicit in the first cornerstone of Russia's formula for world domination—"Self preservation of the Soviet Union plus the elimination of capitalist encirclement equals the final victory of socialism."

Fact 8: A nuclear capacity for effective destruction even approaching that of the United States and Russia must not be permitted to develop in any other nation whose restraint may not be so marked. From our standpoint, this includes particularly Red China, which would have less to lose from a nuclear war than any other nation on the face of this earth.

Fact 9: Time is running out. We cannot continue indefinitely in a posture of suspended life and death, nor can the Soviet Union. For reasons too numerous here to mention, the likelihood of effective nuclear controls through the United Nations or other existing or foreseeable world organizations cannot be realized within time limitations of a significant or meaningful character.

Fact 10: The people of the United States and of the Soviet Union have one thing in common—they want to live.

Confronted with the foregoing 10 facts, there can be but one answer to the problem which they present: The United States and the Soviet Union must—out of their mutual distrust and indeed by reason thereof—join together, bilaterally, to insure that a further nuclear military capacity does not develop in any other country of the world.

And for those of you who might be offended by such an association of survival under any circumstances, I can think of no more fitting comment than that of Winston Churchill: "I would make an alliance with the devil if it meant saving the Empire."

For us, far more than a mere empire is at stake—embracing the solution means our very lives, the salvation of America, of civilization, and of humanity.

THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR A NEW TRADE LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Sunday it was my pleasure to speak to the International Affairs Conference for College Editors in New York City at the Overseas Press Club.

One of the other speakers was Mr. Peter Jones, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Policy. He gave these student editors, and all of us in the audience, an outstanding presentation of the issues involved in the President's request for a new trade law.

I was unable to obtain a copy of the speech Mr. Jones gave on this particular occasion, becaues he spoke extemporaneously, but I ask to have sent to me manuscripts of other speeches he had given on this subject, which covered in essence the substance of his remarks last Sunday. The Department of Commerce has sent me copies of other addresses Mr. Jones has delivered on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address by Mr. Jones entitled "Free Trade and the Future of America," delivered before the Southeastern World Trade Group, Charlotte, N.C., on December 6, 1961.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech by Mr. Jones entitled "Foreign Trade: An Opportunity and a Challenge," delivered before the National Paperboard Association in New York City on November 15, 1961.

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

FREE TRADE AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

(Address by Peter T. Jones, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Policy)

I am delighted to have an opportunity to come before this distinguished audience to discuss a subject close to every one of us. On behalf of Secretary Hodges, and all of us at Commerce, I want to thank you for your invitation and for your hospitality.

Since I arrived, I have become conscious of a curious paradox. In commerce and industry, the unhurried graciousness of the old plantation economy has given way to a zeal and an energy and a creativeness that has made the South one of America's fastest-growing and most exciting areas. But in your personal and human relationships, in your willingness to make a Yankee stranger feel welcome as a Smoky Mountain breeze in August, the Old South is still the Old South. This, I suppose, is what is meant by "Southern Comfort." To this Yankee, it is the happiest of paradoxes. I hope it never changes.

I said a moment ago that the subject of world trade is close to every one of us. I mean just that. I mean that world trade involves not only importers and exporters, but housewives and teachers and policemen. I mean that it involves us, and our children, and our children's children for generations to come. I mean that when we talk about world trade, we are talking not about profits and losses alone, but of the very survival of our economy and our vitality and our freedom. We are talking about the future of America.

In this part of our Nation, the vision and leadership of men and women like yourselves long ago caused an awakening to the challenges and the opportunities—of increased trade, both at home and abroad.

During the fifties, the Southern States recorded a phenomenal 95.5 percent increase in wages and salaries in manufacturing—the second highest increase in the Nation. In five of your States, manufacturing payrolls reached the billion-dollar mark. By 1960, you had more commercial and industrial establishments than any other section of the United States, yet your rate of business failure was the lowest. You added more than 3¼ million more taxpayers to the Federal rolls, attracted close to 2 million new readers for your newspapers, built hundreds of thousands of new homes, and assumed national leadership in a number of vital industries.

The carryover of this unprecedented growth is evident as we move into the sixties. During the first half of 1961, you produced nearly 90 percent of the Nation's supply of cotton broad-woven and manmade fiber fabrics, more than 80 percent of our tufted textile products, and close to half of all our woolen and worsted-woven goods.

Nor have you ignored the worldwide implications of your domestic growth. North Carolina, for example, climbed into fifth place in the Nation in rate of gain in export trade—34 percent in the first 8 months of 1961. Today, 12 Southern customs districts handle more than 25 percent of our country's total exports.

How have you accomplished this? You have done it by the same formula you used to attract hundreds of new industries to North Carolina. You have done it by a formula as old as America itself. You have done it by competing—in ideas, in facilities, in products, in salesmanship.

I think another remarkable example of this kind of forward-looking approach was your North Carolina World Trade Mission, back in 1959 and 1960. You may recall that a gentleman named Luther Hodges played some part in this exciting project, along with Voit Gilmore, who now heads our new U.S. Travel Service, J. Edgar Kirk, of Raleigh, and distinguished citizens of Charlotte like Mac Wasson, Col. Norman Pease, Edwin Jones, and many others.

The kind of spirit and imagination that sparked this operation also characterizes your aggressiveness in other trade areas—your North Carolina Trade Fair, for example, which President Kennedy had the pleasure of opening just this past October.

In the years immediately ahead, the South will be challenged as never before to use this same ingenuity, vision and resourcefulness to help maintain America's position of leadership in the free world and to improve America's competitive position in free markets.

The challenges to the resiliency of our business system come from many quarters. But perhaps the most potent lies in the economic alliance known as the European Common Market. But the Common Market is more than a challenge. It is an unparalleled opportunity for new and greater achievements for industry, and the attainment of new heights in the American standard of living, in the South and throughout the Nation.

The South can be a leader in this achievement. Its past record of growth and progress leaves no doubt that it can successfully match its brainpower, its manpower, and its sellingpower against businessmen anywhere. Its assets are infinite; they must be equalled by its determination.

What exactly is the challenge and opportunity of the Common Market? Let's look at the facts.

The Common Market today includes Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and its soon-to-be associate member, Greece—a total of roughly 170 million people.

Within the immediate future, it is likely that three additional nations may be admitted—England, Denmark, and Norway. Finally, there is the possibility that these nations' partners in the European Free Trade Association will also become Common Market associate members.

The Common Market would then embrace more than 300 million people—people who

last year alone purchased some $5½ billion worth of American products.

Today, the Common Market is the world's second largest producer of steel. Last year, its gross national product rose 6.5 percent, its industrial production was up 11 percent, and its external trade increased by 23 percent.

And the Common Market will continue to grow, with its gross national product expected to increase by 50 percent or more during the next 10 years.

At the same time, tariffs between the member nations have been reduced 30 percent—a year ahead of schedule—and eventually will be eliminated altogether.

Well, where does this leave the United States in its ability to do business in this huge marketplace?

Under present circumstances, the external tariff barriers of the Common Market—that is, the tariffs which Common Market member nations levy on the incoming goods of nonmember nations—make it increasingly difficult for the United States to compete effectively.

An American-made car, for example, could be exported to Germany prior to the Common Market at a duty of 17 percent. A French-made Dauphine would have paid the same amount. Today, the Dauphine pays 11.9 percent which will probably be reduced to 8.5 percent in 1962. The American car must now pay 18.86 percent, and eventually will have to pay 23.2 percent. This is a disadvantage hard to overcome.

A similar pattern could develop for many of the $5½ billion worth of American products now sold to Europe—a pattern whose net effect would be a shrinkage of American foreign commerce, a severe loss of jobs and profits, a serious blow to our position of leadership in the free world.

Yet we are in a position today to help prevent this. We can make it possible for the nations of the Common Market to welcome American-made products on a truly competitive basis by lowering their external tariff barriers.

We can do this by accepting their products on the same basis, that is by lowering our own barriers to their trade. Only in this way will our common market—50 States, 185 million people strong—be able to continue to do an expanding business with theirs, a business upon which many jobs and many enterprises absolutely depend.

The alternative is virtually to assure the success of the determined efforts of the Soviet-bloc nations to drive a divisive trade wedge between America and her allies.

To keep this from happening, we must cast off the prejudices of McKinley's America, and look for the modern meanings behind scare-word bugaboos like "high protective tariffs."

Just how protective are they? And to whom? At what cost to our national economy do we erect prohibitive tariff walls to shelter this industry or that from foreign competition if the result is to invite retaliation and thus exclude many other industries from lucrative markets abroad.

The answer is they often are not very protective because the cause of the problem frequently is not imports; they help relatively few and the national cost is enormous.

The obvious but too often forgotten fact about a reciprocal trade program is that it must be reciprocal to work.

The Common Market will lower its external tariff wall only if we are prepared to lower ours. It is a straight business deal. And we can lower ours only when we give President Kennedy the necessary new legislative authority to do so—which is why the President will send new trade legislation to Congress this coming year. When Congress passes the new trade act, the resulting gains will far outweigh the losses.

There are additional reasons for bringing down this Common Market trade barrier which affect our whole economy. Once we know the wall is going to come down, thereby assuring access for products made in the United States, we will stop exporting capital and jobs to Europe in order to get behind the tariff wall. If this happens we will have launched an attack on our balance of payments and unemployment problems simultaneously.

And if you don't think this flight of U.S. capital and jobs to Europe is of consequence, let's look at the record. In the last decade our capital investments in all Western Europe more than tripled and last year alone we invested more than $2,500 million of our private capital in the six Common Market countries. In the last 3 years over 800 American enterprises became active in some form in Western Europe.

Assuming we do receive the requisite tariff reducing authority, we must then ask whether the best method to negotiate with our European friends is to swap one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls, or to offer to trade layer for layer? Most Europeans are convinced that item by item reciprocal tariff reductions, the one brick at a time approach, no longer can achieve reductions which will substantially increase the flow of trade from the United States to Europe and vice versa. In part, they say this is so because the European and U.S. rates whose reductions are likely to increase trade substantially are so politically sensitive that it is extremely difficult if not impossible to obtain their lowering through conventional selective negotiations. They argue that only some form of across the board, layer by layer, reductions can make any real progress. This is especially true in view of the fact that each Common Market member would probably have a veto right over any particular concession under the one brick at a time formula. I might add that for much the same reasons an across-the-board approach is being used to lower the internal tariff.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk focused on the whole matter of the Common Market recently when speaking to an audience about its importance to our national interest. "It is crucially important," he said, "that the United States be in a position to negotiate for fullest possible access to the Common Market. Our present trade law does not provide enough leeway for negotiating with the European trade bloc, which last year emerged as the No. 1 U.S. export customer, surpassing Canada. The present law, which permits only superficial and sometimes self-defeating tariff cuts on only a handful of relatively unimportant trade items," he said, "requires us to act defensively and timidly when our true interests call for boldness."

Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, long an authority in the trade field, echoes this in calling the present law hopelessly inadequate to negotiate with the Common Market. He calls for authority to negotiate across-the-board cuts in the tariff and in order to be able to do so he urges a tightening up of the current law's escape clause, peril point, and other procedures which have impeded effective negotiations heretofore.

At the same time we must, and will, never forget that a freer and more flexible trade policy will not be without problems and hardships; it won't. We know that there are many business people—perhaps some of you right here—who are genuinely fearful of the effects upon your particular industry of competition from abroad. They, and you, should not be expected to bear the costs alone of a program which is so vital to the national interest.

Both the President and the Secretary of Commerce are very much aware of these problems. The Secretary has stressed on a number of occasions that the new trade act must contain proper safeguards for U.S. industry. And the President made it clear just yesterday in his speech before the National Association of Manufacturers that he intends to keep and improve those safeguards and to send to the Congress a proposal to permit industries seriously injured or threatened by increased imports to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government.

It is the President's conviction—and ours—that far more businessmen, workers, and farmers will gain direct and tangible benefit from a bold new trade policy than will experience any adverse effects from resulting foreign competition. We had $20 billion worth of U.S. exports last year supporting the statement I just made, while only $5 billion in imports competed with U.S.-made products, the other $10 billion of last year's imports being in commodities we don't produce at all or don't produce in sufficient quantity to create any serious competitive problems. Twenty billion dollars in job, business, farm supporting exports versus only $5 billion in competing imports. Far more jobs and more profits—it isn't Luckies 2 to 1, it's exports 4 to 1.

But what, we must ask, are the prospects of getting such legislation? Congressman BOGGS, who is well acquainted with the politics of foreign trade, says the chances are just as good for pushing through a bold new program as they are for trying to hold the line with the status quo. Essentially the same political forces will be at work. Nevertheless there are problems which can only be overcome by real effort.

There is a potential renaissance of protectionist strength evident today as indicated by the upturn in the number of protectionist bills, resolutions, hearings, and general activity in Congress, and, of considerable importance, the continuing problem of unemployment. As one lawmaker said recently, "Whatever may be the cause of unemployment, imports get the blame."

Protectionists in and out of Congress have been hard at work for the past year building their case against trade liberalization through hearings, advertisements, newspaper articles, etc. Their aim: not only to block any attempt to liberalize the trade legislation, but if possible to restrict it further.

For example, they will almost certainly put on a drive to make Tariff Commission decisions mandatory on the President; a power, incidentally, all six Tariff Commissioners unanimously testified in 1958 they did not want and should not have. This is because it is beyond their capacity or responsibility to weigh the many factors affecting the national interest which must be taken into account before a final decision on tariff relief can be made.

What then must be done, in view of this protectionist activity, to make sure that we have a new and more effective trade policy so vital to our national interests.

We believe that if the facts about the need for a new program are gotten to the American people and their representatives in Congress, they will come to realize fully what is at stake and the country's needs in this field will be taken care of.

This can be done and people such as yourselves can help immensely. The economic and business aspects of foreign trade, such as the opportunities of the Common Market, can be readily brought home to all Americans, including the ever-growing number of businessmen, farmers and workers whose own livelihoods are directly and increasingly affected by this activity. All it takes is some elbow grease.

What is less well understood, and still more important to the country and to the passage of the bill is the critical role trade plays in our Nation's foreign affairs.

The Communists understand this and thus have made foreign trade an integral part of their strategy for years. The analysis which

guides much of their action today was set forth by Joseph Stalin in October 1952 before the 19th Communist Party Congress. Although he has been downgraded, the analysis has not been and we can learn much about the important role of foreign trade in foreign affairs by examining it.

"The disintegration of a single world market," Stalin said, "must be considered the most important economic consequence of the Second World War. China and the satellite nations of Eastern Europe, have broken away from the capitalist system, forming with the Soviet Union a united and powerful camp opposing the camp of capitalism."

He maintained that as Britain, France, Germany, and Japan began competing with the United States and other non-Communist countries for the shrunken world market left to them, tensions within the more industrialized non-Communist nations would intensify.

As Japan, for example, sought to expand her markets in south Asia and elsewhere, Stalin said she would run headlong into the commercial interests of America, France, and Great Britain. "If Japan attempted to expand her sales in the United States itself, the threat of unemployment and loss of profit in American factories," he said, "would create pressure to raise tariffs to shut out Japanese goods, and bitterness between Japan and the United States would mount."

In the meantime, the rapidly expanding industrial power of the Soviet Union could be used to disrupt further the economic ties between the Atlantic nations and the underdeveloped middle world of Asia, Africa, and South America.

As to the importance of disrupting these ties, Stalin once said: "The backs of the British ultimately will be broken not on the Thames, but on the Yangtze, the Ganges, and the Nile."

By capturing the markets and raw materials of China, India, Egypt, and the other underdeveloped countries, by means of trade, aid, subversion, and open aggression, the Communists would seek to break the economic back of England and the rest of Europe which depend so heavily on the oil, rubber, metals, and markets of these turbulent areas. With the weakening or neutralization of Europe, the United States would stand little chance of escaping eventual Communist domination.

In view of the fact that the Yangtze is now in Chinese Communist hands, and the Nile can hardly be said to be freely and securely at the disposal of the free world, although by no means under Communist control, we would do well to keep this prophecy in mind.

This is particularly important because of the stepped up trade and aid offensive by the Communist bloc in the last few years.

Since about 1954, the policy of the Soviets has been to achieve political, cultural, and economic penetration of many countries, especially underdeveloped nations.

Let me cite a few facts and figures that the State Department released earlier this year.

From the start of 1954 through the end of last year, the Sino-Soviet bloc poured a total of $4.8 billion in credits and grants into 24 less-developed countries on four continents. Of the $4.8 billion, almost $3.6 billion was for economic, rather than military aid.

There has also been a marked upturn in Soviet trade with developing nations. Before 1954, the Soviet Union showed relatively little interest in building up trade with the less-developed countries. Since then it has eagerly made trade offers, both for imports and exports; has increased the number of its trade missions and its participation in trade fairs; and has mounted an intensive campaign to push through bilateral trade agreements with the developing nations. As of the end of last year, Soviet bloc nations had signed over 200 such agreements with 32 different countries.

Between 1954 and 1959, total trade of the Soviet bloc with less-developed countries shot up from $860 million to $2.3 billion, a gain of nearly 170 percent. Meantime, the trade of the U.S.S.R. alone with developing countries has climbed from a modest $215 million in 1954 to $810 million in 1959, or almost a 300-percent increase.

In 1960, the Sino-Soviet bloc accounted for more than 10 percent of the trade of Turkey, Finland, Iraq, Jordan, Sudan, Cambodia, and Uruguay. It accounted for more than 20 percent of the total trade of Iceland, Guinea, Iran, and Greece. And in Egypt, its share was more than 40 percent of the total, which compared with 15 percent in 1955.

Add to this financial assistance, some 6,500 Communist technicians now living and working in these areas as engineers, trade and financial advisers, and agricultural workers, and you have a formidable cold war weapon which the Soviets are not at all bashful about using. As Premier Khrushchev once said: "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes."

What is our answer to this? In overall terms it must be to pursue one simple and clear purpose. It is to further the growth and cohesion of the free world. For if we can strengthen and hold together the principal associations we have; and strengthen and encourage the uncommitted nations in their independent development and participation in an open economic and political world system, we will more than compensate in expanded economic activity for the prior loss of some markets to the Communists, we will reduce to manageable proportions the tensions that are bound to arise within the free world and we will be furthering our own positive goals as to the kind of world we wish to live in, while at the same time doing much to counter the Communist drive for world domination.

That growth is necessary to accomplish this is obvious. That cohesion is equally necessary may not be so obvious, but it is just as true. Benjamin Franklin's words apply now as they did then: "We must all hang together or we will surely hang separately."

Every specific policy ought to be tested against this overall purpose—does it contribute to the growth and cohesion of the free world? The lowering of trade barriers and the expansion of international trade clearly does; a retreat into a shell of protectionism clearly does not. As U.S. News & World Report said the other week one result of a move toward freer trade with Europe will be that Russia will be an "economic pigmy" compared to the U.S.-Common Market combination.

It is time for boldness. Secretary Hodges summed it up recently when he said:

"We are not afraid of competition. We welcome the increased opportunities for trade which have resulted from the revival of other industrial economies.

"We shall do all we can to prevent restrictive trade policies. Instead we shall seek to increase our exports, expand our markets, stimulate travel from the rest of the world to the United States, and attract foreign investment in our own country."

With a new and more effective extension of the reciprocal trade act we will be able to carry out this program. With your help this will be done. And remember, for more jobs and more profits "Buy Foreign Trade, It's Exports 4 to 1."

Foreign Trade: An Opportunity and a Challenge

(Address by Peter T. Jones, U.S. Department of Commerce)

We thought it might be of interest to you to know that the post of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade Policy, for which I have been designated, was created in the Department of Commerce for the first time this year because of Secretary Luther Hodges' firm belief that our Nation's reciprocal trade program and the signficant opportunities it presents for growth of the American economy, is vitally important to American business, as well as to the Nation as a whole.

To this end, the President has made it clear that he regards an effective extension of our reciprocal trade legislation as being in the highest national interest, and as he indicated at his press conference last Wednesday, final decisions on matters of timing and content of the legislation will be made in the next several weeks.

Even before these decisions, however, it is possible to begin to define what is meant by an effective extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

By an effective extension of the act we mean, in the broad sense, one which will enable us to make substantial strides toward the further reduction of trade barriers and the continuing expansion of international commerce. These two goals have been the overriding trade policy objectives of our two major political parties ever since the inception of the reciprocal trade program under Cordell Hull in 1934. They are objectives which both parties reaffirmed in their 1960 presidential platforms.

The Economic Advisory Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers also in effect endorsed these objectives in a recent report in saying:

"The prosperity of any one nation does not depend on the poverty of other nations. On the contrary, given sound economic practices, each nation's prosperity is promoted by the prosperity of other nations, since under such circumstances there are more opportunities for mutually advantageous trade among them. Economic growth in the rest of the world should open up new markets for American products which those countries could never afford before."

This same viewpoint is actively supported by important civic, farm, and labor groups as well.

At the same time, since our entire American community receives the benefits of this policy, its costs should not work an undue hardship on a few. This principle that the individual must not be unjustly sacrificed for the good of the community is deeply embedded in our western heritage. Thus, as Secretary Hodges reiterated again last week, the new extension of the trade act must contain proper safeguards for U.S. industry. In this connection, the President has said previously that he would "send to the Congress a proposal to permit industries, seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports, to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government." It is thought that a proposal of this sort may well be included in the administration's new trade program.

Further light can be shed on the general dimensions of what is required by examining one matter of great importance to all of us, including your own paperboard industry.

This is the European Common Market, now composed of Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and its associate member, Greece. Over 170 million people strong, and the world's second largest producer of steel, the Common Market last year increased its gross national product by 6.5 percent, its industrial production by 11

percent and its external trade by 23 percent. Within the coming decade, and probably sooner, this powerful economic entity plans to eliminate entirely its internal duties, that is, those duties which apply to the transactions of member nations with each other. Already tariffs between the six countries have been reduced by 30 percent—a year ahead of schedule—and they will be cut another 10 to 20 percent by the end of this year. Some authorities are willing to make the roughest guess that 70 to 80 percent of the internal tariff may be eliminated by the end of 1965.

In addition, there is the distinct possibility that England, Denmark and Norway—now members of the European Free Trade Association—will also join the Common Market; and that other members of this group, which also includes Austria, Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland, may work out an associate status along the lines now enjoyed by Finland. The Common Market would then embrace over 300 million people to whom last year alone we sold some $5,500 million worth of American products.

With continued growth a foregone conclusion, to the extent of a 50 percent or greater increase in gross national product by 1970, according to some authorities, the Common Market clearly presents American business with an enormous opportunity for expanded sales.

To take advantage of this opportunity there is one thing we must, and can, do. This is to make certain that each reduction in the internal duties does not in effect add another brick to the external tariff wall surrounding the Common Market which American businessmen, workers and farmers have to climb over before they can do business there. This could only happen if the Common Market external tariff—the tariff which applies to the rest of the world—remained unchanged while the internal tariff went down. Under such circumstances the tariff costs to an American trying to sell his products in Europe would increase relatively every time the internal tariff, which his European competitor pays, is lowered. This is why it is of such importance to have the Common Market external tariff reduced.

Look for a moment at its importance to your own industry whose production for export has jumped 425 percent since 1950 compared to a domestic increase during that time of 40 percent. Last year you sold about $72 million of paperboard to some 65 foreign countries. The largest single customer of your industry was the United Kingdom which alone bought over $22 million of U.S. paperboard. West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Belgium also were large purchasers and their consumption of paperboard is expected to increase markedly in the future.

Looking ahead we have seen that it is not at all unlikely that the United Kingdom and Denmark will soon be nestled comfortably behind the Common Market's external tariff wall with the 6 percent members. And along with them will probably be one or more of the Scandinavian countries, your chief competitors for Europe's paperboard business. These competitors will then be able to sell paperboard to all Common Market countries without contending with any duties, while we outsiders will have to continue to climb over the external tariff wall before we can do business—unless we persuade the Europeans to tear it down.

A portent of this future problem is seen in the present situation regarding the United Kingdom. On sales to England, Sweden, and Finland, two important paperboard exporters, today pay a 30 percent lower duty than do U.S. paperboard manufacturers because of the preferential tariff arrangement extended countries included in the European Free Trade Association. And the competitive disadvantage will get worse as these preferences increase, hitting our Kraft liner board sales to the United Kingdom very hard indeed.

The only answer is to bring down the external tariff wall so we can compete on equal footing with our European neighbors.

There are additional reasons for bringing down this trade barrier which affect our whole economy. Once we know the wall is going to come down, thereby assuring access for products made in the United States, we will stop exporting capital and jobs to Europe in order to get behind the tariff wall. If this happens we will have launched an attack on our balance of payments and unemployment problems simultaneously.

And if you don't think this flight of U.S. capital and jobs to Europe is of consequence, let's look at the record. In the last decade our capital investments in all Western Europe more than tripled and last year alone we invested more than $2,500 million of our private capital in the six Common Market countries. In the last 3 years over 800 American enterprises became active in some form in Western Europe.

But assuming the external tariff wall did come down, some of you may still be asking how can American business compete? Lower wages, lower transportation costs, strange methods of doing business and other uncertainties all prompt this question. One partial answer was given right here at this meeting just a year ago when Dr. James Gates, dean of the College of Business Administration at the University of Georgia said: "Innovation is the source of profits.

"They don't come from higher production; they come from producing things which are new, in getting into this temporary monopoly position—because they can come temporarily until everybody catches up; if you have a superior marketing kind of setup, and the like."

I am told your own industry has demonstrated the truth of this principle by taking over an increased share of the container business for transcontinental and other shipments of iced vegetables, etc., by adding resin materials to linerboard to toughen it and make it moistureproof. I am also told you feel that increased research and development expenditures for your industry would yield greater results along this line.

A more general answer to the question is that we can compete successfully here the same way we have always done—by becoming better in a thousand different ways. This includes becoming better in the field of statistical data so vital to future planning, and here's where your own National Paperboard Association comes in.

For example, in your annual report on "Statistics—Paperboard Industry," you show considerable detail on grades of paperboard produced for domestic use but include production for export in your "all other paperboard" category. Perhaps in the future you will want to expand your statistical breakdown to help your members take advantage of the growing importance of foreign markets.

We also can be of some assistance in this area. This past year, for example, in connection with the Commerce Department's export expansion program, our Forest Products Division reviewed with officials of your association the growing importance of foreign markets and the substantial potentials that exist for increasing paperboard exports in the years ahead.

Working in close cooperation with your association and at its request, the Forest Products Division undertook this summer a comprehensive "World Paperboard Supply-Demand Survey." With only limited facts now available concerning world trade in paperboard, this survey proposed to assemble, through the facilities of the U.S. Foreign Service, data on capacity, production, imports, exports, and apparent consumption by four major groups of paperboard. The data will cover actual figures for 1958–60 and projected figures for 1961–63. These basic statistics, coupled with supplemental information on industrial and social trends in each country, should point up the growing opportunities throughout the world for further enlarging the markets for paperboard produced in the United States. We believe that the results will be assembled and available to your industry sometime early this spring.

An informational survey of this type is really only the starting point. As individual manufacturers and exporters are awakened to the potentials that appear to exist, the Commerce Department services can supplement their own initiative in investigating markets, establishing oversea outlets, and selling their products.

And the general awakening doesn't have to await the results of the Commerce Department study either. We already have the projections of Western Europe's demand for paperboard, prepared by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which are enough to whet any appetite.

By 1965 Western Europe's consumption of paperboard will jump from the 1959 figure of 4,500,000 metric tons to about 6 million tons, and 10 years later in 1975 it is expected to be more than 8,500,000 tons.

It is clear foreign competition can be overcome with substantially increased profits the result. But once again, all this depends on first bringing down the Common Market's external tariff wall or our competitive disadvantage will be too great to overcome in many cases.

But how do we go about persuading our European friends to dismantle their tariff wall? First and foremost, we must be prepared to lower our own barriers to their trade or there will be no deal. This is the heart of the matter. Neither as politicians, statesmen, or businessmen are the Europeans going to give us something for nothing very long. If they did, the politicians would be voted out, the statesmen fired, and the businessmen sent to have their heads examined. Thus the new extension of our Trade Act would have to give the President authority to reduce our own tariffs substantially in order to permit us to negotiate effectively.

Assuming we do receive the requisite tariff-reducing authority, we must then ask whether the best method to negotiate is to swap one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls, or to offer to trade layer for layer? Most Europeans are convinced that item-by-item reciprocal tariff reductions, the one-brick-at-a-time approach, no longer can achieve reductions which will substantially increase the flow of trade from the United States to Europe and vice versa. In part, they say this is so because the European and U.S. rates whose reductions are likely to increase trade substantially are so politically sensitive that it is extremely difficult if not impossible to obtain their lowering through conventional selective negotiations. They argue that only some form of across-the-board, layer-by-layer reductions can make any real progress. This is especially true in view of the fact that each Common Market member would probably have a veto right over any particular concession under the one-brick-at-a-time formula. I might add that for much the same reasons an across-the-board approach is being used to lower the internal tariff.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk focused on the whole matter of the Common Market the other day when speaking to an audience about its importance to our national interest. "It is crucially important," he said, "that the United States be in a position to negotiate for fullest possible access to the

Common Market. Our present trade law does not provide enough leeway for negotiating with the European trade bloc, which last year emerged as the No. 1 U.S. export customer, surpassing Canada. The present law, which permits only superficial and sometimes self-defeating tariff cuts on only a handful of relatively unimportant trade items," he said, "requires us to act defensively and timidly when our true interests call for boldness."

Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, long an authority in the trade field, echoes this in calling the present law hopelessly inadequate to negotiate with the Common Market. He calls for authority to negotiate across-the-board cuts in the tariff, and in order to be able to do so he urges a tightening up of the current law's escape clause, peril point, and other procedures which have impeded effective negotiations heretofore.

But what, we must ask, are the prospects of getting such legislation? Congressman BOGGS who is well acquainted with the politics of foreign trade says the chances are just as good for pushing through a bold new program as they are for trying to hold the line with the status quo. Essentially the same political forces will be at work. Nevertheless there are problems which can only be overcome by real effort.

There is a potential renaissance of protectionist strength evident today as indicated by the upturn in the number of protectionist bills, resolutions, hearings, and general activity in Congress, and, of considerable importance, the continuing problem of unemployment. As one lawmaker said recently, "Whatever may be the cause of unemployment, imports get the blame."

Protectionists in and out of Congress have been hard at work for the past year building their case against trade liberalization through hearings, advertisements, newspaper articles, etc. Their aim: Not only to block any attempt to liberalize the trade legislation, but if possible to restrict it further. For example, they will almost certainly put on a drive to make Tariff Commission decisions mandatory on the President; a power, incidentally, all six Tariff Commissioners unanimously testified in 1958 they did not want and should not have. This is because it is beyond their capacity or responsibility to weigh the many factors affecting the national interest which must be taken into account before a final decision on tariff relief can be made.

What then must be done, in view of this protectionist activity, to make sure that we have a new and more effective trade policy so vital to our national interests?

We believe that if the facts about the need for a new trade program are gotten to the American people and their representatives in Congress, they will come to realize fully what is at stake and the country's needs in this field will be taken care of.

This can be done and people such as yourselves can help immensely. The economic and business aspects of foreign trade, such as the opportunities of the Common Market, can readily be brought home to all Americans, including the ever-growing number of businessmen, farmers and workers whose own livelihoods are directly and increasingly affected by this activity. All it takes is some elbow grease.

What is less well understood, and still more important to the country and to the passage of the bill, is the critical role trade plays in our Nation's foreign affairs.

The Communists understand this and thus have made foreign trade an integral part of their strategy for years. The analysis which guides much of their action today was set forth by Joseph Stalin in October 1952 before the 19th Communist Party Congress. Although he has been downgraded, the analysis has not been and we can learn much about the important role of foreign trade in foreign affairs by examining it.

"The disintegration of a single world market," Stalin said, "must be considered the most important economic consequence of the Second World War. China and the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have broken away from the capitalist system, forming with the Soviet Union a united and powerful camp opposing the camp of capitalism."

He maintained that as Britain, France, Germany and Japan began competing with the United States and other non-Communist countries for the shrunken world market left to them, tensions within the more industrialized non-Communist nations would intensify.

As Japan, for example, sought to expand her markets in south Asia and elsewhere, Stalin said she would run headlong into the commercial interests of America, France and Great Britain. If Japan attempted to expand her sales in the United States itself, the threat of unemployment and loss of profit in American factories, he said, would create pressure to raise tariffs to shut out Japanese goods, and bitterness between Japan and the United States would mount.

In the meantime, the rapidly expanding industrial power of the Soviet Union could be used to disrupt further the economic ties between the Atlantic nations and the underdeveloped middle world of Asia, Africa, and South America.

As to the importance of disrupting these ties, Stalin once said: "The backs of the British ultimately will be broken not on the Thames, but on the Yangtze, the Ganges, and the Nile."

By capturing the markets and raw materials of China, India, Egypt and the other underdeveloped countries, by means of trade, aid, subversion and open aggression, the Communists would seek to break the economic back of England and the rest of Europe which depend so heavily on the oil, rubber, metals and markets of these turbulent areas. With the weakening or neutralization of Europe, the United States would stand little chance of escaping eventual Communist domination.

In view of the fact that the Yangtze is now in Chinese Communist hands, and the Nile can hardly be said to be freely and securely at the disposal of the free world, although by no means under Communist control, we would do well to keep this prophesy in mind.

This is particularly important because of the stepped-up trade and aid offensive by the Communist bloc in the last few years.

Since about 1954, the policy of the Soviets has been to achieve political, cultural, and economic penetration of many countries, especially underdeveloped nations. Let me cite a few facts and figures that the State Department released earlier this year.

From the start of 1954 through the end of last year, the Sino-Soviet bloc poured a total of $4.8 billion in credits and grants into 24 less-developed countries on four continents. Of the $4.8 billion, almost $3.6 billion was for economic, rather than military aid.

There has also been a marked upturn in Soviet trade with developing nations. Before 1954, the Soviet Union showed relatively little interest in building up trade with the less-developed countries. Since then it has eagerly made trade offers, both for imports and exports; has increased the number of its trade missions and its participation in trade fairs; and has mounted an intensive campaign to push through bilateral trade agreements with the developing nations. As of the end of last year, Soviet bloc nations had signed over 200 such agreements with 32 different countries.

Between 1954 and 1959, total trade of the Soviet bloc with less-developed countries shot up from $860 million to $2.3 billion, a gain of nearly 170 percent. Meantime, the trade of the U.S.S.R. alone with developing countries has climbed from a modest $215 million in 1954 to $810 million in 1959, or almost a 300 percent increase.

In 1960, the Sino-Soviet bloc accounted for more than 10 percent of the trade of Turkey, Finland, Iraq, Jordan, Sudan, Cambodia, and Uruguay. It accounted for more than 20 percent of the total trade of Iceland, Guinea, Iran, and Greece. And in Egypt, its share was more than 40 percent of the total, which compared with 15 percent in 1955.

Add to this financial assistance, some 6,500 Communist technicians now living and working in these areas as engineers, trade and financial advisors, and agricultural workers, and you have a formidable cold war weapon which the Soviets are not at all bashful about using. As Premier Khrushchev once said: "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes."

What is our answer to this? In overall terms it must be to pursue one simple and clear purpose. It is to further the growth and cohesion of the free world. For if we can strengthen and hold together the principal associations we have; and strengthen and encourage the uncommitted nations in their independent development and participation in an open economic and political world system, we will more than compensate in expanded economic activity for the prior loss of some markets to the Communists, we will reduce to manageable proportions the tensions that are bound to arise within the free world and we will be furthering our own positive goals as to the kind of world we wish to live in, while at the same time doing much to counter the Communist drive for world domination.

That growth is necessary to accomplish that is obvious. That cohesion is equally necessary may not be so obvious, but it is just as true.

Benjamin Franklin's words apply now as they did then: "We must all hang together or we will surely hang separately."

Every specific policy ought to be tested against this overall purpose—does it contribute to the growth and cohesion of the free world? The lowering of trade barriers and the expansion of international trade clearly does; a retreat into a shell of protectionism clearly does not. As U.S. News & World Report said the other week one result of a move toward freer trade with Europe will be that Russia will be an "economic pigmy" compared to the U.S.-Common Market combination.

It is a time for boldness. Secretary Hodges summed it up recently when he said:

"We are not afraid of competition. We welcome the increased opportunities for trade which have resulted from the revival of other industrial economies.

"We shall do all we can to prevent restrictive trade policies. Instead we shall seek to increase our exports, expand our markets, stimulate travel from the rest of the world to the United States and attract foreign investment in our own country."

With a new and more effective extension of the reciprocal trade act we will be able to carry out this program. With your help this will be done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to have these speeches in the RECORD at this point as a preface to the very short comment I wish to make on the President's trade program.

I was so favorably impressed with the analysis of the President's trade program presented by Mr. Jones that I have asked him to make himself available for an informal, unofficial coffee hour meeting with members of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I extend an in-

vitation to all Members of the Senate—who may wish to gather some afternoon at 4:30 in the Foreign Relations room in the Capitol to listen to Mr. Jones present the same analysis I heard him present to the college editors last Sunday and to subject himself to our questions.

Mr. President, this is one of the most important legislative issues which will confront us in this session of Congress. I emphasize that it should be approached, I care not what the party alinement of any Senator is, in a nonpartisan manner. We are all in the same boat so far as the economic future of the United States is concerned. The problem which confronts us is to try to find what are the facts and what the legislative course of action ought to be in the light of those facts, to best protect the greatest and most important security weapon we have for our battle in the years ahead against the threat of communism. That security weapon is the economy of this country.

It should not take any argument, but ought to be a matter of judicial notice, that the strength of America in the contest between economic freedom and economic totalitarianism is the economy of America. This is the contest, when all is said and done, between political freedom and communism. That contest will be resolved in our favor only if we keep the economy of economic and political freedom strong.

I should think we also ought to be able to take judicial notice of another fact, which is that we can no more live in the world of today as economic isolationists than we can live in the world of today as diplomatic isolationists.

I hold to the view that economic, diplomatic, military, and political isolationism is gone forever if America is to survive forever. But if we seek to resuscitate economic isolationism as a part of a great political grand strategy on the part of partisans in the United States, we shall do the work of the Communists for them. Of that I am convinced.

In my judgment, the goal and objective of the President's trade program are sound. As legislators our problem, so clearly brought out by Mr. Jones in his discussion last Sunday, is to determine what courses of action we need to take that will make it possible for the free economy of the United States to compete successfully with the Common Market of Europe.

We shall have to determine also what courses of action will successfully compete with another common market that is on the horizon and is coming fast. That is the common market of Latin America. We must consider competing with another common market, with only a few years to go, for which we must plan now, and in regard to which the legislation that we pass this year could pave the way for successful competition, and that is the common market of southeast Asia. In the foreseeable future—and already talk of it has started—we must consider a common market of Africa.

To the extremists on the right I say that, "I will be no party to your aiding the extremists on the left."

I know that a specific case of disjointure, hardship and injury which might be caused to some segment of the American economy could be used to whip up a political storm, and the instigator might receive the plaudits of those who want us to vote against the President's program. But I forewarn that yielding to that temptation would do great damage to the future strength of the economy of this country.

Let me make it clear that what I have said does not mean that the senior Senator from Oregon will not insist upon a careful appraisal of each segment of the economy that may suffer great disjointure or injury through the adoption of the overall trade program recommended by the President. But I would have all keep in mind what the President has said. The President has made very clear that he wants to know what the effect of his trade program will be on each segment of the American economy. He has made perfectly clear, both in his public statements—and I betray no secret when I say in his conferences—that he does not sit in the White House to liquidate the American economy, but that he firmly believes that the policy he is following will strengthen the American economy.

I shall undoubtedly propose, in connection with some of the segments of our economy, definite Government programs of aid and assistance that will take up the shock of any damage to any part of the economy until sufficient time has elapsed for the economic readjustment necessary to provide either a competitive equality with foreign trade with regard to a particular item or a subsidy to the particular business—which would be a wise expenditure of defense dollars—or a retraining or relocation of the personnel into other jobs, with assistance to management to transfer into other production.

But I shall not lose sight of the overall goal of the President of the United States in regard to the proposed trade program. My mind is open for an evaluation of such facts as will be presented in the historic debate that will occur on this subject; and in keeping with my desire to find out what the facts are, I have made the announcement this afternoon that I have invited Mr. Jones to come to the Foreign Relations Committee room at a date to be announced later to brief us and discuss with us some of the problems that he raised last Sunday at the Overseas Press Club.

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 (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I discuss the capital punishment issue next week, I shall give some attention to the matter of the pardon power, particularly with respect to the pardon power of the President of the United States which, I wish the RECORD to show, cannot be taken away from the President by any legislative act of Congress. I sought not to give that impression when I discussed pardon policy this afternoon. I am talking about the power of the State legislatures in respect to pardon, subject, of course, to one exception, and that is if a pardon power is in such a constitutional form in a State constitution which would require a constitutional amendment by the State to limit in any way the exercise of the Governor's pardon power, then my position is that such constitutional amendment should be adopted.

The controlling feature of my amendment, as will be seen from a reading of it—is that I seek as a matter of law, and which can be done by statute, to deny one sentenced to life imprisonment any right to parole thereafter.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on January 12, 1962, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture James T. Ralph, addressed the Kansas Agricultural Convention in Topeka, Kans. He spoke on the subject of self-regulation as a principle basic to our democratic system and he urged that this principle be given greater play in the economic order of agriculture.

Dr. Ralph presents this thesis simply, yet persuasively. In the course of his speech he asks us to recall the elements which make up our economic order, and in so doing, he makes us, once again appreciate the brilliance of those who molded our free economic system with the tools of political democracy to create the regulated capitalism which, by any test, meets in better fashion the needs, desires, and aspirations of our citizens.

Mr. President, I think that there is one point, and I now speak in a jocular vein, concerning Dr. Ralph which the Senate will find of interest. Like most of the New Frontier farmers in the Department he is a very hardworking man. I rather suspect that Secretary Freeman has set a pattern which permeates all of his agencies in this regard, but I can testify from personal observation that when Dr. Ralph visited my State last November he was working with our mint people, our fescue people and our poultry people not only on weekends but on a weekend, Veterans' Day, which included a national holiday.

In all seriousness I do wish to pay tribute on behalf of the farmers in my State for the help which Dr. Ralph has been to them in connection with the manifold activities of the Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech entitled "Equality for Agriculture," to which I have alluded, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE

(Address by Dr. James T. Ralph, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, before the Kansas Agricultural Convention, Topeka, Kans., January 12, 1962)

We Americans enjoy a system of regulated capitalism. The role of Government in this system of regulated capitalism is to equate the balance of strength between economic groups; to be certain that no one group has enough power to unfairly treat another one; to create a climate in which all groups may share in the bounty made possible by our system; to preserve the principles which make the system workable—private enterprise with competition and widespread ownership of private property.

Said another way the role of Government is to protect the rights of the economically weak, to preserve their hope that by hard work they too can improve themselves and become bigger in an economic sense. Many of our institutions are designed just for this purpose: To maintain hope among the great mass of our people that they can improve themselves under our system of regulated capitalism.

Most notable of these is our public education system. Every person is offered a minimum level of education to better equip him or her for the economic struggle for improvement of position. This is the economic rationale of our entire welfare program—to raise these people high enough to latch onto the ladder of hope—to renew their confidence that they may improve themselves by hard work. To rehabilitate people in a capitalistic society is really to reestablish incentive, give them the means to work but more important give them the purpose, the hope that by working they can improve themselves. Our unemployment compensation insurance is designed to correct one of the weaknesses of a highly organized private enterprise economy. That is, unemployment. With unemployment compensation we assist people to maintain their dignity and their status until they again can be employed so that hope is not lost. All of these things serve to maintain a belief in our system. Although we know our system is the most productive for all of our people, individuals may lose hope and belief in the system as a result of their individual circumstances.

THE REASON OUR SYSTEM WORKS

Private enterprise expands production by encouraging individual initiative. The profit incentive leads to efficient production. Widespread ownership insures the participation of a greater number of our people in the entrepreneural function. Even if ownership is not in productive facilities, widespread ownership insures a greater respect for private property and consumers enjoy fully the benefits of private enterprise. Much of our regulation of industry is designed either to maintain competition within business or to preserve the principle of widespread ownership. Without the profit incentive private enterprise would be less efficient. Without widespread entrepreneurship, understanding of the system would be less prevalent. Without the widespread ownership of property itself, respect for private property would not exist. These points are understood by many but what is not so well understood is that the system would not work if there were no regulations to preserve these principles.

SUPERIORITY OF THE AMERICAN CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM

Communism maintains that the State can best organize productive facilities to avoid economic waste and that the State is better qualified to decide what each individual should have. Capitalism maintains that if every man is allowed to pursue his own selfish interest he will produce more goods for the good of all, and further, that with private enterprise production will be more efficient. However, there is a strong tendency under unregulated capitalism for all property to agglomerate into the hands of a few people.

Communists and Socialists overlook or ignore the possibility that under Democratic Government regulatory measures may be instituted to preserve competition and to protect the principle of widespread ownership. Early proponents of capitalism recognized this could be done and advised that it should be done. They knew that for capitalism to work the principle of widespread ownership must be preserved. The hope of the masses that they, too, could improve themselves by hard work must be maintained. This has been done in America. Regulated capitalism in America has proven itself. It is the best economic system man has ever devised.

IMPORTANCE OF THE EFFICIENT COMMERCIAL FAMILY FARM

The efficient commercial family farm is the outstanding example of widespread ownership of productive resources in our country. The farm owner and manager is our best example of widespread entrepreneurship. It also illustrates well the central theme of capitalism that every man pursuing his own selfish interest will produce more goods for the good of society. Certainly our family farm system has proven that it can produce more foods and fibers than any other known or tested organization for agricultural production. Because of the close connection between the family farm and the principles which have made our society so productive the family farm should be protected. The family farm is important not only because of its efficient productive tendencies but because of the social effects of having so many thousands of capitalists scattered all over our country.

TWO TYPES OF REGULATIONS

Whenever we speak of regulated capitalism most people automatically think of direct Government regulation. It is too often overlooked that one of the chief stabilizers of our economy is Government authorized self-regulation. Regulation that is organized and run by members of a business or profession itself exercising a privilege granted by law.

DIRECT REGULATION

Our antitrust laws are among the best examples of direct Government regulation. Through these laws we prevent the encroachment of the strong upon the weak. We maintain competition by avoiding excessive mergers and we prevent the excessive agglomeration of economic power into the hands of a few. By Government allocation of air routes excessive and wasteful competition is prevented. The companies which are granted airlines are given a situation with a reasonable expectation of profit. Another example of direct regulation is ratemaking for public utilities such as gas or electric companies or railroads. Such ratemaking prevents persons who have been granted a monopolistic position from unduly harming the interest of others.

One of the most regulated industries in the country is the banking industry. In banking the Government not onl regulates the supply of the service sold—credit—but the Government also administers a minimum price for this service. It is interesting at times for a student of agriculture to observe bankers criticizing price supports for farmers. It is almost comical to see those who benefit from an industry with administered prices as well as administered production criticizing the administered minimum prices for a few commodities in agriculture. We might even suggest that there is such a thing as licensing in the banking industry in addition to the administration of supply and price. Licensing is, of course, a further means of restricting entry into a profession.

Interesting enough this bastion of private enterprise, the banking industry, is run well. It works well. It serves the public interest. And it is doing a good job in serving the public interest. Certainly if Government regulation was harmful the banking industry would have been dead long ago because it is the most regulated industry of any I can think of.

GOVERNMENT AUTHORIZED SELF-REGULATION

A form of regulation which is most effective, especially for those who are participating, is indirect regulation. In the case of self-regulation of an industry or profession under particular laws, it is too often overlooked that this type of regulation represents a privilege granted by Government. A good example of self-regulation is the medical profession. By their system of standards, examinations and licensing, the medical profession has been allowed to self-regulate itself for many years by setting high standards to limit entry into the trade. By a code of ethics they regulate how a person may practice and by the practice of licensing they operate a check on all those who would practice their profession. At the same time this quality control, of course, increases confidence in our great medical profession and encourages us to make greater use of their services. Supply management by means of quality regulation has been very effective in this profession. Over the last 30 or 40 years the percentage of doctors among our people has varied very little. As a matter of fact the number has ranged from 125 per 100,000 in 1930 to 132 per 100,000 in 1960. If farmers were authorized to regulate supply in this manner they would have little difficulty in maintaining their income or price position.

The legal profession also has a means of self-regulation. Through the institution of the bar examination they are able to maintain high standards for their profession and at the same time limit entry into the trade. Such quality regulation, of course, increases the income that is possible for lawyers to earn and strengthen public confidence in the legal profession.

In many States our barbers and other tradesmen have been given the privilege of setting standards, rates, and requiring a license of anyone who wishes to practice the trade.

Even the self-regulation of many of our basic manufacturing industries is made possible through privileges granted by Government. The formation of a corporation is a privilege granted by law. Certainly if we did not have the institution of corporations the organizers of industry would be unable to amass the capital necessary to operate the large-scale firms which dominate most of our basic manufacturing industries.

The Securities and Exchange Commission type of regulation strengthens public confidence in and bolsters the institution of corporations. By Government regulation of the sale of stocks and bonds investors spread wide over our country are given the necessary confidence to invest in ownership of a corporation whose plants are distant from them and whose managers and officers they do not know. Thus, the self-regulation of our basic industries by a few large firms is made possible by Government.

EQUAL PRIVILEGES FOR AGRICULTURE

A few basic commodities in agriculture have been publicized a great deal. The majority of farmers have not until recently had available to them any means of self-regulation. Farmers should have the same privileges of self-regulation made possible for them that have been made possible for other industries and professions. At the same time, this should be a means of self-

regulation which preserves the valuable institutions existing within agriculture. Some years ago the Congress offered farmers the privilege of forming cooperatives through the Capper-Volstead Cooperative Marketing Act of 1922. At that time it was thought this would be an effective means of self-regulation.

However, due to the widespread nature of production in agriculture and the existence of so many hundreds of different entrepreneurs in any one commodity, it has been impossible for voluntary cooperatives to organize a sufficient number of producers of any one commodity to have the same type of effect over the supply or price as is exercised by people in other industries and professions.

Some may suggest that if aluminum producers and steel producers who are also basic manufacturers can organize together into a small number of corporations, why don't farmers do the same thing. This is possible but not probable. It overlooks a basic characteristic of agricultural production. Until the Agricultural Act of 1961 was passed only a very few of America's farm producers were eligible for programs of self-regulation. This act has added for the first time an additional 90 or so commodities which may develop programs of self-regulation having the economic effect similar to the self-regulation authorized for other people.

Someone may ask the question: Why can't agriculture organize itself into a few corporations such as other basic industries have done and then not rely on the Government for any form of regulation? There are two reasons why this is either difficult or undesirable. First, the natural resources available for the production of any agricultural commodity are far more widespread than the resources necessary for the production of such products as steel and aluminium. While the number of sources of high grade iron ore or bauxite are so limited that a few firms can readily gain control of these known sources the resources available for production of an agricultural product are widespread over practically the entire country.

Let us take avocados for example. This is an agricultural product that can only be produced in a limited number of areas where the soil and climate are suitable. Yet, even today, if the price of avocados was guaranteed at any reasonable level there is at least 10 times as much land readily available to be put in production of this restricted product as is now being used. The point is, for any small group of private firms to control the production of any agricultural commodity they would have to control every acre of land in America that could be put into production of that product.

But there is an even more compelling reason why most of us would not like to see self-regulation of agricultural production through a small number of private corporations. That is, that food is far more important to the day-to-day needs of our people than steel or aluminum. Food is something that must be purchased and consumed regularly. The supply of food must be readily available. We want that our people should have adequate quantities of food at a reasonable price. If self-regulation is authorized for agriculture many of us think it far better to be a form of self-regulation where the Government has some power to veto decisions that may harm the public interest.

A means for agriculture to self-regulate itself with self-determined programs developed by the industry, but with a public official having veto power in order to protect the public interest, is available through marketing orders and agreements.

GIVING FARMERS EQUALITY OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR SELF-REGULATION

A marketing order may be defined as a legal document which sets the limits within which an agriculture commodity group may self-regulate itself. Marketing orders are always initiated by the industry concerned. They are always designed by an industry committee and for 25 years they have been administered by industry nominated boards of producers and handlers.

But in the broader context a marketing order is an institution that may be compared with the self-regulation of the medical profession, the self-regulation of the legal profession, or self-regulation of our other basic industries. This sort of an institution is in keeping with the American tradition.

One proponent of the national turkey marketing order, as proposed, has compared marketing orders with our form of government itself. He would say that the marketing order compares with our Constitution; the advisory board with our Congress. An advisory board may make regulations under the marketing order just as the Congress may pass laws in conformity with our Constitution. Just as the President has veto power over laws proposed and passed by the Congress, the Secretary would have veto power over regulations proposed or passed by an advisory board.

There is an essential difference here. The Secretary of Agriculture having all the legal power has an absolute veto over the proposals of an advisory board, while a Presidential veto of an act of Congress may be overridden. The Secretary's veto, we believe, is justified because a marketing order board is representative only of the interested groups within an industry and not representative of the public as a whole.

EXAMPLES OF UNREGULATED CAPITALISM

Our system has been described as one of regulated capitalism. I have stated that it is by far the best economic system the world has yet seen organized. As an economic system it also contributes greatly to social values by cultivating individual responsibility, individual initiative, and by giving pride and dignity to the citizens as a whole that they are working to take care of themselves. We all agree that this system contains the methods for gradual progress and thus is vastly superior to any system of communism or socialism. It is also helpful to compare our system of regulated capitalism with unregulated capitalism.

We have several examples in the world of capitalism which were unregulated. We have only to look at some countries in Africa, Asia, and South America to see a form of capitalism which did not have the democratic regulation that is existing in America, Canada, and Western Europe. We can see in some of those it is obvious that all property has agglomerated into the hands of the few. We do not see the regulation to preserve competition nor do we see the democratic institutions to maintain the hope of the masses. In most of those countries a few people have taken over all the property and the great masses of the people have lost the hope that they can improve themselves through hard work. They did not establish early a broad system of public education to prepare people to compete in a capitalistic economy. They did not ordain the institution of family farms which have contributed greatly to our economic development. Many of their social measures have been designed to alleviate poverty rather than to correct its causes. In short, in countries where capitalism has not been regulated it has not worked as well as it has in our country.

Sometimes one is caused to think that if the people we send abroad could explain our capitalism as it is and could show how democratic government has regulated capitalism to maintain the principles of widespread ownership, then they would be able to encourage hope in the great mass of people to provide equality of economic opportunity. Certainly, people of those countries would then want to adopt a system similar to ours rather than going to the extremes of socialism or communism.

Individual initiative and the profit incentives are great instigators to bring forth high levels of production. I sometimes wonder if our people who go abroad make the mistake of trying to sell our system along the classical economic theory that we have never lived under.

Since our country was first started we have had regulated capitalism. The subsidization of railroads and turnpikes and canals was a governmental means of promoting enterprise and pushing industry. The granting of free lands to veterans in the homestead laws was designed to promote widespread ownership of property. Our early tariffs were designed to protect industry. Government in America has been acting to regulate business to maintain equality of economic power between the various segments since 1789. I submit to you that this is why our capitalism has worked while capitalism in other countries has not worked so well.

GIVE FARMERS PRIVILEGES OTHERS HAVE

Our program and our policy has been to ask Congress to make available to all commodity groups in agriculture the right of self-determination which has been enjoyed by many professions and industries for many years. We are not promoting programs for particular commodities, but we are promoting the idea that all commodities be afforded the right to set up their own regulatory program if they wish to have one. We believe that if industry-nominated committees can design stabilization programs they will be well constructed. We believe that if an industry-nominated board is allowed to administer a program it will be well run.

We believe that if the industry is required to pay the cost of its stabilization operations, these measures will be judicious. And we believe that when the Secretary has the veto power over the actions of a board the public interest will be protected. We submit that a great part of the reason that farmers have been forced to look to Government for direct means of regulation to protect prices and incomes is that farmers have not been given the equal opportunity for self-regulation with other people.

Proper self-regulation in different industries takes different forms. We want to see made available to farmers a means of self-regulation which allows them to protect our time-honored institution of the family farm.

We believe this to be in the best interests of farm people. We believe it is in the best interests of our system of regulated capitalism and private enterprise. We, therefore, believe it is in the best interests of our American way of life and our system of self-government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter and an attached resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oregon relating to the subject be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF OREGON,
Portland, Oreg., January 15, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Yesterday afternoon at the executive committee meeting we discussed the enclosed resolution and passed it unanimously. Many local farm groups and leaders are very concerned by two things in regard to a potential change in agricultural policy.

First is the apparent lack of emphasis given to the title IA approach in the state of the Union message. Many of our local farm groups see in title IA the first real

chance that producers have to design a program to fit their real needs on a continuing basis.

The second problem arises from reports that the title IA approach is in substantial jeopardy.

The reason that the executive committee acted, rather than waiting for the full State convention in March, is the proximity of the President's special message on agriculture. We understand that the first draft of that speech tends to reduce the importance of the title IA approach. If this is true, and the administration does not stand firmly behind title IA, we fear that Mr. Cooley's opposition may destroy it.

You will notice that the second part of the resolution deals with personnel rather than theory. The reason is that Dr. James Ralph, who originally comes from California, is the stanchest defender of title IA and has been a very great help to our people in approaching the Department for title IA assistance. We feel that he deserves any backing or help that you can give him.

We would appreciate anything that you can do to influence the executive department to maintain and, if possible, expand the application of title IA.

Sincerely,

E. D. SPENCER,
State Chairman.

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF OREGON, JANUARY 14, 1962

Whereas the health of agriculture is of extreme importance to the economy of Oregon; and

Whereas title IA of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961 is a great step toward the sound and continuing solution of the agricultural problems of the United States and particularly of Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oregon, That President John F. Kennedy is respectfully urged to promote most strongly the following concepts in regard to agriculture:

1. That title IA of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961 be utilized as widely as possible in order that producers, who are those most directly affected by depressed agricultural markets, may have a strong and direct voice in proposing solutions to the problems of their respective commodities;

2. That the expanded availability of marketing orders, developed, administered, and paid for by producers, is a vital part of the change in approach to agricultural problems which is expressed in the 1961 act;

3. That where they are applicable, and desired by producers, marketing orders offer the best continuing solution to the problems of many individual commodities;

4. That the power of the Secretary to protect the interests of consumers under a marketing order is essential to the fair resolution of agricultural problems; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oregon commends Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on the high quality of his appointments, particularly the appointment of Under Secretary Charles Murphy and Assistant Secretaries John Duncan, John Welch, and James Ralph.

We further commend Secretary Freeman and Assistant Secretary Ralph for the excellent work done by Assistant Secretary Ralph during his trip to Oregon on the weekend of November 10 through 13, made at the request of grower groups, during which he assisted groups of growers of more than 15 commodities to work on self-help stabilization plans for their commodities.

RESOLUTION FAVORING PRESENT NATIONAL FARM POLICIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution recently adopted by the Riverview Farmers Union No. 113, of Scio, Oreg. This organization, which represents many of the farmers of the area, commends the excellent work of Secretary Freeman and his associates. It is a heartening thing, in my judgment, when such organizations composed of grassroot farmers find themselves in a position to commend the work being carried on through the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have alluded be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION FAVORING PRESENT NATIONAL FARM POLICIES

Whereas the Kennedy administration's Agriculture Department, under the direction of Secretary Orville Freeman, has brought about an upturn in farm income and a downturn in costly grain surpluses; and

Whereas the 1961 Farm Act has broadened the list of commodities eligible to use Federal marketing orders as a supply-control device; and

Whereas farm credit laws have been streamlined and the food-for-peace program extended: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Riverview Farmers Union No. 113 place in their records written approval of the present administration's efforts to increase economic equality for the Nation's farmers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Secretary Freeman, each of our Senators and Representatives, and to our Oregon-Washington Farmers Union and National Farmers Union headquarters.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there is at present pending before the Senate Committee on Armed Services a proposed reorganization of the Department of the Army. The Secretary of the Army, when he testified before that committee, and the report transmitted to the Congress on the reorganization indicated that this was primarily a reorganization involving the simplification of command responsibilities and improvement of top management efficiency.

Employees at the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command in Detroit and the entire Detroit community have been disturbed by persistent rumors that a part of this reorganization plan involved the impending transfer of a large number of positions and functions at OTAC out of the Detroit area. The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and I, along with other members of the Michigan delegation, have sought assurances from the Secretary of the Army and Department of Defense officials that this was not a part of the plan nor were these rumored substantial shifts of employment contemplated in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which Senator McNAMARA and I issued on February 13; a statement issued by the Department of Defense to the press on that date, and a letter which Senator McNAMARA and I have addressed to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] chairman of the Armed Services Committee. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a series of letters and telegrams I have received from individuals, companies, and employee groups in the Detroit area expressing their concern over the reported reorganization.

Similar expressions of concern have been received by other members of the Michigan delegation.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATORS MCNAMARA AND HART

We have been assured by the highest authorities of the Defense Department that the Army contemplates no significant movement of jobs or work from its Detroit Tank-Automotive Command.

We have been informed that the only possible changes in the foreseeable future would be the reassignment of titles and command responsibilities but no physical movement of OTAC operations.

The proposed Army reorganization plan submitted to Congress suggests, among other things, that the responsibilities of OTAC be assigned to a newly created Army weapons and mobility command.

According to the report, this would help provide the Army with the "flexibility essential to meet rapidly changing technological developments." We are told this could well mean movement of additional work into Detroit rather than out of it.

Included with the report are a series of working-paper charts which show how the various reorganization proposals might be implemented.

One such chart, clearly labeled "Concept of Weapons and Mobility Command," implies that command responsibility for tracked vehicles, which now rests with OTAC, might be shifted to Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.

It is this chart that apparently gave rise to rumors that actual jobs would be moved from Detroit to Rock Island.

However, this definitely is not what is intended, according to the strongest assurances from the Army and the Defense Department. In fact, we are given to understand that the chart is erroneous.

In any event, the chart simply is a concept of how command responsibilities might be assigned; it has not been studied and approved by top officials of the Army and the Defense Department; its attachment to the reorganization report does not mean it is adopted along with the report.

We have been aware of these proposals for some time. We, too, were concerned. But, as a result of our initial inquiries, we were verbally assured that the employees of OTAC had no cause for concern.

However, as rumors began to spread in the Detroit area, we decided it would be helpful to have further assurances so that there could be no question.

Thus, last week the Michigan Democratic congressional delegation jointly addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense asking for clarification. This resulted in reaffirmation of Army's intentions.

STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FEBRUARY 13, 1962

The current Army reorganization plan visualizes that the existing, as well as the planned facilities at OTAC, will be fully utilized—specifically the production of M–60 tanks will continue to be performed at the Detroit Arsenal.

If at some future date it is determined that certain activities are to be relocated from the Detroit area, such action will be offset by the transfer of other activities into the area.

There can be no doubt that the Detroit area, long known as the arsenal of democracy, will continue as a major contributor for the national defense effort as it has in the past.

FEBRUARY 14, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed Army reorganization plan submitted to the Congress, which is pending before your Senate Armed Services Committee, has been presented to the committee and to us as basically a reorganization affecting top command and management levels. The Secretary, in transmitting the proposal, has stated, "It should be pointed out that while this plan for reorganization involves significant changes in the Army major command structure, it calls for little change in military and civilian personnel at the operating level in the field. The main impact of this plan is on the headquarters of the Department of the Army, the headquarters of the U.S. Continental Army Command, and the headquarters of the two new commands. Below these headquarters, installations and personnel, by and large, are undisturbed. The emphasis is on simplifying command responsibilities and on improving managerial efficiency, while preserving the operating structure in the field."

Within recent days a great deal of confusion has resulted in the Detroit metropolitan area as to the effect this proposed reorganization might have on existing arsenal and Army ordnance installations. Specifically, the proposal to reassign the responsibilities of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command has resulted in persistent speculation that upward to 2,600 employees presently at this command would have their functions reassigned to the Rock Island Arsenal in Illinois.

The only firm basis for this rumor seems to be the chart 14 which was attached as a concept to the reorganization proposal. Enclosed is a statement which we have issued as a result of our inquiries made to the Department of Defense and the Secretary of the Army. It is our understanding that the Secretary's statement to your committee and to Members of Congress that is quoted above also applies to the specific situation with regard to any large number of present employees at OTAC.

Prior to your committee's approval, we would sincerely hope that the committee might assure itself that the information we have received on this is essentially correct. It would be most disturbing, not only to us, but we believe to other Members of the Senate who have installations in their States involved in this reorganization, to feel that behind the proposal pending in your committee are plans in being to effect major personnel and installation changes.

With every best wish.

Sincerely,

PAT MCNAMARA.
PHILIP A. HART.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding the proposed reorganization of the Department of the Army Ordnance Corps as reported in the Detroit News Sunday, February 11. This report is causing deep concern among the employees and the community. The reported transfer of a function at the Detroit Arsenal and command headquarters will affect the employees most adversely. The said change might necessitate a reduction in employees of approximately 50 percent. This would further complicate the surplus labor force in the Detroit area. The employees that might be absorbed at Rock Island and Fort Eustis would necessitate the disposal of their properties at an estimated tremendous loss and would affect the employees of a minority group adversely more seriously. The facilities and technical know-how and enthusiasm of this command surpasses or equals any in the Nation. To cease utilizing it is not deemed to be in the best national interest. On Thursday, February 15, the Congress will have an opportunity to veto this proposed reorganization. I implore you to use influence of your office to insure the continuation and perhaps an increase in the mission function of this most efficient organization. It is my sincere hope that this agency might become the headquarters for the Weapons and Mobility Command, if it should be deemed in the best interest of the Government that the ordnance corps be reorganized.

Thanking you in advance in the behalf of employees of this command.

WILLIAM A. COLIN,
Vice President, Local 16, National Federation of Federal Employees.

MOUNT CLEMENS, MICH.,
February 14, 1962.

The Honorable PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

The Macomb County Board of Supervisors has been informed of the possibility of a transfer of over 2,000 positions of employment from the Detroit Tank Arsenal to Rockford, Ill. A protest is hereby registered on behalf of Macomb County residents and request is hereby made that a course of action be pursued to prevent this move which would critically affect the economy of this area.

MRS. MILDRED B. STARK,
Vice Chairman, Macomb County Board of Supervisors.

WARREN, MICH., *February 14, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Washington, D.C.:

In light of this area having been proclaimed a distress area having high unemployment and being the recipient of the food stamp plan the city council of Warren at a special meeting held on Tuesday, February 13, 1962, went on record as being opposed to the removal of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command facilities to another site. The council urges that you use every endeavor to halt the shift.

HAROLD F. STILWELL,
Secretary of the council.

WARREN, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Stop proposal of reorganization of Army Ordnance Corps, 5,200 employees affected in Detroit area, incurring undue hardships on many of the citizens of the State of Michigan.

LEONARD WAMBACH
(And 10 employees, of Ordnance Tank Automobile Plant).

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNION NO. 16,
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Warren, Mich., February 10, 1962.

Senator PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: The reorganization of the Army Ordnance Corps goes before the committee next Thursday, February 15 for approval. Unless this plan is vetoed, approximately 2,500 employees in the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command will be affected.

Many of these employees have purchased their own homes in this area and stand to lose thousands of dollars if forced to move to other localities in order to retain their employment.

I do not believe that this move would be in the best interest of the Government, as it would cost millions of dollars to transfer the functions and construct new buildings to handle the research and development activities now performed at the Detroit Tank Arsenal.

As president of Local No. 16 NFFE, and the Michigan State Federation of Federal Employees Unions, NFFE, I seek your support in getting this plan vetoed and keeping these jobs in the State of Michigan.

Thanking you for any help that you may give us, I remain,

Cordially yours,

RAYMOND C. BEATTY,
President.

THE A. C. LEUCHTMAN CO.,
Detroit, Mich., February 11, 1962.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Reference is made to the attached clipping from the Detroit News of this date concerning the proposed transfer of tank development and procurement responsibilities from Detroit to Rock Island, Ill.

In the article, Mr. Pipp points out that this would immediately mean a loss of over 2,600 jobs in an area already plagued with chronic and increasing unemployment. Mr. Pipp was merely speaking of Government employees. What he did not discuss was the strong possibility of a far greater loss in employment through the reduced business available to the many small manufacturers in this area who are producing replacement tank parts on direct contracts as well as on subcontracts with prime manufacturers.

These men will lose an advantage they now enjoy over manufacturers in lower-paid labor areas in that their proximity to the procurement agency insures their receiving every bidding opportunity as well as access to engineering data.

It seems strange that with a $50 million investment in facilities at the Detroit Arsenal alone, and a staff of experienced personnel, the Army finds it necessary to transfer this responsibility elsewhere. Certainly, corps consolidation can be effected without such excessive cost to the taxpayer. Since OTAC is to be part of the new command, there seems no logical reason for the transference of a function which OTAC has ably performed.

We ask that you give this matter your immediate consideration and do everything possible to prevent this wasteful and costly move.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

A. C. LEUCHTMAN.

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 11, 1962]

TANK CENTER MOVE STILL UNCONFIRMED

(By Edwin G. Pipp)

The commander of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command (OTAC), Saturday refused comment on reports that the Army plans to move tank development and procurement activities from the Detroit area.

Brig. Gen. John F. Thorlin, OTAC chief, said a reorganization of the Army's Ordnance Corps is planned, but that he cannot comment on details.

This reorganization plan will go into effect next Friday if not vetoed in committee Thursday by Congress. Army Secretary Stahr has said it will take 18 months to complete the reorganization.

THREE-WAY MERGER

Under the plan OTAC would merge with the present Ordnance Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill., and the Transportation Corps with its research center at Fort Eustis, Va., to form the Weapons and Mobility Command.

The reports are that OTAC's function of developing tanks at the Detroit Arsenal and purchasing them and their parts from the office at 150 Beard Street will be moved to Rock Island.

Development and procurement of wheeled vehicles would remain here.

OTAC employees say that this could mean a loss of nearly half the jobs of workers at OTAC and the arsenal.

TOTAL OF 5,300 JOBS IN ALL

The 2 installations have a combined employment of 5,300, mostly civilians.

The arsenal in Center Line is considered one of the most modern tank and automotive development facilities in the country. The cost of replacing its specialized buildings and equipment is estimated at nearly $50 million.

A new $5 million office building to serve as OTAC Headquarters is under construction on a site near the arsenal.

In a report to employees of the two installations General Thorlin told them to continue work as usual, that no definite plans have yet been announced on how the reorganization could affect the Detroit area installations.

AWAITS DETAILS

In an interview he said he did not believe he should comment publicly on the reorganization program until he was given specific details and asked by the Army for his recommendations.

"If Congress does not object, a new organization called the Materiel Development and Logistic Command will replace the present Ordnance Corps," he said.

"It would not be right for me to comment on this organization which has not yet been formed," he said.

HAZEL PARK, MICH.,
February 13, 1962.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Having recently heard about the planned movement of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command (OTAC) from the Detroit area, I felt it my duty to write you a short note concerning this matter. As I understand, this proposed movement will affect approximately 5,200 persons who are now employed for OTAC in the Detroit area.

Sir, I feel that the movement of OTAC from Detroit is doing the people of Detroit a great injustice. As you know, Detroit and the Detroit area, has been hard hit by high unemployment. The movement of OTAC will only increase this unemployment greatly; not to mention the financial difficulties incurred by the individual.

The estimated cost of the proposed movement is approximately $50 million. This is indeed an expensive movement. Also, what is to be done with the already partially constructed building which was to serve as GTAC headquarters at an estimated cost of $5 million? Are these moneys just to be forgotten? In these troubled times, the estimated cost of this movement, and the increased unemployment would only add to the already heavy burden.

Senator HART, I feel it is your duty to object strongly to the proposed movement of OTAC from the Detroit area because of the above-mentioned reasons. I hope you will act accordingly.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND PACKWOOD.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

Hon. PHILIP HART.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am an employee at Ordnance Tank Automotive Command, Detroit. Suggest you take necessary action to retain OTAC in the Detroit area.

Yours,

A. P. SCHWARTZFELD.

ST. CLAIR SHORES, MICH.,
February 13, 1962.

Hon. PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Take a good look at Army reorganization as it affects Michigan. As a taxpayer I protest wanton disregard of millions already invested in combat vehicle R. & D. facilities at Detroit Arsenal. Let's keep tank-automotive activities in our distressed auto capital of the world.

R. H. BARNOWSKE.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 14, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The possibility of losing the tank-automotive buying and research programs in the Detroit area is abhorrent. To keep on top of this problem is not enough. The proposed move will result in further economic chaos for Michigan and Detroit. You must take action to save these 6,000 jobs.

MARVIN RICHELSOPH.

GREATER DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
Detroit, Mich., February 13, 1962.

Hon. E. J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: An unconfirmed report has been called to the attention of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce that a part of OTAC will be moved out of this area. Up to the present, we have been unable to confirm this proposed move-out.

Since our organization is always interested in jobs in the Detroit area and in anything that might affect them, this report is of prime concern to us.

We have always advocated greater efficiency and economy in Government. This is evidenced by our support of the new OTAC headquarters building now being built at the arsenal which will result in tax savings.

It is our hope that before any move of the tank facilities is recommended, a thorough study be made. We feel that these facilities are well developed and are certainly located ideally for manufacturers and suppliers concerned with the building of tanks. From the meager information that we have of the contemplated transfer of tank production from Detroit to Rock Island, we cannot see any economic justification for such a move.

The know-how in metalworking of our citizens is well recognized. Our research facilities are immense and constantly expanding.

We hope that your office will inform us as soon as possible as to the details of that part of the reorganization plans affecting OTAC and the Detroit arsenal.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. BIXBY,
President.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

DEAR MR. HART: Relative to planned moving of OTAC mission from Detroit to Rock Island request that you do everything in your power to retain this activity in Detroit.

Hundreds of Government employees, who need their jobs, major industries, small business, people and merchants will suffer from such a move.

Sincerely,

MABEL C. MEEHAN.

HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.,
February 13, 1962.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Relative to the planned moving of OTAC mission from Detroit to Rock Island, please do everything in your power to retain this activity in Detroit, Mich. Not only would its removal affect hundreds of jobs of Government employees who need the work, but it would also take away business and hurt both major industries and small business, and hurt both the people and merchants of Detroit.

Thank you.

T. M. HAAFF.

SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF ARCHBISHOP JOSEPH SLIPYJ, PRIMATE, UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Mr. HART. Mr. President, February 17, 1962, marks the 70th anniversary of the birth of the metropolitan confessor, Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, who has been a prisoner of the Bolshevik regime for the last 17 years. During that time he has suffered and continues to suffer for the Christian faith and the Ukrainian people and has become a symbol of faithfulness to God, to the Catholic Church, and to his nation.

By the initiative of Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn and under the direction of all our bishops, the Ukrainian clergy and faithful in the free world will honor this anniversary with the celebration of Divine Liturgies and prayers for Metropolitan Slipyj on this coming Sunday, February 18, 1962.

The city of Detroit, on Sunday, February 18, will be the scene of a celebration in the form of a solemn concert by those dedicated men and women sympathetic to this worthy cause.

I know the Senate salutes this demonstration of devotion and patriotism on the part of those who will assemble and, as well, those who in spirit will join in the assembly on Sunday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 19, 1962.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15, 1962:

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1966, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Walter L. Lingle, Jr., of Ohio, to be a Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

U.S. MARSHALS

Cornelius J. McQuade, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Russell R. Bell, resigned.

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Guam for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 22, 1961.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232, Army of the United States (brigadier General, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Walter A. Churchill

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles H. Cox
George E. Tomlinson
John L. Winston

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles F. Duchein

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Curtis C. Gauntt, Talladega, Ala., in place of B. B. Hardegree, resigned.

ALASKA

Maude I. Wright, King Salmon, Alaska, in place of F. L. Nally, resigned.

ARIZONA

Laurie V. Guthrie, Gadsden, Ariz., in place of H. H. Butterworth, retired.

ARKANSAS

Charley E. Wahlquist, Mammoth Spring, Ark., in place of E. E. Sterling, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Helen S. Kinderman, Ludlow, Calif., in place of V. E. Sherraden, retired.

Carroll A. LaJaunie, Palm Desert, Calif., in place of W. L. Myers, resigned.

Daniel J. Stanton, Redlands, Calif., in place of W. A. Page, retired.

Martin H. Scheeper, Stateline, Calif., in place of H. S. Clifton, resigned.

Jim H. Mann, Yucaipa, Calif., in place of J. C. Cummings, resigned.

FLORIDA

Robert L. West, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman, retired.

GEORGIA

Annie M. Carroll, Allentown, Ga., in place of E. L. Johnson, retired.

H. Rhodell Dunn, Jr., Richland, Ga., in place of M. W. Overby, retired.

Thomas O. Fowler, Woodstock, Ga., in place of J. P. Dawson, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Russell W. Miller, Ashley, Ill., in place of S. S. Barrett, retired.

Lola M. Baumunk, Bardolph, Ill., in place of J. L. Baumunk, retired.

Verna H. Welsh, Durand, Ill., in place of Lillie Doyle, retired.

John R. Ryan, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.

Curtis J. German, Rossville, Ill., in place of Joseph Brown, deceased.

INDIANA

Carl F. Cloyd, Clinton, Ind., in place of H. L. Mitchell, retired.

IOWA

Carl M. Dudden, Grundy Center, Iowa, in place of P. A. Thoren, deceased.

John M. Kuster, Persia, Iowa, in place of C. E. Hamann, retired.

KANSAS

I. Miller Wilson, Easton, Kans., in place of B. M. Stafford, retired.

LOUISIANA

Carrie E. Doughty, Tullos, La., in place of B. D. Dunlap, retired.

MAINE

John R. Fortin, Portland, Maine, in place of J. L. Cook, retired.

MARYLAND

Loise S. Copes, Brooklandville, Md., in place of R. E. Slaughter, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph F. Smyth, Grafton, Mass., in place of E. F. X. Jalbert, retired.

MINNESOTA

Orville J. Mortensen, Lyle, Minn., in place of D. W. Matter, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Clyde C. Parker, Calhoun City, Miss., in place of Inez Hiller, deceased.

Joy S. Rials, Jayess, Miss., in place of J. W. Sartin, retired.

William L. Barbee, Lula, Miss., in place of L. H. Birdsong, deceased.

MISSOURI

Robert H. Theiss, Warrensburg, Mo., in place of H. M. Cash, retired.

MONTANA

Clinton L. Sennett, Lewistown, Mont., in place of E. J. Coyle, retired.

NEVADA

William A. Morby, Sparks, Nev., in place of Katie Reilly, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Charles H. Schubert, Allendale, N.J., in place of F. A. Farrell, removed.

John B. Porter, Runnemede, N.J., in place of F. R. Barker, retired.

NEW YORK

Edith L. Walker, Farnham, N.Y., in place of C. L. Walker, retired.

Olga A. Mihanowich, Glenham, N.Y., in place of O. B. Timmons, removed.

George L. Nelson, Glen Head, N.Y., in place of J. T. McLaughlin, retired.

Stanley W. Cermak, Holcomb, N.Y., in place of C. R. Hallock, retired.

William B. Mackey, Schenectady, N.Y., in place of J. F. Connelly, deceased.

Edna M. Mulvey, Wilmington, N.Y., in place of F. H. Courtney, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ophelia S. Wilson, Columbus, N.C., in place of A. T. Clarke, retired.

Leslie T. Fowden, Williamston, N.C., in place of W. E. Dunn, retired.

Ruby M. Dawson, Zebulon, N.C., in place of M. J. Sexton, retired.

OHIO

Lyman D. Wise, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of W. R. Hapner, retired.

John M. Tertel, Toledo, Ohio, in place of W. P. Kilcorse, deceased.

Charles F. Seither, West Richfield, Ohio, in place of H. R. Eastwood, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Rex E. Pettijohn, Stigler, Okla., in place of C. E. Shepherd, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

John W. Richard, Elysburg, Pa., in place of S. L. Hower, removed.

J. Perry Hockersmith, Shippensburg, Pa., in place of C. F. Hockersmith, retired.

Robert J. Faust, Tower City, Pa., in place of R. A. Ganly, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

John J. Bento, Tiverton, R.I., in place of R. L. Campbell, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Joe B. Campbell, Blaine, Tenn., in place of J. B. Campbell, retired.

VIRGINIA

Alvis T. Davidson, Jr., Faber, Va., in place of A. T. Davidson, retired.

E. Guy Smith, Gloucester, Va., in place of T. W. Cooke, retired.

G. Hoyt McCartney, New Castle, Va., in place of J. W. Ohmer, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Keith E. Hand, Malott, Wash., in place of K. A. Hand, retired.

Sheldon P. Sageser, Poulsbo, Wash., in place of J. V. Mayrand, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

George E. Nolte, Bethany, W. Va., in place of Miriam Netting, resigned.

Virginia L. Kyle, Hendricks, W. Va., in place of W. H. Ryan, retired.

WISCONSIN

Blanche M. Huggett, Fall River, Wis., in place of J. A. Lane, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15, 1962:

U.S. MARSHAL

Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshall for the western district of Kentucky.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the tendency has been for industry to refuse to employ older workers and to terminate older workers when a reduction in force becomes necessary. A worker who loses his job after the age of 45 finds it almost impossible to obtain employment with a new firm, even though his training, experience, skill and productive capacity may be at the peak of proficiency. At the age of 45 a worker's financial load is probably higher than ever before. At that age, his children are in the midst of their educational careers, and many promising young students in the scientific and professional fields are compelled to abandon college because their parents have lost their jobs. This is a loss not alone to the worker and his children but to America where the deficit in scientific graduate students is already alarming.

The problem is just as important with reference to workers who are approaching their 60th birthday. They are too young to retire and too old to find a new job. Yet, they may be burdened with mortgages on their homes, heavy hospital and medical expenses and other obligations peculiar to our elder citizens.

This is an acute national problem but one which is not easily solved by government. Congress has no constitutional power to compel employers to hire older workers or to retain older workers in their employ. Even if Congress had the power, a compulsory statute would be offensive to our sense of economic freedom and to the principles of the free enterprise system. Moreover, such a compulsory statute could not be properly policed without greatly expanding the ranks of the Federal bureaucracy.

Accordingly, the only possible solution to the problem is an incentive program to encourage employers voluntarily to employ and retain in employment older workers. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 531) providing for a voluntary tax incentive program. Under that bill, an employer would be allowed to deduct as a business expense not only the gross salary paid to an employee but an additional 2 percent thereof for every employee between the ages of 45 and 50, 3 percent for every employee between the ages of 50 and 55, 4 percent for every employee between the ages of 55 and 60, and 5 percent for every employee over the age of 60.

The passage of this bill would mean an initial loss of revenue, but over the long run there would be a corresponding increase in tax revenue from the salaries and wages paid to these older employees and there would be a corresponding reduction of unemployment benefits consumed and the load on the State and local welfare rolls would be lightened.

It might be argued that a policy encouraging the employment of older people would reduce the job availability of younger workers. Such an argument is at odds with the laws of economics. Economic history proves that the more people we have working, the more we produce; the more we produce, the more we transport and sell; the more we sell, the cheaper the price; the cheaper the price, the more we consume; the more we consume, the greater the demand; the greater the demand, the more we need to produce; the more we need to produce, the more jobs we have available. More jobs for everyone, regardless of age, must be our continuing policy.

We as a nation have, over the years, depended for our growth upon the wisdom, training and acquired skills that come only with age and experience. Some of our most revolutionary inventions and some of the greatest contributions to our economic, cultural and scientific life have come from men and women of advanced years in both humble and exalted positions. This reservoir of wisdom and skills is one of America's greatest assets and one in which we have a great investment. We must by every appropriate means protect that investment and use that asset to advance our national interests.

Monsignor Wrzeciono

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Eighth District of New Jersey and the city of Paterson lost a distinguished resident.

It is with deep regret that I announce to the House of Representatives the death of Rt. Rev. Monsignor James Wrzeciono, prothonotary apostolic, pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church.

Monsignor Wrzeciono was born April 30, 1879, in Tarnau county of Oppein, upper Silesia. He pursued his seminary studies in Krakow where he was ordained to the sacred priesthood on June 6, 1903.

The young clergyman migrated to the United States in 1940. After serving as a curate in two New Jersey parishes, he became pastor of St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, where his pastorate extended until January 1932.

Thirty years ago, Monsignor Wrzeciono came to St. Stephen's. The parish continued to thrive over three decades. Pope Pius XII recognized the dedicated pastor's many accomplishments by elevating him to the rank of domestic prelate with the title of "right reverend monsignor." The Pope further honored Monsignor Wrzeciono by appointing him as a prothonotary apostolic in 1954.

This beloved servant of God was buried in the parish grounds adjoining the church he had served so faithfully.

Urban Affairs Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting during this week in which we are observing the birthday of a great American, Abraham Lincoln, that I bring before you for your study a matter involving our present President and his actions on the Urban Affairs Department.

I wonder what Abraham Lincoln would think, could he, who genuinely loved freedom and wanted it for all Americans, regardless of pigmentation or nationalistic background, today witness the recent attempt by our Chief Executive to play on racism in its worst form, as a threat, in an attempt to get urban affairs legislation passed.

I am hopeful that Mr. Kennedy's injection of the racial issue, into what should be a starkly legislative consideration, was the result of too hasty acceptance of ill-proffered advice, and not a measure of his true beliefs. I cannot believe that our President is guilty of personal advocacy of the cynical demagoguery which his statements would seem to imply.

Viewed clinically, the urban affairs bill is simply an attempt to create an artificial Cabinet position. It is an attempt to establish a Negro Cabinet member as a symbol of progress, in an effort to derail the necessity of taking positive action for the good of the entire Negro race.

Examples of failure are not difficult to see. It was the President himself who said that by a stroke of the pen he could end racial bias in housing. Yet the pen has laid in its holder, unused. It was the President himself who 2 years ago said that civil rights legislation was even then in preparation and would be put before the Congress in short order. Congress is still waiting.

And where is the FEPC legislation so loudly and broadly demanded in the Democratic platform? Would this symbolic Cabinet member truly compensate for the very real failures in the field of civil rights by the Kennedy administration?

As for the Urban Affairs Department and its functions, it is inevitable that once established it would grow just as have other Government agencies. The scope of functions in the proposed bill

which the House Rules Committee killed, is astronomical.

Perhaps we should all take note that this is the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Agriculture. It was formed to bring a few scattered agencies together under one department. In 1862 it had nine employees and a budget of $80,000. In 1962 it has 100,000 employees and a budget of $7 billion. The employees spend much of their time and the Department's money paying farmers not to farm. Every farmer who gets a Government check is ur der Government control. This is how a "harmless" agency that just brings a few scattered Government functions together can grow until it strangles the purpose for which it was created.

I believe that it is high time that the administration and the Congress stop talking about hyphenated Americans. I do not believe we gain anything for America by discussing the voting power, the likes and dislikes and the political potentials of Negro Americans, Jewish Americans, Polish Americans, Latin Americans. All of these are just plain Americans. On the bloody beachheads of World War II and in the freezing misery of the Korean conflict, no one stopped to ask whether or not our GI's were hyphenated Americans—they were there, they fought, they were wounded, and many died, for the simple purpose of defending what America means—freedom.

The Kennedy administration has chosen to cast its lot on the urban affairs issue with racial discrimination. I propose we consider and vote on American traditions.

As a matter of information to my colleagues, I have compiled a list of congressional districts in the United States with more than 10 percent nonwhite population.

It is obvious that very few congressional districts are affected basically by considerations influenced wholly by the racial nature of their population. Therefore I think the viewpoint expressed by our white and Negro national leaders in both political parties is a sound one: race should not be a factor in congressional voting—on the Urban Affairs Department issue, or on any other.

Many Members of Congress do not realize how very, very few congressional districts in States outside of the traditional South have nonwhite populations of 10 percent or more. For this reason, and because recent statistics on this point are available from the Bureau of the Census, I am submitting the following table which shows clearly the total nonwhite population for each State and for each congressional district with 10 percent or more.

The only States omitted from this table are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—all States which have a nonwhite population of obviously heavy proportion.

The table also includes a breakdown by race into white, Negro, other races and percentages of nonwhite population. I invite your attention to these figures, which should be of aid in properly assessing the unfortunate course of threats which have been made in the sending of the Executive order for the Urban Affairs Department to Congress for acceptance or rejection.

The table follows:

	Total nonwhite	White	Negro	Other	Percent
Alaska	51,621	174,546	6,771	44,850	22.8
Arizona	132,644				
2d District	96,214	542,437	18,284	77,930	15.1
California	1,261,974				
4th District	42,997	332,374	17,775	25,222	11.5
5th District	92,916	272,029	56,608	36,308	25.5
7th District	92,077	201,440	77,846	14,231	31.4
15th District	126,241	263,512	96,367	29,874	32.4
23d District	122,646	410,133	119,581	3,065	23.0
26th District	164,327	348,349	150,208	14,119	32.1
Delaware	61,965	384,327	60,688	1,277	13.9
Illinois	1,070,906				
1st District	216,504	18,698	214,034	2,470	92.1
2d District	180,180	168,660	177,223	2,957	51.7
3d District	125,602	293,907	124,907	695	29.9
6th District	117,924	227,360	117,110	814	34.2
7th District	120,964	221,937	119,360	1,604	35.3
9th District	32,925	269,733	24,686	8,239	10.9
24th District	60,205	426,993	59,790	415	12.4
Indiana	273,944				
1st District	87,628	425,641	87,109	519	17.1
11th District	100,729	596,838	99,912	817	14.4
Kentucky	218,073				
1st District	33,203	284,233	32,870	333	10.5
2d District	20,206	301,097	20,121	85	6.3
3d District	78,890	532,057	78,350	540	12.9
4th District	21,398	282,033	20,802	596	7.1
5th District	8,902	320,214	8,804	98	2.7
6th District	42,134	369,325	41,822	312	10.2
7th District	4,657	416,159	4,574	83	1.1
8th District	8,683	314,965	8,606	77	2.7
Maryland	526,770				
1st District	56,580	186,990	56,318	262	23.2
2d District	27,376	594,559	26,649	727	4.4
3d District	82,647	176,179	81,386	1,261	31.9
4th District	128,938	154,382	128,069	869	45.5
5th District	94,213	616,832	91,391	2,822	13.2
6th District	22,220	586,446	20,398	1,822	3.7
7th District	114,796	258,531	114,199	597	30.7
Massachusetts	125,434				
12th District	32,322	252,734	31,235	1,087	11.3
Michigan	737,329				
1st District	117,398	165,904	116,873	525	41.4
13th District	134,835	133,205	133,135	1,700	50.3
14th District	66,666	395,526	65,733	933	14.4
15th District	157,100	179,917	155,964	1,136	46.6
Missouri	396,846				
1st District	111,612	456,417	111,030	582	19.6
3d District	112,403	230,066	111,240	1,163	32.8
5th District	66,008	236,805	65,190	818	21.8
10th District	32,134	268,964	32,019	115	10.7
New Jersey	527,779				
2d District	46,497	269,788	45,155	1,342	14.7
4th District	49,932	440,959	47,994	1,938	10.2
11th District	92,092	216,568	91,331	761	29.8
12th District	63,541	299,373	62,857	684	17.5
13th District	35,131	221,846	34,628	503	13.7
New York	1,495,233				
5th District	82,357	309,046	81,177	1,180	21.0
8th District	61,233	295,728	59,518	1,715	17.2
9th District	97,629	293,610	96,524	1,105	25.0
10th District	141,601	212,181	140,000	1,601	40.0
11th District	41,023	370,965	39,620	1,403	10.0
16th District	267,005	34,569	265,401	1,604	88.5
18th District	43,728	225,640	42,195	1,533	16.2
19th District	34,914	266,585	19,124	15,790	11.6
20th District	28,287	251,188	24,036	4,251	10.1
21st District	44,730	241,400	41,054	3,676	15.6
22d District	48,531	278,682	47,588	943	14.8
23d District	85,095	260,071	83,870	1,225	25.4
41st District	62,099	270,677	60,948	1,151	18.7
Ohio	796,699				
1st District	66,076	309,680	65,355	718	17.6
2d District	58,578	429,790	58,082	496	12.0
3d District	73,029	653,127	72,201	828	10.1
12th District	81,601	601,361	80,235	1,366	11.9
21st District	195,744	226,060	194,911	833	46.4
22d District	49,827	308,171	48,802	1,025	13.9
Oklahoma	220,384				
1st District	37,837	483,705	29,753	8,084	7.3
2d District	49,104	319,872	27,132	21,972	13.3
3d District	26,092	201,600	16,939	9,153	11.5
4th District	27,150	225,058	17,327	9,823	10.8
5th District	49,830	503,033	42,396	7,434	9.0
6th District	30,371	374,632	19,537	10,834	7.5
Pennsylvania	865,362				
1st District	67,318	193,449	66,621	697	25.8
2d District	124,663	219,511	123,435	1,228	36.2
3d District	64,566	209,345	62,803	1,763	23.6
4th District	232,476	82,433	231,684	792	73.8
6th District	37,236	310,228	36,506	730	10.7
28th District	82,964	245,200	82,126	838	25.3
South Dakota	27,416				
2d District	19,600	163,245	729	18,871	10.7
West Virginia	90,288				
1st District	7,437	265,670	7,315	122	2.7
2d District	8,061	268,813	7,875	186	2.9
3d District	9,398	258,936	9,302	96	3.5
4th District	6,150	339,058	6,015	135	1.8
5th District	29,771	246,042	29,680	91	10.8
6th District	29,471	301,614	29,191	280	7.0
Wisconsin	92,874				
5th District	63,429	457,245	61,324	2,105	12.2

An inflated myth is being used to persuade, threaten, or force Members of Congress to vote for the proposed new Urban Affairs Department and its prospective head, Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver.

I agree with President Kennedy, Bob Weaver has done a good job as Housing Administrator. Whether or not we should permit the creation of a new Urban Affairs Department is a matter that should be considered on its merits, not on the basis of prejudice for or against the Negro race.

Very few Members of Congress need fear the adverse votes of Negroes on this issue. Outside of 12 Southern States there are very few congressional districts—only 57 out of 437—where Negroes equal 10 percent or more of the total population.

In the 57 congressional districts where a Negro population is significant outside the Southern States, the Census

records show that there are 8 districts where the Negro population is between 15 and 20 percent; there are 14 districts where it totals between 20 and 30 percent; and there are only 15 districts where the total is over 30 percent of the population.

In light of these figures, it seems clear to me that the current furor about the prospective appointment of Mr. Weaver as a possible Secretary of Urban Affairs is misleading, divisive, and simply political propaganda both for Members of Congress and for the general public.

It is clear from the table that no Members of this body outside of the South and the few congressional districts listed are elected from population in which the Negro electorate forms a significant factor so as to influence voting. Therefore, I earnestly plead again for all Members to disregard the false arguments now appearing in their mail and in the press. The voting for or against the Urban Affairs Department should be upon the merits of the question.

My own record in the field of race relations is well known. The good people of my congressional district have not been fooled by the hypocrisy surrounding the urban affairs proposals.

As for me, I shall continue to represent my people as citizens of the 14th Congressional District of Ohio.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, February 12, 1746–October 15, 1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, whose 216th birthday is today, was one of the many gallant Poles who played a very important part in our War of Independence.

This gifted son of a middle-class family was born with the determination to fight for the freedom of his own people. With that purpose in mind he decided to become a soldier and a fighter. When he had completed his military education in Poland, and then in France, he had become a specialist in artillery and military engineering. By 1776 he had had no real chance to liberate his people, but when he heard of our War of Independence, he rushed to Paris, there borrowed money from friends, set sail for America and arrived in Philadelphia in August of that year. There he applied for military service; he was admitted at once and then charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission. From then on a high place in our Revolutionary War was assured for him. Everything he undertook was performed with distinction, and in October 1783 Congress made him a brigadier general.

Today in observing the 216th anniversary of his birth we do homage to his memory.

Horizons Unlimited for Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National Future Farmers of America Week will be observed this year from February 17-24, and it is indeed a pleasure at this time to pay tribute to this fine organization. The members of the Future Farmers of America fully deserve our support, encouragement, and respect. The continued success and growth of American agriculture depends to a great extent on the ability of the farmer of tomorrow to utilize intelligently and scientifically the rich and productive land that is our heritage. The training our young men are today receiving in their FFA work assures us that the future of American agriculture will be in good hands.

In 1928, the national FFA organization was launched at Kansas City, Mo., and on August 30, 1950, the 81st Congress, through passage of Public Law 740, granted a Federal charter to the Future Farmers of America. If I had been a Member of Congress at that time, I would most certainly have cast the vote of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky for passage of this law.

When we realize that agriculture is America's largest single industry, it is at once obvious that the proper training of our future farmers is of paramount importance. The necessary preparation for a career in agriculture is ably provided by the nationwide program of vocational education in agriculture and its accompanying organization, the Future Farmers of America. Membership in the FFA is open to all boys studying vocational agriculture in a public secondary school.

This country must have a constant supply of new farmers every year to replace those who die, retire, or otherwise leave the farm, and they must be men with experience and training. It is necessary for today's successful farmer to have skill in science, business, mechanics, and other technological advances which the industry has undergone in recent years. Knowing this, the FFA places a great deal of emphasis on training, and each member is required to conduct a profitable farming program at home or on another farm. The success of this program of "Doing to learn," a phrase in the FFA motto and an integral part of the program of the Future Farmers of America, is evidenced by the fact that by the time many FFA members are ready to marry and start a family they are firmly established in a farming program that promises a good future. For those who do not become full-time farmers, many find careers in some phase of agriculture and their experiences in vocational agriculture and the FFA serve well to help them to success. The theme for FFA Week this year is "Honoring Rural Opportunities and Responsibilities" and it is a most appropriate one.

We are fortunate in the Second District of Kentucky in having many chapters of the Future Farmers of America, and we have only to look at the achievements of the individual members of this organization to become aware of the beneficial results this program has on rural communities. I know many members of the FFA and enjoy visiting with these young men and their families when I travel throughout Kentucky. It is always gratifying to see their enthusiasm for farming as a challenging and satisfying way of life.

In closing, I would like to say that I am in complete agreement with the FFA creed which begins with the declaration "I believe in the future of farming." I also believe that the Future Farmers of America are playing a vital part in America's future by training our rural youth to be prosperous and successful farmers, and I wish the members of this outstanding organization and their leaders continued success in all their endeavors.

Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the birthday of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a man honored in the history of both the United States and his native Poland. After a desperate battle against despotism in Poland, Kosciuszko came to America during the days of our Revolution and offered the leaders of our infant Nation every aid to win liberty from another tyrant. He, along with hundreds of other Polish heroes, won undying glory in aiding America to win the Revolution.

General Kosciuszko was trained in the art of war and especially in military engineering; and his services were invaluable to the American cause. His advice and counsel were listened to during the dark days of the Revolution and General Washington bestowed upon him every credit for bringing the War of Independence to a more rapid victory. Congress, in deep gratitude, made him a brigadier general.

Upon his return to his native Poland, he fought against the Russian imperialists in 1792 and 1794. The odds were against him and failure was inevitable. The Russians imprisoned him for over 2 years. When he was freed he returned to America where Congress voted him money and lands. A part of this later went to found one of the first Negro

schools in the United States. This great general was not content to live quietly on his farm, however, and when there seemed to be a possibility of freeing Poland from its Russian conquerors he returned home once more in 1798. He spent the rest of his life until he died in 1817 in an effort to win victory and establish the freedom and independence of Poland.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was a freedom fighter who fought for freedom on two continents. The memory of his life and his devotion to freedom are an inspiration to the Polish people today who are not free but who live under a Communist government. But we also honor him here in the Halls of the U.S. Congress because of the debt of gratitude which we owe to this memory and to the memory of all the other brave Polish men who fought in the cause of liberty during the American Revolution.

Remarks of Representative Silvio O. Conte at Annual Lincoln Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Representative SILVIO O. CONTE before the Middlesex Club on Thursday, February 8, 1962, in Boston, Mass., when he delivered a historical speech on Abraham Lincoln. I think Representative CONTE made an excellent presentation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SILVIO O. CONTE BEFORE THE MIDDLESEX CLUB ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1962, BOSTON, MASS., AT ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY DINNER

Gen. George Pickett, the fighting Confederate commander, was to remember all the days of his life that fateful day at Gettysburg when he led his long gray lines up Cemetery Ridge in the bloodiest assault of the war. And Mrs. George Pickett was long to remember that afternoon at war's end when she opened the door of her Richmond home in answer to the knock of a tall stranger asking her if George were at home. Replying that George wasn't and wouldn't be for some time yet, she asked the visitor's name. The tall, frock-coated man in the stove pipe hat answered simply, "Just an old friend of George's, ma'am, just an old friend from before the war." With that he turned, stepped out into the sunlight and walked slowly down that Richmond street, leaving Mrs. Pickett to the startling realization that the President of the United States had come to call.

The President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln was that—of course he was—but really a great deal more too. For this was a man of many parts, all of them human, most of them great.

As a Republican, a Member of Congress, and an American, I am honored and pleased at your invitation to share a few moments with you tonight in commemoration and consideration of this great man.

The appeal of Lincoln to mankind is universal and indefinable. There is something in Lincoln for all men. He was the master politician, who in 30 long, devoted years of service to his party came to realize that politics, like life, is the art of achieving the possible. Scholars tell us that if we are to realistically seek the man who made Lincoln President in 1860, we must look to the activities of Lincoln himself. In the Presidency he is recognized as more independent of direct appeals to Congress or the people to achieve his aims than any other strong President. He worked behind the scenes with the organization men of his party. In short, he was a "politician's politician." Yet we hardly think less of him for all this.

Then, too, he was Lincoln the family man and father, whose home was torn by strife and dissension and the tragic death of children. Yet it is not here, nor ever, our task to judge Mary Todd Lincoln. The hearts of these two are best known but to themselves. Suffice it for us to remember that on the night of Good Friday, 1865, in Ford's Theater, Mary Todd and Abraham Lincoln sat holding hands in a darkened box.

President, Commander in Chief, statesman, this too was Abraham Lincoln. Intellectual power, moral strength, a feeling for the spirit and needs of the time, instinctive understanding of the masses, a passion for democracy—all these are the qualities of a statesman. All these Lincoln possessed Devoted above all to preserving the Union "with the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired." This he said, this he did and, in so doing, he brought freedom to the slave.

Lincoln was a martyr, too. And in this capacity history preserves and, yes, even enshrines him forever. A martyr, indeed—to the Union, to peace, and to freedom. Lincoln had a lifelong premonition of death, yet he knew that death was not life at its worst, for to him defeat without trying was true failure, and his ceaseless effort to preserve our Union stands as one of the great successes of all time.

This, then, was Abraham Lincoln—politician, husband, and father, President and Commander in Chief, martyr for all mankind. He was truly a man of such dimensions that he made all others seem small, though he would have been the very last to wish to do so, for he was a man with an attractive sense of humility and humor, rare among his peers.

It is these latter aspects of Lincoln that have special appeal to me, for of all the great lessons of democracy and statesmanship our generation owes Lincoln, we, as Americans in our difficult time, like Lincoln in his, also need humor as our safety valve—our weapon against the harassments of life.

An old friend from Illinois once visited him in Washington. "Mr. Lincoln," he asked, "How do you like being President?" "Well," he answered, "It reminds me of the man in Indiana who was being ridden out of town on a rail." He said, "If it wasn't for the honor of the thing, I think I'd rather walk."

His reputation as a storyteller preceded him to the White House and was well deserved. As a boy in Indiana, as a young man in New Salem, as a lawyer in the dreary taverns of the eighth judicial circuit of Illinois, he was always the center of attraction. With his long legs crossed, leaning slightly forward, his face radiant with anticipation and enjoyment, Lincoln delighted both himself and his audience. His humor, like his compassion, was that of the people he understood and loved so well, with all its, and their, good and bad.

But his stories did more than amuse. They often served to reinforce the point he wanted to make in a way that few could misunderstand. Once, when criticized for allowing General Grant to parole an entire Confederate army after the surrender at Vicksburg, he replied with the story of Bill Sykes' dog. Some cruel boys had fed Bill's little yellow cur a sausage stuffed with gunpowder and attached a makeshift fuse to it. When Bill heard the explosion, he came outside and said to what was left of the poor animal, "Well, I guess you won't be much use again—as a dog." "Gentlemen, I don't think that army will be much use again—as an army."

Condemned and maligned more bitterly and personally than any other American President, saddened beyond knowledge by the struggle that was dividing his country, standing almost alone for what he believed to be right against the demands of both conservatives and radicals, he once confided to a friend, "Without humor, I think I should die."

The earthy and the sublime, the magnificent and the humble, the ridiculous and the profound—contrasts in the man are never ending. A mind that could encompass Bill Sykes' dog and the Gettysburg address, stories which could delight a rough frontiersman and his second inaugural address—these are the complexities, the mystery, the greatness of the man whom we commemorate this evening. A man whose appeal so moved Carl Sandburg to say: "Not often in the history of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as a rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm—and peace unspeakable and perfect."

Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks at the annual installation banquet of the Lithuanian Citizens' Club, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 4, 1962:

The Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence was organized in 1907—almost 33 years before the Russian Communists invaded Lithuania and deprived that country of its independence.

But I believe that your club will be an active social and civic center for Americans of Lithuanian origin long after the Soviet Union has been replaced by a democratic government that abandons imperialism and liberates its own people as well.

This may sound like wishful thinking.

There are signs, however, of trouble within the Soviet Union.

When Communists start to argue among themselves, that's a good sign for the rest of the world.

And as Russian children grow up to become teachers, doctors, or engineers they expect a more comfortable, more peaceful way of life, free from treachery and terror.

The denunciation of Stalin and his cruelties shows that there are changes going on behind the Iron Curtain.

Khrushchev has publicly denounced Stalin as a criminal and a murderer.

The Lithuanian people will never forget the thousands of their countrymen who

were liquidated and the tens of thousands who were forcibly deported to remote areas of the Soviet Union. The younger generation, having heard from their parents' lips of uncles, aunts, and cousins who were the victims of Communist oppression, will remember and will look forward to the day of their country's emancipation.

Khrushchev is caught in a contradiction that must be plain to intelligent Russians. How can he denounce the crimes of Stalin, which include the brutal subjugation of the Lithuanian people and at the same time expect the rest of the world to forget Lithuania's right to be independent again?

Even Stalin—at his worst—could not break the spirit of the Lithuanian people or their religious faith.

Since the beginning of history, oppressive governments have come and gone because they could not crush the fundamental courage and decency that is found in most human beings.

More than 12 million people have escaped from Communist countries since the end of World War II. Add to this number the silent, thinking, and suffering people of Russia and China who resent the closed systems of government that drive them mercilessly—plus the hundreds of millions of people in the free world—and we have the overwhelming majority of mankind either actively or passively opposed to communism.

That's what the Communists fear most.

While they bluster and threaten and conspire against the world in front of them—they secretly worry about the world behind them that they control—on the surface.

In this modern world, no "iron curtain" can succeed in completely isolating one group of people from another. We have means of getting information through to the people of Lithuania and other captive nations, and they have means of communicating with us.

In this way we strengthen our mutual hope and determination to join hands one day in a world without fear united by representative and cooperating governments.

The Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence, by encouraging the rights and responsibilities of freemen, is doing its share to build a better future for the United States, for Lithuania, and for all nations in the family of mankind.

Little People to Little People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of interest that I read the remarks of my distinguished colleague from the State of New Jersey, the Honorable PETER RODINO, concerning the initiation of a little-people-to-little-people program.

There is indeed much merit in this suggestion and Congressman RODINO'S son, Peter III, is to be commended for the effort to transform this meritorious idea into an effective program. At a time when understanding between the people of the world is essential to peace and cooperation, it could go far in breaking down the inaccurate stereotypes which exist in the minds of men.

The children of our country are our greatest asset. In many instances they, in their simplicity, can see and perceive more clearly than those whose minds are lost in intricate details. Certainly a children's crusade of letters urging the children of the world to join them in a campaign for world peace and security could be an important contribution to good will and understanding among the peoples of the world.

Congressman Holifield for Quality and Stabilized Merchandise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD of California, a retail clothier, delivered the following address, in part, before the National Convention of Retail Clothiers being held here in Washington, D.C.

His remarks and advice, considering his long experience as a retail merchant should be read by all Members of Congress:

CONGRESSMAN HOLIFIELD FOR STABILIZED MERCHANDISING

(Remarks of Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, at the National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers luncheon meeting, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 14, 1962)

THE DOMESTIC RETAILER LOOKS AT THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—PART I

Mr. Chairman and fellow clothiers, 35 years ago I became a retail clothier in a small southern California town. Though serving in Congress for the past 20 years, I have maintained my original business and increased its operation with the help of a good manager. Therefore, I have more than a passing acquaintance with the basic problems which you face.

New problems have arisen over the past three decades. Our customers are more sophisticated. They demand a wider selection of style, color, and materials. Expanded use of charge accounts has increased our capital investment. We face a new type of competitive challenge from giant discount houses in many areas. Protecting the normal profit margin of a legitimate business operation is indeed a serious problem.

Along with many of you, I built my retail business on lines of nationally known brand merchandise. If discount houses continue to acquire such brand merchandise and slash normal retail prices, you and I are threatened with the damage or destruction of our traditional way of doing business.

Court decisions have practically nullified the protection of the so-called fair trade laws. It is evident that the independent merchant, to survive and prosper, must reexamine the legislative possibilities.

Congressman MADDEN'S quality stabilization bill seems to offer a carefully considered new approach. It seeks to establish a more complete property right in the brand name so that the manufacturer can (a) specify conditions under which the brand name can be used in the final sale to the consumer, and (b) reclaim merchandise at no actual loss to the seller, in the event the latter offers the merchandise in violation of the manufacturer's specified conditions of sale to the ultimate consumer.

While I am not a lawyer (I only help to make the laws which confuse lawyers), I have been advised that the legal barriers in the fair trade laws may be overcome by the concept of the quality stabilization bill.

Certainly the manufacturer should have the right to protect his distribution system and his branded merchandise from the cannibalistic practices of the "loss leader" and "price gimmick" operator.

Manufacturer and retailer collectively expend millions of dollars in advertising national brand merchandise. The resulting consumer recognition and acceptance of brand name merchandise is a real tangible business asset to both manufacturer and retailer. This joint asset should not be misused and dissipated by others.

I note that on February 2 of this year, the National Retail Hardware Association, comprising 22,000 independent retailers, endorsed the Madden-Capehart bill. Certainly it deserves serious attention by all independent retail associations.

As a Member of Congress who knows the problems of the retail clothing industry and believes in the fair trade principle, I have cosponsored the Madden-Capehart quality stabilization bill.

Now, may I turn to a matter of great importance to our Nation's destiny, and therefore of great importance to you and to me as businessmen.

Because of our great economic and military strength, the United States has become the leader of the free world.

Since the end of World War II, under a bipartisan national policy decision, we have expended many billions of tax dollars to help rebuild the economic, political and military strength of allied, neutral and former enemy nations. These nations have survived and remained free. They have done more. Great Britain, West Germany, France, Japan and smaller nations have expanded their industrial production far beyond pre-World War II levels. The European part of this great industrial productive capacity is now being melded into a trade and tariff alliance of tremendous potential economic power.

Initially the Common Market consisted of the so-called Inner Six nations on the European Continent. Then in a belated move for self-protection, Great Britain organized the Outer Seven. Now, as you know, there are negotiations for melding the Inner Six and the Outer Seven into a greater Common Market grouping of nations. If this occurs during the next few years there will be a close trade and tariff arrangement among nations containing some 300 million producers and consumers.

Listen carefully—this Common Market trade alliance will increase the economic strength of the participating countries individually and as a whole. The growing economic power of the Inner Six is shown by the rapid strides in output. Over the last year this area increased its gross national product by 6½ percent. Since 1950, its annual growth rate has averaged more than 5 percent compared with our bare 3 percent. In the industrial sector of production its annual rate of increase for the past 10 years has averaged 8 percent, compared with our slightly more than 3 percent.

This is a powerful economic challenge to the United States—make no mistake about it.

The prospects for the Common Market complex then are these:

First, through reducing or eliminating internal tariffs, it will accelerate the interchange of merchandise and labor resources. Therefore, it will become more self-sufficient and less dependent upon imports from the United States.

Second, unified and growing economic strength and industrial capacity will generate greater quantities of goods for export throughout the world.

On the first point, bear in mind that the 13 nations of the European Economic Community were customers last year for $5½ billion worth of American goods. This is an important segment of our total exports of $20.4 billion. It would be very damaging if we should find ourselves excluded by high tariff walls from this market.

On the second point, we must consider the impact of the Common Market on our export trade to other areas, which amounts to $15 billion, or three-fourths of our yearly total of exports. The Common Market nations will be strong competitors in exports because of their growing production capacity, and they will in turn offer the powerful inducement of potential markets among their 300 million people for goods of the other trading nations.

Why should we, as retail clothiers in small or large towns, be concerned with all of these complicated problems of international trade and tariffs and the Common Market Alliance?

In the brief time of this luncheon speech—and every luncheon speech should be brief—I cannot do justice to the question and give a full answer. Part II of my speech, which I shall not read, has facts and figures which many of you will find interesting and relevant to your business role in the national economy. The second part amounts to a brief for the proposed new approach to international trade which will be debated in Congress in the coming weeks and months.

The remainder of my remarks today, I hope, will be a stimulus to your examining this problem in depth—a problem which I believe is second only to that of avoiding a nuclear world war.

I could speak to you with great feeling and a wide background of information on the Soviet military challenge. As chairman of the House-Senate Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my responsibilities are heavy in the field of atomic energy development. The nuclear weapons we need for deterring war range from small tactical weapons to megaton bombs carried by our great SAC bombers, many of which are on constant airborne patrol. Our nuclear submarines armed with Polaris missiles are gliding silently and continuously under the surface of the great oceans, and our great intercontinental ballistic missiles stand guard for freedom.

But these are programs in being. These fantastic weapons and weapon systems are in professional scientific and military hands. They are under the direction of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. There is little that we can do individually in this area of national survival—except to pay taxes.

But if we turn our attention to the economic destiny of the United States to those areas of business development and Federal legislation having to do with our stability as a nation, then there is something important and constructive which we can do.

If our Nation is to remain strong militarily, we must take every step necessary to maintain the strength of our economic system. We speak of the American way of life and we speak of competitive free enterprise. Are we mouthing generalities which are familiar enough to sound pleasant, but fuzzy enough to hide the crucial challenges of our times?

Our American way of life is changing. We have moved rapidly from farm to city. Seventy-four percent of our people live in urban areas. Ten million farmers produce more food and fiber than 60 million produced five decades ago. Our great industrial plants, steel, textile, rubber, automobile, operate on a part-time basis. The workweek dwindles from 60 hours or more when I was a young man to 40 and even 25 for some. Our labor force grows at the rate of 1½ million per year.

We are employing more people but the percentage of permanent unemployed has risen to between 5 and 7 million. Automation takes its toll in industry after industry, and pools of technologically displaced workers grow in stagnant areas of our Nation. I know all the stock answers, but I also know the inadequacy of most of them and so do the unemployed, the displaced miners, automobile workers, railroadmen and others.

Yes, we have problems which are not being solved. They invoke basic factors of change in our American way of life.

Our agricultural production outruns the domestic ability to consume. We use all kinds of controls and subsidies to keep it from collapsing, not under the blessing, but under the curse of abundance.

Our industrial plants, running only part time, produce more steel, autos, refrigerators and soft goods including men's clothing than our domestic market can buy. If you look beneath the surface of general prosperity, you see these cracks in the foundation of our economy.

What can we do to keep those cracks in the economy from spreading? The basic need is a wider distribution and greater consumption of goods. If this can be accomplished our factories can operate more hours. They can utilize more employees which will help to reduce our stagnant reservoir of unemployed and add domestic consuming power.

But how do we get this wider distribution if our domestic market is saturated with goods?

It seems to me we must look to new markets for our goods from factories and fields. This means increased exports.

If the European Common Market threatens our present export market, as I believe it does, then we must meet that challenge promptly.

The President, backed by expert economic advisers from the financial and business world, has asked Congress for more flexible tariff adjustment powers—powers that will allow him to bargain with the Common Market tariff controllers so that we can continue to participate in that great 300 million population market. It will take congressional action to delegate to him this broad general power. If after study you believe it is wise, you can help by making your wishes known to your Senators and Representatives.

But far more is needed than our continued access to the European Common Market consumers.

We need to develop new markets in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Here lies the great challenge and the great opportunity for our part-time production capacity.

If we are to really turn our production capacity loose, if we are really going to utilize our skilled manpower and train our unskilled workers for the production job for which we are capable, then we must become masters of the machine and not the victims of technology.

So, I say to you today, the United States must meet the challenge of greater distribution. It must fight a more efficient competition in existing world markets to maintain our existing exports.

It must vigorously, courageously, and intelligently move into the great underdeveloped markets of the world where millions, yes, hundreds of millions, yearn for the goods we know how to produce.

We must take the place as the leading international trading nation which Great Britain occupied for so many centuries. She can no longer play the part. She has handed the baton to us.

We will either ignobly fail this task or we will carry the baton to victory.

We can falter in our obligation to meet today's challenges to the American way of life as we have known it, and if we do fail, we will slip into the oblivion which is reserved for all nations or civilizations which grow old and tired and fail to cope with new problems in a new and dangerous age.

I do not believe we will fail. I believe that we have the intelligence to solve the problem of distribution—greater distribution to domestic and foreign consumers through utilizing unused or partly used manpower and machine power. Our Nation of free people has in a period of some 300 years built the greatest production capacity ever known in the history of the world. Starting with a wilderness to conquer and faith in freedom and the democratic way, we have eliminated the scarcity of food, shelter, and goods which has plagued mankind for thousands of years—yes, which still plagues more than two-thirds of the human race.

It would be unthinkable for us to allow this magnificent system of production to choke on its own abundance, while two-thirds of the world starves for food and cries for goods. It would be a tragic ending indeed for the American dream, if we were to falter in the face of the Communist threat, be it military or economic.

We are facing up to the military threat, but do you know that since 1955 the Soviets have completed 206 trade agreements with non-Communist nations? Did you know that from 1954 to 1960 the export trade volume of the Soviet Union jumped from $860 to $2,700 million—more than triple in a 6-year period?

Gentlemen, this is your world. This is your Nation. This is your challenge. It is a challenge which we can and will meet. It is a goal worth winning if we are to have a world of liberty and freedom for ourselves and our children.

The 100th Anniversary of the Founding of the Sokol Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on February 16, 1862, the world-renowned Sokol gymnastic organization of Czechoslovakia was founded in Prague. This event which has long been commemorated by Czechoslovaks, is an appropriate one for commemoration now by the entire Western World. It represented not only the attempt of that well-known Czechoslovak, Dr. Miroslav Tyrs, to educate his countrymen to a high level of physical, spiritual, and moral fitness, it was also a notable advance in the history of the democratic idea. The Sokol organization, which became an integral part and feature of Czechoslovak national life, had as its ideal from the very start democracy and human freedom. The basic principles of democracy and freedom were an integral part of its organizational structure from the very beginning, and its regulations were based on the principles that all officers should be freely elected by all of the members. Membership was open to all regardless of class, creed, or political affiliation.

One has but to review the history of Czechoslovakia over the past 100 years to see the role that this organization

has played. At times when the Czechoslovak people have been brutally suppressed the Sokol movement has led them in their heroic efforts to resist and throw off suppression. The organization participated valiantly in the First World War, and after the war helped to make secure the newly created Czechoslovak state in the center of Europe. In the period between the two world wars the organization was one of the strongest elements in Czechoslovak democracy.

It was not surprising, in view of the organization's historic opposition to the evil of totalitarian movements, that very soon after the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1939 the organization was declared an enemy of the Third Reich and was disbanded by the Nazi authorities. Although its property was confiscated and some 5,000 of its leading members were put to death, those who survived were notable in the successful resistance against the Nazis during the war.

After the war, under the Czechoslovak Republic, the organization once again came out into the open and carried on its work of training its members in accord with its ancient motto, "Healthy mind in a healthy body."

The subsequent history of this organization, as of all freedom-loving movements in Eastern Europe, is a well-known story. Suffice it to say that wherever individuals are dedicated to freedom, the names of such organizations as the Sokol organization will ring loud and clear. We have a Sokol organization in Milwaukee, Wis., which is continuing its good work in building healthy minds and healthy bodies and a healthy respect for freedom. It is with great pleasure that I salute this organization on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding.

Senator Keating Cautions Against Loss of Congressional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, in a very timely and perceptive speech earlier this month, Senator KENNETH KEATING, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, called attention to one of the most disturbing trends in Government today. I refer to the determined efforts being made by the President and the executive branch of the Government to assume power and authority which traditionally has been vested in the Congress.

Speaking before the 43d Midwinter Trust Conference of the American Bankers Association, held in New York City on February 6, Senator KEATING discussed the President's new trade legislation and outlined his own proposal for retaining a modicum of congressional control over the tariffmaking function.

In a still larger context, the Senator warned of the repeated attempts of the present administration to usurp legislative prerogatives. He suggested that if the procedures and deliberative processes of the Congress are too cumbersome and antiquated to deal effectively with present-day problems, the proper solution lies not in abdicating legislative responsibility in favor of the Executive but rather in reforming and improving the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the Senator's position on this matter and I commend his thoughtful remarks to the attention of every Member of the House and to everyone else who is concerned with the continued vitality of our system of responsible self-government. Under leave granted, I include Senator KEATING's address in the RECORD:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(Address of the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senator, New York, before the 43d midwinter trust conference sponsored by the Trust Division of the American Bankers Association, New York City, Feb. 6, 1962)

"Where Do We Go From Here?" That's quite a title. It limits me a great deal to what I can talk about. It leaves out the past. I hope that this title, which was suggested by Tom Beacom, was not meant to reflect on my past.

You are all trust officers, or most of you are. That's a name that has always intrigued me. I wonder, is there any relationship between a trust officer and a confidence man?

* * * * *

We in the Congress in 1962 will wrestle with several great issues which will have a dramatic effect upon our Nation's future. Trade, health care for the aged, aid for higher education, tax reforms, civil rights, many others are critical. But new trade legislation, I believe, will be in the forefront of our problems.

This is one of those exciting turning points in our history. We are facing a new phenomenon—the growth of mighty constellations of trading power: the Common Market of Europe and the common markets of the future of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Will we move forward or backward? Will we accept this challenge to speed the building of closer economic relationships among the nations of the free world, relationships which depend even more greatly upon the exchange of goods and services among nations?

This is not an issue for conservatives or liberals. It cuts both ways. It is liberal in the sense that it will expand trade. It is conservative in the sense that it will help us to preserve and strengthen the free enterprise system around the world.

We must move ahead: not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans.

We must work to build a businesslike understanding among free people, joined in a mutual striving for prosperity and peace—combining, to the fullest extent possible, the talents and energies of every nation that loves freedom and hates the atheistic Communist ideology that is dedicated to its destruction.

How shall we do this? This is the only real question; for do it we must.

The Congress will, I hope, enact a program that will permit an orderly progression toward wider trade contracts. I stress the word "orderly" for it is this concept of an orderly movement to expand trade that we must keep uppermost in mind.

Let me explain what I mean by orderly expansion.

While increasing our trade with the nations of the free world, we must at the same time see to it that our domestic economy is strong and that we permit it to continue to grow and prosper by reserving the condition for it to do so. Here at home, we must avoid having trade policy decisions bring about the unnecessary disruption of men and industries.

The President, as well as the Congress, is not unmindful of the importance of assuring an orderly expansion of trade among nations of the free world. I support the general objectives which the President outlined in his trade message, although I am certain that changes will and should be made in certain parts of the trade bill which he has recommended to the Congress.

Above all, the President left out one big and important point that affects the fundamental workings of our Government.

Since the war, the structure of our Government has changed drastically. The balance of powers within our Government is very different. It will never be the same again. The Congress, once the nerve center of initiative, has taken a distinct secondary role. For generations, Congress was in the front seat driving carefully at 35 miles an hour. Now, Congress is in the backseat and the President is navigating at thousands of miles per second, just to keep up in this age of space and astronautics.

The field of trade is one of the best examples. The Congress under the Constitution has the responsibility for trade matters. According to the Constitution, this power belongs to Congress and Congress alone. But this too is part of the past—gone the way of buggy whips, outdoor plumbing, and mustache cups.

Today, under the Trade Agreements Act—the so-called reciprocal trade program—the President negotiates trade agreements with foreign governments, which amounts, in fact, to the levying of tariffs. This act expires on June 30, 1962. In requesting an extension in the form of sweeping new tariff-cutting powers, the President did not make as much as a single mention of the role of the Congress in this vital area.

CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

I have advanced a proposal to bring the Congress back into this picture. I recommended granting to the Congress—by a two-thirds vote—veto authority to disapprove major trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch.

Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution clearly assigns the Congress authority to "lay duties, imposts, and excises" and to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." My proposal seeks to restore a portion of this authority to the Congress, recognizing that in the fast-moving world in which we live, the day-to-day implementation of trade policy must be under the control of the President.

This is how my proposal would work: When the President had negotiated a new trade agreement or a modification of an old one, he would send it up to the Congress. It would be referred to the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate. The agreement would be before Congress for 60 days, at the end of which time it would go into effect as negotiated by the President unless both bodies of the Congress voted to disapprove it by a two-thirds vote.

If the relevant committee did not report out a resolution of disapproval but a Member of either body wanted to reject a given agreement, after 10 days the Member could move to discharge the committee. Discharging a committee requires a simple majority vote. If a resolution of disapproval passed both bodies, which would only be possible under quite extreme circumstances, the agreement would go back to the White House disapproved.

When you consider that the recent agreement with the Common Market took 16

months to negotiate, giving the Congress 60 days to think it over is not unreasonable.

It is my opinion that granting such a trade veto power to the Congress would have the additional advantage of helping to win the kind of broad congressional support necessary to take the giant step that we must take to strengthen and secure America's trade relations with the Common Market and with all of the nations of the free world.

In this continuing process of breaking down our own trade barriers, we must, of course, make certain that we get our money's worth. We must not trade horses for rabbits.

It is worthwhile to keep in mind that after World War II, when Europe was rebuilding, we went along with certain rather restrictive tariff rates and trade practices which have no justification under present conditions. For example, while we have always admitted large quantities of low-wage goods from countries such as Hong Kong and Japan, we have condoned the virtual exclusion of these goods from European markets. While we poured billions in foreign aid into war-ravaged areas and more recently into underdeveloped countries to bolster their economies and their standards of living, we have received relatively little help in this undertaking from some of our now prosperous allies. These factors are not given much notice in the various Executive messages touting the importance of the President's new trade bill.

Our Nation has long been at the forefront of the battle for expanded trade. In trade negotiations, when circumstances seemed to demand it, we have given miles to get inches. But the tables are turned. Europe is strong and prospering, a fact in which all Americans can take considerable pride. Now, Europe and the Common Market have an obligation to us. They must join in promoting and expanding trade. They must also put their shoulders to the task of rebuilding the less fortunate nations who want and deserve our support.

The growing strength of the Common Market is too often cited as the major and only reason for the President's new trade proposals. There is also good reason for insisting that our prosperous allies pay a fuller share of the aid programs, absorb a larger part of the world's exports, and do away with certain remaining preferential tariffs and quotas.

Reserving a veto power to the Congress appears to me necessary not only to conform to constitutional requirements, but to make sure that American industry and employees get a square deal. I am strongly in favor of breaking down artificial trade barriers. However, I would prefer to see more stress placed on flexibility than on the power of the President to make concessions. Trade is a two-way street. We are not going to get much from our trading partners if they think the only direction we intend to go is down.

POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

This is not an isolated example of an area in which the President has attempted to assume powers formerly lodged in the Congress. Back-door spending—a banker's nightmare—is now a routine governmental practice. The President gets funds directly from the Treasury to spend as he wants, circumventing the time-honored, deep-voiced solons of Capitol Hill.

The President's annual budget message and his Economic Report are today major engines of initiative. The President acts. The Congress reacts.

The Reorganization Act, the means by which the President can rearrange the agencies of Government, is another example. The President submits a plan. The Congress can merely approve or disapprove. The initiative is his alone. The President, for instance, has used machinery to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs.

In this complex world in which we live, Executive action is being relied upon more and more. I do not question that there is justification for the Executive being given certain new powers to cope with the complex conditions of the postwar world. But I am concerned about the recurrent insistence on the part of the present administration that more authority be taken from the Congress and given to the President. If this trend is allowed to continue unchecked, I fear that the question, "Where do we go from here," will receive a less favorable reply. We cannot afford to permit our machinery of Government to become too centralized in terms of giving new and broader powers to the President.

The year 1962 has seen a new raft of proposals for more Presidential and less congressional initiative. The President now wants the power to lower taxes and to have a shelf of public-works projects to start when he thinks the economy is on the "bum."

Now you are bankers. Think about this. The President wants the power to lower taxes. Tell me, who in this whole wide country of ours is really against lowering taxes? Let the President send a bill to the Congress telling us how he wants to cut taxes; it would pass quicker than a bill to give lollipops to orphans.

He doesn't want the power to raise taxes. I wonder why?

I have made it clear that I am willing to accept a certain part of this trend away from the Congress and to the President, but I do not for a minute go along on his request for the power unilaterally to lower taxes. Nor can I readily accept his request for wide, new authority over tariffs unless it is coupled with congressional oversight to assure that the President administers our trade laws in the way in which the Congress intended.

Perhaps what we most need to do to govern our Nation effectively in the space age is modernize and strengthen the Congress, rather than to weaken it. We must make the Congress more responsive and more efficient. For example, it has been suggested that we could have longer sessions to meet today's challenges, with only a short summer recess. Similarly, we could set aside a special session for appropriations, obtain more and better staff people to serve our committees, get rid of the filibuster (the greatest evil in the legislative process), and make it easier to bring bills to the floor and act upon them with dispatch. I would endorse such moves. These and similar steps would help redress the growing imbalance between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

This relationship between the President and the Congress cuts across many issues which are essential to our Nation's future. I hope that we will not make the mistake of permitting the Congress to become a vestigial, honorary branch of government—a parlor for thoughtful seers—a French Parliament or a House of Lords.

THE STRENGTH OF OUR ECONOMY

As bankers, I hope I have given you some insight into my views on economic issues as well as on the present challenge to the structure of our Government which I believe will greatly affect our Nation's future. Trade and taxes, both of which I have discussed, are economic issues of great moment in the Congress.

Let me add to these comments a few of my predictions as to the course of our economy in the months ahead.

Despite the President's insistence, I do not think his fiscal 1963 budget will balance. If it is not balanced, this will, of course, mean a speedup of inflation.

One of the best indicators of the condition of the price level, believe it if you like, is the price of mink pelts. Many observers claim that fur prices are an accurate barometer of overall price movement. This winter, prices on mink pelts are running 7½ to 10 percent ahead of last year. A bad omen.

If any of you gentleman are planning to buy minks for your ladies, you had best reconsider. You can tell them KEN KEATING suggested that out of a patriotic service to our national economy, you should hold off. Fight mink. Fight inflation. This isn't going to make me popular with the ladies or the furriers, but it ought to nail down a great big slice of you gentlemen.

Prices, in recent weeks, have shown signs of deterioration in a number of other key industries. With our economy moving ahead in the thrust of a recovery, I reiterate that I am very much concerned about inflation in 1962.

On the international scene, our balance of payments position has gotten much worse. In the fourth quarter of 1961, we hit a sky-high rate of $5 billion outflow per year. This could become a grave problem, especially with inflation, if it continues into 1962.

These, I believe, are the two most important potential trouble spots. With the exception of inflationary pressures and an acceleration of our imbalance of international payments, I think we are in for good times. Our economy should continue upward, hopefully carrying with it a decline in present high unemployment rates.

So here I am. I have revealed my innermost prognostications. Next year, at your midwinter meeting, you may want to invite me to dinner. I hope I won't have to eat my words. But if I am wrong, you can serve me deflationary stew with a side order of balanced budget; and, for dessert, a small slice of recession pie, topped with a scoop of whipped predictions.

The 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in proportion to population few if any of the countries of the world have contributed so importantly to the growth and development and strength of the United States as has the small Baltic nation of Lithuania.

As one who represents a congressional district which includes among its residents a substantial number of people of Lithuanian descent, I speak from personal knowledge that Union County, N.J., is a better place in which to live because of their presence as our neighbors and fellow citizens.

If I may be pardoned a further personal reference, Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform our colleagues in the House that the prayer to be delivered at the opening of today's session in the Senate is scheduled to be offered by a distinguished constituent, the Right Reverend Monsignor Michael G. Kemezis, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul's Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church in Elizabeth, a man and priest greatly loved and honored by all who know him.

By commemorating the 44th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian

independence, Mr. Speaker, we are honoring not only our fellow Americans of Lithuanian ancestry but all Americans, regardless of their national heritage, who share the love of freedom and liberty which has motivated the determination of Lithuanians everywhere to see their homeland free again.

Freedom is not an accidental quality, to be awarded or withdrawn arbitrarily or capriciously. It belongs, by the very nature with which Almighty God has endowed mankind, to every individual human being. Governments are required by the moral law to respect this freedom and to rule their countries in such a way as to give full scope to the growth and development, in freedom, of the capacities and talents of their people. Governments which deny freedom and which subject their people to the burdens of tyranny violate the law of God and invite the condemnation of the free world.

Freedom has another characteristic. It flourishes only where those who enjoy it take it seriously and strive to protect it and strengthen it and extend its benefits to others. It withers and dies where it is taken for granted, where apathy and disinterest reign, where it is used and exploited only to serve a selfish purpose.

It is important to remind ourselves of these fundamental facts about freedom, Mr. Speaker, and it is particularly appropriate that we do so on the occasion of Lithuanian Independence Day. Tragically, Lithuania lost its freedom or, more properly, was deprived of freedom by the force of arms and by the perpetuation of a foreign-supported tyranny, in gross violation of international law and of the God-given rights of man.

But Lithuanians have not capitulated to tyranny. They have not surrendered. At great sacrifice, they have continued to resist oppression. And in their determination to be free again, to establish once more an independent, truly Lithuanian government, they have the dedicated support of their fellow Lithuanians in America and of all Americans who cherish our Nation's heritage.

We shall not abandon Lithuania, nor forget her sister states of Latvia and Estonia. We, who represent our people in the Congress of the United States, are proud to rededicate ourselves to the noble objective of the independence of the Baltic States and the freedom of people everywhere.

As a part of my remarks on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of resolutions adopted on January 28, 1962, by the Lithuanian-Americans of Linden, N.J., gathered under the auspices of the Linden Branch of the Lithuanian American Council, and signed by Vladas Tursa, president, and Stasys Vaiciunas, secretary:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON JANUARY 28, 1962, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH, FOR COMMEMORATION OF THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania through their representative council at the historic capital of Vilnius, proclaimed to the world the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania; and

Whereas the years of independent government fully proved and justified the nation's integrity for self-government and completely warranted credence and recognition as a free and independent state, accorded her by the other world nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, in pursuance of secret agreements between Joseph Stalin and his government with Hitler and his government, in 1940 invaded, occupied and subjugated the three independent Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas Nikita Khrushchev, present head of the Communist Party and of the present Soviet Government, in October of last year at the assembled 22d Congress of the Communist Party made charges against Joseph Stalin, the late head of the Communist Party and Government of the Soviet Union, condemning him as an insane criminal and denouncing most of his acts and those of his government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American citizens of Lithuanian birth or extraction of Linden, N.J., reaffirming their adherence to the moral and political principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America, call upon the Government of the United States to take cognizance of the admission by the present Government of the Soviet Union that the policies and actions of the Soviet Government under Stalin were criminal and that this admission should be made applicable to the Soviet policy in the Baltic States; and be it

Resolved, To request the Government of the United States to take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the policy of colonialism of Soviet Russia in the Baltic States and bring about the reexamination of the Baltic situation with the view of reestablishing freedom and independence to these three nations; and be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency John F. Kennedy; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer; and to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

A Tribute to DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a statement made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a U.S. Senator, calling the Disabled American Veterans an organization which has "little more than a shirttailful of active members who attend meetings."

I am familiar with the Paterson Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, and I know that it is an active group composed of men who are dedicated to the protection of the rights of disabled veterans as well as to the welfare of our great Nation. I understand that other posts throughout the country are similarly active.

I do not think that the gentleman who made the statement intended to belittle the organization, but was carried away by the heat of debate. However, I would be remiss if I did not express my own sentiments about this fine organization.

Robert Welch and the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this statement which I have released to the press.

It may clear up some of the misunderstanding about Robert Welch and the John Birch Society.

The statement follows:

ROBERT WELCH AND THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

There have been many comments recently about Robert Welch, the founder and present leader of the John Birch Society. I have the following observations to make on this subject:

1. I totally disagree with Mr. Welch's position about former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I made this position very clear in April 1961 at a regular press conference. I have reaffirmed this position publicly on many occasions. The thesis that Mr. Eisenhower was either used by or was (a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy) was advanced by Mr. Welch in a manuscript known as "The Politician." This has never been part of the John Birch Society. As a matter of fact, the council, made up of 28 fine dedicated citizens, disavowed Mr. Welch's position on this issue very clearly when the John Birch Society was founded in 1958. I personally have had other areas of strong disagreement with Robert Welch and have made this clear not only to the press and my constituents, but also to Mr. Welch himself.

2. Though I have had obvious and pointed disagreements with Mr. Welch in certain areas this does not mean that Robert Welch and/or other members of the John Birch Society cannot unite in several basic purposes.

(a) To encourage the education and responsible understanding among Birch members and all Americans of the threat which the Communist conspiracy poses for our Nation. Attorney General Robert Kennedy confirmed the need for knowledge and alertness when on September 24, 1961, he said: "Communist espionage here in this country is more active now than it has ever been." In the "Blue Book," Mr. Welch has stated: "All we must find and build and use, to win, is sufficient understanding. Let's create that understanding and build that resistance, with everything mortal men can put into the effort—while there still is time" (p. 174).

(b) To give all Americans a full understanding of the insidiousness of the Marxist doctrine to destroy our concept of constitutional freedom in this country.

(c) To regenerate in each citizen a proper appreciation of the protection of individual rights given to us by the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

3. Robert Welch and all the members of the John Birch Society are doing their part

to contribute not only to the resurgence of the conservative movement within the country, but also positively contributing to the anti-Communist program in this country.

4. There have been recommendations that Mr. Welch be asked to step aside because he is "damaging the cause of anticommunism." I disagree with this thought and wish to make that clear at this time. It seems unrealistic to me to ask any segment of our conservative anti-Communist movement to be removed from the battle line at the time when we are beginning to win and just because we do not agree with every item.

5. Strenuous discussion on all the vital issues is healthy and necessary in order to develop new approaches to solve the problems which face our Nation. Furthermore, the very existence of strenuous disagreement within conservative rank proves the vitality of the conservative anti-Communist movement. Conservatives, contrary to the concept peddled by the collectivist establishment, not only tolerates discussion and disagreement, but encourage it as a means of achieving the desired end of intellectual honesty and academic freedom.

6. Robert Welch is an intense foe of communism and the fact that he is the anti-Communist most often attacked in Pravda as well as other Communist publications throughout the United States and the rest of the world, attests to the validity of this thesis.

7. Finally, claims that the John Birch Society is Fascist or dictatorial are preposterous. Mr. Welch has said over and over: "Our members are told specifically and emphatically in our bulletins, about once every 3 months, never to carry out any of our requests or to do anything for the society that is against their individual consciences or even contrary to their best judgment." (Footnote 27, p. xv, 4th printing of the "Blue Book.")

Members of the John Birch Society are fine, dedicated, intelligent Americans who adhere to the motto "less government, more individual responsibility, and a better world." This motto as well as activities of the members, directed to this end, are completely consistent with the heritage passed on to us by the Founding Fathers of America.

All of Us Should Drink More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been alarmed for some time at the declining consumption in milk and dairy products brought about, in great measure, by overemphasis in certain media on the problems of nuclear fallout and cholesterol.

It was gratifying that the Department of Agricuture, with the participation of President Kennedy, recently held a National Conference on Milk and Nutrition. I hope that the conference has resulted in a clearing of the air with regard to the fears, real and imagined, which have blighted the reputation of milk as instrumental in adequate nutrition and good bodily health.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Vincent Crowley, of Crowley's Milk Co., Binghamton, N.Y., forcefully outlining the problems which have beset the dairy industry as a result of milk's poor publicity in recent months. I forwarded the letter to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman for his comments, and I here include excerpts from Mr. Crowley's letter, the letter of comment by Secretary Freeman, and a summary of the remarks made by President Kennedy at the recent conference:

CROWLEY'S MILK CO., INC.,
Binghamton, N.Y., December 27, 1961.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HOWARD: I am writing you this rather lengthy letter because of two situations which are causing the milk industry considerable concern; namely, radioactive fallout in milk and milk products, and diet-cholesterol findings. It seems that every time we turn around, we are being clobbered by the press, radio, and television with regard to these two items. Since you are representing a dairy farming area, and this fallout scare certainly affects the farmer * * * your constituents need to be made aware of the facts in order to combat the sensationalist press.

Milk seems to be the press' favorite whipping boy. Why? We think it is because it is a food item produced the year around all over the United States. It is perfect for testing whereas other products used for testing are, at some time of the year and in some parts of the country, not in production, with the result that the milk industry is carrying the full burden of the testing and the publishing of the results. Our plight is partly the result of the sensational headlines which frighten our people and they curtail the use of dairy products which can lead to malnutrition. Unfortunately, the press does not try to make amends when someone does make a find which reverses much of the material they have put in print and circulated. This is not considered sensational, or apt to build their circulation, and consequently they bury such items in the back of the newspaper.

We have been hearing a great deal about strontium 90 in milk. In fact, HOWARD, we have accumulated a considerable file of articles, pamphlets, etc., on this very subject. Recently, the USDA reported the building of an extractor for taking strontium 90 out of milk. It is a very small and costly one, and it is estimated it will cost us 5 cents per quart to use such a machine for this purpose. It is possible to put one in use, however, considering all of the reports submitted here by the National Dairy Council, the Milk Industry Foundation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Surgeon General, we can see no justification for putting this machine into use at this time.

From my own conclusions drawn from a recent report which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report (Nov. 27, 1961) by R. Lauriston Taylor, the chairman of the National Committee on Radiation Protection End Measurements, and chief of radiation physics, National Bureau of Standards, I am wondering what all the shouting is about. Mr. Taylor does not seem to be greatly concerned about the problem, at least not to the point the hysterical press is. His approach and outlook seem most sensible and what seems to be needed at this particular time, is a calm look at things, and a commonsense approach to the problem. After all, Mr. Taylor stated among other things, that a man sitting in front of his TV set night after night is getting as much radiation from sitting near the set as he is getting from fallout. (And I'll bet he won't give up his TV viewing just because this is so.)

I think we need to get the experts in this field to come to an agreement on what is and is not dangerous and above all, we need to have some strong assurance with regard to foodstuffs that there is no need for concern and for the changing of dietary patterns which could lead to malnutrition.

Pretty much the same situation exists with regard to cholesterol and the diet. Medical men so far cannot agree on the relationship between high blood cholesterol levels and cardiovascular disease. As a result, many physicians advise against specific fat-containing dairy products for the high cholesterol and cardiovascular disease patients with the result that margarine is substituted for butter, skim milk is on the increase, and in this year more doctors recommended against cheese and cream as butterfat containing products as did in 1959. These items appear in our newspapers, on radio and television as a matter of course, and many perfectly healthy, normal individuals become fearful, and curtail the use of dairy products in the hope of avoiding high cholesterol counts. In many cases, this practice leads to bad health habits and an impairment of bodily well-being. * * *

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. CROWLEY.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROBISON: Thank you for your letter of January 19, enclosing a letter from Mr. Vincent Crowley on the publicity on radioactivity and cholesterol in milk and its effect on milk and dairy product consumption.

The President and I have been concerned about the overemphasis in the press and other communication media of this subject and the implications of this publicity on the Nation's nutrition and physical fitness. The National Conference on Milk and Nutrition was called to discuss this problem. We are concerned also about other ramifications of this problem, including the effects on the welfare of our farm population and on our soil, water, and animal resources.

Enclosed are copies of two of the statements made at this conference including the statement by the President. As you will note, the President had this to say regarding fallout: "* * * It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure." Regarding cholesterol, he stated: "* * * The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually perscribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems." He also pointed out that milk is still one of the best sources of nutrition for children and adults.

These points were brought out more fully at the conference by experts in each field.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT MILK AND NUTRITION CONFERENCE

Following is a summary of remarks made by President John F. Kennedy before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, Interdepartmental Auditorium, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962, 10:30 a.m.:

"Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation to all of you for participating in this conference, which I think is most important to our farmers and to our country.

"And I want to say a few words this morning about a very important subject to us all. And that is milk.

"Almost every State produces milk. It provides twice as much of the cash income for our farmers as any other basic crop. It's our most nourishing food.

"And last year we consumed either in the form of milk or in the form of butter, cheese, or ice cream, about 125 billion pounds of dairy products. But in the year before we consumed between 2 billion and 3 billion pounds more. At the same time, our population increased 1.7 percent. And milk production, in an effort to keep pace with population production, increased 1½ percent. And in that same time, milk consumption declined 2½ percent.

"This is a serious matter for us, serious for the dairy industry, for all of our farmers, and for the United States.

"First, it's a matter of concern because it implies poor nutrition and a less balanced diet.

"Secondly, it presents problems in the area of the management of our milk production. It will require adjustment. We cannot continue to accumulate dairy products in still larger inventories. Nor can we embark upon a policy that will jeopardize the economic interest of so large a segment of our farm population. For there is a close relationship between prosperity on the farm and prosperity in the city, between economic health of our farm community and the economic health of our Nation.

"Third, the drop in milk consumption has a serious implication for the best use of those soil, water, and animal resources that are now involved in dairy production. I doubt that anyone can be sure of the reasons of this sudden drop in consumption. We only know that the slow decline in consumption over a period of time became immediate and precipitous last year.

"I have long been convinced that milk is an important aid to good health. This has led me to direct that milk be served at every White House meal from now on. And I expect that all of us will benefit from it.

"If we are to be a vigorous and vital nation as we all desire, then, of course, we must depend on the consumption of a balanced diet. And milk must be a part of it.

"I am aware that there has been a good deal of public discussion about the effect of radioactive fallout upon our food supply. Most of the discussion has unfortunately used milk as an example of food products that might be contaminated. This recognizes the importance of milk in our daily diet, but it has the unfortunate effect of causing an identification in the minds of some between fallout and milk. I should like to correct any misunderstandings that may exist about this.

"The Public Health Service and other agencies have been instructed to keep the problems of fallout in food under constant surveillance. Detailed guidelines to protect the health of the people against radiation have been developed by the Federal Radiation Council. It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure.

"The milk supply offers no hazards—on the contrary it remains one of the best sources of nutrition for our children and for adults. And I hope that the American people will appreciate this more and more as time goes on. In addition, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems.

"In the past 50 years, our children have grown more vigorous and sturdy because of better diets and better health. Our young adults are now about 2 inches taller than they were half a century ago. I should like, and I am sure all of us would like, to see this trend continue.

"A large proportion of our people now attain a physical condition once attained by a very few. But nutritionists tell us that 10 percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies, I'm told, are in the very minerals and vitamins such as calcium and vitamin A—most prevalent in milk. I'm sure all of us would like to see this nutritional gap narrowed.

"Those who are familiar with the needs and the problems of our older citizens also tell us that older people need more calcium than they now get. Again milk offers the best and most economical source of this vital mineral.

"There are many schoolchildren today who do not participate in the school milk and school lunch programs because their schools do not and often cannot make them available. Last year we expanded these programs. I hope more and more children will be able to receive school milk and lunches in the days ahead. These find, I think, increasing support, these programs, among the people of other nations. We have encouraged this development and will continue to do so.

"These are some of the areas which I hope this conference will cover. I do not say that it is an easy matter that we are now faced with, but we do want to emphasize that this is a great productive resource of our country. We're rich in a very basic food. We are anxious to have the consumption of it increased as our population mounts and I believe that this conference will help bring attention of the public to what a valuable asset we have and to make sure that we develop it more fully. And therefore I want to express my thanks to all of you for being here today."

Speech Delivered by Senator Kerr at Columbia, S.C., February 7, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a speech delivered by the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, distinguished Senator from the State of Oklahoma, before a Democratic audience in Columbia, S.C., on February 7.

The speech follows:

I am delighted to be here tonight in this beautiful capital city with so many fighting, unterrified Democrats from the great Palmetto State—a State which was one of the original 13; a State whose star was sewed upon this Nation's first flag with the threads of bravery, patriotism, and religious reverence. Tonight that star still brightly shines in the constellation of the 50 States of this mighty Union, which is again moving ahead under the leadership of another great Democratic President.

I am delighted to be in the home State of all of your distinguished congressional delegation, especially my two great colleagues in the Senate, OLIN JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND. I am glad to be here with your distinguished Governor Hollings and Congressman BOB HEMPHILL. I join with you in mourning the passing of your beloved Congressman, John Riley.

I came here tonight at the request of one of the Senate's most respected and powerful Members—my cherished friend and your senior Senator, OLIN D. JOHNSTON. Meeting and talking with many of you tonight made it easy for me to understand why the good people of your fair State have for 30 years elected OLIN JOHNSTON to serve them in public office. I became acquainted with him when we were both Governors. While I was Governor of Oklahoma I visited him in your Governor's mansion—a house unique in all America, fashioned from what was left of two homes after parts of each had been destroyed during the Civil War. Those of us who have been fortunate to serve as Senators with OLIN JOHNSTON in the Senate respect his knowledge and grasp of all the difficult matters that come before the Senate. And specifically, we look to him for leadership as chairman of the powerful Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as ranking Democrat of the virtually important Agriculture Committee, and as a member of the Judiciary, Appropriations, and other Senate and joint committees. In view of this, it is no wonder that since 1944, when you first sent him to Congress, his seniority in the Senate has grown to the extent that out of 100 Senators, only 10 now outrank him. Yet, in power and influence he is second to none.

I was not surprised when I read not long ago that the Republicans here have listed him as their No. 1 target for defeat in this State. I've got news for them—they will be like the fellow who tied himself to the 3-year-old bull. He said after about three jumps, he saw where he had made a terrible mistake.

A little over a year ago, during the last presidential campaign, both candidates came to this gracious southern capital city and asked for your votes for the highest office in this land.

Nixon stood on the steps of your capitol and told you that the Democratic Party had "forfeited its right to ask you to support it when it adopted its platform in Los Angeles."

Nixon further told you that you had never had it so good as you had during the past 8 years under Eisenhower, and he promised that it would be even better under him.

Kennedy stood on those same steps and sought your vote as the first Democratic nominee for President in the history of South Carolina to come to this State and ask your help. He did not promise you an easy road if you followed him. He said: "I think to be a citizen of the United States in the 1960's is going to be a burdensome and hazardous occupation." He asked for your prayers and your help, and he promised if he were successful he would get this country moving again."

The results of that historic election are known and have been felt in South Carolina and throughout this country. South Carolina joined the majority of the people across this Nation who shouted "no" to Nixon and another 8 years under the Republicans, and "yes" to John F. Kennedy. Thus in the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman, we elected our youngest, and one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever known. And with him we elected the wise and able, distinguished, and competent Vice President, LYNDON JOHNSON. We do not claim perfection for either Kennedy or JOHNSON, but just think how much better off we are under them as our leaders than we would have been with Nixon and Lodge.

Since that election "poor Richard" has been in a state of confusion and semiretirement, and I understand that a fellow named Brown out in California is going to make Nixon's retirement permanent. But the confusion and frustration of the rank and file members of the Republican Party is even worse than Nixon's. No longer can they say "take me to our leader," because they don't know who their leader is. I understand the

Republicans have organized a committee to pick a nominee for 1964 who: looks like Rockefeller, talks like Goldwater, plays golf like Ike, who is as tricky as Dickie, and who thinks that a Rambler is somebody wheeling toward the White House. However, they wouldn't unite behind such a candidate if he could be found. They would much rather pursue their present course of "feuding, fussing and fighting."

John Kennedy assumed the Presidency during one of the most perilous times in the history of this country, and for that matter, in the history of mankind. After 8 years of Eisenhower there was deep trouble at home, and with the increasing Communist menace, there was more trouble abroad. Now we Democrats aren't like the Republicans who for 20 years have called us the war party. We do not say the Republicans created the cold war. But neither did they meet its challenges. And so when Kennedy assumed the Presidency, he also assumed the problems of a nation needing able and decisive leadership and of a world needing renewed hope and confidence in the United States and in the cause of freedom. And I might add, that not since the early days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term has a President moved so quickly and decisively on so many fronts.

In the field of agriculture, Kennedy inherited from Benson and Eisenhower a situation which shocked even the most hardened sensibilities. During the bleak period of the Eisenhower administration the farmer's share of the national income had been reduced from its alltime high to far below what it had been even in the dark days of the Hoover depression. While the farmer's net income had fallen to a 21-year low, the cost of his farm production had risen to an alltime high. But in spite of this sorry record, the cost of running the Department of Agriculture during those 8 years exceeded what it had cost to run that same department in the 100 years "B. B.", that is—"Before Benson." Benson may have gone back to sheep-herding but his name will live in infamy for a hundred years because of his mistreatment of the American farm families and their problems. What he did was like giving them an enema when what they needed was a transfusion. Benson sawed off the supports and cut back the parity on every agricultural commodity except tobacco. And had it not been for your ever-vigilant OLIN JOHNSTON, who helped write into law the firm 90 percent parity which could not be tampered with, Benson would have ruined your tobacco industry.

Since Kennedy took office, support prices have been increased, farmers have had a $1½ billion rise in net farm income, while the administration was making a real start in reducing the farm surplus. Kennedy promised to restore rural electrification to its former role of preeminence, "enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low-cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family." This was no idle campaign promise. He added $100 million to the Eisenhower budget request last year, and next year he has asked for $100 million more, for a total of $345 million, whereby more loans will be made and even more farm homes lighted. Here in South Carolina alone, nearly $95 million in loans were made to 28 borrowers who serve 143,000 farms and other rural consumers in this State. This year, service will be extended to 25,000 more rural consumers in South Carolina. What a record this is, in view of the fact that when REA was created in 1935, only 2.3 percent of the farms in this State had central electric service. OLIN JOHNSTON, as Governor of this State at that time, had a survey of rural electrical needs made, and then established South Carolina's REA program, a program which now accommodates 97 percent of your farm population with central station electrical service.

These are but a few examples of progress in the farm program since Benson left, but we know that many problems still face us in this area. Let us give thanks, however, that men and women sympathetic to the family sized farmer and his problems are in the saddle in Washington after 8 long desolate years under Eisenhower, Benson, Nixon. They are building programs which will help restore the faith in their Government of our producers of feed, food, and fiber.

Farmers now have more faith in their Government, and the consumers will have more faith in the farmers. We can be thankful that we now have a Secretary for instead of against agriculture.

Secretary Benson spent his time misrepresenting instead of representing the farmer. Now Secretary Freeman has a double load, not only to provide justice for the farmer, but to undo so many of the wrongs of Benson. Can you imagine Secretary Benson popping up in a supermarket to tell the housewife the farmer's side of the story? Thanks to Secretary Freeman, the consumer will learn that the farmer is his best friend, and that the average farmer does not have two Cadillacs in every field.

Now, for a moment, let us look at what is being done by this administration on other fronts.

A million more people are at work today than last year at this time. How different was Kennedy's attitude to the problems of unemployment than were the cruel words of Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense, when he called the unfortunate unemployed "kennel dogs who do nothing but sit on their fannies and howl."

In 1 year the Kennedy administration has brought us back from the valley of three recessions to the highroads of recovery and growth. Shortly after taking office, the President increased greatly the distribution of surplus food to the needy, established a pilot food stamp plan for critical areas, reduced FHA and community facility loan interest rates, directed the Veterans' Administration to speed up distribution of $258 million in life insurance dividends, and slowed the outward flow of our gold from Fort Knox and reduced the number of foreign claims against this gold. All of these quick decisive moves put more money into the sluggish economy left over from Eisenhower's recessions. How different were these actions from the cruel policies of the Republican leaders of high interest rates, hard money and tight credit.

President Kennedy also ordered a speedup in Federal procurement and in the building of public works and highway construction. What a pleasant change are these policies from Eisenhower's death knells of no new starts. I have often wondered where I would be if my mother and father had practiced the philosophy of no new starts.

President Kennedy's determined buildup, speedup, and firmup in the related fields of military preparedness, space, and foreign affairs have brought a complete change in the answer to the question, "Who's winning the cold war?"

In 1 year, the first year of the Kennedy administration, our overall military strength has almost doubled.

Our Navy is in control of the major seas of the world with close to 900 ships in our 4 fighting fleets containing 17 attack aircraft carriers (of which Russia has none). With the doubling of the acquisition rate of Polaris submarines we shall shortly have 41 of them carrying a total of 700 missiles with ranges of up to 1,800 miles.

In the air we have doubled the number of aircraft on ground alert since Kennedy took office, and at the end of this year, we shall have added to our current number of 1,200 jets capable of carrying nuclear weapons by building up 14 wings of the long-range B–52 bombers. Our bomber fleet is now several times the size of Russia's force, and this favorable gap is increasing daily.

On the ground, we will have by the middle of this year a total of 19 Army and Marine divisions equipped with modern weapons and experienced in guerrilla and other new tactics of warfare. These ground forces are expected to be 45 percent more effective than our forces last year.

The pendulum of the missile gap has now swung in our favor with production doubled on Minuteman missiles, and with the current rate of production on that missile and the Polaris, Titan and Atlas, we will have 1,700 missiles capable of being launched at Russia by 1965.

In the field of space, under President Kennedy, we have stopped strolling in the moonlight and have started racing for the moon.

Our space research has been broader, more methodical and has been conducted on much higher standards. We seek to conquer space not only for our national security but even more so for peaceful purposes. We strive, and will succeed to master the science of weather forecasting. Then will come control of the weather.

In a few short years, we will be operating a worldwide system of communication satellites—telephone, radio, television. What a day it will be when the golden voice of a Billy Graham or a Bishop Sheen can carry the message to a billion people of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Prince of Peace.

In the overall space effort, we are now ahead of Russia and our lead continues to increase. A major deterrent to the U.S. space program has been the lack of a larger booster rocket. We now have it—the world's largest known rocket—the eight-engine Saturn which was successfully and dramatically fired from Cape Canaveral on October 27, a total success on its very first firing. It was larger than the Statue of Liberty, the height of a 20-story building, and generated a total thrust of approximately 1,300,000 pounds. This is half a million pounds more than the 800,000 pounds generally estimated for the first stage of the vehicles that put the Soviet Union's astronauts into orbit.

Real facts of the acceleration under President Kennedy and our programs for the future are both illuminating and dramatic.

Last year we launched more than eight times as many earth satellites as did the Russians, scoring a 34–4 victory.

In a few days, we hope, a U.S. astronaut will orbit the earth and later this year astronauts will make day-long journeys of 18 orbits.

In 1963 and 1964 we plan to orbit spaceships carrying two men on week-long orbits around the globe.

In 1964–65 our Apollo mooncrafts will be operational and will make training flights, training crews of threes for trips to the moon.

In 1966 our Saturn rocket will launch Apollos and crews on half-million-mile flights around the moon and back.

And, in 1967, President Kennedy's space program shall reach the spectacular goal of landing Americans on the moon by the use of the powerful Nova rocket.

In the field of foreign affairs Russia has been plagued by failures, while America has begun to regain prestige and respect.

Albania and Communist China have openly defied Russia's control of the Communist world, and other countries such as Rumania and Poland are tugging at the Russian leash. Inside the Kremlin an ideological battle is now dividing the leaders of Russia.

A great new economic force, the Common Market, is rising up on Russia's doorstep, and is becoming a new factor in the world's balance of power.

Since 1948 the only new conquest brought home to Moscow was that of Castro's Cuba. Guinea, once thought to be in the Communist orbit, recently caught and ousted the Russian Ambassador for directing a plot to overthrow the Government.

In this same field of foreign affairs, the United States has outstripped the Russians and we have stopped merely reacting to Communist aggression and started acting and taking *decisive steps*. Kennedy established a Peace Corps, harnessing our most valuable resource, our young people, as ambassadors of good will at the local level, working side by side with and among the people of 11 countries. Already numerous other countries have asked that a contingent of the Peace Corps be sent to them.

President Kennedy has strengthened NATO, has stood firm in Berlin, and has fought for a neutral government in Laos and for the unity and peace of the Congo. And Cuba has been made to swallow their own Castro oil; last week, Cuba was kicked out of the Organization of American States, thanks to the diplomatic moves by this administration at Puenta del Este. How good and how pleasant has been the change our image from the Ugly American to the image of strength and determination against our enemies, yet one of compassion and help to our friends and to those who need our aid in withstanding Communist aggression.

But all of these facts and figures cannot and do not tell the complete story of why we are winning the cold war under President Kennedy.

I believe the decisive ingredient is what is contained, and what has been rekindled, in the hearts and minds and spirits of 185 million Americans.

It is because of my faith in their faith, my confidence in their confidence, my courage because of the knowledge of their courage, my strength to endure because of their strength to endure, that makes me positive and convinced that America is most certainly winning and will continue to win the cold war.

Is there any wonder that after a year of positive action on all fronts that the Gallup poll shows that 85 percent of the people of this country approve our new President and his leadership.

We know that Kennedy and Johnson were elected because Eisenhower, Nixon and company had been tried and found wanting. After 8 years of being lulled with misstatements, misevaluations, and overdoses of political tranquilizers, the alarm clock has sounded. We have awakened to a world full of peril and pain, but a world offering the greatest opportunities and challenges ever known to mankind. We have accepted the challenges of the cold war, of outer space, and of our duties to our fellow Americans instead of dozing and dreaming with the Rip Van Winkle Republicans. You can feel the quickened pace, the vitality and the new will to compete and win. John Kennedy's election as President has brought about one of the most exciting transitions in evolutionary government that I have ever witnessed.

Let us unite under the banner of Democracy.

Let all Democrats show the way to America and to the world.

Let the battle be joined. Let us not be idle dreamers, but let us dare to dream.

Let us be fully prepared if war is forced upon us, but let us pray for peace.

Let us not act from fear, but not be afraid to act.

Let us gird our loins with patience in the knowledge that communism will not end tomorrow, but that when it does end, it will be a complete victory for democracy and freedom.

Let us bring a new meaning to those words our Founding Fathers penned at the conclusion of the Declaration of Independence, that to insure the successful outcome of this struggle we hereby "dedicate our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday February 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an outstanding article entitled, "Automation," by my distinguished colleague on the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, who has been serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.

Few Americans are so well informed on the implications of automation as Congressman HOLLAND. His article contains a valuable summary of the reasons it is essential that Congress this year pass his bill, the Manpower Development and Training Act. I hope very much that the House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity for action on this legislation which was favorably reported by a bipartisan majority of 24 to 3 in the House Education and Labor Committee.

The text of the article, which was published in the February 2, 1962, issue of the Criterion in Indianapolis, Ind., follows:

AUTOMATION

(By Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania)

There is little doubt but that automation has become a household word within the last decade in America.

We have pushbutton kitchens, laundries, garages and appliances in our newer homes and our older homes are being renovated and modernized to include these improvements.

The horizon holds almost unbelievable vistas for the individual with all our laborsaving devices.

However, on our way to that horizon we will—and we are—encountering quite a hazardous and rocky road.

As chairman of the special Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation during the first half of the 87th Congress, I listened to representatives of labor, management, government and educational institutions, testifying at our public hearings on this subject and they described the immediate and future problems for which we must find a solution. We all realize that automation is the promise of the future, but we also recognize that it is also a problem of the present.

We do not fear automation nor do we wish to avoid it. We know that we must have it in order to maintain the strength of the American economy and retain our world leadership.

However, we feel that the fruits of automation should be shared by all, not just a few.

We know the housewife welcomes all laborsaving devices in the home and the manager of an industrial plant welcomes laborsaving devices in the plant just as readily. The difference, however, is that in the plant, the mill, or factory these laborsaving devices mean the elimination of jobs.

If jobs are not available the housewife will not be in a position to buy these modern appliances nor can she look forward to enjoying the fruits of automation because an unemployed husband cannot supply such benefits for his home.

During our recent hearings it was brought out that—if we continue to automate at the present rate—we will eliminate 1½ million jobs a year. These are jobs in heavy industry and the service industries—production jobs, office jobs, clerical jobs, cleaning jobs, vending jobs, elevator jobs, and many more. These are both blue- and white-collar jobs.

Let me tell you what has happened in the past 10 years—the years of experiment and development in automation. (The official term is R. & D.—research and development.) You can then well imagine what the future holds since they are advertising now machines which make other machines.

In the electrical industry, production jobs decreased 10 percent or 89,000 less jobs, but production (output) increased 21 percent. Production jobs in the appliance field dropped 50 percent and in the production of electrical instruments production jobs dropped 15 percent or 30,000 jobs, but output increased.

Over 20,000 Illinois packinghouse workers have seen their jobs vanish in the meatpacking industry.

In the oil industry there are 10,000 less production workers than before but, here again, production is up. Incidentally, this is one of the most highly automated industries in our Nation.

In the auto industry, it is estimated that over 160,000 auto workers will never be recalled to work because of modernized plants.

In the chemical industry, production rose 80 percent from 1953 to 1960, yet production workers' jobs shrank by 13,000.

In the steel industry, it now takes 12 men to produce the same amount of steel that it formerly took 20 men to produce. In 1960 the same amount of steel was produced as in 1950 but there were 80,000 less steel workers in 1960.

During the postwar period, productivity in the soft coal industry rose 96 percent but employment—jobs for miners—fell by 262,000 jobs.

Railroad productivity rose by 65 percent during these years but employment fell by 540,000 jobs eliminated.

In the offices, it has been estimated, there were 10,000 computer installations during 1961 and each installation affects approximately 140 people. Therefore, it was expected that 1,400,000 workers would be affected last year as a result of these installations. Mr. Howard Coughlin, president of the Office Employes' International Union, testified that within the next 5 years he would not be surprised to see at least 4 million office workers replaced by computers.

It is true, of course, that many of these individuals who have been replaced by machines, computers and the like, have not been thrown out of work immediately. Many of our industries have found other jobs for them. However, in most cases the workers have been downgraded, or forced to work for less money at a lesser job. Upon their retirement or resignation, their job is eliminated and no one is hired to replace them.

This practice is called silent firing and covers—in many cases—the claims made by industry that automation is not responsible for our present unemployment problem. Nevertheless, jobs are not available for the new entrants into our labor market.

During the years between 1960 and 1970, we will have from 1½ to 2½ million yearly enter the labor market. These are high school graduates and, while some will go on

to college, it is estimated there will be 26 million seeking jobs. What jobs?

In New York City alone, during the past 10 years, 25,000 elevator operators have been replaced by the automatic elevator. Vending machines have replaced salesmen, cleaning machines have replaced charwomen and custodians, dishwashing machines have replaced dishwashers in hotels, hospitals, schools, institutions and similar establishments. These conditions exist in other cities too.

Today there are over 1 million long-term unemployed. These are men and women—unskilled or skilled in only one field—and that field has been automated.

We also have 1.5 million young people between the ages of 17 and 21 who are unemployed, many of whom never have been able to find a job.

Both these groups need additional education and training if they ever hope to secure employment.

This, then, is our immediate problem.

In an effort to assist those who are classified as "long-term unemployed" last August I introduced legislation known as the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, H.R. 8399.

At the time of this writing, the Holland bill is in the Rules Committee of the House and is expected to be among the first order of business of that committee when it meets later this month.

There has been much interest in this legislation. The Kennedy administration has endorsed it and is anxious to see it passed. Many of the more liberal leaders of industry are also in favor of its passage. However, I must admit there is opposition to it and that comes from some highly organized groups within industry such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Holland bill provides a program for training our long-term unemployed. While attending such classes, the participant will receive an allotment from the Federal Government equal to the unemployment compensation rate paid by the State in which he resides.

This, of course, will not be in addition to unemployment compensation for those who are attending these classes are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation. (At the present time all but 15 States in America prohibit those on unemployment compensation from attending retraining classes as the laws in the 39 States explicitly say that "the recipient of unemployment compensation must be able to go to work immediately if called upon to do so." There is a move on to correct this as it is now recognized that everyone should have the opportunity to secure additional education in order to improve their capability. However, the correction cannot be made under this particular legislation—it must be a separate bill presented by the Ways and Means Committee.)

The courses, under the Holland bill, will be given under vocational school supervision and on-the-job training and will be no longer than 52 weeks in duration.

In order to qualify for such training, the applicant will apply to the State employment offices and there he will be given necessary tests to find out his aptitude and ability. He will then be counseled as to what course he should take.

The courses recommended and taught will be in skills which will be needed in the years ahead.

In order to assure those taking part in this program that they will not be taught needless skills, the Holland bill has provided that authority be given to the Secretary of Labor to conduct a nationwide survey on our manpower needs and our manpower resources.

There is little doubt that many of the long-term unemployed are undereducated for our highly automated industrial world, and unless we help them to secure additional educational opportunities, the remainder of their lives will be spent on public assistance rolls at the full expense of the taxpayer.

The cost of the program, under the Holland bill, has been estimated to be approximately $260 million for 2 years. Those who oppose it state we cannot afford to spend this money now.

I would like to point out that our public relief rolls are continually growing and today we are spending over $2 billion a year—that is State, county, and Federal costs. If we can get a program, such as I have suggested, underway, I am sure the public assistance rolls can be reduced, little by little. I firmly believe we cannot afford not to put this program into effect.

The Department of Labor expects to get at least 200,000 retrained and reemployed under this program, thereby letting these people again support their families, educate their children, live as human beings and contribute to the national economy with their purchasing power.

The Secretary of Labor will find out the plans of our industries and our businesses and their need for specified manpower in the next 5 or 10 years. This will be based on an estimate, of course, for we all know that every successful industry or business enterprise has plans for their future. However, their cooperation is needed if we hope to have full employment and an expanding economy here in the Nation.

When the needs of our industrial society are known, the Secretary of Labor can then specify the courses to be provided and financed by the Federal Government. The individual States will then be notified and through their departments of education such schooling can be offered the unemployed.

We recognize that even with the passage of the Holland bill, all our problems will not be solved. However, many of us feel that without it we will never be able to get many of our long-term unemployed off the relief rolls and enable them to become self-sustaining.

In 1959, a special educational census was conducted and it showed that we had 7.8 million functional illiteracies in our Nation—of these 2.6 million had never attended school. This total consisted of 6.4 percent of the white population over 25 years of age and 23.5 percent of the nonwhite population over 25 years of age. These people will become taxpayers again, and cease to become "taxtakers."

There will be some who say that under the recent Area Redevelopment Act a retraining program was offered and, up to date, it has not proved to be very successful. I would like to call their attention to the fact that the training provided under this act is only for 16 weeks, and in today's world of automation and technical skills, not much can be learned in 16 weeks, especially if any academic training is needed as is the case most of the time. Also, only those residing in certified depressed areas can receive this training.

Those opposing this bill—H.R. 8399—state that individual workers, under the free enterprise system, have the responsibility to secure additional education themselves. They also state that industries and businesses should be required to retrain those whose positions have been eliminated.

In answer to the first suggestion, unemployed workers cannot afford to pay for additional education, even if it is available.

As to having industries and businesses retrain those they dismiss, in the cases of large companies this may be feasible, but here I should like to point out that even Westinghouse Electric has just discontinued its apprentice training course. In the case of small companies—the cost would be too great.

Recently the Wall Street Journal had a feature story—"Job Outlook—Many Firms Will Boost Hiring, but Efficiency Increase Limits Needs." In the story it says: "The Nation's factory workers will find more jobs open in the early months of 1962 but probably not enough more to put back to work everyone furloughed during the recent recession." It further states: "The companies which do not need more workers now say they have no trouble finding unskilled or semi-skilled workers to man production lines, but for skilled workers, including machinists, draftsmen, and especially engineers, the story is often very different." Also the paper reported: "Other concerns are relying largely on greater efficiency rather than more workers to boost output."

In Houston, Tex., just several weeks ago, it was announced that there was in operation a wholly automated steel mill which produced seamless pipe.

In New York City, a wholly automated train was put into operation in the subway between Times Square and Grand Central Station. This was on a trial basis, but the handwriting is on the wall. Similar trains are now being suggested to solve the mass transit systems in many cities.

At Boeing Airplane Co.'s plant in Wichita, Kans., a piece of aluminum is lifted onto a machine bigger than a three-story house. After more than 100 operations, it comes out the wing skin of a B–52 plane. Nowhere in the machining process does a human hand touch the aluminum, nor is there a machinist standing by. A computer does the work.

At Food Machine and Chemical Corp.'s plant in Hoopeston, Ill., 80 holes are drilled and tapped in a piece of steel moving through another giant tool. The steel comes out a finished part for a food-processing machine. No human operator is in sight.

In Washington, D.C., a computer is coming to the rescue of lawyers who must wade through thousands of old cases in search of precedents. The project uses computers to track down information such as law case references and legislative history buried in the mass of legal literature. It is aimed at cutting to a minimum the delays and drudgery connected with research or merger or monopoly cases. At the hearings of my subcommittee last summer, it was reported that such a machine could—in 11 minutes—do the work now done in 7 hours by a law clerk.

These examples are just a few of what is ahead of us, what we can expect, and what we must prepare for.

While the Holland bill deals only with our long-term unemployed, the heads of families, so to speak, we realize the problem of our young people entering the labor market is one that must be faced and solved, also.

Let me point out that our young people must be encouraged to get as much education as possible.

Today, even a high school diploma is seldom enough to secure a position. Last year one of the mills in Pittsburgh hired only young men with 1 or 2 years' college education for laboring jobs. Their argument was that in the years ahead—in order to grow with the company and the continual increasing use of technology—at least a basic college education was necessary.

Possibly if our high schools upgraded their curriculum and offered some technical training—definitely more mathematics, more languages, more science—our young people would be better fitted to work and live in the highly automated society we will have.

Possibly junior colleges must be opened in our cities and counties, providing additional educational opportunities to our youth thereby preparing them more adequately to earn a living, support and raise a family, and eventually take over the management of this Nation of ours.

We must remember today's youth—tomorrow's leaders.

The future of our Nation depends upon them. We must give them the best if we want America to remain a world leader.

As I stated earlier in this article, the administration is in favor of the Holland Manpower Development and Training Act, and President Kennedy, in his state of the Union address stressed the importance of this act and asked for its immediate enactment.

He said that our unemployed "whose only skill has been replaced by a machine, or moved with a mill, or shut down with a mine" must be given the opportunity to secure retraining if we ever hope to have them return to work.

In recognition of the unemployment problem of our inadequately educated and trained youth, the President also asked that the Youth Employment Opportunities Act be passed this session.

The word "automation," that household term, is certainly changing our present way of life. It will be responsible for even greater changes in the years ahead.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 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:

Our Father, strong to save, amid the shifting shadows of the temporal, take Thou the dimness of our souls away, so that with clear and clean eyes we may discern the shining truth of the eternal.

Forgive us that in the heat of partisanship so often we have forgotten that above our selfish ambitions and our hollow pride lie unchangeable verities like granite peaks piercing the sky.

Facing days which tax all their resources, give to Thy servants here in the stewardship of public affairs the untroubled calm which illuminates faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

In a world which is a battlefield where truth and falsehood are locked in mortal combat, even as we face unnumbered foes endeavoring to destroy the things which to us are dearer than life, bar our own hearts to all cynicism and hatred.

As we fight the good fight with all our might, may our strength be as the strength of 10 because our hearts are pure.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One who declared, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 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 agreed to the 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. 258) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that statements in the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for today and for the remainder of the week, if at this time he can give us some indication in that regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reply to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, let me say it was anticipated that today the Senate would proceed with consideration of the President's proposal to create a Cabinet position for Urban Affairs.

However, in view of the fact that the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has worked with such diligence and dispatch in holding hearings and in trying to comply with the wishes of the Senate in this respect, I believe it only fair and proper that the Senate, in turn, observe the normal rule of procedure which has marked this institution through the years. Consequently, there will be a postponement, for the time being, of consideration of the President's proposal.

The pending business will be House bill 5143, Calendar No. 496, to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901. There has been some small amount of debate on that measure. It is hoped that the Senate can dispose of it either today or tomorrow.

It is anticipated that other items on the calendar will be brought up during the course of the week; and the Senate will be in session every day this week, in an effort to clear the calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I certainly applaud the majority leader's decision. Over the weekend I have followed the news in regard to the reorganization proposal—not only through the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, its chairman, but also through the minority leadership. I understand that some of the testimony taken before that committee is still to be corrected, before it can be returned to the committee. The distinguished chairman of the committee can speak about that for himself.

However, under the circumstances I think the course stated by the majority leader is a wise and prudent one to follow—and then to make sure that every Member is on notice that, other things being equal, the reorganization measure will be taken up a week from today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. Certainly he has shown diligence and dispatch in connection with consideration of the reorganization plan. It is the feeling of the leadership, after consultation, that the course which has been announced is the proper one; and we hope it will apply wherever possible in all cases in connection with proposed legislation of this nature.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I appreciate very much the statement of the majority leader in regard to this problem. There are some who are very anxious to have the bill he has mentioned disposed of at an early date.

As chairman of the committee—and I speak for all members of the committee—I wish to state that there has been no undue delay. In fact, we have moved with expedition in an effort to process the bill, so there will be a record on it, and so that those who have very firm views about the merits of the proposal will have had an opportunity to register their views and to give their testimony.

So far as I know—and I said this also last Friday afternoon—the public hearings are closed. We did keep the record open, so that insertions might be made of statements which were submitted—as is proper—and also so that we might insert in the record certain information requested from the Director of the Budget. That information had not been received early this morning; it may arrive here during the day. When it is received, it is the intention of the chairman of the committee formally to close the hearing and to close the record, and to send the record to the Public Printer. After it is returned from the Public Printer, we shall call a meeting of the