



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Michael P. Hinnebusch of the Church of the Assumption, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit:

O great and holy God, loving Father of us all, look down with favor upon us, make Thy holy spirit fill our hearts, and enkindle in us the fire of Thy divine love.

Bless, we pray Thee, the words that we shall say and the works that we shall do and the purpose of our speech and action today.

Through Thy loving grace, grant to each of us a share of Thy infinite love so that we may be enabled and strengthened to love one another as Thou hast also loved us.

Grant that through this gift of love we may realize Thy eternal fatherhood over us all and live with one another in a continuing spirit of brotherhood.

We pray Thee to bless our Nation and its leaders, our citizens and their families, and our own personal efforts toward good living.

Grant that in all things we may say or do, each one of us may promote Thy eternal honor and glory.

For this great blessing we pray Thee through our Lord, Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in union with the Holy Spirit, God, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1988. An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 383. An act to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes.

PHILADELPHIA COUNCIL FOR COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. 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. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today the Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement is the recipient of a \$165,000 grant in order to plan an extensive antidelinquency program. The council includes representatives of the city and State governments, the Philadelphia Board of Public Education, the Health and Welfare Council, Inc., the United Fund, the Citizen's Committee on Public Education, the Greater Philadelphia Movement, the local chapter of the NAACP, Temple University, and the University of Pennsylvania. The announcement of the grant has been made by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency under authority of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, administered by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff in cooperation with Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Chairman of the President's Committee. The grant will support a 12-month planning period for the development of a comprehensive program dealing with the causes of delinquency in Philadelphia, and the funds are to be used to support training programs for persons who work with youth and to support local demonstration projects which utilize a comprehensive approach to the causes of juvenile delinquency.

Under the guidance of the cooperating groups in the city of Philadelphia I feel certain the seriousness of the delinquency problem will be thoroughly covered and that an effective program will be developed. The grant we are receiving today will be of tremendous help toward the eradication of this social problem, and I am certainly pleased to know that we are to share in the program.

NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

Mr. EDMONDSON. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, some months ago the President launched a physical fitness program in order to try to improve the physical condition and readiness of the young people and their parents as well across the country. Tonight in the city of Muskogee, Okla., thousands of schoolchildren will join in a physical fitness festival to herald the success of the first year of the program in this pilot city. X-15 Pilot Joe Walker, of NASA, and Olympic Champion Wilma Rudolph will be among the national figures joining in the Muskogee festival.

Mr. Speaker, one of the remarkable things that was developed at the start of this program was a survey which showed that approximately 6 out of 10 children in our schools could not do the simplest exercises, such as chinning themselves. After about 8 months of a daily physical education program under the leadership of Coach Bud Wilkinson and Alph Stanphill, the figures today show that more than 90 percent of the young people in the schools of Muskogee can now meet the standards laid down in the President's program.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a splendid tribute to the schools in Muskogee, to the school board, administrators, and teachers of that system, and to every child in the school system who joined in this program and participated actively and enthusiastically in it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend not only President Kennedy and Coach Wilkinson for the national leadership which they have given to this movement, but men, women, and children all over the United States who are joining enthusiastically in it in order to make our people and our Nation stronger for the future.

ANNUITY INCREASES FOR RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide much needed annuity increases for retired Federal employees and their survivors and to provide for the adjustment of inequities in the Civil Service Act.

One of the three bills I am introducing provides for the stabilization of civil service retirement with social security benefits; an automatic cost-of-living increase for retired Federal employees

each year, if the increase exceeds 1 percent; a corresponding increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees when current employees receive a pay raise. Under the terms of one of these bills, immediate annuity increases would be provided in the amount of 20 percent of such annuity for the first \$1,000 and 10 percent for the annuity above \$1,000. Similar increases would be provided for survivor annuities, and previous restrictions on annuity increases voted by Congress in 1952 and 1955 would be eliminated.

This legislation is long overdue. Increases in annuities should be granted whenever pay increases are granted to active Federal employees. The cost of living affects retired employees as much as it affects present employees. Retired Federal employees are finding it very difficult to exist on fixed annuities, and this is no reward for their many years of service to their country.

I urge the Congress to act favorably on this legislation which is so vital to retired employees.

THE FEDERAL PAY RAISE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it follows logically that a well-deserved pay increase for the largest group of Federal employees—those who work for the Post Office Department—must be matched by a corresponding pay raise for all other classified employees of the U.S. Government.

Years ago, before the old age and survivors' insurance system was organized under Federal law, the retirement benefits for career employees of the Federal Government provided the incentive that attracted many young people to the civil service of the United States.

Even in those days, the salaries under civil service lagged behind comparable jobs in private enterprise. But the prospect of retirement security compensated for the below-average pay. When the Social Security Act became law, providing retirement benefits for those working in the private sector of our economy, the advantage of working for the Federal Government lost some of its appeal. Proof of that is to be found in the excessive and wasteful turnover of employment in the civil service.

We are losing too many good people to private enterprise, and are unable to attract the best type of replacements because we have failed to make public pay standards equal those prevailing in business and industry.

We cannot afford to let the level of competence in Federal employment decline through lack of consideration for the economic predicament in which Federal employees find themselves. Because they are not sharing in the rising standards of living, they must find jobs elsewhere that will permit them to do

so. Unless we provide suitable salary incentives, we shall not be able to attract and hold the qualified people who are necessary for the efficient functioning of the U.S. Government.

To those who are close to the situation, it is no secret that there is dissatisfaction among Federal employees because their fixed incomes are falling behind the rising cost of living and the rising standard of living.

The Morrison bill providing for a genuine pay increase, will raise Federal employees to the same status as their counterparts in private enterprise; will strengthen the morale of Government employees, reduce job turnover, and encourage the enlistment and retention of the capable civil servants that the Government needs.

I join with many of my colleagues in supporting a real pay increase for Federal employees retroactive to January 1, 1962.

INVESTIGATION OF AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. SHRIVER. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a month since my colleague from Kansas [Mr. Dole] introduced a resolution calling for a thorough investigation of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to be conducted by the House Committee on Agriculture.

In this ensuing period we have seen that the activities of Billie Sol Estes, the Texas financier, resulted in improper influences upon a number of Government officials here in Washington. The full scope of the so-called Washington project of Mr. Estes continues to widen.

I have joined with Mr. Dole and other Members of the House in introducing a resolution calling for a relentless, but fair and impartial investigation of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I am particularly disturbed by the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate actions against Mr. Estes and other officials in his Department until the spotlight of publicity had been focused on those activities of Mr. Estes.

On October 19, 1960, President Kennedy who was then campaigning for the Presidency, stated in the Washington Daily News that "an official in the Government of the United States must have one allegiance, and one allegiance only—a complete dedication to the interests of our National Government."

I concur fully with this statement made by the President and I hope that the Congress will fulfill its responsibility in ferreting out all of the facts in this case. We must be assured of the integrity of all public servants—including Members of Congress—if we are to retain

the confidence of the American people in their Government.

As a final thought, Mr. Speaker, I note that over 5 million bushels of wheat were moved from Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, and Nebraska to Billie Sol Estes in Texas last year. It might be well for the Colorado congressional delegation to introduce a resolution, which I would support, prohibiting the moving to Texas of that beautiful and spacious Rocky Mountain National Park—also known as Estes Park.

INCOME TAXES OF FARMERS

Mr. FINDLEY. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, Mortimer M. Caplin, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, made a statement this week to the Farm Editors Association charging that American farmers fail to report an estimated \$4 billion a year in taxable income, amounting to about \$1.5 billion in taxes.

This is a serious charge, particularly so because it is directed at rural America, long regarded as a stronghold of integrity. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture—the only one from the great agricultural State of Illinois—I feel compelled to request the facts on which you base this allegation.

American farmers are becoming accustomed to taking it on the chin from the Federal Government, but is there no limit?

They are told by Uncle Sam what to plant and how much. They sell their produce in markets dominated by the Federal Government and depressed by Government-owned surpluses. This year they were even confronted with an administration proposal spelling out jail terms for dairy farmers, and heavy fines for other farmers who fail to trot in Federal harness. In recent weeks several farmers were forced to sell out at heavy loss in order to pay fines assessed by the Federal Government.

When the heavy hand of government also gives farmers a slap alleging colossal tax evasion, that calls for proof or apology.

THE BILLIE SOL ESTES-AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SCANDAL

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Ellsworth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution calling for a full-scale investigation by the House into the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S.

Department of Agriculture for its activities in connection with the scandal involving Texas cotton, wheat, and fertilizer magnate, Billie Sol Estes.

The House must take part of the blame for the 40 days of coverup in the Billie Sol Estes-Agriculture Department scandal. Swift action on the part of the House might have assured full justice in the case, particularly in view of the fact that the administration has tried to keep the lid on this mess since Estes' arrest on March 28. The coverup or the attempted coverup is inconsistent with the statement of President Kennedy on October 19, 1960, that "an official in the Government of the United States must have one allegiance, and one allegiance only—a complete dedication to the interests of our National Government."

Secretary Freeman's appointment of Estes to the National Cotton Advisory Council after Estes had been fined \$48,000 for violating Agriculture Department regulations, and now Freeman's attempts to cover up a much greater scandal than the mink coats and deep freezers of the Truman era are also inconsistent with Presidential pronouncements relating to the integrity of Federal officials. The shipment of grain from Kansas to Estes' storage facilities in Texas has cost the taxpayers a fortune, and this very fact alone makes a shambles of Secretary Freeman's statement that the Estes scandal has not cost the taxpayers 1 cent. The Secretary's alibi that Estes has not cost the Government any money is the final straw, and the Secretary should be fired out of hand.

I strongly urge that our Agriculture Committee or an appropriate committee of the House proceed immediately to a complete investigation of this scandal, as the loss of public confidence in the Agriculture Department demands. I also urge that the President, instead of sending telegrams praising the Secretary of Agriculture, fire him. And, Mr. Speaker, in addition to an investigation by an appropriate committee of this body, the administration should do everything in its power to dispel the impression of "coverup" which it has given the American people in the course of this fiasco by joining in a vigorous prosecution of the matter.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK BEGINNING MONDAY, MAY 21, 1962

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the acting majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and next week.

Mr. MOSS. It is intended on the completion of the two bills before the House today to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn until Monday of next week.

On Monday, the Consent Calendar will be called. There is one bill which

will come up under suspension of the rules; namely, H.R. 7757, relating to unrelated business income of nonprofit hospitals.

On Tuesday, H.R. 7596, the Indian, Navajo Indian irrigation project.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the National Astronautics and Space Administration authorization bill for 1963, H.R. 11737.

It is intended that there be no rollcall votes on Friday because of the Wisconsin convention.

Of course, there will be no rollcall votes on Saturday if the House should meet on that day, because of the North Carolina primary.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes except on rules or procedural questions on Monday or Tuesday of next week go over until Wednesday because of the Oklahoma primary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that there are primaries on those days?

Mr. MOSS. That is correct, there is a primary on Tuesday of next week in Oklahoma.

Mr. GROSS. Then why does the gentleman's request include Monday, if I may ask?

Mr. MOSS. So as to protect Members who are necessarily absent and have to be in Oklahoma because of the primary.

Mr. GROSS. It would not be to protect those who take advantage of the T. & T. Club; is it?

Mr. MOSS. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member of that club.

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

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

There was no objection.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

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, I want to discuss briefly a couple of unrelated items. Yesterday, on the House floor, I asked the question as to when we might expect some of our so-called free world friends, on whom we have lavished \$100 billion since the end of World War II, when we might expect them to start showing a disposition to get into the Southeast Asian situation. This morning I read in the paper that the New Zealand cabinet met last night. Apparently, they had been asked by somebody in the U.S. Government to at least display the New Zealand flag in Thailand

where we are now involved. I hope we will get something more than a display of flags.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed this morning in the Commerce Business Daily, published by the Department of Commerce, the fact that the Defense Department on May 11, 1962, awarded a contract for 403 tents costing \$88,472. On May 15, 1962, and I do not know whether this is by coincidence, but on May 15, the Army declared surplus 10,000 tents and the State Department immediately announced that the \$600,000 worth of tents would be shipped to Algeria to shelter refugees. May the Lord help the taxpayers of this country.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Albert	Fountain	Patman
Alexander	Fulton	Pirnie
Alford	Gavin	Powell
Andrews	Granahan	Rains
Aspinall	Hagen, Calif.	Reece
Ayres	Hall	Riley
Barrett	Hébert	Roberts, Ala.
Boggs	Henderson	Saund
Bolling	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Bonner	Holifield	Scott
Boykin	Horan	Selden
Brademas	Ichord, Mo.	Sheppard
Bray	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Miss.
Brewster	Kee	Spence
Buckley	Kitchin	Steed
Casby	Kornegay	Stubblefield
Cohelan	Kowalski	Taylor
Cooley	Kyl	Teague, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	Lennon	Thompson, La.
Daddario	Lesinski	Waggonner
Davis	McSweeney	Whitener
James C.	Magnuson	Whitten
Dowdy	Mason	Wickersham
Durno	Meador	Williams
Elliot	Morrow	Willis
Fallon	Millikin	Wilson, Ind.
Fascell	Morrison	Winstead
Flood	Morse	Yates
Fogarty	Moulder	Zelenko
Ford	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 643) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the Eighty-seventh Congress, the Committee on Science and Astronautics shall be composed of twenty-nine members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON REVENUE ACT OF 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Finance not to exceed one thousand additional copies each of part 1 and all subsequent parts of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962, held by that committee during the Eighty-seventh Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: In line 3, after the word "thousand" insert "five hundred".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is a printing bill out of the Committee on House Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It deals with what?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The additional 500 copies of the 1962 Revenue Act hearings, referred to in the resolution, are for the use of the House Committee on Ways and Means. It is in the interest of economy that these be printed additionally with the original thousand. Agreement by leaders of both sides to this action has been secured.

Mr. GROSS. This does not include any employees of any nature?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It does not.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I ask this question—and I think perhaps some of the Members might be interested in this—because last year a resolution came out of the Committee on House Administration providing for a \$5,000 entertainment fund. The resolution also provided for an additional employee to administer the \$5,000 entertainment fund. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who is listening and who is interested, I am sure, in this matter, because he is interested in governmental economy, that they proceeded to appoint and put on the payroll a \$14,435-a-year employee to spend the \$5,000.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is no such matter in the resolution before the House now. I move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the so-called NASA bill.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 592 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expense of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$400,000 including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittee within and without the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, this resolution and the others that are to follow have been discussed with me by the minority members of the Committee on House Administration and, as far as I know, are approved by them.

I have asked for this time in order to have it appear in the RECORD that an arrangement has been made by which and under which the so-called Fountain subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations will provide for the appointment of a minority counsel for that committee. As I understand it, that committee is about to undertake certain investigations of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation, particularly having to do with what is now known as the Estes affair as it concerns this Department.

As I said, I just want the RECORD to show that that arrangement had been made.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I wish to state I know of no such arrangement. I know the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] of the full Committee on Government Operations has always been fair and will be fair as far as this question of committee help is concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. I know the Republican Member on our side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] discussed the matter with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] who I see is nodding his head in assent, and I am sure that this arrangement will be carried out.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTING U.S. TREASURY ACCOUNT IN OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 637) to adjust the U.S. Treasury account in the Office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the Sergeant at Arms of the House the sum of \$1,651.83, which shall be used by the Sergeant at Arms to make good to the Treasurer of the United States on his endorsement, during the calendar years 1955, 1956, and 1957, of U.S. Treasury checks payable to purported employees of the folding room of the House, which were cashed by the Sergeant at Arms and were subsequently found to be forgeries. There shall also be paid out of the contingent fund the sum of \$339.23, which may be paid by the Clerk of the House to reimburse any other innocent endorser on the forged checks while in the employ of the House folding room against whom a judgment has been obtained as an endorser growing out of the forgeries.

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

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

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the House would like to have an explanation of this matter and I am sure the gentleman from Maryland would be happy to give it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I will be very happy to do so.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for the sum of \$1,651.83 and an additional \$339.23 to be made available to the Sergeant at Arms for payment to the U.S. Treasury. This matter arises as the result of some forged checks that went through the Office of the Sergeant at Arms. We had a gentleman in charge of the folding room who was getting innocent employees to cash checks for people who were not working but who were put on the payroll. The total amount involved in the forgeries was \$11,651.83 of which amount the bonding company made good to the extent of \$10,000. This is a matter of bookkeeping now to clear up the records in the Office of the Sergeant at Arms.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What was the total amount involved here?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The total amount originally was \$11,651.83. This took place over a period of several years—1955, 1956, and 1957.

Mr. GROSS. And how much do you ask for here?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This resolution calls for \$1,651.83.

As I pointed out previously, the bonding company made good to the extent of \$10,000.

Mr. GROSS. Who was supposed to supervise this payroll?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The gentleman is in jail today. He was prosecuted and the Government has a judgment against him and will try to recover. He is a young man and they claim he has a lot of productivity ahead of him and the Government hopes to get the \$1,600.

Mr. GROSS. When did this occur?

Mr. FRIEDEL. In the years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL LABORERS, DOORKEEPER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 638) authorizing additional laborers for the office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation for the temporary employment of seven additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, at a basic salary rate of \$1,650 each per annum; such temporary employment to terminate at the close of business on August 31, 1962.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 3, strike out "seven" and insert "four".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is needed to pay several day laborers to take care of the east wing of the new part of the Capitol. There are three floors with the following rooms:

Gallery floor: Seven Committee on Appropriations rooms, one large store-room, one library room, three lavatories; double stairway from attic—Atomic Energy Committee—to principal floor; marble corridor to center of the Capitol.

Principal floor: Speaker's suite of four large rooms, two lavatories, two large rooms—at present unoccupied—double stairway from principal to first floor; marble floor to center of the Capitol; reception room—not completed; parquet floors will require daily waxing.

First floor: One large room with lavatory, one room, suite of three large rooms—office of the Clerk; marble corridor to center of Capitol; double stairway to basement.

The Senate janitor has all of the Atomic Energy Committee on the attic floor.

Carpeting in each room must be vacuumed daily.

Marble floors and stairs must be swept and mopped daily.

All lavatories must be mopped daily.

All three floors must be polished and picked up thrice daily.

Additional trash carted in trucks to baling room and trucks returned to Capitol.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Are these people to be employed as an additional force in this new plush part of the east front of the Capitol?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Do you suppose these employees would have time to put some names on the doors? All I can find are just numbers on the doors. I do not know who has any of these rooms. I am sort of curious to find out who has all those plush quarters over there. I cannot find any names on the doors. It is very unsatisfactory to anyone going there to have nothing but numbers and no names.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I would think it would be up to the Doorkeeper to make proper provision for identification of the rooms.

Mr. GROSS. Under whose jurisdiction will these employees be?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Under the jurisdiction of the Doorkeeper.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman's Committee on House Administration will give some consideration to bringing under one head or substantially so, these employees in the Capitol. As I understand, one side of the corridor might be cleaned by employees under the jurisdiction of the Doorkeeper and the other side by an employee under the jurisdiction of the Architect or some other officer. Does not the gentleman think somebody ought to give a little attention to this diversified control so we will know who they are and what they are supposed to be doing and so forth?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I want to assure the gentleman that the committee gave very serious consideration to bringing them under one head. As it is now, some are employed under the Architect of the Capitol, some under the Doorkeeper, and some under the Clerk, and then others of course are employed on the Senate side.

Mr. GROSS. And some under the Superintendent of Buildings.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes. Some under the Superintendent of Buildings. We are working on that now and hope to come up with one uniform plan of employment, getting all employees in this category under one head.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman has success in this enterprise.

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the new rooms in the east front of the Capitol. I think in all fairness I should state that as that work was progressing former Speaker Rayburn said he would assign a room to me to be used by the minority. That room number, for the benefit of the

gentleman from Iowa, is HE-203. It does not carry my name, it does not carry any name. Let me say here and now that Mr. Rayburn assigned that room to me for minority use. It was carried out by Speaker McCormack, for which I thank him, as I thank former Speaker Rayburn. I might also say that the room is used almost every day. It is used by our policy committee, it is used for leadership meetings and all sorts of other meetings involving Republican Members of the House. Let me emphasize that we all appreciate it. It is very helpful to us, and I do not want to let this opportunity go by without saying I am glad we have the room.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

MARKETING OF EXPERIMENT STATION CROPS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 641 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10594) to amend section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 641 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10594, a bill to amend section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 10594 is to extend to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations the same exemption

from marketing quotas which now applies to publicly owned agricultural experiment stations. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 has provided for several years that crops which are grown for experimental purposes by publicly owned agricultural experiment stations may be marketed even though such crops were grown in excess of any acreage allotment which the experiment station might have. There are a few privately endowed and operated agricultural experiment stations in the United States which should have the same exemption from the marketing quota provisions.

The exemption from marketing quota penalties extends only to crops which are grown for experimental purposes. Such crops will not be eligible for price support, if grown in excess of any allotment the experiment station may have, and the granted exemption will merely mean that these crops may be sold on the open market for whatever they may bring, and will not have to be destroyed to avoid conflict with the marketing quota provisions of the 1938 act.

Since any crops covered by this exemption would not be eligible for price support, there would be no additional cost to the Federal Government as a result of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 641.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has fully explained the purpose of the legislation covered by this rule. There is no objection to the rule, although there may be some comment in order on the bill itself.

As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out to you, this bill would authorize privately owned experimental stations to engage in the development and experimentation of crops and varieties of crops and would permit them to sell these crops on the market without a marketing penalty. This they cannot do under present law. I have no objection to this, and I think probably the legislation is in order. I would like to remind the Members of the House that there are some rather substantial nonprofit experimental stations in operation, and I think we ought to make the record abundantly clear here today that this should not be construed as an invitation to them to engage in some sort of quasi-experimental operation, then use this opportunity to place that production on the open market in unreasonable quantities or volumes.

Now, I had suggested to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] that perhaps an amendment should be offered to the bill placing a limit on each crop that could be raised or harvested by any such privately owned nonprofit experimental station, in order that this would not develop into a commercial type of operation. The gentleman from Texas agreed with me that some kind of limitation would be in order. Then, for various

reasons that we later discussed, such an amendment would become burdensome from an administrative standpoint. Therefore, I am not going to offer an amendment placing such a limitation on the bill.

However, there are two or three statements that should be made: No. 1, I want the record to be abundantly clear here today—and I think the gentleman from Texas is in agreement with me—that if this bill passes, next year the Department of Agriculture should advise the House Committee on Agriculture as to the extent of participation under the authority granted under this bill. In other words, one, how many such nonprofit experimental stations are there and, two, how many total acres are engaged in experimental development and the number of acres in each particular crop.

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

Mr. AVERY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I would like to have it understood that I do agree with the gentleman from Kansas. I think his original suggestion has merit, that there seems to be a little difficulty in administration, and I believe that the report that he suggested—which I am sure our committee will be glad to ask for—will give the information we need, and there cannot be any substantial abuse under that procedure.

Mr. AVERY. And the gentleman will further agree that if this report does reveal that there is determined to be an unreasonable production, that we will reconsider it?

Mr. POAGE. I agree with the gentleman, and if there appears to be any large or unreasonable acreage, we will try to cut it down.

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

Mr. AVERY. I will be glad to yield to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. I want to concur in what has been said by the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Kansas discussed this amendment with me, and as far as I was concerned, I was ready to accept it, but in view of some of the difficulties pointed out, I think it is the expressed desire to defer action to see how it will operate. If it gets out of hand, I assure the gentleman from Kansas I shall be ready to support the type of amendment he has in mind.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two additional comments: One is that this legislation should not be interpreted by any such nonprofit experimental station to authorize them or to infer that they should in any way engage in production beyond what is considered to be reasonable for experimental purposes and certainly should not engage in the area of commercial production. No. 2, I would like to, at least from my own point of view, point out this fact. I cannot speak for the committee or the House, obviously, but I would not want this to be understood as meaning there would be any "grand-

father rights" conferred on them by experience after the passage of this bill. Since we are deferring limitation, it does not mean that just because, for example, they might elect to plant 2,000 acres in any one crop this year, and we decided later that it was unreasonably large, Congress would not be obligated to recognize that number of acres as a base on a normal operation.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 642, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10708) to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 642 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10708, a bill to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 10708 is to bring up to date the definition of telephone service which appears in that portion of the Rural Electrification Act authorizing loans for the development of rural telephone service. The present definition is limited to "service whereby voice communication through the use of electricity between the transmitting and receiving apparatus is the principal intended use thereof." Since 1949, when the law was enacted, the development and common use of closed circuit picture, data, and signal transmission has

made this type of service an increasingly larger part of normal telephone operations.

The bill would amend the 1949 definition to include the transmission of "sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds" as part of the definition of telephone service. It would permit REA telephone loans to include funds for the lines and facilities used to transmit such signals.

The bill does not change any other requirement respecting REA rural telephone loans and retains without change the definition of rural areas, the requirement for full area coverage, and the prohibition of loans for telegraph facilities or radio broadcasting services or facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 642.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, again, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has very adequately explained the resolution and the bill which the resolution makes in order for consideration. I can only add that it is my understanding that there will be an amendment offered to this bill when the House is resolved into the Committee of the Whole. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has an amendment which the gentlemen will then offer.

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

Mr. AVERY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman is correct; an amendment will be offered.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, there was some objection to this bill because it was not clear as it is presently written as to just how far the REA might go in the way of providing facilities in the area of picture communications. The amendment, as I understand it, will limit it strictly to educational facilities which they will provide and make available to such public or private users as might be willing to purchase that service from their existing customers. For that matter, I presume, new customers might also develop in the areas which they serve.

Under that circumstance, Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, or any objection to the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Is there anything in this bill that will allow the REA's to operate television stations?

Mr. AVERY. No. I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], that it is my understanding—and I am sure this will be made abundantly clear during the debate on the floor of the House today—that this only authorizes them to become engaged in the transmission of signals, the same as they are presently authorized to do. Now they can transmit only sound signals. This would only expand that operation to the point where they could transmit the pictures as well as the sound, but only to the extent that such transmission

would be related to educational television.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Do we know that this is not a case of getting the nose of the camel under the tent; that as soon as they begin to broadcast educational services we will soon be told that this is not sufficient, and we will then have to give the REA's the authority to go into the business of setting up television stations all over the country without any requirement that they secure permission of the FCC?

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman's question is certainly in order. However, I would assure the gentleman that I know of no such intention on the part of the sponsors of this bill to in any way establish a precedent whereby the REA might subsequently become engaged in the function of broadcasting of educational or any other kind of programs. In the first place, it would not be feasible, I am sure the gentleman would agree.

Since the bill clearly states that this is just an authorization for transmission, while I cannot assure the gentleman that there will not be such a request for broadcasting, I can assure him that the gentleman from Kansas presently addressing the House will stand beside him and oppose any such effort. It is clearly beyond the intent of this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I might say to my colleague from Kansas that feasibility is the last thing REA worries about. We have made them a nice arrangement whereby we lend them money at 2 percent, and they take it and instead of investing it in the facilities for which they were created, they turn around and invest the money in Government bonds, and pay a nice dividend to their stockholders or to the people whom they service.

Mr. AVERY. Their patrons.

Mr. SAYLOR. Their patrons, yes; but also stockholders since the REA's make loans to telephone companies. It has come to my attention that they have gone so far that in northeastern Pennsylvania a firm that is in the process of determining whether or not they should locate in northern New Jersey or in northeastern Pennsylvania, one of the enticing things that has come to their attention is that an REA has come along and told this firm that if they will locate in the service area of this REA they will be glad to lend them money at 2 percent for the erection of their building and for the acquisition of all of their property. Certainly this was never the intention behind the REA. It was never the intention of Congress in establishing it or authorizing these extensions even in the area redevelopment bill. It is perversions such as this that have caused REA to come under a cloud.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I can only respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania by saying that I hardly believe that this is the appropriate time to review the present activities of the Rural Electrification Administration. I am not

aware of the situation the gentleman has mentioned nor am I in a position to pass judgment. I do know that the REA has provided a tremendous service to the rural areas of America. I think it is appropriate that authority be limited to the extent included in this bill, and as it has been recited and explained here today. I remind the gentleman that I would certainly view with apprehension the development of becoming engaged in establishing a broadcasting facility.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING OF EXPERIMENT STATION CROPS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10594) to amend section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10594, with Mr. DENTON in the chair.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to engage in a long discussion of this legislation which has so recently been discussed in the House in consideration of the rule.

Basically, the legislation simply provides that we should apply to nonprofit, privately owned agricultural research establishments the same rules we apply to publicly owned and operated agricultural research establishments of the same character, which allow those research establishments to sell their products in the market without regard to the marketing quota laws.

Primarily this relates to wheat and cotton. Those commodities are both now being subjected to a type of research which was not common in years past. Most of us think of agricultural research as some kind of greenhouse operation into which somebody tosses the pollen of one plant onto another and tries to produce some crossbreed or a new plant or a new fruit or a new vegetable. That type of research is still going on; that type of research is still important, but in recent years we have found that of vast importance in practical research is the amount of cultivation, the type of cultivation, the amount of fertilization, and the season of the year at which the crop is planted. Those things make a tremendous difference. They must be tried out in field tests. This means several hundred acres, and it can sometimes go into even larger acreages. Unless these

stations have the opportunity to sell the products of these experiments, it imposes a limitation on their income and, therefore, on the work they can carry on.

We all say we are in favor of this work, or else we would not encourage these stations, else we would not spend millions of dollars of the public money carrying on this work. All this bill would do would be to apply to these privately endowed agricultural research stations exactly the same rules that we now apply to publicly owned and operated research stations in the same field.

The gentleman from Kansas has properly called attention to the possibility of overexpansion of this type of work. We frankly do not know how many of these stations there are that might claim the exemption. I know of but one in the State of Texas. I have talked to some of my colleagues, and I think you will find that probably the average over the Nation will not exceed one to a State, and some States will not have any. But they do do a substantial work. The work they do gives relief to the taxpayers to the extent that they do that work, because it otherwise would be paid for by public money. So we feel that while this fear is a very remote matter, if it should develop into something objectionable we would object to it. I can repeat the assurance given to the gentleman from Kansas that the Committee on Agriculture will next year attempt to find out how many of these there are. We cannot find out now, but we can find out when they claim an exemption. We will try to find out something more definite as to this size, and should there be any evidence that we might have created a Frankenstein, we will certainly apply the brakes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any opposition to this legislation; in fact, it is a bill that could well have been placed on the Consent Calendar. I imagine the only reason it is here under a rule is to create the impression that the House is very busy with legislative matters.

The purpose of this bill is to extend to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations the same exemption from marketing quotas which now applies to publicly owned agricultural experiment stations. Section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 has provided for several years that crops which are grown for experimental purposes by publicly owned agricultural experiment stations may be marketed even though such crops were grown in excess of any acreage allotment which the experiment station might have. Recently it has come to the attention of the committee that there are a few privately endowed and operated agricultural experiment stations in the United States which should have the same exemption from the marketing quota provisions.

It will be noted that the exemption from marketing quota penalties extends only to crops which are grown for experimental purposes. Such crops will not be eligible for price support, if grown in

excess of any allotment the experiment station may have, and the granted exemption will merely mean that these crops may be sold on the open market for whatever they may bring, and will not have to be destroyed to avoid conflict with the marketing quota provisions of the 1938 act.

Since any crops covered by this exemption would not be eligible for price support, there would be no additional cost to the Federal Government as the result of this legislation.

Again I want to emphasize what was said in the colloquy between the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and the gentleman from Iowa now addressing the Committee. If this extension gets out of hand, and if there is an overexpansion, I am sure the Committee on Agriculture will see to it that that kind of operation will be properly restricted.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1372), is amended by striking out subsection (d) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) No penalty shall be collected under this chapter with respect to the marketing of any agricultural commodity grown for experimental purposes by any publicly owned agricultural experiment station or by any privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment station or foundation."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7 after the word "this" strike out "chapter" and insert "Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE) having assumed the Chair, Mr. DENTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10594) to amend section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations, pursuant to House Resolution 641, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RURAL TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10708) to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 10708 with Mr. DENTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], for 30 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill was adequately explained in the consideration of the rule within the last few minutes. It simply allows the use of the REA-financed telephone facilities for the transmission of educational TV programs over those lines and facilities.

It shall be my purpose at the proper time to offer an amendment on page 2, line 5 of the bill, after the word "facilities" to insert the following: "or community antenna, television system, services, or facilities other than those intended for educational purposes."

The purpose of the amendment, of course is obviously to make it absolutely clear that there is no authority granted to enlarge any of the existing powers except in the case of the educational programs.

The bill was inspired by reason of the fact that there are a number of communities in the United States where today it is impossible to secure direct television programs for their schools and other educational institutions which would include a college and, we think, probably would include hospitals under certain circumstances.

I realize that many of my colleagues find it rather difficult to understand how there could be a community which could not receive direct television programs, but as soon as you get into an area more than a hundred miles from a broadcasting station you begin to find exactly that situation. To correct that condition there has developed a rather thriving industry in some sections of this Nation known as Central Antenna Television where some entrepreneur comes into a community and locates the highest

hill and on it builds an antenna or tower. Normally it may be 100 feet or 200 feet, depending upon the size of the community and the amount of money he is willing to invest in it, but the higher he builds the farther away he can get acceptable TV signals.

Obviously he can receive signals from a much greater distance than can the ordinary private individual even though he has an antenna on his roof. The individual or corporation that builds the tower normally then provides transmission lines to the homes in the community. The normal charge in my area for tapping on to this central antenna is \$6 a month. I do not know what it is in other areas. The householder gets what in effect is city reception from the TV stations that are possibly located 200 or 300 miles away, and in that way he is enabled to receive programs he could not possibly receive with his own set without such a tower. The central antenna operations are, of necessity, confined to the towns and cities, because there simply is no way to make them pay anywhere else.

I know of nothing at the present time that would preclude any of these people from extending their lines into the rural areas and providing for rural schools the direct service that this bill contemplates for these schools. But the sad fact is it simply does not pay to do so. The sad fact is it is not an economically sound investment for these central antenna companies to provide rural service, and especially rural educational service. The result is they do not try to get out of the cities and towns. Large areas do not have the opportunity to get educational TV.

There is no purpose in this bill to substitute REA-financed lines for these central antenna systems. We only hope to provide an opportunity for rural schools to get a service no one wants to provide.

I think I should point out right here that in the telephone program of the REA there are more than twice as many privately owned stock companies as there are cooperatives. Some of us are living under the impression that the REA lends money only to cooperatives. Some of you do not like cooperatives, so you are prejudiced against the whole program. For each cooperative which borrows money for the extension of a telephone system under the REA program there are two privately owned stock companies that are operating on money from the same source at the same rate of interest and on the same terms.

This pending proposal is not a matter which involves stock companies versus cooperatives or cooperatives versus private companies or anything of that kind. It is a question of how you get these TV signals to the rural areas. I think in a good many rural areas these companies and these cooperatives which have been financed by the REA have lines which could be economically used. They cannot carry these signals on the lines as they now exist, but with a much less expenditure than would be required in building up a completely new line they can convert existing lines so they can

carry these programs out to our rural schools. I do not believe there is any opportunity in the world for them to make a profit on it, but the REA Telephone Act was set up with the idea of taking modern facilities to the rural areas and making them available to our rural people.

There are at the present time, as far as the committee knows, only some five or six instances in the United States where there has been any expression of interest in doing this, but I think there are five or six places where we could move acceptable telephone reception out into the rural areas if we pass this bill. We believe that is a highly desirable thing to do, and we would like to do it. We do not want it to interfere with anybody, corporation, or cooperative; and to make absolutely certain there will be no use of this except for educational purposes, I shall at the appropriate time offer the amendment, which I have previously read, which specifically confines this to education programs.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Under the terms of the Rural Electrification Act, a rural area is defined. I have forgotten what the population is.

Mr. POAGE. Fifteen hundred.

Mr. NELSEN. Fifteen hundred. Under the terms and the definition of a rural area, would a community antenna system that might exist in a town of 1,499 be permitted to use these funds within this village to pipe out their community antenna program by the system they could set up under this act?

Mr. POAGE. I do not understand that they would, for the reason that the original loan must be made primarily to provide voice communications, so obviously the original establishment of a community antenna system could not be financed by REA.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. NELSEN. Now, in the event that an educational program is transmitted over this system, would it not be logical to assume that perhaps it might be extended for use other than that? Could you confine it by language in the law?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly the fear that certain Members and certain interested parties had of the original bill, the fear that it might be extended to other purposes. And, it is for that purpose that I have advised the House that I will, as quickly as we reach the amendment stage, offer an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "facilities"—which is a limitation incidentally—adding the following words, and these are limitations: "or community antenna television services or facilities other than those intended for educational purposes." In other words, we limit it so that you cannot use it for purposes other than those intended for educational purposes.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. POAGE. Certainly.

Mr. MICHEL. May I ask the gentleman whether or not this then could not be used as a justification, in the name of education, for beefing up the transmission lines? Is there any information that has come to the committee that any request would be made by any operating company or cooperative for the express purpose of beefing up transmission lines to carry these programs?

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman refer to electric transmission lines?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. This does not amend the electric provision of the law at all. It relates solely to telephone systems. And, there is nothing that I think of in terms of transmission lines in connection with the rural telephone system—

Mr. MICHEL. If I may interrupt the gentleman, there is nothing involved here enlarging that program, at least, beefing up the expenditure of the rural telephone service for carrying this type of a program?

Mr. POAGE. This would allow the Administrator to make loans to telephone companies and cooperatives that were otherwise financed by REA for the preparation of their line, or whatever is necessary—and I am not enough of a mechanic to understand just what has to be done—to convey these signals to educational institutions; yes.

Mr. MICHEL. Have there been any estimates as to the additional cost?

Mr. POAGE. The estimate is that it will not require any additional money because there are only five or six known instances in the United States where there is any interest at all expressed in it, and we do understand that they are in a position to put these lines in, if they have the authority. At the present time the REA-financed lines, that is, the lines belonging to either a company or a cooperative that is receiving REA financing, are the only lines in the United States that are prohibited, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, from carrying these very fine programs. Now, there are State regulations in some of the States which do prohibit it. It is not prohibited in my State, but I am sure there are certain States that do. But, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, the only systems that cannot do it are the ones getting REA financing.

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

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have listened very carefully to the statement of the gentleman from Texas in regard to this bill. I have read very carefully the bill itself, together with the amendment and the report of the committee. It is very apparent that both the bill and the amendment which you propose to offer state that they are facilities intended for educational purposes. Now, the question that I have is this, that once one of these facilities is installed for educational purposes, what is there to stop the REA—after the schools are closed at 3:30 or 4 o'clock and the children have gone home in a bus—what is to stop them from starting at 8 or 9 or 10 o'clock from running "Gunsmoke" over these same facilities?

Mr. POAGE. I think the same thing is there to stop them that is there to stop them from giving service in a town of 1,500 or any of the other facilities that are prohibited by law.

Mr. SAYLOR. There is nothing in the bill or language in the amendment that would prevent the use of these facilities for commercial purposes once they have been installed for educational purposes.

That is the reason some of us have looked askance at this bill. This bill has been drafted very carefully to put the opening wedge in to allow both the companies and the cooperatives that offer telephone service to engage in the general transmission of television signals. The only limitation is that they originally be installed for educational purposes.

Mr. POAGE. I would like to comment on the gentleman's admission, and I appreciate it very much. I had not realized just how far these people who are presently engaged in providing central antenna television service wanted to go to help the REA and the REA borrowers. I want to give the House my word that this amendment was—and I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], to listen to this explanation—I want the House to understand that this amendment was written by and very carefully prepared as the gentleman says—very carefully prepared—by the attorneys for the Central Antenna Television Association.

We were requested by the association and not by the REA to use this language. It is the language of the people whom the gentleman fears are going to be injured. It is not the language of the REA. It is not the language of any group seeking to expand their activities. It is the language of the very people—and it is word for word and has not been changed, not even by a comma—it is the language that was requested by the very people whom the gentleman suggests are to be somehow or other destroyed by this amendment.

I believe these gentlemen are not only fair to their opponents, but I believe they are fair to themselves. I believe they have adequately protected themselves. I believe they have come in and asked for a reasonable limitation. As long as it seems to be a reasonable limitation, I for one—and I believe the House Committee on Agriculture—is disposed to try to grant any reasonable limitation.

Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that we are going a pretty long way when we say that we are opposed to any kind of legislation which would allow any kind of use of these facilities after 4:30 in the afternoon. But if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will offer an amendment to confine the use of these facilities from 8:30 in the morning until 4:30 in the afternoon, I am sure the House will be delighted to pass on it. Of course, I would hope it would be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a good bill. I believe we have a bill here which should pass. I think we have a bill here that is in the interest of America. It cannot do anyone any harm.

The bill has the approval of the Agricultural Committee, it has the approval of the REA. It has the approval not only of the cooperatives and the private telephone companies who would be accepting a burden to provide this service—but also of the very companies that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] seeks to protect.

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

Mr. POAGE. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] about the apparent unity for this bill, and also the history of the proposal as well as the origin of the language and how badly it is needed. But I do not know what it does. I have listened to the gentleman very carefully and, unfortunately, I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's discussion. However, based upon the discussion which I have heard here, I am not sure whether this is an extension of service for the Community Antenna Television Service, or whether it is to provide such facilities as microwave service and so forth for the extension of telephone service.

Mr. POAGE. No, it is neither.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what you have been talking about here and that is the reason the question was raised in my own mind.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, I regret that the gentlemen did not hear the discussion under the rule or hear the beginning of the debate on the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. The explanation was made that the purpose of the bill was to extend educational television through this means. I am interested in finding out how you are going to extend it under the bill.

Mr. POAGE. Unfortunately, the gentleman from Arkansas was not present when the matter was discussed. The matter under immediate discussion was the amendment that I expect to propose to the bill and the objections raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] which did not bear on the basic purpose of the bill. The basic purpose of the bill is to allow those rural areas that presently cannot receive direct television signals of acceptable quality, to provide some method so that more acceptable signals could be sent to the more or less remote areas, for educational purposes. The purpose of the amendment is clearly to limit it to educational purposes. That is what we started out to do. The members of the committee have no objection to limiting it to exactly what we intended. The wording of the amendment is the wording of the Central Antenna Television people and meets their objections.

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

Mr. POAGE. I should like to answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman asked what was the purpose of the bill. There are many areas in the United States that do not receive acceptable television signals because they are too far from the television station. In most of the urban areas they are not too far away, and in most of the towns they have

these central antenna television companies who set up a high antenna and pipe the programs to the houses in the town. They do not find it profitable to go out of these towns because it is simply not a profitable operation to carry those programs 15 or 20 miles out into the country. The result is the companies do not do it. There is not anybody engaged in that business. As far as I know there is not one single instance in the United States where anybody is engaged in it.

There are, however, about five rural telephone establishments in the United States who have said that if they had the authority they would provide the service even though it might not be immediately profitable to do so. It is provided in the Basic Rural Telephone Act that such area coverage must be given. They say that they will give that coverage if they are given the authority to do it. This bill is merely an effort to give them the authority to carry that service to those rural homes. We believe that we have limited the authority. Nobody now wants to perform this service. These people have offered to perform the service and the bill permits them to perform the service. If we defeat the bill then we will have said that there is nobody who will perform this service and the service will not be performed. It comes down to a question as simple as that.

Here is a way to have the service performed. If we defeat the bill we will be saying that the service will not be performed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, he is not helping me a great deal. I am not criticizing; I am asking for information.

Mr. POAGE. What is the gentleman asking?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. POAGE. I am delighted to yield if I may have the gentleman's question.

Mr. HARRIS. What kind of service is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. POAGE. We are talking about television service.

Mr. HARRIS. How are you going to extend television service from the broadcasting station to the locality where you are going?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman asked me a question, but I said in the beginning I was no technician or expert, as the gentleman from Arkansas is, on just what to call these lines that they put on their poles to carry these programs. I am not that much of a mechanic, but I do know you can put up lines to carry TV broadcasts. I do know that these CAT concerns do put lines from their antenna to the houses. I do know that the same kind of lines can be carried on the poles of the rural telephone companies out to these rural schoolhouses, but it has not proven to be profitable in the past and nobody else wants to do it. The gentleman asked me the mechanics of it. I do not know the mechanics of broadcasting.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman let me have some time, then?

Mr. POAGE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, but since I have only 5 minutes more I think I had better let the other side yield first.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at this from the viewpoint of what kind of situation we all would like to have. I am a little afraid this thing would permit individuals under the REA to go in and operate without any control by the Federal Communications Commission of the broadcasting that would be set up under this bill. It seems to me that ought to be gone into very carefully, as we ought not to have or attempt to have a setup that is altogether different from what most of us feel there should be. Frankly, I feel that the Federal Communications Commission should have control over these things. Unless you do give it to them you are going to make a great mistake. You are going to have two outfits trying to do the job that one ought to be doing.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], if he wishes to continue his colloquy with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to impose on the House, but I cannot develop this in 2 minutes. There are some problems here that we should clear up, and if not, I will have to enter an objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Now let me ask some questions.

Would this extend to a rural cooperative the power without any authority from the Federal Communications Commission—and I observe the limitation in the bill—to use boosters and reflectors?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman gets me in deep water when he uses scientific terms. I do not know any more about boosters than I do about medicine.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me try to educate the gentleman just a little bit.

We got into a serious problem in the Northwest by letting things take their course. They put in operation about 1,800 extensions of service by boosters and reflectors. Out in the Northwest, Montana, and out through there, they did this in an effort to extend the service, and the signals met each other coming down the valley. We had a terribly difficult problem trying to straighten it out. As I say, they had some 1,800 operations which were getting such signals. It was a controversial problem.

We finally were able to do something about the authority of boosters and reflectors, but we did not tackle the CATV problem. If the gentleman is referring to the kind of operation that would extend say, a community television operation, in other words where you have one antenna in a given community with wires that go to the homes, that is a community antenna television operation. If the gentleman has in mind to extend wires out into the country to rural areas, or to have one cable that would extend it out into some school, then I think it would be a good idea.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly what I have in mind.

Mr. HARRIS. You may have that in mind, but that is not how I read the

bill. I read the bill to say that, where you have the words "through the use of electricity" to use electrically operated devices for this purpose, it would get into what is being used by the telephone services, and if it is for the purpose of a microwave to extend that signal out to an area, this is used all the time by the telephone industry. Then that is still another problem. But, if you are setting up a program here that would give any group—and I do not care whether it is cooperatives or anyone else—legislative authority, without any look at it whatsoever, to start sending boosters and reflectors out into the country, you are going to find yourself in another terrible dilemma all down the line. I am just trying to find out what you are proposing to do.

Mr. POAGE. I believe with the help of my attorney here, I may be able to clarify this somewhat. The bill provides, that is the amendments with the existing law reads, that it shall not mean telegraph services or facilities or radio broadcasting services or facilities within the meaning of section 3(o) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

Broadcasting under the terms of this act, which is referred to there, means, or rather it defines broadcasting as a means of dissemination of radio communications intended to be received by the public directly or by the intermediary of relay stations. It would seem to me to define rather clearly the operation and the type of thing that the gentleman from Arkansas is discussing, unless the booster has some other meaning than the relay stations and, frankly, I do not know about that.

Mr. HARRIS. I, very frankly, observed that as to the reception, and that is what really confused me a little bit about what you are seeking to do. I cannot see that you are doing anything here except extending to the rural cooperatives the right to have a closed system operation.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly what I understand it to mean.

Mr. HARRIS. If that is what you are doing, then I have no objections.

Mr. POAGE. That is all in the world I understand is involved here, but the gentleman from Arkansas is far more familiar with that than I am.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I wonder if I might have a couple of more minutes to pursue this a little further.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman. I regret having to take the time. If this is merely a closed circuit operation, that is, purely a wire operation, I have no objection.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly what I understand it to be, but the gentleman has presented some technical terms and I confess I do not know the technicalities.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, let me read what the report says. The report reads:

Service whereby voice communication through the use of electricity between the transmitting and receiving apparatus is the principal intended use thereof.

Mr. POAGE. That is the existing law. That is not the new law. That is the existing law. That is what we have been under the last 10 or 12 years.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the definition of telephone service.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, and this has to do with rural telephone service.

Mr. HARRIS. Now I see you then define what communications means: "through the use of electricity between the transmitting and receiving apparatus, and shall include all telephone lines, facilities, or systems used in the rendition of such service."

Mr. POAGE. We are not changing that. We are trying to make this read just as does the bill which came from the gentleman's committee—I believe it came from the gentleman's committee—in the matter of the definition that is now in the statute in section 153 which provides:

That for the purposes of this chapter unless the Congress proposes otherwise—

"Wire communication" or "communication by wire" means the transmission of writing, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by aid of wire, cable, or other like connection between the points of origin and reception of such transmission, including all instrumentalities, facilities, apparatus, and services (among other things the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) incidental to such transmission.

We are seeking to get the same definition here.

Mr. HARRIS. Let me say to you if it is what is referred to and commonly known as closed-circuit operation I can see no objection to it, but if it gets into anything beyond that I would have serious objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly not hold myself out as being specifically qualified to speak on this legislation, as is the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]; however, in listening to the colloquy between the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Texas I would say that it is my understanding that this legislation does not extend to REA any authority in the area of communications dealing with microwave; nor does it extend to REA any authority in the area that is referred to as "booster stations"; nor does it extend to REA any authority in the area of satellite stations for re-broadcasting. It simply extends to REA authority to lend in the existing authority where they can lend other telephone services to cooperatives and to telephone corporations. There is no extension of authority as to the eligibility of cooperatives or companies, but there is an extension of authority as to the services within otherwise eligible cooperatives or corporations as to service which is not now authorized and which could be established in the concept that the gentleman from Arkansas mentioned; that is, a closed-system type of service, and amending the existing law that permits loans for the transmission of signals which are not limited to that of voice but to signals and pictures and related signals or the facilities using the signals to

extend that service beyond that of simple voice, which we would understand, of course, as telephone service. This would permit lending on the part of REA to cooperatives and corporations in the telephone service and permit these organizations to extend the service to the point of establishing other lines; or these organizations would be permitted to transmit a signal that would be an equivalent. We extend that as a TV signal, but, as we considered this legislation in committee, it is certainly not our understanding that this goes to the extent of permitting an REA telephone service or company to which the REA loans, to put themselves in the broadcasting business with the TV signals, or permitting the transmission of TV from point to point through microwave or any of the associated facilities to implement the microwave transmission. It would permit them the simple authorization over lines which are established on the land, you might say, this type of service within the area now served by that telephone company and particularly for the service of educational use.

I think the colloquy between the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Texas was, I am sure, to some of us a little less than clear because we are not all conversant with the terms used; however, I think out of that colloquy came a clear understanding, certainly on my part, that the reference that the gentleman from Arkansas made was to a closed circuit, for that is our understanding of this type of service. It is not our intention by the language in this bill, as proposed, to give REA telephone lines any authority whatsoever except to transmit by wire service and by line within their area a TV signal for the service within the area, particularly for educational purposes. I hope my comments may have helped to clarify the situation somewhat, but I would again say I am not an expert in this field.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Maine.

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

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. In reading this bill, it is written in a manner that is sufficiently vague, I am sure, to leave more than one question in the minds of those of us who have followed this discussion. Pinning it down, do I understand from the statement made by the gentleman from Maine that this is in fact to be restricted to closed circuits as that applies to any television operation that will be developed from it?

Mr. McINTIRE. That is certainly my understanding. All we are proposing to do by this amendment is simply to amend the bill, as the gentleman will note on what we might say is a broadening of the definition of the words "telephone service," and to define them so that included in the definition would be the authority to transmit other than just voice; that is, to transmit a signal that would give a picture on a screen.

Mr. COLLIER. On two occasions, as this particular question arose, we have heard as a reply, "It is my understanding that." If it is an understanding, I would like to know, at least with some degree of certainty, whether or not it will be restricted to closed circuits, not a question of what someone's understanding is, because this is a very important point as far as I am concerned.

Mr. McINTIRE. I may say to the gentleman I can only go to the point of saying what I believe and honestly think.

Mr. COLLIER. Perhaps we ought to write it into the legislation we do not want the REA in the television business.

Mr. McINTIRE. It is not the intention of this member of the committee to put the REA in the television business.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. Chairman, as far as making legislative history on this bill is concerned, may I make it perfectly clear that there is no intention whatsoever of putting the REA in the television business. The purpose of this bill is to bring up to date the definition of "telephone service," which appears in that portion of the Rural Electrification Act authorizing loans for the development of a rural telephone service. The bill does not change any of the requirements respecting REA rural telephone lines, and leaves without change the definition of rural areas and the requirements for all the area coverage and the prohibition of loans for telegraph facilities or radio broadcasting activities or facilities. There would continue to be expressly excluded from permissible financing telephone property for radio or television broadcast facilities. That is the intention of the Committee on Agriculture and I am also sure this is the intention of the Committee of the Whole House.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I join with the gentleman from Iowa in pointing out it is clearly the intention of the committee to simply define "telephone service," and to leave in the limitations that are already in the law, including the prohibition in reference to these concerns, cooperative or corporate, to engage in broadcasting. That is written in the law as plain as we know how to write it, and we are not trying to change that.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am glad to have the gentleman state that he is in accord with our joint observation that that is clearly the intent of the Committee on Agriculture.

I would like to emphasize further that this bill would not open up a new field of REA financing for a new industry, but would be a matter of enabling REA to take care of its telephone borrowers' needs in providing a service which telephone organizations will normally be called upon to provide.

Since loans by REA may be made only in an amount established annually by Congress, and since any loans which might be made as the result of this expanded definition of telephone service would come within such limitation, there would be no additional cost to the

United States as the result of the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, let it be specifically understood that we are only bringing the definition up to date and nothing else, and there is no intention whatsoever of expanding the services of the REA in the field of television as the term is generally understood.

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 924), is amended by striking out subsection (a) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) As used in this subchapter, the term 'telephone service' shall be deemed to mean any communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity between the transmitting and receiving apparatus, and shall include all telephone lines, facilities, or systems used in the rendition of such service; but shall not be deemed to mean telegraph services or facilities, or radio broadcasting services or facilities within the meaning of section 153(o) of title 47 (section 3(o) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended)."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "subchapter" and insert "title".

Page 2, line 6, strike out "153(o) of title 47 (section)".

Page 2, line 7, strike out "amended" and insert "amended".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 2, line 5, after "facilities," insert "or community antenna television system services or facilities other than those intended for educational purposes."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I informed the committee earlier that I would offer. This is the amendment which I pointed out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania was prepared by and offered at the suggestion and request of the attorneys for the Central Antenna people. It is offered in order that there might be no question that this bill does not extend the powers of the REA-financed telephone companies or cooperatives to go into any other type of business. This leaves all of the limitations that are in existing law and specifically adds the further words that loans shall not include community antenna telephone system services or facilities other than those intended for educational purposes.

Now, it is true that there is no bond required of those who borrow the money that they will not run this system at midnight or try in some way to evade the law. I cannot see how anybody can make any money by evading this law,

and I do not think there is any danger of anybody getting into business without any prospects of making any money.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment. It is a clarifying amendment. As far as we are concerned on this side of the aisle, we are ready to accept it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR to the amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: After "facilities" insert "such services and facilities shall be limited to closed circuit television operations."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, we have just heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] state that—

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. That carries out, as I understand the use of the term, exactly what we are intending to do. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I think that is a good amendment to the amendment. I am ready to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRICE] having assumed the chair, Mr. DENT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10708) to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity, pursuant to House Resolution 642, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet again on Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with the program for next week, Calendar Wednesday business be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the House to be adjourned on Monday next?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No; until Monday next.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight to file a report on H.R. 11721.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENCE DAY IN NORWAY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in about a month and a half, the Fourth of July to be exact, all Americans will hail the founding of our free democracy by raising proudly our flag of red, white, and

blue. Today, the 17th of May, another bastion of freedom is raising its own flag of red, white, and blue as a proud symbol for the world to see. I refer to "syttende mai"—independence day in Norway. This is the 148th anniversary of the signing of the Norwegian Constitution, a document that has lived through assault and occupation, only to emerge stronger than ever.

It is a proud day for Norwegians. It should be a proud day for all of the free world. The May Day parades of the Communists receive much publicity each year, but a much more appropriate parade for the free press of the world to headline would be the annual parade of children in Oslo today.

This celebration of fun and merriment starts soberly in church. Norwegians are a religious people and many of us in this country received our firm religious background from those rigid traditions.

There will be prayers of thankfulness for deliverance from the evils that have threatened, but never conquered, these people. The Norwegians were assaulted by the Germans in the 1930's and displayed an unmatched bravery during World War II. We must remember the underground, the courage in combat, as these freedom-loving people defied totalitarianism. The postwar construction was painful, but the determined Norwegians made it. Even today, their proud flag waves in the very shadow of danger, on the border of the Soviet empire.

The ties between the United States and Norway are great. This fact was evidenced again last week when I had the privilege of attending a state dinner for Norwegian Prime Minister and Mrs. Gerhardsen. The Prime Minister noted that there is hardly a family left in Norway that cannot claim relatives in the United States.

Many of those relatives are in the Midwest, including my beloved Minnesota. My own ancestry is traced in part to Norway, through a Norwegian-born father and a Swedish mother. Dad brought with him the strength and vision that is so characteristic of the Norwegian people. Joe Langen, now retired, continues to display his independent thinking and on occasion even fails to be impressed by the opinions put forth by his Congressman son. A man of physical as well as mental strength, he still takes a daily swim as long as the Minnesota weather permits.

Minnesota has another Norwegian tie that has been disputed for years, but is believed true by Norwegian and other scholars around the world. A mass defection from the Norse colonies in Greenland to the North American mainland in 1342 caused, as the story goes, an expedition to be formed to search for the lost colonists. It left Norway by royal decree, probably in 1355. At least a part of this expedition is known to have explored Hudson Bay, probably during the years 1360 and 1362. A party of men are reported to have made their way from Hudson Bay to Minnesota, by the direct and relatively easy route along the Nelson River, Lake Winnipeg, and the Red River of the North. The now famous Kensington Runestone was discovered

near Alexandria, Minn., in 1898. It tells the story of a visit to the area in 1362 by a party of 22 Norwegians and 8 Goths.

Controversy may continue about the runestone's authenticity, but the Viking expeditions and the immigrations in the years that followed are full evidence that the sturdy Norwegians played a large role in developing America as it is today.

In Minnesota, we are celebrating the 600th anniversary of the Runestone. In Norway today, they are celebrating the 148th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution. In Washington today, we salute these gallant and free people.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Having the privilege of representing the second largest Norwegian city in the world, second only to Oslo, I want to concur wholeheartedly in the statement of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota regarding his ancestral country. Speaking from years of close association, there certainly are no finer people anywhere than the Norwegians and their descendants in our State.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman. I hope I can accept the compliment in their behalf with grace.

NORWEGIAN CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, today is the 148th anniversary of the adoption of the Norwegian Constitution of May 17. The Constitution which was adopted that day in May has served the Norwegian people ever since as a model for democratic government. Even under the dominion of the Swedish King the Norwegians continued to press for their independence and used the Constitution of May 17 as their talking point.

The fierce independent spirit of the Norwegians is expressed most clearly in the words of their pet and champion of independence, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, in the Norwegian national anthem:

Yes, we love with fond devotion

This, the land that looms

Rugged, storm-scarred, o'er the ocean,

With her thousand homes.

Love her, in our love recalling

Those who gave us birth,

And old tales which night, in falling,

Brings as dreams to earth.

Norseman, whatso'er thy station,

Thank thy God, whose power

Willed and wrought the land's salvation

In her darkest hour.

All our mothers sought with weeping

And our sires in fight,

God has fashioned, in his keeping,

Till we gained our right.

Yes, we love with fond devotion

This our land that looms

Rugged, storm-scarred, o'er the ocean,

With her thousand homes.

And, as warrior sires have made her

Wealth and fame increase,

At the call we too will aid her,

Armed to guard her peace.

ITALY WANTS EMIGRANTS TO RETURN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, while a number of bills introduced recently in the House and in the other body propose to increase the size of immigration to the United States, there appeared this morning in the Washington Post a most enlightening article regarding Italy's need for the return of those Italian emigrants who left that country in the past.

The article confirms the impression of many of us who have surveyed the international migration situation for years, namely, that the booming economy of Europe needs workers urgently, while this country still suffers from unemployment or—in other words—from a surplus of manpower, temporary, I hope.

It appears to me in the light of the article and information reaching us from other countries that to pass legislation opening wider the doors leading to the United States would be tantamount to an unfriendly act toward the many countries of Europe, particularly the countries of the European Common Market who not only wish to retain within their borders their manpower, but to procure more workers from abroad.

The article that I referred to follows:

ITALY BEGINS DRIVE TO LURE BACK NATIVE TECHNICIANS LIVING ABROAD

(By Leo J. Wollemborg)

ROME.—The Italian state oil agency recently issued a public appeal to Italian technicians and skilled workers who have found employment abroad, inviting them to return and announcing that it had jobs for more than 1,800 of them.

The appeal, prominently printed in the major national papers, reflects the continuing expansion of the activities of the ENI (Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi) as well as the marked flair of its dynamic boss, Enrico Mattei. But it must also be viewed in the broader context of the startling changes that have taken place in Italy over the last few years.

Traditionally Italy has been known for her large surplus of manpower which was feeding both a high level of unemployment at home and a steady stream of emigration abroad. In more recent times, however, the country has become an exporter of capital and know-how as well.

EXPANSION THREATENED

Now the quickening industrial growth, unattended by an adequate increase in school and vocational training facilities, has led to a shortage of skilled personnel, which in turn threatens to become the main stumbling block to further expansion.

In the underdeveloped areas, there are still hundreds of thousands of unemployed and underemployed; but most of them are unskilled and often illiterate laborers. At the same time, the want ads sections of the northern dailies (particularly in the Milan-Turin-Genoa "industrial triangle") are full of job offers for trained workers and technicians in the metalworking, mechanical engineering, chemical and electrical industries.

It is estimated that the overall deficit of industrial cadres already tops the 300,000 mark (over 200,000 skilled workers and about 100,000 executives), while shortages of trained manpower are beginning to develop in such other sectors as transportation and other service activities.

Conservative projections indicate that by 1975 Italy will need 10 million skilled workers (as against the 4.5 million of today), almost 4 million junior technicians (there is just about 1 million of them now) and almost 2.5 million senior technicians and executives (as against half a million today).

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED, THROUGH FREE-ENTERPRISE ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS, WITHOUT GOVERNMENT CONTROL

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill (H.R. 11794) that will provide protection against the cost of medical care for every aged American who desires its benefits.

My bill is entirely voluntary and is based on the sound premise that the American people are better qualified than Federal bureaucrats to spend their own money and to determine exactly what kind of medical protection, if any, that they need. It recognizes that there is an existing need for assistance to some of our aged population, and that it is a problem national in scope. It, therefore, treats the problem as such by providing that Federal assistance shall come from the general revenues, as any adequate health plan must, by spreading the burden among all the taxpayers instead of loading it upon the backs of only those who pay social security—many of whom are least able to pay.

My bill is so simple that it will undoubtedly amaze the bureaucrats and confound the welfare-staters. It provides for those who pay taxes a tax credit for the cost of medical care insurance, not to exceed \$125 per individual and thus allows such persons who pay taxes to finance their own health insurance programs.

This tax credit will be available to any individual, age 65 or over who buys health insurance for himself or his spouse, or to any relative who buys insurance for an individual over 65, or by an employer who follows the growing practice of buying insurance for retiring employees over 65.

To refute false claims on King-Anderson (social security approach) and to compare it with the Cramer bill—H.R. 11794—the following table is furnished:

General comparison of King-Anderson and the Cramer bills (H.R. 11794)

	Cramer bill	King-Anderson bill
Pays doctor bills.....	Yes	No.
Pays surgeon.....	Yes	No.
Pays dentist.....	Yes	No.
Pays nurse's fees.....	Yes	No.
Pays for drugs (outside the hospital and nursing homes).....	Yes	No.
Gives exclusive choice of diagnostic physicians.....	Yes	No.
Gives choice of coverage or noncoverage (noncompulsory).....	Yes	No.
Preserves private enterprise and avoids Government control.....	Yes	No.
Avoids risk of socialized medicine.....	Yes	No.
Pays hospitalization without patient payment of initial cost.....	Yes	No.
Spreads cost burden over all taxpayers instead of least-able-to-pay wage earners.....	Yes	No.
Further cost burden on shaky social security fund avoided.....	Yes	No.
Covers all citizens over 65.....	Yes	No.
Encourages relatives who are able to pay insurance or medicare costs.....	Yes	No.
Cost of administration minimal.....	Yes	No.
Total cost is less in long run.....	Yes	No.
Prevents the wealthy from getting large unneeded benefits.....	Yes	No.
Total cost can be more easily determined.....	Yes	No.
Avoids Government decision on benefits.....	Yes	No.
Prejudice of present insurance policyholders avoided.....	Yes	No.
Avoids pauper's oath.....	Yes	Yes.
Avoids overcrowding of hospitals when such treatment unneeded.....	Yes	No.
Avoids Government control of hospitals, nursing homes.....	Yes	No.

All that an eligible individual has to do is to file a Federal income tax return for each year. My bill provides that the Treasury shall issue a simple, easy-to-prepare return for this purpose. Each individual who files a Federal income tax return and owes a tax can deduct as a credit from the tax due the cost of the premiums on one of the approved plans in an amount up to \$125 per individual, or \$250 per married couple. This provision allows these individuals to spend their own money rather than pay it into the Federal Treasury so that bureaucrats can select a compulsory policy for them, the benefits of which would be clearly diminished by the cost of bureaucratic overhead.

In the case of those individuals who file a return and whose tax is less than \$125, however, or who owe no tax at all and so indicate by filing the simplified return, they will receive from the Treasury Department a medical care insurance certificate which may be used to pay the premiums on a medical care policy and which will be redeemed by the Treasury in an amount not to exceed \$125 when the insurance carrier presents it for payment. For example: A person owes the Government an income tax of \$75. He files a return, the \$75 is forgiven, and he receives a certificate worth \$50. He then uses both the cash and the certificate to buy a policy approved by this bill. A further example: A married couple owes no tax. They file a simplified return and receive from the Treasury a certificate worth \$250, which they use to buy an approved policy. The Treasury then pays the insurance carrier \$250 upon the submission of the certificate.

There are undoubtedly many elderly people who now have policies providing medical care which in their judgment are adequate and satisfactory even though they may not technically comply with the coverage specified in either of the programs recommended by my bill.

They are, after all, the best judges of their needs and how their own money should be spent and ought to be entitled

to the same tax credit available to those who elect to take one of the prescribed policies. I have, therefore, provided that such people are entitled to the same tax credit up to \$125 per person, or \$250 for a married couple, by allowing them to deduct the amount of premiums paid for health insurance, the benefits of which are substantially equivalent to the benefits of the two plans mentioned in my bill.

There are also undoubtedly some elderly people of self-reliance and private initiative, who have compunctions against any form of insurance at all and who are ready, willing and able to pay their own cost of medicare out of pocket and retrieve part of the cost thereof by deducting it as an allowable medical expense under the income tax laws. There is no reason why these people should not be encouraged to do so, or why they should be penalized. There is no justification for making this a compulsory insurance program.

I have, therefore, provided in my bill that such people, or their relatives, who are taxpayers, can deduct as a tax credit the cost of medical expenses paid during the taxable year, not to exceed \$125 per individual, or \$250 per couple. Such individuals can then deduct the balance of their expense paid for allowable medical care under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code—title 26, United States Code, section 213. This section of the Internal Revenue Code is quite generous in allowing such deductions from taxable income for individuals 65 years or over without regard to the so-called 3-percent rule which applies to ordinary taxpayers. This section is as follows:

SEC. 213. MEDICAL, DENTAL, ETC., EXPENSES.

(g) MAXIMUM LIMITATION IF TAXPAYER OR SPOUSE HAS ATTAINED AGE 65 AND IS DISABLED.—

(1) SPECIAL RULE.—Subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), the deduction under this section shall not exceed—

(A) \$15,000, if the taxpayer has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and is disabled, or if his spouse has

attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and is disabled and if his spouse does not make a separate return for the taxable year, or

(B) \$30,000, if both the taxpayer and his spouse have attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and are disabled and if the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013.

(2) AMOUNTS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year for medical care, other than amounts paid for—

(i) his medical care, if he has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and is disabled, or

(ii) the medical care of his spouse, if the spouse has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and is disabled, shall be taken into account only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed the maximum limitation provided in subsection (c) which would (but for the provisions of this subsection) apply to the taxpayer for the taxable year;

(B) if the taxpayer has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and is disabled, amounts paid by him during the taxable year for his medical care shall be taken into account only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed \$15,000; and

(C) if the spouse of the taxpayer has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and is disabled, amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year for the medical care of his spouse shall be taken into account only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed \$15,000.

(3) MEANING OF DISABLED.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an individual shall be considered to be disabled if he is unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. An individual shall not be considered to be disabled unless he furnishes proof of the existence thereof in such form and manner as the Secretary or his delegate may require.

(4) DETERMINATION OF STATUS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the determination as to whether the taxpayer or his spouse is disabled shall be made as of the close of the taxable year of the taxpayer, except that if his spouse dies during such taxable year such determination shall be made with respect to his spouse as of the time of such death. As amended September 2, 1958, Public Law 85-866, title I, sections 16, 17(a), (b), 72 Stat. 1613; May 14, 1960, Public Law 86-470, section 3(a), 74 Stat. 133.

My bill imposes no pauper's oath and thus no income limitations with regard to benefits, and I think none in this approach, limited to \$125 per person, is warranted. I have, therefore, imposed no means test, for the further reason that the cost of administering such a test is greater than the saving, and the largest number of citizens over 65, over three-fourths, have so little income that they pay, after deductions, no taxes. Further, tax credits have traditionally been across the board.

There are in 1962 approximately 17 millions of people in this age bracket: 13.75 million of whom are beneficiaries of old-age survivors disability insurance; five-tenths of a million others who are railroad retirees, and about 3 million covered by neither and thus not covered by King-Anderson. Current statistical income data on these people is either not available or not complete. However,

according to official Government publications, there were, as of March 1960, 15,641,000 civilians 65 or older, composed of 7,058,000 men and 8,583,000 women—U.S. Bureau of Census, "Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1961," page 266. This source also indicates that in 1959 there were 12,955,000 such people who had a median income, which excludes any evaluation of net worth, of \$1,076.

According to the U.S. Treasury, in the calendar year 1959, there were 6,712,000 taxpayers 65 years or older who filed Federal income tax returns—determined by those claiming exemptions for old age, \$1,200 per taxpayer, or for old age and blindness, \$1,800 per taxpayer—"Statistics of Income: 1959," U.S. Treasury, table 14, page 59.

Of this number, 3,298,000 paid some tax, which means that their taxable incomes—exclusive of such totally or partially tax-free sources as social security—exceeded exemptions and deductions—see title 26, United States Code, sections 151 and 213, for the amounts allowable. The remaining 3,414,000 were required to file returns but paid no tax because combined exemptions and deductions exceeded their taxable income. The difference between the number of 15,641,000 people 65 or more as of March 1960 and the above number of 6,712,000 who filed 1959 returns is 8,929,000, whose income was apparently too small to report. This would seem to agree with the above-reported median of \$1,076. These figures would also suggest that the number of older people with substantial taxable income is perhaps relatively small, although undetermined; and that the majority of them are of relatively modest means, although many of them have nontaxable or partially nontaxable income in addition thereto, such as social security annuities, railroad retirement annuities, and veterans' disability pensions.

The benefits of my bill are superior to the inadequate and misleading King-Anderson bill sponsored by the administration. I will include a comparison of the main features of the two plans at the conclusion of my remarks, and will cite just a few examples here:

First. The King-Anderson bill will not pay doctor bills. Either of my two plans will do so, including \$5 per call for other than surgical or postoperative care.

Second. The King-Anderson bill makes the patient pay part of his hospital bill, \$10 a day for the first 9 days, or a total of \$90. Senior citizens living on a very small social security annuity, many of whom need this care most of all, could ill afford such a burden. My plan No. 1 pays the entire bill with no deductions.

Third. The King-Anderson bill would protect only those covered by either social security or railroad retirement, and totally ignore the 3 million oldsters not covered by either. My bill covers and protects everyone 65 years or over.

The King-Anderson bill would further increase the heavy social security tax on gross income and further imperil the OASDI trust fund which in recent years has not had a very commendable record of solvency. For the years 1957, 1958,

and 1959, respectively, this trust fund, most of which has been borrowed by the Treasury to finance deficit spending, has operated at deficits of \$126 million, \$528 million and a whopping \$1,724 million; and for the year 1960, had a thin surplus of only \$184 million—U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1961," page 272.

For this same 4-year period, the parasitic bureaucrats dug into this fund to the tune of \$743 million for net administrative expenses. That \$743 million would buy a lot of medical care for senior citizens if spent for insurance under the Cramer bill or any other private enterprise plan. This item is conveniently ignored by the welfare staters whose hearts bleed so profusely for the oldtimers. Look in vain for any such radical suggestion from them, for it has been said, Mr. Speaker, that just as the 18th century Englishman fought to protect his home or castle, so too will the bureaucrat fight to defend his job and his special privileges of big government and to expand their numbers.

The cost of benefits of my bill is difficult to determine due to such imponderables as the number of participants and the amount of income tax deductions now taken by people 65 or more which would have to be offset against the cost of the tax credits. Opponents of this approach have charged, as did ex-Congressman Forand, that it would cost \$1.7 billion. I think this is far too high. But assuming the correctness of this estimate for argument only, by more generally distributing the tax burden, its impact will be far less than the social security approach. In 1959, I am advised, there was a total of about 97,548,297 taxpayers who filed individual and joint returns with the Internal Revenue Service. Computed on these terms, the benefits would cost an average of about 34 cents per week or 5 cents a day per taxpayer, the price of an egg.

This is to be contrasted with the social security approach. The proponents of this plan claim that without administrative costs it would cost \$1.1 billion the first year, but this figure has been challenged by competent experts. The Health Insurance Association of America has found that H.R. 4222, the King-Anderson bill, would, in fact, cost \$2,197 million in 1963, and in 1964, this cost would rise to \$2,483 million.

Further, the distinguished and respected commentator, Mr. Raymond Moley, commented on the social security King-Anderson approach as follows in Newsweek magazine, on May 14, 1962:

Under the present law the social security tax will rise and rise. In 1962 it is 3½ percent on employer and employee alike. In 1963-65 it will be 3½ percent. In 1966-67 it will be 4½ percent on each. In 1968 it will be 4½ percent. If the King-Anderson bill passes, one-fourth of 1 percent would be added in 1963 and thereafter. The self-employed would pay higher percentages all along. And the base pay subject to tax would be raised from \$4,800 to \$5,200.

This tax bite for social security (including the King-Anderson addition) for both employer and employee would in 1968 amount to \$507, or \$21.12 a month each—an increase of 76 percent from 1961.

All this is based upon the estimate of the Government that the plan would cost \$1 bil-

lion a year for a while. But like all Government guesses, this is probably too low. Competent actuaries put the figure at two or more times that amount.

According to the Office of the Actuary, Social Security Administration, and to refute false claims of the cost of King-Anderson, the following is furnished—and it is to be remembered these costs have to be paid largely by the wage earner that is least able to pay:

King-Anderson will, first, raise the taxable income base of everyone under social security from \$4,800 to \$5,200; second, bring about a raise in employee tax from \$174 per year to \$201.50 per year in 1963, and for self-employed tax, from \$259.20 per year to \$301.60 per year; third, bring about a raise in employer tax from \$174 per year to \$201.50 per year in 1963; fourth, bring about a raise in employee tax from \$198 per year to \$227.50 per year in 1966 and in self-employed tax from \$297.50 per year to \$343.20 per year; fifth, bring about a raise in employer tax from \$198 per year to \$227.50 per year in 1966; sixth, bring about a raise in employee tax from \$222 per year to \$253.30 per year in 1968, and in self-employed tax from \$331.20 per year to \$379.60 per year; and seventh, bring about a raise in employer tax from \$222 per year to \$253.50 per year in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the financial unsoundness and demagoguery of the King-Anderson bill, there is a more fundamental objection to financing medical care under social security which goes to the very heart of the free enterprise system of the Nation, the envy of the free world, which some of us would like to pass on to our children and generations yet unborn. The noisy insistence by the administration and the liberal pressure groups on this compulsory plan, which rejects out of hand all other rational and voluntary approaches to this problem, can be explained only in terms of an opening wedge to socialized medicine. It is the old foot-in-the-door technique which the so-called liberals and leftists understand and practice so well. I do not care how loudly or how often they deny it, nationalized medicine is the ultimate intent or purpose of such legislation.

The people in this country have always opposed socialized measures when they are clearly labeled as such, witness the demise of the Socialist Party, which has never been able to gather more than a handful of votes in a national election. But the Socialists have learned from this experience. They now masquerade as "liberals" and hawk their wares under the guise of "liberal" or "progressive welfare legislation," or in this case, "prepaid medical insurance." Only in rare moments of candor will they ever admit that this legislation is, in fact, socialized medicine or "national health insurance" as it is commonly understood in England and which has had such disastrous results there.

The schemers and loudest backers of the social security approach are such Socialist-oriented pressure groups as the ADA and the labor bosses, led by Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers, who hold such a heavy mortgage on the National Democrat Party and the Ken-

nedy administration. However, now and again there appears a public acknowledgment from one of their spokesmen that the ultimate goal is to socialize the medical services in this country.

For example, ex-Congressman Forand, author of the earlier parent legislation of the present administration-backed King-Anderson bill, was quoted in the Chicago Daily News on January 13, 1961, as saying:

If we can only break through and get our foot inside the door, we can expand this program after that.

United Auto Worker President Walter Reuther, a big wheelhorse in the ADA and a longtime Socialist, had his moment of truth when he testified in support of the old Forand bill before the House Ways and Means Committee:

It is no secret that the UAW is officially on record as backing a program of national health insurance [as socialized medicine is called in England], but even if we were against national health insurance, we would favor passage of the Forand bill.

The newspaper New America, which describes itself as "an official publication of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation," devoted most of its December 1, 1960, issue to supporting the Kennedy administration's plan to socialize medicine through the Forand-type legislation. Under the headline, "Forand Bill Sparks Renewed Fight for Socialized Medicine" this paper editorializes as follows:

Socialized medicine—a defeated cause ever since Congress rejected Harry Truman's national health insurance plan—now promises to become the major welfare issue of the Kennedy sixties.

Once the Forand bill is passed this Nation will be provided with a mechanism for socialized medicine, capable of indefinite expansion in every direction until it includes the entire population. And it is already evident that there will be massive pressures in favor of such expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I am and have been for a sound, noncompulsory, nonsocialized medicine medicare program for senior citizens as witness my vote for Kerr-Mills bill in 1960 and my sponsorship of this bill, but I am opposed to the King-Anderson bill, as I believe are the great and overwhelming majority of the people in this Nation and, I believe, in Congress itself. The people of the First District of Florida did not elect me to Congress with a mandate to socialize medicine and make our senior citizens a pawn whose welfare can be bartered away in exchange for votes for the New Frontier. The opinion poll sent to some 15,000 people in my district, recently, showed 2 to 1 in opposition to the compulsory social security approach. If this legislation should pass, I can confidently predict that senior citizens in time will have to have clearance from the Democratic ward bosses in order to receive medical attention. I know there is a small minority of misguided people in my district who threaten to defeat me at the polls if I do not vote the Kennedy-ADA-Reuther line. I say to them now: I cannot in conscience vote for something which I know to be wrong and which will only add to the further deterioration of the moral fabric of our

people. I have given due consideration to and have rejected their counsel. I will not betray what I believe to be the best interest of the Nation for votes. My reply to these pressure groups is that "I cannot woo you and serve you too."

I insert hereafter the text of my bill H.R. 11794; followed by a comparative analysis:

H.R. 11794

A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and tax credits, and for other purposes

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 "Free Enterprise Medicare and Voluntary Health Insurance Benefits Act of 1962".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that (1) many elderly Americans have resources inadequate to meet the expenses of major illness, (2) that more than one-half of all citizens who have reached the age of sixty-five have taken advantage of the growing opportunity to insure against such expenses, (3) that health and medical care insurance can be made available to all citizens regardless of previous medical history, (4) that health insurance coverage of all citizens who desire such coverage and who have reached age sixty-five is a desirable national objective, (5) that this coverage should be extended without Government interference on a voluntary rather than a compulsory basis, and (6) that it is in the public interest to provide Government assistance and encouragement to elderly Americans who seek the protection of medical care and hospitalization.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to make it possible for every citizen of the United States who has reached age sixty-five to obtain on a voluntary basis comprehensive medical care and hospitalization insurance of his choice, subject to minimum standards designed to protect against the costs of the customary illnesses of old age as well as major medical expenses, on a guaranteed renewable basis regardless of prior medical history, with direct Government assistance for all who are otherwise unable to obtain such protection, and with tax incentives for elderly citizens, their relatives or former employers who are able to provide medical care or protection against such costs utilizing the facilities of the voluntary health insurance carriers of the United States in a manner consistent with the dignity and independence of each individual and the historic ability of the American people to solve social problems through their own initiative and enterprise, making certain that the Government will not control the individual's free choice nor interfere in his selection of a physician or hospital.

SEC. 3. (a) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by redesignating section 38 as section 39, and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED.—

"(a) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR THE AGED.—As used in this section, the term 'qualified medical care insurance program for the aged' means a program, offered by one or more insurance carriers operating in accordance with State law, providing protection under guaranteed renewable insurance for individuals 65 years of age or over against the costs of medical care (as defined in section 213(e)) through a system of benefits including either—

"(1) a plan providing benefits which may not be less than:

"(A) \$12 for hospital room and board charges per day of confinement and \$1,080 for all days of confinement in a calendar year;

"(B) \$120 for hospital ancillary charges in any calendar year including any such charges in connection with surgery or emergency treatment on an outpatient basis;

"(C) \$6 for convalescent hospital room and board charges per day of confinement and \$186 for all days of confinement in any one calendar year, immediately following confinement in a general hospital;

"(D) surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a \$300 maximum; or

"(E) \$5 per call for physician's services, other than for surgery or postoperative care;

"(2) a plan providing payment at the rate of not less than 75 percent of the following covered medical expenses after a deductible and subject to a maximum as specified in (B) below:

"(A) covered medical expenses must include at least the following:

"(i) hospital room and board charges equal to the hospital's customary charges for semiprivate accommodations;

"(ii) hospital ancillary charges including any such charges in connection with surgery or emergency treatment on an outpatient basis;

"(iii) \$6 for convalescent hospital room and board charges per day of confinement immediately following confinement in a general hospital and \$540 for all days of confinement in any one calendar year;

"(iv) surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a \$300 maximum;

"(v) \$5 per call for physicians' services, other than for surgery or postoperative care;

"(vi) \$16 for professional (registered) nursing charges per day and \$480 for all days in any one calendar year;

"(vii) charges for drugs and medicines which require a doctor's prescription; diagnostic X-rays and other diagnostic and laboratory tests; X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope treatment; blood or blood plasma not donated or replaced; anesthetics and oxygen; and rental of durable medical or surgical equipment such as hospital beds or wheelchairs; or

"(B) payment of benefits for the foregoing charges may be subject to either

"(i) a deductible of not more than \$100 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than \$5,000;

"(ii) a deductible of not more than \$200 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than \$10,000;

If a medical care insurance program which is otherwise qualified under the provisions of this section offers protection for individuals under age 65 as well as those 65 and over, such program shall be considered a 'qualified medical care insurance program for the aged' for purposes of this section but only with respect to beneficiaries who are 65 years of age or over.

"(b) DEFINITION OF CARRIER.—'Carrier' means a voluntary association, corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental organization which lawfully offers a health benefit plan.

"(c) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—There shall be allowed to an individual, as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year, (1) an amount equal to the aggregate of the premiums paid during the taxable year by such individual under one or more qualified medical care insurance programs for the aged (as defined in subsection (a)), to the extent that the aggregate of such premiums does not exceed \$125 for any one person covered by such program or programs, or (2) an amount equal to the aggregate of the premiums paid during the taxable year by such individual under one or more medical care insurance programs

for the aged if the value of the benefits under such program or programs is substantially equivalent to the values of the benefits under qualified medical care insurance programs for the aged (as defined in subsection (a)), to the extent that the aggregate of such premiums does not exceed \$125 for any one person covered by such program or programs, or

"(3) an amount equal to the expenses paid during the taxable year for medical care by such individual who is not the beneficiary of any medical care insurance program for the aged, to the extent that the aggregate of such medical expenses do not exceed \$125 for any one such individual, plus

"(d) INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT.—The credit under subsection (c) shall be allowable to a taxpayer only if—

"(1) he is the beneficiary of the medical care insurance program involved and is 65 years of age or over, or

"(2) each beneficiary for whom the premiums were paid under such program is a person 65 years of age or over who bears any of the relationships to the taxpayer defined under section 152(a), or

"(3) he is not the beneficiary of a medical care insurance program and is 65 years of age or over, or

"(4) each person for whom the medical expenses (referred to in subsection (c)(3)) were paid is a person 65 years or over who bears any of the relationships to the taxpayer defined under section 152(a).

For purposes of this section, an individual shall be considered to be 65 years of age or over throughout any taxable year if he has attained such age by the close of such year.

"(e) COVERAGE CERTIFICATES.—Each insurance carrier offering a qualified medical care insurance program for the aged (as defined in subsection (a)) shall issue, to each individual who is covered under such program, a medical care coverage certificate setting forth the name of the insured, the amount of the premium, and a certification that the coverage meets the requirements of this Act.

The credit provided by subsection (c)(1) shall be allowed for any taxable year only if such certificate or a copy thereof is attached to the taxpayer's return for such year.

"(f) CREDIT IN CASE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, if any employer provides protection against medical costs for its retired employees who are 65 years of age or over, by purchasing coverage for such retired employees under one or more qualified medical care insurance programs for the aged, such employer shall be entitled to a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle equal to the amount of the credit to which it would be entitled under subsection (c)(1) if it were an individual taxpayer and such retired employees were persons described in subsection (d)(2).

"(g) INDIVIDUALS NOT DERIVING FULL BENEFIT FROM CREDIT.—In the case of any individual—

"(1) who is 65 years of age or over,

"(2) whose tax under this subtitle for the taxable year will be less than \$125 (as estimated in accordance with regulations of the Secretary or his delegate), and

"(3) who is not the beneficiary of a qualified medical care insurance program for the aged (as defined in subsection (a)), the Secretary shall upon application by such individual issue to him a medical care insurance premium certificate which may be used by him in purchasing coverage under such a program and will be redeemed for cash by the Secretary when presented by an insurance carrier who certifies that it was accepted in payment of the premiums on such a program. The amount for which any certificate will be redeemed under the preceding sentence shall be the amount of the premiums payable on the program for the year or \$125, whichever is less, reduced by the amount (if any) of the individual's tax for such year as estimated under clause (2) of such sentence and further adjusted (unless such an adjustment would be in-

equitable or impose undue hardship) to take account of any amounts by which benefits made available to such individual under this subsection in previous years were greater or less than they would have been if the estimate under such clause (2) for such years had been correct. No certificate under this subsection shall be issued to any individual for any taxable year unless he furnishes the Secretary with satisfactory proof of his compliance with clauses (1), (2), and (3) of the first sentence.

"(h) CREDIT NOT TO CAUSE REFUND OF TAX.—The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under sections 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and 37 (relating to retirement income).

"(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations (including regulations providing for the application of this section in the case of joint returns) as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by striking out

"Sec. 38. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 38. Costs of medical care for the aged.

"Sec. 39. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 4. Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) EXCLUSION OF AMOUNTS ALLOWED AS CREDIT.—Any expense allowed as a credit under section 38 shall not be treated as an expense paid for medical care for purposes of this section."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Comparison of specific provision of Cramer and King-Anderson proposals for medical care

	Cramer bill	King-Anderson bill
Who is covered.....	Everyone who reaches age 65 who wishes health insurance.....	OASDI eligible persons age 65 and over, including employed aged; also includes railroad retirees; 13.75 million OASDI beneficiaries and 0.5 million railroad retirees.
How many.....	17 million (as of 1962), everyone over 65.....	14.25 million (as of 1963).
Benefits.....	Medical care insurance under a choice of policies, the minimum benefits of which are described as plans 1 and 2. Tax credits for others.	Hospitalization, nursing home, and diagnostic care subject to deductible charges enumerated below.
	Cramer plan 1 (payment of all charges made by the insurance carrier)	Cramer plan 2 (subject to a deductible feature with not to exceed 25 percent coinsurance) ¹
Hospitalization.....	Hospital room and board up to \$12 per day, and up to \$1,080 in a calendar year; other hospital charges, including charges for surgical or emergency outpatient treatment, up to \$120 in any calendar year.	Hospital room and board equal to charges, for semiprivate accommodations; other hospital charges including charges for surgical or emergency outpatient treatment.
Nursing homes.....	Convalescent hospital room and board up to \$6 per day, and up to \$186 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital.	Convalescent hospital room and board up to \$6 per day, and up to \$540 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital.
Home health service.....	None.....	None.....
Nurses' fees.....	None.....	Up to \$16 per day for registered nurse, and up to \$480 in any 1 calendar year.
Surgeons' and physicians' fees.....	Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a \$300 maximum and \$5 per call for other than surgery or postoperative care.	Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a \$300 maximum, and \$5 per call for other than surgery or postoperative care.
Diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services.....	When hospitalized as above.....	Diagnostic X-rays and other diagnostic and laboratory tests; X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope treatment.
Drugs and related requirements.....	Drugs used in hospitals.....	Charges for drugs and medicines which require a doctor's prescription; blood or blood plasma not donated or replaced; anesthetics and oxygen; rental of durable medical or surgical equipment such as hospital beds or wheelchairs.

See footnote at end of table.

Comparison of specific provisions of Cramer and King-Anderson proposals for medical care—Continued

	Cramer bill	King-Anderson bill
Financing method.....	Through tax credits for individuals who pay their own bills or premiums or are covered by insurance or bills paid for by near relatives or former employers, and through issuance of "medical care insurance certificates" for all others.	Increases OASDI taxable wage base from \$4,800 to \$5,000 beginning with 1962; provides for rate increase beginning in 1963 of 1/2 of 1 percent of 1st \$5,000 of employee wages; 3/4 of 1 percent of 1st \$5,000 for self-employed.
Total costs (estimate).....	Cost estimated to be less than other legislation, but difficult to predict because of lack of (a) precise information on amount of deductions now taken by or for individuals over 65 which would be an offset against cost of tax credit; (b) knowledge concerning probable degree of participation; (c) savings in Kerr-Mills, State and local matching programs.	\$1.1 billion, 1st year cost, estimate by sponsors; Health Insurance Association of America say, \$2.4 billion.

¹ Payment of benefits may be subject to either (1) a deductible of not more than \$100 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than \$5,000; or (2) a deductible of not more than \$200 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than \$10,000.

ADMINISTRATION LOBBYING FOR MEDICAL CARE

Mr. SHORT. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Speaker, in Tuesday's Record I inserted an article from the May 2, 1962, New York Herald Tribune which explained in some detail the vast lobbying organization the administration has launched to pump its medical care for the aged proposal.

A story in the May 15, 1962, Washington Star provides a significant followup. The Star article revealed Justice Department feelings on the oft-heard suggestion that administration aids are breaking the law by lobbying for legislation supported by the White House.

Assistant Attorney General Herbert J. Miller, Jr., head of the Justice Department's Criminal Division, wrote:

The power to recommend measures to Congress would appear clearly to include the power to urge arguments upon individual Members of Congress in support of such measures.

Necessarily, the President must entrust part of this function to subordinate officers within the executive branch. Our Federal Government could not function efficiently if the President and his subordinates could not do so.

The question is, How far do they go?

The United States Code specifically prohibits the expenditures of public funds "for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress."

Not only are Members of Congress being buttonholed by White House lobbyists but, as the Herald Tribune article pointed out, White House personnel are "writing television and radio scripts, drafting advertisements, and helping with publicity releases for private organizations that are backing the administration's medical care plan."

Mr. Speaker, this is governmental press agency with a vengeance.

The Wall Street Journal as far back as February 14, 1962, noted that the administration is "calling out the reserves

in their battle for sweeping new powers to cut U.S. tariffs."

Some of this propaganda turns up in the most peculiar places. For instance, the Post Office Department is using its stamp cancellation machines as vehicles for slogans supporting the pending trade legislation. I have a copy of a post card mailed in Philadelphia May 7, 1962, with the cancellation: "Sales Abroad Make Jobs at Home."

The administration's so-called Trade Expansion Act of 1962 presumably would be the cure-all.

The Wall Street Journal article says, in part:

Extra public-relations men and lobbyists are being mobilized at the White House. Regional selling seminars are being organized by friendly Governors. The President himself may take to the air with a specialized public appeal. And juicy bait is being dangled before possible holdouts against the administration's wishes.

These are just a few of the steps being taken or contemplated by the Kennedy regime in the top-priority fight for freer trade.

The article points out that a congressional aid has been borrowed to work in the White House trade lobbying office. And it says:

Lobbyists from other agencies will help.

The Justice Department, apparently, believes this whole business is completely aboveboard and legal. Perhaps it is time for Congress to check the propriety of much of this White House lobbying pressure.

WHY NO SEATO ACTION IN LAOS?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGregor. Mr. Speaker, the United States should immediately call an emergency conference of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization to consider what steps can be taken to restore the badly damaged cause of freedom in that part of the world.

Swift advances of the Communist-supported Pathet Lao troops in Laos have for the first time brought communism to the border of Thailand, and have tremendously increased the threat to South Vietnam and to all of southeast Asia.

The Kennedy administration has not been frank with the people in outlining the alternatives available to us. We hear that the only way to keep Laos from "going Communist" is the massive introduction of American troops. Why not use concerted action through the vehicle of SEATO?

Thirteen months ago at the Bangkok Conference the Governments of Thailand and the Philippines stood ready to provide troops and other military help in Laos. At first we gave informal support to this move by our allies; then, at the insistence of France and Britain we reversed our field and embarked on the near hopeless task of seeking to establish a neutralist government in Laos by diplomatic and political means.

Now that the Kennedy administration's policies have proved unworkable, the SEATO countries should be given another chance to roll back the aggressive Communist forces. Troops from Thailand, the Philippines and others of our SEATO allies could, if they agreed freely to do so, mount a force in Laos to reestablish the cease-fire line as it stood before the Pathet Lao stormed across it 10 days ago.

American forces might well be restricted to logistics, supply, airdrop, and training missions.

If President Kennedy desires congressional support for an emergency SEATO conference, and for the use of SEATO power in the cause of freedom for Laos, I am sure that Members of Congress from both parties will immediately give him that support. I am today introducing a joint resolution which will state congressional support for this policy and authorize the President to take appropriate action.

During the years 1943 to 1945 I was assigned to the Office of Strategic Services, U.S. Army, and served in the general southeast Asian area which presently is inflamed by a major conflict between the Communist forces and the free local governments. My assignments covered intelligence activities and the organization of guerrilla and counter-guerrilla warfare activities by native forces behind Japanese lines. I know many of the southeast Asian peoples through experience in working directly with them.

Notwithstanding difficult terrain, health, and climatic conditions, we demonstrated in World War II that we can wage effective paramilitary operations in northern Thailand and in Laos.

We were successful then with units composed largely of native troops and guided by relatively few American soldiers. We can be just as successful now.

THE COURSE OF TRADE CONSIDERATIONS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the opportunity of addressing the National Industrial Conference Board in New York City. At the time I commented on the course of the considerations of the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962. A great deal of committee work has been necessary to rewrite the proposal as it was presented by the administration, putting in guidelines to direct the exercise of new powers granted the Executive. I believe the bill, as it is being rewritten, can offer a real step forward in the formulation of a stronger American trade policy.

I am placing this speech, given this morning, in the RECORD, as a comment on the course of trade considerations.

THE SHAPE OF A NEW FOREIGN TRADE POLICY: A CONGRESSMAN'S VIEW

(By Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri)

I believe that the first remarks I must make should relate to the title of my address, "The Shape of a New Foreign Trade Policy," because I am unaware of any proposal pending before the Congress of a new foreign trade policy. The Ways and Means Committee held public hearings 2 months ago on H.R. 9900 which has been propagandized as a new trade policy but the more we examined the administration witnesses on the bill the more we realized that the proposed legislation was merely an extension of the Reciprocal Trades Act with a few refinements here and there.

As a matter of fact, H.R. 9900, was described by someone as more of a narrative than a bill. Certainly, the rewriting of the bill which the Ways and Means Committee has been doing the past month, and we are by no means finished, fully supports the accuracy of this witticism. As a matter of fact, in effect we have stricken the enacting clause of H.R. 9900 and are writing a new bill. Yet the White House propaganda machine continues to press home its theme.

Let me state what a new trade policy might have been. It might have been related to the broad band of trade barriers as does GATT instead of the narrow band of tariff restrictions. Indeed it might have borrowed much of the GATT language, to define unfair trade practices and unfair trade barriers. It might even have recognized and approved of the GATT and established permanent working machinery for it as was once timidly suggested by the previous administration in the OTC only to be abandoned.

It might have directed attention to section 2 of NATO and the OECD and spelled out how we should coordinate our trade policy in the framework of GATT, NATO, OECD, UN, and the European Common Market and whatever other common market might be established.

We might have really grappled with the problem of agriculture commodities instead of pushing them under the rug as if they did not exist. Indeed, if we were properly

concerned with the so-called undeveloped nations we would have dealt forthrightly with agricultural commodities.

We would have extended the list of unfair trade practices set forth in the GATT to cover the infinite number of varieties of state subsidies in the whole economic process of producing and processing raw materials into finished products and marketing and servicing them. We would have taken up the subject of state trading, international cartels and antitrust legislation. We would have delved into the problem of patent laws and other regulations designed to encourage research and development by establishing fair rules for the recapture of the investment in research and development and a sufficient incentive return on the capital.

We would have studied the importance of insisting upon reciprocity in extending the most-favored-nation clause to any trading partner so that the problem of Japanese foreign markets could have been properly dealt with.

The administration in the public hearings treated questions directed into these areas as if the matters were completely foreign to the matter of a trade policy. With similar astigmatism Secretary of Commerce Hodges could see no relation, let alone inconsistency between the President's trade proposals in H.R. 9900 and the taxation of foreign income proposals in H.R. 10650, which now lies, I hope dying, in the Senate Finance Committee.

The shape of the foreign trade policy contained in H.R. 9900, or in the bill the Ways and Means Committee is writing, from a Congressman's viewpoint relates primarily to the manner in which the Congress delegates power to the Executive to enter into trade negotiations with foreign nations.

President William McKinley first proposed this reciprocal trade technique of having the Executive negotiate trade treaties instead of the Congress write the detailed tariff schedules.

There has been little or no dispute even from those dubbed "protectionists" about the need to give to the Executive additional trading authority in order to make new and further beneficial agreements with foreign nations, particularly with the European Common Market. The entire concern seems to be centered around the guidelines the President be required to follow in exercising these powers.

Of course, there is a requirement in the bill that peril points be found before negotiations are entered into. As the Executive witness and the Tariff Commission testified in preparation for negotiations they always went through a process of, in effect, finding peril points before entering negotiations. Even if Congress did not require that this be done, and the Congress didn't until post-World War II, commonsense dictated that it be done. It was done before Congress spelled it out and commonsense would dictate that it be done even if Congress did not spell it out in this new law. The present bill does spell out a great deal more formal procedure in preparing for trade negotiations. It establishes procedures in such a way that industry, labor and interested groups as a matter of right and knowledge of how to utilize the right can present the data and arguments which bear on the question of tariff reductions for any particular product or range of products.

The present bill requires for the first time that our trade negotiators have faces, as it were, and have the status necessary to carry on effectively their responsibilities of negotiating. The chief negotiator becomes a formal title with the rank of Ambassador Plenipotentiary. He and his chief deputy are appointed by the President with Senate confirmation.

The bill provides the formal procedure and a forum whereby parties who allege that there have been unfair trade practices com-

mitted by foreign companies or countries or by their own domestic companies or country can register and have adjudged their complaints. It provides that appropriate remedies including withdrawing trade concessions in the event that these allegations prove to be well founded.

The bill provides the usual escape clause procedures for matters related to the defense of our country and where an industry or a laboring group have been damaged.

It probably will provide (we are still drafting) that the President in remedying the damage to a business or labor group may do so through withdrawing a trade concession but he may instead do so through the loans available under the Small Business Act, in the Area Redevelopment Agency, the Manpower Retraining Act, and the unemployment insurance acts.

The committee is still working over the draft in respect to these alternative means of redressing damage resulting from foreign trade competition.

Within these guidelines and procedures the President has been given the power to reduce tariffs largely to the extent that he requested in H.R. 9900.

The question in my own mind, and the one I posed to the Government witnesses was whether indeed this proposal had been intended to be a new foreign trade program and was a great deal more than an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act. But that the real purpose had not been stated. It was not to free up trade through making it fairer and more reciprocal, but rather to substitute for the tariff as a method of regulations the more regression and burdensome trade barriers of quotas, license embargoes, state subsidies, and international cartel arrangements.

The Government witnesses said that these fears were unfounded that they did not plan a new trade policy along these lines and that they did not wish to remove and reduce tariffs only to impose in their place these other trade regulators.

However, my fears have not been that easily dismissed nor will they be until the administration agrees to sponsor the repeal of section 201 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act put in the law in 1956 and enlarged at the administration's behest just a month ago. This section of the Agriculture Adjustment Act gives the President blanket authority to enter into quota, license, and embargo agreements and have these agreements apply even to nations which are not parties to that agreement, in respect to agricultural products or products manufactured from them and textiles. It makes all the machinery established to provide rights by law set up as we are writing H.R. 9900 meaningless. Section 201 is raw delegation of power to the Executive without guidelines or objectives.

It is this authority the President relied upon to enter into the Government-sponsored international cartel agreement in Geneva, this January in respect to cotton textiles. I asked Secretary Hodges in the public hearings how it was to be determined how much of each kind of textiles manufactured by which companies from what countries would come into the port of Boston, the port of New York, the port of Charleston, etc. He replied, they were using the data in the 1960 census. Is freezing the economic pattern of textile trade as it was in 1960 freeing up trade? Increasing it? I ask you, gentlemen, here, the same question. Secretary Hodges had no satisfactory answer.

Was the self-imposed quota on oil imports by our domestic oil companies freeing up trade? Was it a violation of our antitrust laws? Was setting up subsidies for lead and zinc domestic mining freeing up trade * * * making it fairer?

What is the trade program the President proposes but to junk the tariff system which at least has the merit of being law and of

enabling any firm to figure out for themselves what the costs in trading are to be. In place of this system are we to have one of license, quota, subsidy and cartels which require dancing attendance on a governmental bureaucracy which can smile or frown, grant economic life or pronounce economic death on any firm or labor group as a matter of Executive decree not by procedures set up by law?

When I find a strange unresponsiveness on the part of administration witnesses to questions pointing up the regressiveness of these other than tariff barriers to trade and a failure on the administration's part to even list these barriers which are so numerous and insidious, I really wonder whether a really new but regressive American foreign trade policy has been proposed.

When I see a system of trade adjustment proposed which is partly designed at any rate to keep companies in business through governmental subsidies, I wonder how this differs in result from a system of tariff differentials designed to do the same. I further wonder whether the purpose is not to free up and strengthen the private market place, both domestic and international, but to substitute governmental decision to allocate our resources instead. H.R. 9900 as proposed substitutes for a relatively liberal tariff method of reflecting wage and cost differentials, the more regressive and elaborate method of State subsidy.

Secretary Udall was pleased to report that the California tuna fisherman had been helped, not through tariff adjustment, but through Government loans to modernize their fishing boats and so stay in competition. Did this free up trade and increase trade? What is the difference in this approach and the approach of increasing the tariff? Under the tariff increase the more efficient domestic fisherman could proceed under his own initiative to modernize his boats. Under the State subsidy approach a fisherman had to persuade a bureaucrat to give him the loan. The ability to persuade a bureaucrat became the test of survival, not the marketplace.

I pointed out to Secretary Hodges a complaint I received from some of our manufacturers that they were unable to compete with certain Western German firms in Venezuela because the Germans could extend a 10-year line of credit which they could not match. They said the German Government subsidizing made this possible by extended credit. Secretary Hodges' response was, "Well, we have fixed this up. Our Government will counter by subsidizing our companies through the Export-Import Bank tax to extend a comparable line of credit."

Does this free up trade? Make it fairer? Indeed not. It restricts it and makes it less fair for all other nations. The way to free trade is to persuade Germany to withdraw their subsidy, then no one would be subsidized.

Gentlemen, I can see the wisdom of the writers of the Constitution in vesting in the Congress the power to regulate both interstate and foreign trade. This power of regulation has within it the power of economic life or death over all our citizens. This power should only be delegated to the Executive with proper guidelines. It must be delegated in a manner which establishes rights and remedies by law and not by bureaucratic decree. If we fail to do this we have a system of government by men, not by law. This is the antithesis of the system of establishing freedom and justice.

The trade legislation as a Congressman views it is, How does Congress delegate the powers which should be given to the Executive so he can enter into mutually beneficial trade agreements with other nations in a manner which establishes proper rights in our citizens and yet does not unduly hamper

the Executive? These are the issues confronting the Ways and Means Committee in drafting the extension of the law which extends our old trade policy. As I have previously stated, would that we were engaged in this pastime and at the same time considering a new and broad trade policy. We badly need a new trade policy. The issue of war and peace is wrapped up in it and we move closer to the breakage as we temporize and put our new wine in Old World bottles.

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, "With law shall we build our land, not with lawlessness lay it waste."

So reads the introduction to Norway's ancient code of laws. It is a notable fact that wherever the Vikings went they set to work establishing ordered kingdoms of commonwealths, and that many of these became the lasting foundations of social or political life. Norwegians settled Iceland and the Faroe Islands, conquered and settled the Shetland and the Orkney Islands, the Hebrides and parts of northern Scotland. They established kingdoms at Dublin and on the Isle of Man. Incidentally they have also been accused of putting the blue in the Irishman's eyes. In all these settlements or conquests the law was supreme.

An old French poem about the Vikings, who invaded France, tells an anecdote which reveals the impression they left on their contemporaries in the country they conquered. It is said that a messenger from the King of France came to ask for their chief, and he got the proud answer, "We have no chief, we are all equals." They felt themselves to be freemen, and what they really obeyed was the law. Today, the 17th of May, marks the 148th anniversary of the Norwegian independence. Like "The Star-Spangled Banner"—"Ja, vi elsker" the Norwegian national anthem will ring throughout the land.

In Norway this day is set aside to ceremony and celebration, and fairs are held throughout the land. The day is begun to festivity by dedications of the royal family, whose head is Olav V, King of Norway. All Norwegian subjects, men and women, will take part in this day of celebration; but most of all it is a day set aside for the children of this great nation. A great children's parade is held in Oslo, going to church, playing games and waving of the Norwegian red, white, and blue flags. For Oslo today is a gay city.

The terrible experience of foreign conquest and tyranny has not destroyed the Norwegian ideals of law and freedom. On the contrary, the nation is more determined than ever to carry their ideals, and leave them to younger generations. No less than in the past Norway will in the future support international organization under law. In this she sees the only hope for her freedom and that of all nations. Through the dark and hard

centuries the Norwegian people had fought against all kinds of oppression—economic, social, political. And they had managed to rescue the fundamentals of their liberty.

For three centuries Norway had seemingly disappeared from the European society of states. It was governed from a foreign country and by foreign masters. Yet it preserved its legal existence as a kingdom and, still more important, its national traditions, the proud consciousness of hereditary freedom and law. In fact the particular development of the country had made its social constitution the most democratic in existence in all of Europe; the only European country where practically no nobility, and certainly no serfs, were to be found.

The 19th century brought the restoration of national independence and the complete liberation of the people. The great Norwegian novelist, Arne Garborg, once wrote of his people:

They are a strong, stubborn folk who dig their way through a life of brooding and care, putter with the soil and search the Scriptures, force a little corn from the earth and hopes from their dreams, put their faith in the penny, and trust in God.

Over 2 million Norwegian people have come to America. The story of the fortunes of these "strong, stubborn folk" in the New World has been preserved in letters that were treasured by families in Norway and later collected by historians; in memories of the pioneers who, in the dreamy days of old age, recalled their youthful conquest of the new earth; in Norwegian newspapers published in the Midwest, the East, and the West of America; in pamphlets and books which traced the history of local churches, schools, towns, and societies organized and built by the immigrants.

Norwegians began to come to the Montana Territory in the 1860's and continued to arrive all through the seventies and eighties. A considerable number of Norwegians settled on the grazing upland of the Flathead Mountains, Crazy Mountains, Big Belt, and Little Belt Mountains. About half of the 25,000 first- and second-generation Norwegians in Montana in 1940 lived on farms and in rural communities; the best concentrated mainly in Great Falls, Butte, Anaconda, Missoula, Billings, and Helena. In some of these towns there are Sons of Norway halls where "lute-fisk" dinners are served in the winter, where the Norwegian townspeople gather to play whist, dance, and sing Norwegian songs. About half of the Norwegian-Americans in the State belong to the Lutheran Church.

The story of the settlement of Norwegians in the Far West is very like a play within a play. There is the overreaching action of the intercontinental migration, spanning the century from 1825 to 1925. Beneath it are the smaller continental migrations; New York to Illinois, Illinois to Wisconsin to Minnesota, Minnesota to the Plains, a pause, and then the long jump over desert and mountain to the Pacific Ocean. It is this last migration that curiously parallels the larger in the similarity of the cause that produced them. In the early fifties Norwegians in

Illinois and Wisconsin, too, left their recently cleared farms and headed for Sacramento Valley. Most of them were young, unmarried men like Hans Christian Heg, later a colonel in the Union Army, and three companions who left southern Wisconsin in 1849. From his letters sent back to a Norwegian newspaper in his home community the people there followed his journey to the West. Another such record has been left by Tosten Kittelsen Stabaek, who with 19 Norwegians and 1 Frenchman formed a caravan of 7 wagons and 68 head of cattle that left Wisconsin in the spring of 1852.

Men and cattle died on the 5-months' march. But most of them reached the goldfields, spent a few years panning and digging, then returned to their families in Wisconsin and Illinois, richer, if not in money, at least in experience and in knowledge of America and her many peoples.

The story of Americans from Norway and the generations to follow, has not been fully recorded. As it unfolds in the years to come we shall know more intimately their life in the Coastal States, on the western ranges, and their part in the labor movement, as well as we now know them as farmers, clergymen, and politicians. America has reaped much from whence they came. From Norwegians such as Leif Erickson, about the year 1970, to Trygve Lie, not only America, but the world has selected an honored place for their deeds.

I am happy to note that the sturdiness of the Norwegian people is revealed to this day, in an article from the News of Norway, Marianne Vik, a 4-year-old girl of Brannfjell, near Oslo, skied altogether 155 miles on 23 trips this past winter to earn the skiing badge. As a group the Norwegian-Americans came of age, intellectually, as the Nation began to turn to the scientists and the technically trained for leadership, when America began to call experts into the laboratories not only of educational institutions, but hospitals, industrial plants, and Government agencies. It is in these areas that the immigrant stock has had its greatest opportunities and made a larger share of its contributions.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

NORGES FRIHETSDAG

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, det er en fornøyelse for mig å feire idag 148 år dagen for Norges uavhengighet.

Nordmennene er kjent gjennom sin historie for sin forkjærlighet for demokratiske institusjoner i deres styre av sitt land. Deres uavhengighetsdag blev ikke et resultat av seir i kamp men kulminerte efter måneders vanskelige og omhyggelige parlamentariske forhandlinger. 17 de mai er årsdagen for den dag Norges konstitusjon blev vedtatt.

Norge var ett av de første land i Europa som vedtok en demokratisk kon-

stitusjon. Konstitusjonen erklærer at Stortinget, eller det Norske parlament, skal uttrykke folkets vilje. Videre erklærer den at Kongen ikke har makt til å oppløse foosamlingen, eller til absolutt veto. Den første konge efter at konstitusjonen var vedtatt blev valgt, og valget stadfestet ved folkeavstemning.

Drømmen om uavhengighet blev virkelighet i det 20de århundrede. Norge fikk invasjon av svenske tropper: og 1814 og det blev nødvendig å forbli i union med Sverige inntil 1906. Det svenske styre var dog ikke helt dominerende. Det Norske Storting var den lovlige autoritet, og kom til sist til å sette Regjeringens medlemmer for riksstett. Stortingets uavhengighetsbestrebelsel førte til sist til folkeavstemningen 1906. Norge blev fritt.

Nordmennenes utrettelige og effektive hengivenhet for sin frihet har vaert en inspirasjon til demokratisk Regjeringen i alle land. Det er en ære for mig å feire uavhengighetsdagen for vår forbunds-felle Norge og å ønske velkommen til vårt land Norges æreder Statsminister, Einar Gerhardsen.

[Translation]

NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

It is a pleasure for me to observe today the 148th anniversary of Norwegian Independence Day.

The Norwegians have been noted throughout their history for their devotion to democratic institutions of government. In fact their independence day is not the occasion of a victory in battle but the culmination of a month of difficult and painstaking parliamentary negotiation. May 17 is the anniversary of the day on which the Norwegian constitution was adopted.

Norway was among the first of the European nations to adopt a democratic constitution. The constitution provided that the Storting, or parliament, should be the repository of popular will. It further provided that the king should have no power of dissolution or veto. The first king to be the titular head of the Norwegian Government was elected by the Storting—elected by the people by referendum.

Unfortunately, the dream of an independent nation did not materialize until the 20th century. Norway was invaded by the Swedish Army and forced to remain in union with Sweden until 1906. However, the Swedish domination was not harshly repressive. The Norwegian Storting continued to be the main source of legal authority even to the extent of impeaching the officials of the Swedish King. The independent actions of the Norwegian Storting finally led to a plebiscite in 1906. The outcome of the balloting was 368,211 for dissolution and 184 for union. Norway became independent.

The fierce and effective devotion of the Norwegians to their independence has been an inspiration to democratic governments everywhere. It is an honor for me to mark this anniversary of our ally Norway and to welcome to our country the distinguished Norwegian Prime Minister, Einar Gerhardsen.

A CENTURY OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this month marks a century of progress insofar as land-grant colleges in the United States are concerned. One hundred years ago, on July 2, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed into law a bill establishing colleges throughout the country for the purpose of training young men and young women in the art of homemaking and in agriculture and engineering. Possibly at the time the act was passed, very few of those who had a part in it could have dreamed of the important part this program was to play in the development of our country.

In my own State of Indiana, some 10 years later, a land-grant college was established at Lafayette; and it was named after one of the chief donors of land and money, John Purdue. My discussion will deal primarily with Purdue and its influence on Indiana, but what I am about to say could be duplicated in almost every State of the Union, and the story reads almost like a fairytale.

Prior to the enactment of this legislation most of the leaders of our country had held the concept with regard to higher education which in essence stood for training only in liberal arts and the sciences. We had had illustrious colleges producing fine talented citizens during almost a century of the early period of our Nation. It was not thought important, however, in the first few decades of our country's existence to train people in so-called vocational-type efforts. In fact, it was considered almost as a waste of time, particularly with regard to training women as homemakers. So the concept of the land-grant college was really a radical departure.

Today our land-grant college functions in three areas: First of all, it trains young men in the school of agriculture in the various specialty divisions of agriculture such as fruits, crops, animal husbandry, and other phases of our Indiana agriculture. The school of home economics trains young women in all the arts of homemaking. The school of engineering—in which field Purdue has one of the outstanding schools in the whole Nation—trains men in the various phases of engineering—civil, mechanical, and aeronautical.

One of the best yardsticks to measure the widespread acceptance of our school of agriculture has been the enrollment that the school has had through the years. The school has continued to grow and develop, not only in the regular 4-year courses, but also it is training men in the more specialized field looking forward to higher degrees than the normal 4-year course would produce. A very practical 8-week course in agriculture has produced some of Indiana's outstanding farmers.

Thousands of farmers throughout our State have benefited from the training

and educational effort at Purdue University through its agricultural extension service which is conducted in the various counties as an extension or educational arm of Purdue through the county agent system. If anyone were to ask the rural people of Indiana today who the most important leader is in our rural community, they would probably respond "the county agent." The county agent has been the backbone of our agricultural extension system, and his contribution to agricultural progress and development has been almost phenomenal. The same could be said also of home demonstration agents and of 4-H Club leaders.

The rural people in the past 50 years especially have learned not only the know-how of better farming and better homemaking, but they have likewise found through the extension service and through our county extension office a common meeting ground where many of their social activities could be concentrated. This produced a whole new outlook for rural people.

I suppose that of all the efforts of the extension service, there is none that has had a more popular appeal than that of 4-H Club work. When visitors who are interested particularly in agriculture come from other nations, almost the first thing they want to see and talk about are our 4-H Clubs here in the United States. As a youngster on the farm I had the privilege of belonging to one of the first 4-H Clubs in our country. Our leader at that time, Mr. Harry Ainsworth—who became State 4-H Club leader—opened up for us a whole new vista insofar as the challenge of agriculture was concerned. What happened in my case has happened all over Indiana and the whole country as well. The 4-H Club work has been a great medium for challenging young people to attack intelligently the problems of agriculture; it also has built into their concept ideals of leadership and an intelligent understanding of citizenship. These are just a few of the reasons why 4-H Club work has become such a popular and widely acclaimed phase of the extension activities of our land-grant colleges.

Purdue, Indiana's land-grant college, has also devoted itself to cooperation with the other land-grant colleges of the country, resulting in the development through research of more productivity and better quality foods for the consumer. Through research the farmers have become so much more productive, in fact, that today we are the first major nation in all history that has been able to lick effectively the specter of hunger. This we have done, not only because we have had productive land but because through experimental work and research we have learned how to make the best use of our efforts on the land. This phase of activity—in other words, the development of new knowledge—is something that has profited the whole world and is a phase of activity that I will touch upon later.

The coupling of all of these phases of activity by our land-grant college—Pur-

due—has had a revolutionary effect upon what was formerly a rural State. Because we were able to increase the productivity of each farmer in Indiana, we were able to release more and more of our workers for other activity. Because of this same thing which has happened all over the country, we have been able to continue feeding and clothing ourselves and, likewise, we have become the greatest industrial nation in the world. This is all about us and is so commonplace that we are likely to forget what a signal achievement it has been. To be sure, the people who are engaged in industrial service, and professional activities—all these folks are being fed by the smallest number, percentage-wise, compared to other countries in the world. They are also the best and cheapest fed. For this reason we as a nation have a great future to which we can look with much anticipation and justifiable pride.

I stated in the beginning that it would probably be difficult for those who formulated the Land-Grant College Act to envision the full impact of the legislation. By the same token today, it is difficult for us to realize the great challenge that we now face on a worldwide basis. With the close of World War II we found ourselves confronted with a wholly new problem and with very little actual understanding toward its solution. This problem was the fact that vast areas of the world which primarily had been colonial possessions of the major countries of the world were in a very primitive state of life. This awakening that came about has caused these colonial areas to throw off the shackles of their possessors and demand for themselves a new and better life. I think it is fair to say that in many cases the colonial powers that controlled these countries were not necessarily evil or unnecessarily demanding of the people, but in many cases they did not devote too much effort to helping these folks to help themselves; there are exceptions, however, even to this. Some of the more enlightened countries did a great deal in attempting to train the native leaders in these countries in the art of self-government.

We have today in the case of Africa virtually a whole continent where the various major nations of the world have thrown off the shackles and newly emerged nations have embarked upon a quest for freedom according to their own pattern and desires. How this will succeed is difficult at this time to project. Certainly they are in most cases people of very little training and background to accomplish this job. They are almost wholly of an agricultural type of economy. In many cases, even when practically all their citizens are devoted to the task, they are unable to feed themselves or they are only able to feed themselves moderately well. They obviously would like to have manufacturing to raise their standard of living. They cannot, however, set up industrial production in their country until or unless their farming productivity can become

high enough to release a part of their working force for this purpose. This, then, represents the great challenge to us as a nation. If these folks are to accept our concept rather than the Communist concept we must be able to show them that our way of life will offer them more and will make for a better life.

These folks, while very primitive, do know what other nations of the world have and they demand it for themselves. They may not even have a very good concept of how to get it, but nonetheless they are demanding it, and they may become rather willing tools for any other nation which offers them a cure-all formula to meet their problems. Most of us realize that educational processes are rather slow, and that people are not trained for leadership or productive enterprises on a pushbutton basis.

So the great challenge for us as a nation is to try to convey to many of these underprivileged nations of the world—who today constitute the balance of world power—the know-how and to furnish the necessary leadership. We can thereby lead them into ways of self-government rather than to have them fall a victim of the blandishment of the Communist conspiracy.

It is rather significant to note that for all of the bragging claims of the Communist regime, our American system of agriculture remains something the Communists have never been able to emulate or even to copy. Again I say that our form of agriculture provides the foundation upon which our great country has been built. One of the ironic features of this status is that the farmer himself has not actually shared properly in the prosperity that this program has produced. This continues to remain one of the challenges for us as a nation, and one which we must eventually meet if our agricultural foundation is to continue to support the economy of our Nation.

NATIONAL LOTTERY—DEAD AS A DODO BIRD AND WHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform Congress and the American public about the status of the national lottery bill to raise revenue and to reduce taxes. Residents of my district and elsewhere have asked me why we in Congress do not support H.R. 2007, a national lottery bill, or any other lottery bill to raise revenue and reduce taxes. As a consequence, I communicated with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to determine whether or not hearings would be held. The answer I received indicates that no hearings will be held during this congressional session and why no hearings are being held. They are not being held, because the sponsors have not requested hearings. The letter to me from the

chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1962.

The Honorable ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: This is in reply to your letter of April 11 requesting information with respect to whether or not any hearings have been requested in connection with the bill, H.R. 2007, which would provide for Federal lotteries to raise funds for a reduction in the national debt and a reduction in Federal individual income taxes.

Hearings on this bill have not been requested, and in view of the very heavy present and projected schedule of the Committee on Ways and Means it would appear doubtful whether time would be available for the holding of such hearings in the event that a request for them were received. In addition,

no reports have been requested on this bill from the appropriate agencies of the executive department, although reports on similar legislation in prior Congresses were adverse.

I hope the foregoing serves to provide you with the information you requested.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

As Alfred E. Smith, after whom I am named, used to say, "Let us look at the record. What does the record show?" Parliamentary procedure and rules require that no bill can be considered unless the sponsor of the bill requests the committee to which it is assigned that a hearing on a bill be held and that the committee request reports from the appropriate agencies or departments. No sponsor of a national lottery bill requested a hearing. Consequently, none

can be held and no lottery legislation can be adopted.

Sponsors of lottery legislation have asked, "How long are we going to be stubborn? How long are we going to be hypocritical?" I ask who is being hypocritical? The committee to which the bill is referred or the sponsors who introduced such legislation and request no hearing of Congress?

Lottery bills have been introduced in Congress since 1934. People today have gotten the notion that the idea of lottery has sprung from the head of the present sponsors as did Minerva from the head of Jove fully developed and fully grown. That just is not so. The record shows that the following Congressmen have introduced lottery legislation or similar legislation since 1934. They are as follows:

Bill No.	Revenue for—	Sponsor	Congress	Bill No.	Revenue for—	Sponsor	Congress
H.R. 7316	Federal Treasury	Kenney	73d, Jan. 24, 1934.	H.R. 3879	Federal hospitals, care of the blind, recipients of old age assistance and disabled veterans.	Fino	83d, Mar. 11, 1953.
H.R. 26	do	do	74th, Jan. 3, 1935.	H.R. 6626	do	do	84th, June 2, 1955.
H.R. 3414	do	do	74th, Jan. 9, 1935.	H.R. 3520	do	do	85th, June 23, 1957.
H.R. 8510	do	do	74th, June 18, 1935.	H.R. 532	do	Lesinski	86th.
H.R. 4	do	do	75th, Jan. 5, 1937.	H.R. 2534	Reduction in the national debt.	Fino	Do.
H.R. 10414	do	Phillips	75th, Apr. 26, 1938.	H.R. 4190	Establishment of Commission on Federal Lotteries.	do	Do.
S. 2156	Defense	Thomas (Oklahoma)	77th, Dec. 26, 1941.	H. Res. 25	Creation of select committee to conduct investigation and study.	Bosch	Do.
H.J. Res. 299	do	Sabath	77th, Mar. 27, 1942.	H.R. 444	Federal hospitals, care of the blind, recipients of old age assistance, and disabled veterans.	Lesinski	87th, Jan. 3, 1961.
H.R. 6587	do	Knutson	77th, Feb. 12, 1942.	H.R. 2007	Reduction in the national debt and reduction in Federal income taxes.	Fino	87th, Jan. 6, 1961.
H.J. Res. 55	do	Sabath	78th, Jan. 14, 1943.	H.R. 5574	Establishment of Commission on Federal Lotteries.	do	87th, Mar. 14, 1961.
S. 1560	do	Guffey	78th, Dec. 1, 1943.				
H.R. 2784	Premiums plan: savings bonds.	Gale	78th, Dec. 6, 1943.				
S.J. Res. 159	Study of the merits of a national lottery.	Reynolds	78th, Nov. 27, 1944.				
H.J. Res. 239	Veterans	Barry	79th, Sept. 14, 1945.				
H.R. 4421	do	Clemente	81st, Apr. 28, 1949.				
H.R. 8022	do	do	81st, Apr. 5, 1950.				
H.R. 9441	do	do	81st, Aug. 15, 1950.				

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that before you were the Speaker and before you were the majority leader, when you were plain Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK from Massachusetts, you headed a subcommittee which held hearings on a lottery bill. These hearings lasted 2 years. You were the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the lottery legislation introduced by Congressman Kenny, of New Jersey. After long deliberation, the committee did not recommend its passage and Congress did not approve, but at least the sponsor in 1934 requested a hearing and got it. These hearings which I read disclose the reasons for and against lottery legislation.

The reasons for approving a lottery are:

First. Money or other valuable consideration which may be won.

Second. Agreeable excitement of making the wagers.

Third. The pleasure of anticipated success.

Fourth. The thrill of winning.

Fifth. The benefit of using the winnings.

Sixth. Revenue derived for the Treasury of the United States.

The reasons why lottery is opposed are as follows:

First. Money bet.

Second. Time spent in betting.

Third. Distraction from vocation.

Fourth. Questionable associations formed through the indulgence.

Fifth. Formation of a costly habit.

Sixth. Emotional stress to beat the game.

Seventh. Mental and spiritual depression of losing money whose loss could not be afforded.

Eighth. Temptation to obtain dishonestly the means to continue betting.

Ninth. Temptation to dissipation as a false refuge of a loser and an unwise jubilation of a winner.

Tenth. Lessening appreciation of things earned and increasing appetite for things won.

Eleventh. Gradual weakening of the bettor's character.

In addition, every State in the Union, 50 States, have statutes which declare lottery to be illegal. My own State, New York, outlaws lottery. The legislature is Republican dominated; the Governor, Nelson Rockefeller, is a Republican. There is no division of control between the legislative and executive branches or no political reason why agreement cannot be had. Why has not New York approved a lottery? Shall we in Congress foist or impose upon the residents of Massachusetts or Ohio or California a lottery which they may think is immoral?

I personally would vote for a lottery if it were conducted by a State or local government or a local political subdivision, if it could be practical, and if safeguards against corruption and immorality were provided. I would not seek to impose my will upon people in those States who may have religious

scruples, or objections against it. While gambling per se, by and of itself, is not immoral, it can be immoral under certain circumstances. It can be immoral where a parent gambles and deprives his children of milk, food, clothing, and the necessities of life or if an immature child gambles for money, or if persons on relief rolls gamble the funds which a welfare department gives them to pay their rent or buy their food or clothing, or pay for medicine.

Let us stop the hypocrisy, fakery, and quackery of introducing lottery bills and then not moving for their passage or for a report or for a hearing. Will the Daily News, one of New York's great newspapers, which seems to have been duped, disclose the failure to request hearings in the same manner and in the same fashion as it does at the beginning of a congressional session when a lottery bill is introduced or a 1-minute speech is inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD describing the results of a lottery of a nation no larger than our smallest State, Rhode Island?

However, hypocrisy, like murder, will out. I repeat what the great Emancipator Abraham Lincoln observed—that "you can fool some of the people all of the time, all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all of the time."

The legislative wheel of fortune is turning around and the arrow cannot stop at the lottery post because no hearings have been requested.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 649) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CORINNE B. RILEY, of South Carolina, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Science and Astronautics.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHY THIS OBSESSION WITH THE COMMON MARKET, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE REST OF THE FREE WORLD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a movie scene I dimly remember from years ago, a troupe of strolling actors had just been told that the show could not go on that night. Huddled together on the stage, troupier after troupier—I think Jimmy Durante was one of them—exhorts his fellows: "The show must go on."

On and on go the exhortations, until one of the mummies, a little fellow in the back row, stops the proceedings by asking the simple question: "Why?"

For some time now, the U.S. State Department has been exhorting the world: "The Common Market must go on. Britain and a few others must join it at all costs, and any country with a professed policy of political neutrality must be excluded from it at all costs."

It is about time somebody asked—and if nobody else does, I will: "Why?"

DEBATE IN CONGRESS NEEDED

The proposed expansion of the European Economic Community to include others besides the original Six—France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg—presents many problems, both to the United States and to virtually every other third country in the free world. The Congress should debate the issues raised by recent developments in Europe.

Such a great debate will aid Congress in fulfilling its legislative responsibilities for trade, foreign aid, and international monetary arrangements, all of which are vitally affected by the size, composition, and policies of the EEC. More, a great debate can stimulate wider public discussion of the issues at stake. There is still time to reevaluate our position. If it is found to be based upon a creed outworn, there is still time to correct it.

THE ADMINISTRATION POSITION

The State Department policy today, as reported in the press, appears to be this: The EEC is of preeminent importance to the United States, and its enlargement in accordance with our design overrides other considerations of foreign economic policy. Our objective is to get Britain into the Common Market at all costs, and to exclude from membership or associa-

tion in the group any country with a professed policy of political neutrality. No major initiative by this country to reduce tariffs under the new Trade Expansion Act is to be taken until Britain becomes a member of the EEC.

THE BASIC ISSUE RAISED BY OUR POLICY

This policy, if correctly reported, confronts us with a basic issue. Should we now be concentrating our efforts on creating a huge and mighty new Western European Common Market, protected at least at the outset by high tariffs and other preferential arrangements on many important trade categories? Or should we instead be striving, together with the other member countries of GATT, to create the widest possible free world community which would neither include nor exclude countries according to any preconceived design?

Both of these directions in foreign economic policy have respectable antecedents in our postwar history. Since it appears that we are now pursuing the first course, I believe we must look closely at the reasons why it is said we should favor this alternative.

THE ADVANTAGES OF A FORCED-GROWTH COMMON MARKET MAY BE ILLUSORY

The Common Market, as now constituted, has merited and received the support of the United States. The economies of the Six have benefited immensely from a larger internal market and increased competition. It has created new ties of friendship between France and Germany, thereby greatly reducing the chance of renewed animosity between them. These accomplishments are matters of fact today. The vibrant strength of the European Economic Community demonstrates better than anything else that it needs neither high tariffs nor more members to continue successfully on the path it has chosen.

Why, then, do we insist that the EEC must be expanded, and expanded in a manner to include some European countries and not others? The only three possible reasons for our policy—political unity, military strength, and the infusion of British democracy—seem to me largely illusory.

1. POLITICAL UNITY

It is said that if Britain and certain other countries join the EEC, the development of the EEC into a common political unit—a United States of Europe—will be accelerated. We will thereby gain a stronger, more united voice on our side in the cold war.

Neither proposition bears up under examination. The present members of the EEC are badly split on the ultimate goal of political unity. France is unalterably opposed to any abrogation of national sovereignty on matters of importance—economic, political, or military. It does not want a United States of Europe in which France would have to submerge its national powers—it is holding out for what it calls a confederation, which would in most important respects be an international body of a number of European nations. The entry of Britain in the Common Market, much desired by the Benelux Three of the present Six, would not solve this problem. Indeed,

the problem will be accentuated because the British, too, prefer the French goal. British membership in the EEC may thus retard, instead of accelerate, the movement to political unity.

But even if greater political unity should develop from British membership, we may not necessarily add to our own strength in the cold war. France has openly declared the importance of forming a third force in Europe, led by France. It would be the objective of such a third force not to take sides either with the United States or with the Communist powers. By encouraging the expansion of the EEC, we may, therefore, be solidifying a group which will go its own way and which may, from time to time, frustrate our objectives.

2. MILITARY STRENGTH

It is said that the military strength of the West will increase if EEC membership and association are extended to include the United Kingdom and the other NATO powers. By the same token, it is considered desirable to exclude the neutrals—Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, and Finland—since they could not join in a common military policy.

I do not find this argument persuasive. The military strength of the EEC countries will be no greater than the defense contributions which individual countries want to make. Britain, Denmark, and Norway—all applicants for EEC membership—are already members of NATO. Among the present members of the EEC, France, though a member of NATO, has contributed the least to the Organization, and shows least willingness to cooperate in other mutual efforts affecting the cold war. For example, the French have refused to send a representative to the Geneva Disarmament Conference. This is not the kind of atmosphere out of which an expanded EEC could form its own military arm. National differences would make it impossible, just as they did in 1954, for these countries to create a European Defense Community. If NATO will not gain and a new European Defense Community is not likely, I fail to see how we shall achieve any boost to our combined military strength by a forced-growth Common Market.

More serious, we must remember that the first objective of maintaining an adequate European defense is to prevent Soviet encroachment into Europe. The reported administration policy to isolate the neutral countries outside an expanded EEC may, in fact, create new opportunities for the Soviet Union on the eastern frontier of Europe. Both Finland and Austria could well be forced to increase economic ties with Russia and, thus, inevitably to give in to political and to other unforeseeable pressures. Our hard-won gains in Yugoslavia may be sacrificed.

So instead of adding to our military strength, we may in fact be dissipating our present effective strength by our obsession with an expanded Common Market.

3. BRITAIN IS NEEDED IN THE EEC TO ASSURE ITS STABILITY AND DEVELOPMENT IN A DESIRABLE DIRECTION

Quite apart from the desirability of expanding the EEC to increase its future

political and military strength, it is argued that the United Kingdom must become a member so that the British, with their long-established traditions of democracy and stable government, can guide the EEC in desirable directions.

This point of view was expressed very ably by the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT, at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in London, on September 30, 1961:

The single most encouraging trend in recent years toward the strengthening of the free world is the movement toward European unification and the single most important event within that trend is the decision of the United Kingdom to seek admission to the European Economic Community. . . . Without Britain there can be little doubt that West Germany, with its great industrial machine and skilled and energetic population, will play the preeminent, if not the dominant role in the European community. I, for one, can contemplate this prospect with little enthusiasm. Germany, it is true, has come far since the fall of the Third Reich toward earning an honorable place in the society of democratic nations. West Germany, nonetheless, is a fledgling democracy, not yet ready for a role of leadership in the free world. France, on the other hand, is a venerable and respected member of the community of free nations, but she is governed under new and untested institutions and is much preoccupied with problems in North Africa. Only Britain, I suggest, has the long experience, the ancient institutions, and the overall political maturity for leading Europe into a new era. I put it to you that the United Kingdom, whose wisdom and restraint were the preeminent factor in the century of tranquility that history records as the Pax Britannica, must now put these same qualities to use as the primus inter pares of a free and unified Europe.

The difficulty with the role which Senator FULBRIGHT assigns the British is that except for the Benelux countries and the United States, no one much wants the British to be the first among equals in the EEC. Britain comes as an applicant for membership in a going concern very much dominated by a Franco-German-Italian partnership.

As President de Gaulle said only this week:

I do not believe that Europe can have any living reality if it is not made up of France with its Frenchmen, Germany with its Germans, Italy with Italians, et cetera.

The French are reported to be lukewarm about British membership; they are not going out of their way to make British entry easy. Chancellor Adenauer recently hinted that he did not favor giving the British full membership. It appears highly unlikely that either France or Germany would look to Britain for leadership or be persuaded by the British to adopt policies they do not desire.

Indeed, Britain may well have its greatest influence on the EEC before actual entry by exacting conditions for its membership. Those who oppose British entry even say that, far from being able to confer British stability and democratic modes of thought on the European group, British membership in the EEC may even mean loss of that stability in Britain, and the gradual acceptance in Britain of less democratic and more bureaucratic governmental forms.

THE DISADVANTAGES OF OUR PRESENT POLICY ARE REAL

If the supposed advantages of our present policy are illusory, the disadvantages are frighteningly real.

1. THE POLITICAL DISADVANTAGES

By our doctrinaire policy, we aroused sharp criticism from countries which have felt forced to apply for membership, as well as from those which feel they are excluded because of U.S. disapproval of their membership of association.

Robert Estabrook, of the Washington Post, now on temporary assignment in London, writes:

Under Secretary of State George Ball has received considerable criticism in England because of American strictures against Commonwealth trade preferences and associate membership for neutral countries . . . the zeal of some American champions of the Common Market . . . has produced an impression that the United States is trying to dictate the composition of the community and to punish Britain for its delay and the neutrals for their comfortable detachment. (Washington Post, April 10, 1962.)

Roy Jenkins says in the London Observer of April 15:

U.S. (rather than European) pressure against [association of the EFTA neutrals in the EEC] is surely one of the most misconceived aspects of recent American policy and should be strongly resisted.

The Swedish Ambassador to the United Kingdom said in a lecture to the British House of Commons on April 14:

How could one begin the construction of a new and strong Europe by excluding the three countries, Austria, Switzerland, and Sweden, who have belonged to Europe as long as European history can be said to have existed?

Dr. F. E. Aschinger, senior economic editor of the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, said in Zurich, Switzerland, on March 29:

It is necessary that the difference between traditional Swiss neutrality and the neutralism of the neoneutrals be clearly understood by our American friends. . . . Although the United States has not formally recognized Swiss neutrality, she is making use of its advantages in many fields.

Austrian opinion has been equally disturbed at the reported attitude of the United States. In a March 2, 1962, letter to the New York Times, Prof. F. A. Hayek wrote:

If the reports about the attitude of a high-ranking member of the State Department toward the neutral countries of Europe are correct, they suggest an almost incredible shortsightedness. . . .

Both [Sweden and Austria] are greatly dependent on Western Europe for their exports, their prosperity and even a reasonable standard of life. To be left out of an enlarged Common Market would force them to seek alternative outlets for their products in the East. But to be dependent on the Soviet bloc for a large part of their exports would in the long run mean political dependence. This is not a question of their preference but of their daily bread.

Austrian Chancellor Dr. Alfons Gorbach said on April 28:

Far from being an obstacle for a proper European unity, the small states are essential for the preservation of freedom and responsibility. These states have not only a right to be treated as equals, they have

also an obligation to present and develop their spiritual heritage, to support a European economy and to promote Europe with all their moral power.

And on April 27, Austria's Ambassador to Washington, Dr. Wilfried Platzer, pointed out in a Chicago speech the dangers of excluding Austria from association with the EEC:

We must have trade. If we lose Western trade, we will have to trade with the East.

Undue concentration of our political efforts to mold the EEC to our design can be interpreted as inimical to their interests by countries outside Europe. The poorer countries can say that, when the chips are down, the United States is interested only in making rich countries richer.

In countries like Yugoslavia, Egypt, Indonesia, and India, we have invested billions in foreign aid funds to assist their development. Do we want to hand the Soviet bloc the enormous propaganda advantage of being able to say, "The West may give you a little charity from time to time, but it is mainly interested in forming an exclusive club of rich countries in which membership is restricted."

2. THE ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGES

An expanded EEC will automatically mean greater economic discrimination and danger for the exports of the United States and for all countries with trading interests in Europe. If Britain, Norway, and Denmark become members; Greece and Portugal, associate members; and the British African Commonwealth countries and dependencies, associates in the EEC like the former French African colonies, a huge new trading area will be formed. Tariff elimination will confer advantages on producers within the area. Pooling of raw materials and other resources will mean that there will be less need to go outside the area.

(A) EFFECT ON UNITED STATES

Consider, for example, the effect of British entry into the Common Market on our exports. Britain now accords preferential or duty-free entry to imports from Commonwealth countries. If the EEC denies these countries the right to sell the equivalent volume of agricultural products and manufactured goods to Britain or the Common Market, their export earnings will fall, and U.S. sales to the Commonwealth countries will also suffer. If special arrangements are made for the farm products of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand to enter the Common Market, our own chances to maintain agricultural exports to the area, already threatened by a variable tariff levies scheme, will be lessened.

(B) EFFECT ON EUROPEAN OUTSIDE EEC

Economic discrimination from an enlargement of the present EEC will be serious for the United States, but it may be catastrophic for the neighboring countries of Europe who are left out of the Common Market. Their economies have become closely interwoven with those of the expanded EEC. Exports account for a much larger part of the gross national product of these smaller countries than in the case of the United States. In Switzerland, for example, ex-

ports amount to 13.5 percent of gross national product, compared to 4 percent in this country. Moreover, the share of exports going from Finland, Sweden, Austria, and Switzerland to the expanded EEC is 58, 65, 57, and 52 percent respectively. It is obvious that any serious diminution of their exports will have the gravest consequences for these countries.

(C) EFFECT ON OTHER DEVELOPED COUNTRIES OF FREE WORLD

Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, all of whom have long-established economic relationships with the United Kingdom, have major stakes in the maintenance of their present level of exports, particularly of bread grains, meat, dairy products, fruit, and other agricultural products. In recognition of these vital interests, the British have agreed that provision for Commonwealth exports must be made as a condition of its entry into the Common Market. Representatives of these countries have declared that failure to attain this amelioration of Britain's departure from the Commonwealth will result in a major economic upheaval in these countries.

Australian Prime Minister McEwen said in Melbourne on May 14 that the United States was not practicing what it preached in trade policy. He emphasized:

I want all of our American friends to understand that our trading ties with Britain cannot be cut, either now or in a few years, without the most serious consequences to our export trade and the livelihood of our products. (New York Times, May 14, 1962.)

(D) EFFECT ON THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES OF FREE WORLD

Of the developing countries of the free world, only a few—former French, Belgian, and perhaps British territories—can hope to receive preferential treatment by the expanded EEC. For the others, Ireland and Spain in Europe; Israel, Turkey, Iran, and the Arab countries of the Middle East; and most of the countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, the withdrawal of the richest, most highly industrialized, and most rapidly developing nations of Europe into a new preferential bloc means anything from serious trade dislocation to jeopardy for their economic futures. All of them will find it more difficult to attract private capital investment as their markets diminish, and this will accentuate their present distress in the years to come.

Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon will not only be deprived of preferential access to the British market, but will very likely be confronted by high tariffs and other restrictions in the expanded EEC, as well as duty-free competition from light manufactures from the protected areas of developing former French and British territories in Africa.

Tropical products entered duty free from the associated part of Africa will drive out vital exports of bananas, sugar, citrus, coffee, from the West Indies and Latin America.

Israel, which has staked its economic future on expanding trade with Europe, finds that 60 percent of her exports are to the countries of the expanded EEC. Instead of selling oranges, now the prin-

cipal export earner, to the United Kingdom at a nondiscriminatory tariff of 10 percent, Israel will have to try to sell them in competition with duty-free north African and Italian oranges over a Common Market tariff of 20 percent. Israel, like other developing countries, is trying to develop diversified exports, but most of these infant industries are not likely to survive the stiff duty-free competition within the EEC and the generally high tariffs on light manufactures.

WHAT OUR POLICY SHOULD BE

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the many real disadvantages, both political and economic, and the lack of tangible advantages, we must stop concentrating on the Common Market as the major instrument for our foreign economic policies. We should certainly cease needling the United Kingdom to enter the Common Market, and needling the EEC to prevent the entry of the European neutral countries. All needling and undue interference in the problems of the European countries should cease.

What we must do, and do quickly, if we are to repair some of the damage in our relations with the free world countries, is to go back to the alternative course—to greater economic and political integration of a free-world-wide basis.

The first thing which should be done, even before the passage of the Trade Expansion Act this year, is to announce that we will use the powers of the act to reduce world trade barriers quickly and multilaterally for the benefit of all countries. If such an announcement causes Britain or other countries to rethink the basis for their applications to enter the Common Market, this is all to the good. Britain ought to enter the political grouping of the Six because she believes that that is the way to useful political cooperation, not because she is pressed into it by the economic bludgeon of the Common Market's discriminatory tariff.

For Britain to form a full union with the EEC may take years. As Walter Lippmann said this week:

This is so difficult that we may count ourselves fortunate if the negotiations are not broken off and if a way is found to continue them, perhaps for some years. For in the long run, the grand project will, I believe, be realized * * * for ourselves, we shall be dealing with the bigger reality if we keep our hopes and our policies bound up with the will to get on with and to achieve the grand project. For the Europe of 1962 is not the permanent and final shape of Europe. It could change in a few months.

We should certainly not keep the tariff-bargaining powers of the Trade Expansion Act in abeyance for the months, perhaps years, that may be required for British inclusion in the EEC. To hold these powers in abeyance would be doubly wrong: it would deny their benefits to us and the rest of the free world; and it would degrade these spacious powers by making of them a mere instrument of political pressure on Britain.

By determining to use the Trade Expansion Act and to deal with the Common Market in its present form, we will

in fact have a greater chance to reduce Common Market tariffs. While Britain, Denmark, and Norway are outside the EEC, they could join with us, with the European neutrals, and with the rest of the free world to urge the EEC to reduce tariffs in return for concessions from the United States and other countries. The Six, unenlarged, would have a greater incentive to make reasonable concessions.

But as insiders, and particularly insiders who feel resentment over the U.S. pressures that helped them into the EEC, Britain, Denmark, and Norway will be ranged on the opposite side. In any trade negotiation, we shall then have no powerful interest on our own side. The United States will have to carry the major burden virtually alone.

A shift from what Norwegian Prime Minister Gerhardsen called the introvert policy of the Common Market to an extrovert policy of the free world would be greeted with joy, not consternation. Great Britain, Denmark, and Norway would prefer union with the EEC on their own time, rather than under economic pressures. The other EFTA countries would welcome the chance to live economically without having their political neutrality compromised. The rest of the free world, developed and developing, has everything to gain from a program of nondiscriminatory trade. Of the Six itself, the Big Three—France, West Germany, and Italy—have already shown themselves less and less interested in an immediate British accession. And the Little Three—Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—as traditionally low-tariff countries, should welcome the expansion of the free world's low-tariff areas. With our balance of payments and our unemployment problems, the United States certainly does not want the enlargement of the European discriminatory tariff area.

REGIONALISM VERSUS A FREE WORLD COMMUNITY

Mr. Speaker, there was a period just after World War II when it was appropriate for us to use a multitude of devices to try to reconstruct a war-torn world. On the one hand, we convened the nations of the free world to establish the great multilateral tariff-cutting procedure in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. On the other, together with the injection of unprecedented sums in foreign aid, we encouraged the formation of European regional institutions. I was a personal participant in this process, and I am proud of the part I was able to play.

But this is 1962 and not 1947, 1949, or 1950. The time has long since passed when we have any need to put European regionalism at the top of our foreign policy priorities. Our most important task today is to take the leadership and to use every resource at our command to strengthen ties in the free world community at large. Dozens of new nations have entered our ranks. They and others, longer established, are trying to lay the foundations for continuing growth and a better life for their people. The overriding concern of the United States and the prosperous nations of Europe should be the reduction of the

gap between the rich and the poorer nations, the developed and the underdeveloped. This cannot be done by aid alone. We must open our markets to their exports. Unjustifiable tariff and other trade barriers must come down. We shall not attain this objective if we swallow the claim that a new Europe cannot be constructed without the carrot of high preferential tariffs. We must not delude ourselves into thinking we can say to the poorer countries, "This hurts us as much as it hurts you. Please accept your status of poverty until the industrialized countries of Europe get a little richer. Then they may help you." To state this proposition is to reveal its patent absurdity.

Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with expanding the Common Market, we have been pinning our hopes on the wrong group, pursuing the wrong goal, at the wrong time. It is entirely in order for the Congress to debate whether the United States should not start now to build the free world community.

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. REUSS (at the request of Mr. LANE), for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. RYAN of New York, for 1 hour, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. COLLIER and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WILSON of Indiana.

Mr. CURTIN.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 383. An act to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1988. An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific Flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower

Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 21, 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:

2075. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the text of a recommendation (No. 115) concerning workers' housing, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 45th session, at Geneva, on June 28, 1961, pursuant to article 19 of the constitution of that organization (H. Doc. No. 406); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2076. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of certain aspects of operations of the Federal employees' group life insurance program which is administered by the U.S. Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2077. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the development and management of selected aircraft crash fire-trucks in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2078. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claim of Vernon J. Wiersma against the United States, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 413, 31 U.S.C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2079. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 68. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962; without amendment (Rept. No. 1696). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 592. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1697). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 637. Resolution to adjust the U.S. Treasury account in the Office of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

without amendment (Rept. No. 1698). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 638. Resolution authorizing additional laborers for the office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1699). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on improving Transportation Statistics (Rept. No. 1700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9199. A bill for the relief of certain officers and enlisted personnel of the 1202d Civil Affairs Group (Reinf. Tng.), Fort Hamilton, Brooklyn, N.Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 648. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 11737. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1713). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 11677. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 1714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 11721. A bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of \$73 million for that purpose; without amendment (Rept. No. 1715). 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. S. 1881. An act for the relief of Maria La Bella; with amendment (Rept. No. 1692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6016. A bill for the relief of William Thomas Dendy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9180. A bill for the relief of Noreen Joyce Baden; with amendment (Rept. No. 1694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9588. A bill for the relief of Claude Homann-Herimberg (nee Wagner); with amendment (Rept. No. 1695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 423. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 8585) for the relief of Jefferson Construction Co., together with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2836. A bill for the relief of C. Edwin

Alley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6014. A bill for the relief of Stephen A. Eskin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6655. A bill for the relief of Lecll A. Sims; with amendment (Rept. No. 1704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7365. A bill for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8452. A bill for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock; with amendment (Rept. No. 1706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9599. A bill for the relief of Solomon Annenberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 1707). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9834. A bill for the relief of Estelle L. Heard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1708). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William W. Johnston; without amendment (Rept. No. 1709). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10525. A bill for the relief of Francis L. Quinn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11578. A bill for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1711). 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. BATTIN:

H.R. 11791. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 11792. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11793. A bill to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in phonograph records bearing forged or counterfeit labels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11794. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance and tax credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11795. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to provide grants for continuing support of metropolitan planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11796. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage the formation of regional agencies to develop comprehensive plans for meeting, through balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation systems, the transportation needs of metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11797. A bill to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants

by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such grants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 11798. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 11799. A bill defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 11800. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 11801. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize Federal participation in the cost of acquiring air rights as a part of an urban renewal project, and to prohibit luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 11802. A bill to authorize an appropriation for a road in Cherokee National Forest, Tenn., and Nantahala National Forest, N.C., between Tellico Plains, Tenn., and Robbinsville, N.C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 11803. A bill to amend the laws with respect to Federal participation in shore protection; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11804. A bill to amend the joint resolution of September 1, 1959, with respect to the establishment, on the site reserved thereby, of a Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 11805. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 11806. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate the option with respect to certain survivor annuities, and provide for interchange of credits between the civil service retirement system and the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11807. A bill to increase annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to equalize increases in annuity for certain employees retired before October 1, 1956, with annuities of other employees; to increase annuities whenever there is a general adjustment of salaries or the formulas for computing annuities of retiring employees is generally liberalized; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11808. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 11809. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands at Fort Miles, Del., to the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11810. A bill to provide for the issuance under the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 of certificates of public convenience and necessity of indefinite duration to certain air carriers operating in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 11811. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for the pres-

ervation to the maximum practicable extent of objects of historic value, and to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall approve the acquisition of certain lands of national historical significance, or of interests therein, for highway and public building purposes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 718. Joint resolution requesting the President to call an immediate emergency conference of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting Laos and other friendly nations in southeast Asia against armed attack; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.J. Res. 719. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the calendar week of each year during which such May 15 occurs as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Res. 644. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 645. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 646. Resolution providing for investigation and study of the administration and operation of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Res. 647. Resolution providing for investigation and study of the administration and operation of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 11812. A bill for the relief of Napoleon Elcroe Magadia and his wife Milagros De Guzman Magadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 11813. A bill for the relief of John F. Wood of Newport News, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11814. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Gandara Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11815. A bill for the relief of Rinaldo Secci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11816. A bill for the relief of Genia Gasas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 11817. A bill for the relief of Aharon Ron and Mrs. Mazal Ron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 11818. A bill for the relief of Frank C. Sakran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11819. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to Bailey W. Wadlington, Jr.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11820. A bill for the relief of Teresa Carafa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

349. Mr. CAREY presented a petition of the Flatbush Democratic Club of Brooklyn, N.Y., favoring passage of the Anderson-King bill, so that the main burden of the health costs of our senior citizens can be immediately alleviated, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1962

(Legislative day of Wednesday,
May 16, 1962)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. J. J. Hickey, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

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

Eternal Spirit, who dost bring forth Thy righteousness as the light, and Thy judgments as the noonday: In the presence of the ageless realities which the blasphemies of deluded men cannot touch, we pause in reverence with a deep sense of responsibility, as servants of the public welfare, praying for courage to attempt, patience to endure, and power to achieve.

We would commit our way unto Thee, fretting not ourselves because of evil men who imagine vain things and attempt to bring wicked devices to pass.

Our eyes have seen the glory of a government of law bringing peace and prosperity to many states, and to men of all color, creeds, and races within our own Nation. Give us an unshakable faith that a lawful order can be established for the whole world.

In this faith, steel our hearts to march forward toward a clean world our hands can help to make.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. J. Hickey, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HICKEY 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 Wednesday, May 16, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a

nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Harold R. Tyler, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1745) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of school children in the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 383) to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works.

The Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT PROVISIONS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out the provisions of proposed legislation, transmitted to the Senate

on March 21, 1962 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of March 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Marysville, Calif., protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide a Federal income tax on income derived from public bonds, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

William P. Mahoney, Jr., of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Ghana.

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. HILL:

S. 3318. A bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents and for other purposes;

S. 3319. A bill to extend to certain employees in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; and

S. 3320. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3321. A bill to provide for the establishment of Valle Grande National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3322. A bill to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the name of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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