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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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
Cassy	Kornegay	Stubblefield
Cohelan	Kowalski	Taylor
Cooley	Kyl	Teague, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	Lennon	Thompson, La.
Daddario	Lesinski	Waggonner
Davis,	McSween	Whitener
James C.	Magnuson	Whitten
Dowdy	Mason	Wickersham
Durno	Meader	Williams
Elliot	Merrow	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 storeroom, 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 policed 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 if 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 "grandfather 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 "comunication 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 rebroadcasting. 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 intenion 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 Kennsington 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, Björnstjerne Björnson, 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, whatsoe'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 Mattel. 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 3⅛ percent on employer and employee alike. In 1963–65 it will be 3⅝ percent. In 1966–67 it will be 4⅛ percent on each. In 1968 it will be 4⅝ 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 billion 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 subsec. (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 inequitable 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.	90 days per benefit period, with $10 per day deductible required for 1st 9 days, with a minimum deductible of $20.
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.	180 days per benefit period, or 2 days for each unused hospital day up to a total of 150 units of service.
Home health service	None	None	240 visits a year; 2¾ visits for each unused hospital day; includes therapy and homemaker services; medical social work, etc.; no prior hospitalization required.
Nurses' fees	None	Up to $16 per day for registered nurse, and up to $480 in any 1 calendar year.	None.
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.	None.
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.	Provides only for necessary laboratory tests and X-rays in a hospital, either on inpatient or outpatient basis, but requires $20 deductible for each diagnostic study on an outpatient basis.
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.	Only drugs used in hospital.

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 ½ of 1 percent of 1st $5,000 of employee wages; ⅜ 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 agentry 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 counterguerrilla 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 committed 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 rponsor 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 build 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 "lutefisk" 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 970, 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 a feire idag 148 årsdagen for Norges uavhengighet.

Nordmennene er kjent gjennem 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 konstitusjon. 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 a sette Regjeringens medlemmer for riksrett. Stortingets uavhengighets bestrebelser førte tilsist til folkeavstemningen 1906. Norge blev fritt.

Nordmennenes utrettelige og effektive hengivenhet for sin frihet har vaert en inspirasjon til demokratic Regjeringen i alle land. Det er en ære for migafeire uavhengighetsdagen for vår forbundsfelle 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—Purdue—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, percentagewise, 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
H.R. 7316	Federal Treasury	Kenney	73d, Jan. 24, 1934.
H.R. 26	do	do	74th, Jan. 3, 1935.
H.R. 3414	do	do	74th, Jan. 9, 1935.
H.R. 8510	do	do	74th, June 18, 1935.
H.R. 4	do	do	75th, Jan. 5, 1937.
H.R. 10414	do	Phillips	75th, Apr. 26, 1938.
S. 2156	Defense	Thomas (Oklahoma).	77th, Dec. 26, 1941.
H.J. Res. 299	do	Sabath	77th, Mar. 27, 1942.
H.R. 6587	do	Knutson	77th, Feb. 12, 1942.
H.J. Res. 55	do	Sabath	78th, Jan. 14, 1943.
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.
H.R. 3879	Federal hospitals, care of the blind, recipients of old age assistance and disabled veterans.	Fino	83d, Mar. 11, 1953.
H.R. 6626	do	do	84th, June 2, 1955.
H.R. 3520	do	do	85th, June 23, 1957.
H.R. 532	do	Lesinski	86th.
H.R. 2534	Reduction in the national debt	Fino	Do.
H.R. 4190	Establishment of Commission on Federal Lotteries.	do	Do.
H. Res. 25	Creation of select committee to conduct investigation and study.	Bosch	Do.
H.R. 444	Federal hospitals, care of the blind, recipients of old age assistance, and disabled veterans.	Lesinski	87th, Jan. 3, 1961.
H.R. 2007	Reduction in the national debt and reduction in Federal income taxes.	Fino	87th, Jan. 6, 1961.
H.R. 5574	Establishment of Commission on Federal Lotteries.	do	87th, Mar. 14, 1961.

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, trouper after trouper—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 mummers, 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 association 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 tranquillity that history records as the Pax Britannica, must now put these same qualities to use as the primus enter 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 Zurcher 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 respectfully. 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 principal 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 wartorn 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 oragnization (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 firetrucks 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 Lecil 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 preservation 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 Elocre 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.)

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. FONG, Mr. KERR, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 3323. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MCNAMARA (by request):

S. 3324. A bill to provide assistance for research or training projects leading to development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3325. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT AN AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES

Mr. ANDERSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 342) to print as a Senate document an agreement relating to the use and development of water and related land resources, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ANDERSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH AN ILLUSTRATION, A REPORT ENTITLED "FUNCTIONS OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE"

Mr. MCCLELLAN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 343), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document a report compiled by the General Accounting Office at the request of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Functions of the General Accounting Office"; and that there be printed three thousand additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

JURISDICTION OF MUNICIPAL COURT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, 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. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3322) 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, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The letter presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: The Commissioners have the honor to submit herewith a draft of 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." Enclosed also is a copy of a report dated December 19, 1961, of a special committee appointed by the Honorable Wilbur K. Miller, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, to implement recommendations adopted by the 1961 Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit with respect to the municipal court, together with a copy of a letter dated December 11, 1961, addressed to Edmund D. Campbell, Esquire, chairman of the committee, setting forth the separate views of the Honorable Alexander Holtzoff, a member of the committee.

Chief Judge Miller has brought the recommended legislation to the attention of the Commissioners, urging that they initiate the legislation.

In accordance with the recommendations of the judicial conference, the proposed legislation increases the ad damnum jurisdiction of the municipal court from $3,000 to $10,000; increases the subpena powers of the court commensurate with the increased jurisdiction; changes the name of the court to the District of Columbia court of general sessions; and amends existing law so that the authority of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to certify cases to municipal court is increased from $3,000 to $10,000.

The increase in subpena power for the court is accomplished by giving to the municipal court authority similar to that given to the domestic relations branch of the court in the act approved April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 111). This authority permits the court to require the attendance of witnesses by subpena served at any place within the District of Columbia or at any place without the District of Columbia that is within 100 miles of the place of the hearing or trial specified in the subpena.

The authority for the U.S. district court to certify actions to the District of Columbia court of general sessions would be exercisable if "it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at or subsequent to any pretrial hearing, but prior to trial thereof, that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $10,000." At present, the district court may certify an action to the municipal court if "it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at any time prior to trial that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $3,000." While the latter change was not included within the scope of action taken by the judicial conference, it was recommended by the special committee and included in the legislation approved by the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The Commissioners are very happy to join with the judicial conference, and recommend that the bill receive favorable action by the Congress.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER W. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators LONG of Hawaii, BIBLE, YARBOROUGH, BURDICK, BENNETT, KUCHEL, FONG, KERR, ALLOTT, CHURCH, CASE of South Dakota, and MCGEE, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

The small water projects loan program has been highly successful and it is evident that it is a desirable supplement to the Federal reclamation program. The Secretary of the Interior and the Congress have approved applications for 22 separate projects involving loans estimated at over $57 million. Applications for seven more projects and two applications for adjustments in project proposals have also been filed raising the total request for loans to about $75 million. Nine out of the eighteen States in which the program is authorized have submitted applications. I ask permission to enter into the RECORD at the close of this statement a status report on the small projects loan program as of April 18 of this year.

The National Reclamation Association, which first saw the need for a small reclamation projects loan program, has followed closely its progress during the 6 years of its existence. Experience has shown that changes were needed to increase the scope and effectiveness of the program and to bring it more nearly in line with related programs. The amendments I am offering today are supported by the NRA.

The first amendment will increase the maximum amount of Federal funds that can be provided for such projects from an uncertain amount less than $5 million to $7,500,000. The present act requires the subtraction of a local contribution from the $5 million limitation in a manner that causes the maximum loan to vary with local conditions, which has resulted in some confusion and inequities. The amendment also increases the maximum loan to compensate for the increases in construction costs since the program was originally proposed. Other than these two changes, the remainder of the section is the same as before.

The second amendment redefines the amount of detail to be included in the report that is the application for a loan. The present act might be construed to require information that is unnecessary and incompatible with the scope and relative simplicity of these smaller projects. This does not contemplate an applicable change from the type of application now

being required by the Secretary but is intended as reassurance to some organizations now fearful of the requirements that might be imposed.

The third amendment is a clarification. At present the requirement for a local contribution is related to the cost of construction. It has been found that differences of opinion exist as to what items are costs of construction and what might properly be other project development costs. Therefore, it is proposed to relate this to the total cost of the project.

The fourth amendment will amend subsection (d) of section 4 to permit the legislative committees of the Congress to reduce the 60-day waiting period for a specific project by resolution of both committees. At present, the full 60 days must run although the committees may be fully satisfied with the proposal. In several cases, this situation has delayed the projects by nearly a year.

The fifth and sixth amendments will adjust the wording of subsections (a) and (b) of section 5 to clarify the intent. As now worded, it might be construed as requiring an organization to accept a grant or to accept a lower loan because a grant might have been justified. A requirement that an unwanted grant must be made would be unreasonable and incompatible with section 5(d) of the present act which provides authority for operation by the United States or for repayment of the grant in the event of noncompliance with regulations for the project operation to qualify for the grant.

The seventh amendment would change the interest formula to bring it into line with other related programs. This change is identical to that made a few years ago for the Colorado River storage project which originally had a formula similar to that of the existing Small Projects Act. The proposed formula is that of the Water Supply Act of 1958 which was adopted for the Colorado River storage project and has been used in other recent authorizations. This bill would make this change retroactive to loans already made under this program. In all cases, this would reduce the interest payments.

The bill proposes a new section 8 which would permit the Secretary to advance, to the local organization, up to half of the funds required for planning its small project. Experience has shown that some organizations have been delayed and others have been unable to complete their applications because of a lack of funds while others have skimped on their planning to complete an analysis within a limited budget. To some extent, this has been a factor in the localization of activity on such projects. If financial assistance were available for planning it is probable that applications would have been received from more than half of the States. The amendment also contains a provision to allow repayment of other Federal agencies in the event that they had made planning funds available as loans. This will consolidate the obligations.

The new section 9 amends the present section 8 by naming the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act rather than reference to date and statute number. That act has been amended since the original small project act was passed and might be in the future so that the general title reference is preferable.

Except for the section number, section 10 is the same as the old section 9.

Section 11 amends the original section 10 to increase the limit on the authorization for this program. At present, appropriations are authorized up to $100 million. The proposed wording would, in effect, authorize appropriations up to $200 million of outstanding loans. If the limit were reached, loans could continue to be made at the rate at which past loans were repaid. The amendment also recognizes the fact that contracts or agreements will be required to carry out the provisions of section 8 to provide planning funds.

Sections 12 and 13 are unchanged from the original sections 11 and 12, except for the number.

The most significant changes are those which increase the limitation on Federal funds in the form of loans and grants for each project, the change in the interest formula, the authorization for financial assistance on planning and the increase of the overall program authorization. The rest are minor changes to clarify the act or to remove operating difficulties.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be received and lay on the desk for additional sponsors until the Senate adjourns on Tuesday, May 22.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah, and the status report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3323) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The status report presented by Mr. Moss is as follows:

Loan program status of small projects, Apr. 18, 1962

Organization	Region	Loan
Construction completed:		
Bountiful Water Subconservancy District, Utah	4	$3,510,000
Centerville-Deuel Creek Irrigation Co., Utah	4	402,000
Goleta County Water District, California	2	1,650,000
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, California	2	[1] 3,878,000
Pleasant Valley County Water District, California	2	2,040,000
San Benito County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, California	2	1,425,000
South Davis County Water Improvement District, Utah	4	[2] 576,000
Total completed		13,481,000
Under construction:		
Browns Valley Irrigation District, California	2	4,804,000
Cameron County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, Texas	5	4,600,000
Donna Irrigation District, Texas	5	4,067,000
Eastern Municipal Water District, California	3	4,980,000
Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, California	2	3,800,000
South San Joaquin Irrigation District, California	2	4,900,000
South Sutter Water District, California	2	4,875,600
Walker River Irrigation District, Nevada	2	[3] 693,000
Weber-Box Elder Conservation District, Utah	4	304,000
Total under construction		33,023,600
Contract validated but increased loan applied for:		
Haights Creek Irrigation Co., Utah	4	214,000
Jackson Valley Irrigation District, California	2	1,327,000
Total under contract		1,541,000
Contract pending validation, in litigation: Roosevelt Water Conservation District, Arizona	3	2,780,000
Applications approved and 60 days completed before Congress:		
Haights Creek Irrigation Co., Utah (increase)	4	126,000
Klamath Basin Improvement District, Oregon	2	942,100
Weber-Box Elder Conservation District, Utah, loan No. 2	4	811,000
Applications approved and sent to Congress: State of Hawaii (Molokai project)		$4,514,000
Total approved but not under contract		9,173,100
Grand total applications approved		57,218,700
Applications under consideration in Bureau and Department:		
Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, California	2	967,000
Cassia Creek Reservoir Co., Idaho	4	[4] 2,498,000
Fallbrook Public Utility District, California	3	4,457,000
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, California (supplemental)	2	760,000
Jackson Valley Irrigation District, California (increase)	2	1,043,000
Orchard City Irrigation District, Colorado	4	270,000
Roosevelt Irrigation District, Arizona	3	4,620,000
Settlement Canyon Irrigation Co., Utah	4	[5] 1,104,000
Teel Irrigation District, Oregon	1	2,090,000
Total applications under consideration		17,809,000
Grand total applications received [6]		75,027,700
Applications at least partially drafted: [7]		
Central Oregon Irrigation District, Oregon	1	750,000
Indian Hill Irrigation Co., Idaho	1	1,825,650
King Hill Irrigation District, Idaho	1	558,000
Palo Verde Irrigation District, California	3	3,246,600
St. John Irrigation Co., Idaho	3	662,000
Tehama County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, California	2	4,865,000
Total applications in draft		11,907,250

[1] Has applied for an increase.
[2] Repairs estimated at $18,000 added.
[3] Includes flood control grant of $130,000.
[4] Includes grants of $146,400.
[5] Includes grants of $189,000.
[6] Does not include application of Reeves County Water Conservation District, Texas, which was withdrawn by district.
[7] May be incomplete listing; includes only those that have been submitted to the Bureau for comment.

SENIOR CITIZENS ACT OF 1962

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

This bill is the Senior Citizens Act of 1962 which has been sent to the Congress by the President and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In introducing the Department's bill, I would like to make it plain that I do not do so with wholehearted enthusiasm. It lacks my full support because I feel it covers only a small portion of the job that needs to be done if we are to adequately meet the problems of elderly and retired Americans. However, I introduce it so that the Senate may have before it a number of suggested alternatives for its consideration.

The Department's proposal actually is a part of a larger program I have introduced in the Senate as S. 2779, and which Representative JOHN FOGARTY introduced in the House as H.R. 10014. As does our bill, the Department's proposal would authorize grants to public and nonprofit institutions and agencies for:

First. Intensive and long-term training of specialized personnel to work in the field of aging.

Second. Support and encouragement of special demonstration, research, and evaluation projects which could lead to the development of new and improved programs to help older persons.

These are important and needed programs. However, the Department's proposal departs from the McNamara-Fogarty bill in two important respects.

It does not provide for actual Federal financial participation in the establishment of State agencies and in the development of State and community programs.

And it ignores the creation of a U.S. Commission on Aging, which we feel is necessary to serve as a focal point for developing national policy, and to coordinate and support programs in the field of aging.

The Department apparently hopes to escape this last need, through a loophole provided by the President's new Executive order, reconstituting the old Federal Council on Aging as the President's Council on Aging. Whether this is more than just a name change remains to be seen, but at best it would remain as an interdepartment agency with no real power to do the necessary job.

I regret that the Department saw fit to endorse this diluted program for our elderly. However, I am confident that we can—in committee and in the full Senate—produce an improved and much-strengthened measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter transmitting the proposal to the Senate be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3324) to provide assistance for research or training projects leading to development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

MAY 14, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a draft of a bill entitled the "Senior Citizens Act of 1962." The bill has two principal purposes:

First, it will provide assistance for research, demonstration, and evaluation projects leading to the development of new and improved programs to help older persons. These projects will, in most instances, be under the control of the States, local communities, and nonprofit institutions and organizations.

Secondly, it will encourage and assist universities, professional schools and other institutions, organizations and agencies to increase their programs for training those professional and technical people needed to provide the broad range of services required by older people.

The life expectancy of our population, the number of older people, and the number of years that our citizens spend in retirement are increasing. By 1970, approximately 20 million persons will be over age 65. Many of our older citizens face special problems resulting from reduced incomes, inadequate housing, large medical bills, declining health, unproductive leisure time, and lack of opportunity to continue their useful service to society. While our present programs are helping them to meet their most serious problems, important gaps remain in services for our older people.

The purpose of the proposed Senior Citizens Act of 1962 is to enable the Federal Government to help fill these gaps in existing programs through participation in a major cooperative effort with the States and local communities to accelerate efforts already underway to improve the living conditions of this important segment of our population. It will permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist such activities as (1) community planning of coordinated services for older persons, (2) experimentation and demonstration of techniques for more fully using the leisure time of retired persons through community service projects and educational and recreational programs, and (3) training of gerontologists and other specialists needed to expand services to the aged.

For these purposes, an annual authorization for $10 million in appropriations for 5 years is requested.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

WATER RESOURCE PROJECT EVALUATION STANDARDS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on May 15, 1962, President Kennedy approved for application by the agencies of the executive branch, including the Bureau of the Budget, policies, standards, and procedures for the formulation, evaluation, and review of plans for water and related land resource projects. Those standards had been developed at the President's direction by the Secretaries of the Departments of the Army; Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; and Interior, with the latter serving as chairman. The heads of those four Departments which, under the President, have the principal statutory responsibilities for Federal activities concerned with water and land resources conservation and development, were unanimous in their joint recommendations.

This action will place Federal water resource projects proposals in a realistic and forward-looking context that will enable both the executive and the legislative branches to make informed judgments of the merits and desirability of the projects. Thus a significant advance has been made in the resources field. As a consequence, it will be possible soundly to devise, authorize, and execute the large programs that are urgently needed to match water supplies to the water requirements of our rapidly growing population and expanding economy. Furthermore, State officials and the public will also be fully informed about proposed projects.

The recommendations of the four Department heads, and the President's approval of them, are consistent with the established policies of the Senate. They are, in fact, in compliance with requests of the Senate.

The new policies and standards, established in an agreement of the four Department heads, replace Budget Bureau Circular A-47 which caused considerable contention, both as to content and as to the propriety of its source.

On July 26, 1956, in the 84th Congress, the Senate expressed its sense relative to the conservation and development of water and related land resources in Senate Resolution 281 which stated:

> Land and water resources development should be planned on a comprehensive basis and with a view to such an ultimately integrated operation of component segments as will insure the realization of the optimum degree of physical and economic efficiency.

Pursuant to the direction provided in Senate Resolution 281 of the 84th Congress, studies and hearings on the matter were conducted jointly by the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and on Public Works over a period of a year. These led to a resolution proposing standards and criteria for the authorization of projects. On January 28, 1957, after full debate for 2 days, that resolution—Senate Resolution 148 of the 85th Congress—was agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 148 sets forth in considerable detail the Senate's concept of proper standards and criteria for evaluation of water and land resource projects proposed for authorization. It is significant that the standards that have just been approved by President Kennedy for executive branch use in formulation of project plans and proposals conform in an important degree with those set forth in Senate Resolution 148.

An interesting historical sidelight is that Senator Kennedy was in the chair as Presiding Officer when the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 281 which initiated the valuation standards that 5 years later, as President, he applied to the executive branch.

The document approved by President Kennedy states as objectives of planning:

> The basic objective in the formulation of plans is to provide the best use, or combination of uses, of water and related land resources to meet all foreseeable short- and long-term needs. * * *

National economic development, and development of each region within the country, is essential to the maintenance of national strength and the achievement of satisfactory levels of living. Water and related land resources development and management are essential to economic development and growth. * * *

Well-being of all of the people shall be the overriding determinant in considering the best use of water and related land resources. Hardship and basic needs of particular groups within the general public shall be of concern, but care shall be taken to avoid resource use and development for the benefit of a few or the disadvantage of many. In particular, policy requirements and guides established by the Congress and aimed at assuring that the use of natural resources, including water resources, safeguard the interests of all of our people shall be observed. * * *

President Kennedy said to his four Department heads, "You have done a difficult task well."

In order that the Senate and citizens throughout the Nation may be fully informed of this important accomplishment, I am submitting a resolution to have the new agreement between the Departments, approved by the President, printed as a Senate document, together with an exchange of correspondence on the matter between Secretary of the Interior Udall and President Kennedy and these explanatory remarks. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 342) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document an agreement of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of the Interior entitled "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources", together with correspondence of the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States in regard to the matter, and the explanatory remarks of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, on the floor of the Senate May 17, 1962, and that there be printed twenty-five hundred additional copies for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely: On page 31, after line 7, insert:

"ACCESS ROADS

"For acquiring by condemnation or otherwise additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $6,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MAGNUSON also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10802, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Ellender sugar bill (S. 3290) be allowed to stay at the desk until Wednesday, May 23, so that Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ben Hardeman, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney, middle district of Alabama, term of 4 years, vice Hartwell Davis.

Roland S. Mosher, of Arizona, to be U.S. marshal, district of Arizona, term of 4 years, vice Archie M. Meyer, term expired.

Edward Hussey, Jr., of Delaware, to be U.S. marshal, district of Delaware, term of 4 years, vice Herbert Barnes, term expired.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 24, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 17, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States 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.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement made by himself on May 10, 1962, before the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, relating to the establishment and administration of an Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland.

EFFECT OF CHAINSTORE PRACTICES ON THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, some few days ago I was in Omaha, Nebr., to deliver an address; and on that occasion I met a livestock feeder and buyer, Mr. Ernest M. Luther, who spoke in very glowing terms of a constituent of mine in Horse Creek, Wyo., Mr. Courtney Davis. Mr. Luther expressed his admiration for Mr. Davis' far-sightedness in his concern over the welfare of the livestock industry.

Since that conversation, there has been placed in my hands, through the courtesy of Mr. Luther, a copy of a speech which Mr. Courtney Davis delivered last December at the Colorado Cattlemen's Annual Midwinter Convention, at Colorado Springs, Colo. The burden of Mr. Davis' address was that the practices of some of the largest food chainstores have become seriously crippling factors in connection with regulation of the prices of livestock on the U.S. market.

I suggest that Wyoming's distinguished former Senator, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, a distinguished predecessor in this body and a fellow colleague of both the present occupant of the chair, my colleague, Mr. HICKEY, and myself, long conducted a personal crusade in behalf of loosening up the marketing practices, so that the cattle raisers would have a better chance to realize a fair return on the livestock they produce. Through the diligence of Senator O'Mahoney, efforts were repeatedly made to intensify and shore up the Packers and Stockyards Act and the enforcement of the provisions of that act through the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of the cattle producers.

I ask that the speech which Mr. Courtney Davis delivered in Colorado Springs, receive the very careful consideration of the Members of this body. I single out the speech for special mention because, although it was placed in the RECORD some time ago by my distinguished colleague [Mr. HICKEY], who now occupies the chair, it seems to me that the contents of the speech must be returned to again and again for personal scrutiny, because it brings into focus the fact that the meatpackers no longer are necessarily the manipulators of the prices of livestock, as once was the case, as compared with the chainstore operators,

who today purchase so large a percentage of all livestock products turned out by the meat packers.

Therefore, Mr. President, I simply wish to take occasion this morning to emphasize the importance of the observations of Mr. Courtney Davis and to call attention to the necessity of continuing to survey and review the activities of the chainstores in their meat buying and their livestock operations on their own part.

TRANSCRIPT OF RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESSES BY SENATOR JAVITS AND SENATOR KEATING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is a genuine pleasure to hail and congratulate my esteemed colleagues, the Senators from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, both of whom celebrate their birthdays on May 18.

Taking note of this cheerful coincidence, the Metropolitan Broadcasting Co. honored both these gentlemen by inviting them to appear on TV and radio and asking them to give their views on a number of nonpolitical subjects, in keeping with the personal nature of the occasion.

When interviewed by Metropolitan Broadcasting's newsmen Mark Evans and Martin Weldon, Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING revealed some uniquely interesting personal views about life and love, public service, and the motivations of those who serve their Nation in the Senate of the United States.

The program is to receive unusually wide circulation on the Metropolitan Broadcasting television stations WNEW-TV, in New York, and WTTG, in Washington; and on radio over WNEW, in New York; WIP, in Philadelphia; and, overseas, through Metropolitan Broadcasting's shortwave station, WRUL.

As a mark of my own deep respect for my two colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the transcript of the program.

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

JAVITS-KEATING BIRTHDAY SALUTE—METROPOLITAN BROADCASTING SALUTES THE TWO NEW YORK SENATORS ON THEIR JOINT BIRTHDAY—MAY 18.

Mr. EVANS. For the next half hour we are going to try to do the impossible. We are going to be talking to two Members of a rather exclusive group, the U.S. Senate, and are going to try to steer the conversation away from politics and issues.

If this turns out to be a foolhardy effort, at least we have sentimental reasons for trying.

Today, Friday, May 18, is the birthday of both of the men who represent New York State in the U.S. Senate, JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING. Today is their birthday.

Well, this is too rare a coincidence to ignore, so we have invited both men to do their birthday celebrating here now, and with us. And since a birthday is a rather personal thing, we thought we would try to keep the conversation to highly personal subjects, like life and love and philosophy, and other matters that don't regularly find their way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now gentlemen, if you will proceed to blow out the candles, we will make that the signal to get going.

A happy birthday to you, and now let's settle back for a nice, old-fashioned, nonpolitical gabfest.

Martin Weldon, the head of our news and special events department at Metropolitan Broadcasting, will now ask the first question.

Mr. WELDON. Gentlemen, as you look back on your careers, how would you yourselves rate your performances?

Have you been as successful as you hoped?

Senator JAVITS. I would say that I have. I feel that this is a place where one can play out one's life's destiny in a high order of service and I feel—I may not be adequate to the place, though I feel I am, but I feel I have arrived at a place where if I had been dreaming when I was very young, I would have dreamed that I would be.

Mr. WELDON. How about you, sir.

Senator KEATING. Well, I am never satisfied. I always would like to have done more than I have done, but I will say this, that I think to serve in the Senate of the United States and particularly to represent a great State like New York, is the highest ambition that I ever could have thought of in my youth, and I am very happy where I am and enjoy my work immensely.

Mr. EVANS. What has been the greatest influence in your life, Senator?

Senator KEATING. I suppose my mother.

Mr. EVANS. Politically?

Senator KEATING. No, she was politically interested, but—no, in general, I would say, in framing my character.

Mr. EVANS. How about you, Senator?

Senator JAVITS. I would say it was my mother with her flaming interest in education and a terrific drive for getting the most out of my capabilities, because we started in a position where you had to have that in order to get anywhere. It was shown by the fact that she learned how to read and write when she was 55 years old. That is the kind of person she was.

Mr. EVANS. Your backgrounds are so divergent, KEN, coming from a little town—Lima, was it?

Senator KEATING. Lima.

Wait a minute. I want to give credit to my father because he was a two-fisted fellow and quite different from my mother, but I have always said—JACK has heard me say this about civil rights, and my great interest in it. I learned it really from them. I was playing ball out in the yard one day and there was a little Negro boy in our team and somebody called him a name reflecting on his race.

My mother heard this, and she thought maybe I had done that. She brought me in and she gave me a great lecture about it and how we were all God's children and so on. She was very religious.

My father came home from work that night and she told him, and he said "Did you say that?"

I said "No, I didn't say that," and he said "Well, if you ever do, if I ever hear of that, I will thrash you within an inch of your life."

Mr. EVANS. Did he whip you as a boy?

Senator KEATING. Sometimes.

Mr. EVANS. How about you, Senator?

Senator KEATING. I want to finish that thought; I always said that I learned civil rights at my mother's knee and over my father's knee.

I have been spanked. I was whipped by some of the boys in school, too. But I did a little of it on my own.

Senator JAVITS. Well, that we have all had. I was going to add, too, that my brother was a great influence in my life. He is a distinguished lawyer about 10 years older than I am, and he sort of brought the family out of the lower East Side when I was still fairly young—about 14. And so that was a real influence.

My father was a very dear man, a wonderful human being who was a student of Hebrew theology more than anything else, and had a rather humble job all his life, but lent a note of warmth and love and humor.

You asked whether I was whipped. Not in any formal way, as you would say, but I remember the few occasions on which I was slapped. Apparently that was my particular punishment for doing something very wrong, like bringing beer instead of milk, which is an incident I remember very well, and it had such a marked effect upon me in terms of being specific and doing what you are supposed to do and not fuzzing about it or being fuzzy in your head about it. Though it was rare, very rare, it was so very strong an impression that I even to this day retain it.

Mr. WELDON. Gentleman, the New York Post is running a series right now asking the question "What is happiness?" What is your definition?

Senator JAVITS. To me happiness is the joy of being loved and of loving and of having the opportunity in life to develop—to utilize your full capability as a man.

Senator KEATING. I couldn't improve on that. I think that is an excellent definition.

Mr. EVANS. How do you compare the world you grew up in and the world today, KEN? I am sure you have drawn that comparison.

Senator KEATING. Many times. A good many things have changed, but I don't want to accentuate my age. Now in political life you never admit you are within 20 years of your age, and you never can have a sore toe or a head cold or else you are incapacitated.

Well, I can see so many changes. I was brought up, as you say, in this little village of Lima, of 800 or 1,000 people. There were a few automobiles, but not many—we didn't have any—and I learned to drive a horse and feed a horse and milk a cow, and all those things. They are pretty far distant from what I am doing now.

New York City was quite a different town from what it is today. Of course it has changed so much in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. EVANS. It does that hourly.

I mean philosophically, the kind of world it is. Is it a tougher world to grow up in?

Senator KEATING. Well, there are more problems.

Mr. EVANS. Do you think you could be a Senator 30 years from now if you were starting from scratch as you were——

Senator KEATING. Oh, I hope to be a Senator 30 years from now.

Mr. EVANS. Excuse me. Suppose you were starting over?

Senator KEATING. It was so simple to be a Senator then, or a Member of Congress, as JACK knows. We both served in the House before coming to the Senate. In those days, I remember the Congressman when I was a little boy used to come around and call on my dad occasionally, and he was down in Washington in January and February and into March, sometimes, and the problems were relatively simple.

The world wasn't in the chaotic condition it is in today. The domestic and the international problems are so incomparably greater than they were then. It is a different world.

Senator JAVITS. Well, I would say you owe different allegiances. I think KEN has put his finger on it when he says that. In our neighborhood—of course he says he learned how to milk a cow and drive a team. I learned the ins and outs of selling wares off a pushcart and playing rough games in the street and having street fights with other kids.

Senator KEATING. I fought too.

Senator JAVITS. Not in quite such an organized way.

But these are the diversities of our experience. But I would say the talents are different. I really feel that. I don't think I could have been a Senator 50 years ago. Perhaps a Senator. I don't think I could have been a Congressman because I think it took a different type of talent.

You didn't have to be perhaps quite as much of a lawyer, as much of a student, as much of a draftsman. You had to be a neighborhood person.

I think I could be—I was in my own Congressional District a neighborhood person. I think I was well liked, but I don't think it was quite the emphasis on those skills which brought me to this place, as the emphasis upon the other skills which are of today, the modern day.

Mr. WELDON. Do you think being raised in a slum did you any good? Did it do something for you that brought out qualities that made you a success?

Mr. EVANS. Something your boy doesn't have, probably?

Senator JAVITS. Well, I hope my boy will have it. To come by a sense of the humanity of life, a feeling that you are your brother's keeper, a feeling that when things are bad for others they are bad for you, a feeling that what happens to any minority happens to every minority, these are feelings which I think you get in that atmosphere. I don't think the only way to come by it is by being born and being raised in the slums, but certainly there it is almost as natural as breathing and you are either that or you get bitter and cynical and you want to get ahead and you are going to walk over the backs of anybody to do it and then you become a totally different type of a personality or you end up in jail or the electric chair.

Mr. EVANS. How big a part does religion play in your life, Senator?

Senator JAVITS. Religion is important as a residual influence in my life. I have had occasion to refer to that subject before, and the precepts of my faith are a very important reliance to me when there is really doubt, or great pressure.

It is a steadying influence and a fundamental philosophy which is extremely helpful and extremely sound.

For example, if you get very confused about something, as we often do—nothing is black and white—or it is a tough decision, it is hard, you know you will antagonize a lot of people, I find there is a residual strength in the faith of my fathers which says if it is right, you have to do it, you have no choice. There is no alternative. This is your job. This is what you are made to do in life.

In that respect, in rather simple terms, it is extremely helpful.

Mr. EVANS. How about you, KEN?

Senator KEATING. Religion I think is very important. I don't want to annoy any of the members of my faith. I am Presbyterian. But I could be probably just as good a Baptist or a Roman Catholic or a Jew. It wouldn't be too difficult.

Mr. EVANS. I did not mean specific religions.

Senator KEATING. It wouldn't be too difficult for me. I have a very broad religion and it is very important. It has been important to me. But I have a very broad attitude toward it which makes me feel that the particular religion which you profess is of minor importance.

The time may come in this world when all those who believe in God will be arrayed against those who do not believe in God and that is one reason.

Mr. EVANS. This is the case now pretty much, isn't it?

Senator KEATING. Well, it is pretty close to that and that is one reason why I felt that all those who believe in God should be closer together.

I have been very much interested in the effort to bring all of the Christian churches together. I think that is something perhaps that will come, and I would say that religion, today, is the greatest element in my life.

Mr. WELDON. I hear that nowadays—you hear this—the Senators don't do much of their important talking or debating on the Senate floor. They save it for TV, or the newspapers. Is this true?

Senator JAVITS. I don't think so. Now there may not be many Members on the floor to hear an important speech but I think a great many of them are made, an unusual number, really, considering the public impression. Preparation goes into them, feeling goes into them, and in a very strange way, Martin, it does get through those walls. Even if there is nobody in the Chamber. And it has been my experience—KEN will speak for himself, of course—but somehow whether a Member has seen it on the ticker or somebody has told him that you made a great, warm speech on so and so, he will ask you what was the main point of your speech, or he will have read your press release on it which most of us get out when it is an important speech.

Somehow or other it does get through because debate in the Senate is not quick. You know it is not a half an hour and you are finished. There is a chance overnight to break through.

Now the art of great advocacy is no longer the case. You know, where you could get 50 Senators on the floor and win them over to a point, though even that is sometimes done, but I do not believe that any popular impression that debate, eloquent speech is either finished or has seen its day, its usefulness, in fact. I don't feel that way.

Mr. EVANS. Let's pause for just a moment to apprise our audience that they are sitting in on what we think is a rather unique fest, if I may call it that—not a gab fest but a very, very interesting discussion with two men who have much in common: great Americans, Senators from the State of New York, and sharing the same birthday.

It is a philosophical discussion and we hope you will continue with us.

Mr. EVANS. At the middway point we pause to listen to Senator JAVITS as he was talking about the efficacy of debate on the floor of the Senate of the United States. We would like very much to advance the same question to Senator KEATING. How effective is debate, is it effective any more?

Senator KEATING. Well, you compared it with the debates on TV and of course on TV there is more give and take. You fellows don't want answers more than half a minute long, and you want to turn to the next fellow.

In the Senate it does not operate that way. You don't interrupt each other without the utmost courtesy and so on. It is given more to one's speech and perhaps more to a speech without interruption than in the days gone by, according to what I know of debates in the old days in the Senate. However, that is certainly not to say that it is a thing of the past and there are many speeches that at the moment may not have great impact which later do. I have had the experience just recently, having made a speech several weeks ago which had been the result of 6 months of work in investigating the flooding of the entire world with Soviet oil and the use of Soviet oil as a political weapon rather than an economic weapon and just within the last 24 hours it has apparently aroused interest, so it took a little time for that oil to soak in.

It had very little attention at the time but it was something which is on the record and which I think will eventually be considered significant.

Mr. WELDON. Is your mind ever changed in the course of a debate?

Senator KEATING. Occasionally. I agree with JACK that it is occasionally changed. Not very often. There are not many Senators in many cases who change their minds as a result of debate. But I have changed mine as a result of debate. I am sure that has happened to JACK. We like to think of ourselves as perhaps a little more open-minded than some people, but in many cases debate, particularly on amendments to a bill, is important and often does change the result.

Mr. EVANS. How effective is the guidance of the people via letterwriting? I think there is a lot of doubt in people's minds whether or not they play a part in your decisions.

Senator KEATING. Well, I think they do.

Senator JAVITS. Well, I think letters are important in showing the public interest in a question and especially when it is spontaneous.

Now the fact that I say spontaneous——

Mr. EVANS. Can you tell whether it is spontaneous or not?

Senator KEATING. Yes, you can, because they are printed forms and the same text when it is not spontaneous, or with coupons. But even those are important because you still have to cut it out and sign your name and send it in and you have to have some interest.

Mail is important as showing the nature of the interest, its quality, and its size. You should consult it. I hesitate to use the word "influence" because it should influence you in the sense that here are a lot of people who think the same thing. They are entitled to the consideration and dignity of your appraisal of it in those terms. If 25,000 Americans in New York think a certain thing, I certainly ought to think it over very carefully. I may not be with them, but I certainly owe them the fact that I will have evaluated it to the best of my ability.

Mr. EVANS. Do you ever concern yourselves or are you worried about the general posture of politics generally?

Senator KEATING. Could I just say a word on mail before we get into that, Mark, because I want to stress the importance of mail written on the back of an envelope or on a piece of tablet paper that is lined—something that comes from the heart that really expresses the sentiments of the person who is writing, who is so moved to write that he doesn't have to be inspired by some organization to write his letter.

Now the organizational mail is all right and it has its place and it should be weighed as a factor, but the real letters that particularly have an impact upon me are those that obviously are not inspired letters.

Now your next question. I just wanted to be sure and get that in.

Mr. EVANS. I am concerned as I am sure all Americans are who love politics—and I don't use this as a charge against either party because there are indiscretions in both parties. Do you worry about the posture of politics generally? The mother who says "Don't go into politics," to her son, or the schoolteacher who says it is a dirty game?

Senator KEATING. I worry about politics being called a dirty game because there are dirty people in it, but there are just as many dirty people in business or in labor unions or in agriculture or in any other area of activity. Politics is no more dirty than any other activity and in politics there are some of the finest men that I have ever known and dedicated men who are not interested in the almighty dollar, but they are interested in doing something for their country, their nation or their city. And so I do worry about having politics misunderstood.

Mr. EVANS. Would you want your son to run for the Senate?

Senator JAVITS. Yes, I would, and I would like to make my point as to that because I think it is very important. I would hope that in my personal life and in my career it would be an inspiration to young people to want to get into politics because it is a tremendously—I was going to use the word

"holy" really. It does determine the lives and fortunes and destinies not only of our nation but of individual people. Their opportunity for life, their opportunity for dignity, for equal opportunity which Senator KEATING and I are so deeply concerned in. All of this is determined by the science of government and the practice of government.

It is a tremendously noble calling and what we've got to do—and this is something that has been very deep in my heart, always—is to comport ourselves with such credit as to reflect great credit on this profession and to make young people feel: "Well, if KEATING and JAVITS can do it this way, it is not a seamy business and it is worth a man's best talent."

Mr. WELDON. I have a question that runs through a good deal of what you both have just said. I would like to know what motivates you? Are you working for the good of the people of New York State or of our Nation or of the world or for yourselves?

Senator KEATING. Well, Martin, all of those things, and the question is frequently asked "Well, if the interests of the Nation and the interests of your State conflict, what do you do?"

Now usually those conflicts can be resolved, but in my judgment there is only one answer, if they clearly conflict, and if you cannot resolve them, your country must come first. That is what you are sworn to do.

Now within those limits you want to do everything for the State that has honored you by sending you to Washington that you can. That is why Senator JAVITS and I have been so active in this field of defense contracts, to see that New York gets it fair share, and it hasn't been——

Senator JAVITS. We don't want to get into politics on this thing.

Mr. EVANS. I would just as soon blow the whistle on you there.

Senator KEATING. I think you have to think of all those things and of course the interests of your own country are so important in the world interests. You must think of your own country first. But if you look out for the interests of your own country, you are doing a pretty good job for the world.

Mr. JAVITS. I just wanted to add one word and that is the destiny of mankind. I adopt the answer of KEN, but I add to it, the destiny of mankind is critically important. His humanity, his cultural development, his moral development, his aspirations. These are critically important. And the one refinement I would make in KEN's answer is that it is a question of subject.

When it comes to defense orders for New York, that is pro-New York. Now when it comes to the moral strength of our country in terms of civil rights, that is pro the United States and when it comes to the overriding issue of freedom, then we are fighting for the whole free world.

Mr. EVANS. I think we would be very derelict if we didn't take a look at these fellows as they were on their way up the ladder—I don't know how far you were up the ladder here, KEN. [Shows photograph.] Can you give us a little background on it?

Senator KEATING. That was taken the year I graduated from high school. I was 15. I looked pretty innocent there, don't you think?

Mr. EVANS. Oh, I think you do yet.

Senator KEATING. Thank you very much, I have learned a lot since then.

Mr. EVANS. Well, you were a pretty good-looking fellow. The only thing that has changed is your hair. It has changed a little in tint.

Senator KEATING. The tint is somewhat different.

You know they always have great trouble calling me the junior Senator because of this head of hair.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I guess we won't talk about hair, will we, Senator JAVITS?

Senator JAVITS. No, no, no. That's taboo.

Mr. EVANS. At what age were you here, KEN? [Shows photograph.]

Senator KEATING. I was about 18. I was in college then.

Mr. EVANS. You had all the answers then.

Senator KEATING. Oh, yes. Many more than I have now.

Mr. EVANS. Let's take another look here at another fellow.

Where does this take place in your life, Senator? [Photograph.]

Senator JAVITS. That is when I was just running for Congress. I was almost out of the Army.

Mr. EVANS. Is this prior to your getting out of the Army? The Army was first?

Senator JAVITS. The Army was first, definitely. And the next one you are holding [photograph] is the Army and that was the Chemical Warfare Service. Though I was then 38, 39, or 40, I was never in better shape in my life. They really had me down fine.

Mr. EVANS. It looks to me as though you both stayed in pretty good shape.

I have thoroughly enjoyed these few moments with both of you and I know I speak for Martin as well.

Senator KEATING. We thank you and we thank you for these cakes. It seems as if the cake from your last birthday is just starting to get stale when you get another one.

Mr. EVANS. We will help you out on that subject.

Senator KEATING. Well, thank you very much.

Mr. EVANS. Bill Marriott sent those along to you, incidentally.

Thanks to both of you and a very happy birthday. I mean that most sincerely. I know I speak for the people in the State of New York and for certainly this audience.

This has been our way of celebrating the birthday of two men we happen to be very fond of, New York's two Senators, JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, both of whom, in one of the nicest coincidences of the year, celebrate their birthdays on May 18.

Thank you, gentlemen, again and a happy birthday.

With me in questioning has been Martin Weldon, Metropolitan Broadcasting's director of news and special events. My name is Mark Evans. I am vice president in charge of public affairs for Metromedia.

THE EMERGENCE OF ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a column by George E. Sokolsky written in praise of the excellent job which Adlai Stevenson has been doing as our Ambassador to the United Nations.

In this column, Mr. Sokolsky tells of the splendid work that Ambassador Stevenson has accomplished in helping in preserving the United Nations and in giving our country new dignity and strength.

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

THE EMERGENCE OF ADLAI STEVENSON

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When Adlai Stevenson ran for President he was not taken seriously by conservative-minded persons. He was defeated because he could not impress his personality upon the public mind, though in certain liberal circles he appeared to be a genius who brought into politics literate language and academic knowledge and a voice that was not vulgar.

In the United Nations, Stevenson emerged as a significant statesman who is preserving the United Nations at the moment of imminent collapse. There may be those who wish the United Nations to collapse, but among them are none who have a program to offer which is a substitute for this body either as a parliament or an agency for social development.

Nothing is easier than to say "To hell with it" about anything, but that swiftly spoken phrase offers no solution to an immediate problem which may end in war. Stevenson has adopted the role of the leader of those who hold the United Nations together despite the absurdity of 104 members, each with the capacity to maintain the peace alone.

The wrong representative of such a country as the United States can only damage such a body by presenting a chauvinism amounting to weakness while at the same time this country maintains its dignity and asserts the rights of nations in the spirit that our Constitution asserts the rights of man. Adlai Stevenson does this with wit and humor, while at no time sacrificing the stature of the United States.

To conservatives, Stevenson appeared a liberal who would sell his country down the river, but the record of 1961 and 1962 is that the United States has gained in dignity and strength and that Stevenson's role in the United Nations played no small part in that.

I once said to Stevenson that I shall probably be very embarrassed for all the critical things I had written of him. And it seems to me that day has come, particularly as regards the entire Chinese situation, which was so badly understood by the Truman administration of which both Adlai Stevenson and Dean Rusk were members, but which is being so competently handled today by the Kennedy administration of which Stevenson and Rusk are leading members. It is possible to say that for the first time since 1932, the United States is giving Asia a good and understanding look.

The Kennedy team represents this strength; it is working out its programs; Kennedy, Rusk, and Stevenson are able to formulate a policy which presents a doctrine that does not change with the wind. The President stands firm with his associates and they hold loyally to his attitude.

It was anticipated that Stevenson would go off on his own. But he has not done that. He has postured himself as a member of a team and fought the team's battles courageously. This united front has not been usual in the United States, where, for example, William Jennings Bryan moved far away from Woodrow Wilson and John Foster Dulles was his own master. Adlai Stevenson on the contrary has strengthened John F. Kennedy all along the line.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—THE CASE FOR THE KING-ANDERSON BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past Monday it was my privilege to address the Magazine Publishers Association here in Washington and to speak in support of the administration's medical care for the aged program, better known as the King-Anderson bill.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the body of the RECORD.

In this address I predicted that this legislation would be approved by this Congress. Every day I become more confident that that is the case. There

can be no doubt that this proposal has the overwhelming support of the American people, and it deserves such support. The King-Anderson bill is a sound and a moderate proposal which would give our elder citizens protection against financial disaster in case of serious illness. It is fiscally sound and would not place any drain on the Treasury. And last, but not least, it would make it possible for our elder citizens to receive hospital and nursing home care free of any humiliating "poverty test" or coercion or direction as to the hospital or nursing home to which they would go. In other words, it would be completely free of any Government dictation or control. Those who argue that this is somehow a form of "socialized medicine" are simply and plainly in error.

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

OPENING REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, AT THE MAGAZINE PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 14, 1962

I am here to speak for the administration's health insurance, hospital care program under the Social Security system—known legislatively as the King-Anderson bill.

I believe that this is a program that American people—of all ages—want and deserve. I believe that this is a necessary program. I believe that this is a sound and fiscally responsible program. And I predict that it will be approved by Congress and signed into law this year.

First, let me define briefly what the King-Anderson bill provides: It authorizes full hospital cost coverage up to 90 days a year, with the patient paying $10 a day for the first 9 days. It provides full nursing home coverage up to 180 days after a patient has left the hospital. It covers the cost of up to 240 home visits a year for health services. It allows for outpatient diagnostic services at a hospital, with the patient paying no more than $20 for each study.

The important fact to remember about the King-Anderson bill is that the patient's right to select his own doctor, his own hospital, or his own nursing home is guaranteed under this program. Any statement that a program with this feature is "socialized medicine" is either nonsense or irresponsible propaganda.

How will this health insurance program be financed under the King-Anderson bill?

It will be paid for through the actuarially sound principles of social insurance. It will be financed by revenue from a one-fourth-of-1-percent increase of the social security tax on employees and employers on the first $5,200 of income. This will be prepaid hospital care insurance. Patients will not be given a charity handout, but will receive payments for hospital costs as a result of paying into this insurance program over a lifetime of earnings. The cost of this insurance to the average worker will be about $12 a year.

The King-Anderson program would cover immediately the 14,700,000 citizens, over 65, who are now receiving social security benefits. It would cover 95 percent of today's wage earners when they reach the age of 65.

Some opponents of the King-Anderson bill have argued that the Kerr-Mills program, approved by Congress 2 years ago, is "enough," or that the Kerr-Mills bill "has not been given enough time to prove itself."

The Kerr-Mills program could provide a necessary supplement to the administration's program.

But Kerr-Mills requires a humiliating poverty test, it covers only so-called charity cases, it guarantees no free choice of doctor or hospital, its program has not been adopted by most of the States, and—most important—it provides a drain on the Federal Treasury with no provision to balance that drain with new revenue.

Kerr-Mills is not enough, and it could not in 100 years prove itself as the final answer to the need for an effective, soundly financed health insurance program.

Why is a new health and hospital care program needed?

I believe the evidence is clear. Today, more than 17½ million citizens are over 65 years of age. The figure will increase to 23 million in 10 years.

Nine out of ten citizens over 65 years old will be hospitalized at least once. Two-thirds of them will be hospitalized twice or more.

And the average daily hospital cost which was only $9 a day in 1946 is now $32 a day. The average hospital stay for a person over 65 is 15 days.

The heavy needs and the heavy costs for hospital care thus come to our citizens when they are least able to afford it—after age 65. Those needs and costs will continue to rise.

The King-Anderson bill will allow our citizens to pay those costs—through health insurance—during their productive years of earning power.

This program thus provides health care not as charity, but as an earned right. It will sustain the individual dignity, and not just the physical security, of the American citizen in his advanced years.

THE 148TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORWEGIAN CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today marks the 148th anniversary of the Norwegian Constitution Day.

Norway, as a nation of bold, daring, independently minded, adventuresome people, symbolic of the Viking tradition, continues to play a vital role in the free world.

Strongly pro-Western and pro-American, Norway, by its strategic location and firm adherence to NATO, serves significantly in blocking the outspreading of communism.

For such policy, it has been the target of pressures and vituperative propaganda attacks from the Communist bloc.

Despite these attacks, however, Norway has stood stanchly and bravely like the Vikings of old, helping to hold aloft the beacon of freedom.

Of Norwegian ancestral heritage myself, I can, I believe, humbly, yet with objectivity and pride, point also to the significant contributions which the sons and daughters of Norway, immigrating to U.S. shores, have made to the progress of our Nation; and particularly to my home State of Wisconsin.

The anniversary observance, then, offers us a new opportunity to pay tribute to Norway as a symbol, throughout history, of the independent adventuresome Viking spirit; for the contributions of the Norwegian people to progress, not only in their homeland, but also in the United States and the world; and, as a stanch ally for freedom in the cold war.

Upon the 148th anniversary of Norway's Constitution Day, however, we must match our words with deeds by reaffirming U.S. dedication—as an ally, a friend, and a comember of NATO—to protecting the integrity of Norway, despite pressures from the Communist bloc; cooperation with Norway, not only for defense, but on mutual projects to promote progress for the people of both our countries; a resolution to maintain a close, nongovernmental, people-to-people tie between our respective nations; and redeclare our dedication to mutual efforts for creating a global climate in which all nations may enjoy the right to self-determine their own destinies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a friend and admirer of the Norwegian people, I would like to offer my respects and the highest commendation to them on the 148th anniversary of their independence. On May 17, 1814, with the drafting of a constitution by a representative assembly, Norway became an independent nation with an elected King. The striking thing about the birth of Norway's independence is that it came about in an orderly, peaceful manner—without the bloody disturbance of war, which has been the price that many other peoples have paid for their freedom.

I would not claim to be an expert in the field of Norwegian history, but I am very much aware of their history in this country and in my own State of Minnesota. It has been a long history of contribution and accomplishment in economic and social justice and I think it is fair to say that any history of our country would find their presence in the Middle West of great significance in the democratic development and subsequent prosperity of that section.

A week ago today we had the honor of welcoming to our country Prime Minister and Mrs. Einar Gerhardsen of Norway, and on that occasion I referred to the innumerable ties which bind the Norwegian and American peoples. Not the least of these is a similar tradition of democracy, justice, and social welfare. I would like to wish for this progressive country a continuing history of freedom, peace, and prosperity. Norway today and throughout its history, demonstrates those great qualities of indomitable will for freedom and independence, courage in the face of adversity, honor and integrity in a world plagued by deceit and naked power. Norway is a loyal and faithful ally in NATO, a forward-looking member of the United Nations, and a respected nation in the chancelleries of the world.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, today, May 17, is the 148th anniversary of Norwegian independence. It is a pleasure to mark the anniversary of a nation which has persevered in its struggle to maintain its democratic institutions. And it is a source of satisfaction to note that the outcome of the struggle has been successful.

On Monday, April 11, 1814, representatives of the Norwegian people met in the small town of Eidsvold to draw up a constitution. The battles of the Napoleonic War were over. Political forces were in the process of regrouping. In that political hiatus the Norwegian delegates gathered to determine the future of their country.

It was a raw spring day that April 11. The roads were muddy, and the lodgings of the delegates were uncomfortable. Most of the members of the constitutional convention walked to the assembly hall through the slush. The convention was held in the main building of the Eidsvold ironworks in a long narrow room equipped with hard wooden benches.

The constitutionmakers were dedicated to the welfare of their country. They were representatives of the responsible elements of the Norwegian nation. Of the 112 delegates, 37 were farmers, 16 were businessmen, and 59 were officials including 12 representatives of the army and navy. Although the military representatives played little part in the proceedings, the other officials took the lead.

All were agreed on one point—that Norway needed a written constitution based on popular will. There was a division on whether Norway should join in union with Sweden or declare independence. The independence faction was successful in getting its point of view adopted. Once there was agreement on that fundamental point the drafting went smoothly. Eleven principles were presented to the assembly by the draft committee. The first began:

Norway is to be a limited, hereditary monarchy; it shall be a free, independent, and indivisible kingdom, and this regent shall have title of king.

This was adopted as part of the victory of the independence faction. The 11th principle was rejected as being too controversial for its day—it provided that all male citizens should be under equal obligation to do military service.

The assembly did its work carefully. The Constitution was discussed paragraph by paragraph. At last on May 17 the Constitution was signed and became the law of the land.

Although Sweden was subsequently successful in November of 1814 in imposing her authority over the Norwegian Nation, the Constitution of May 17 was never forgotten. The Norwegian Storting, or parliament, continued to regard it as the basic law of the land. May 17 was celebrated as Norwegian Independence Day from that time onward. And the Storting engaged in a series of parliamentary skirmishes with the Swedish King, using the Constitution of May 17 as its base of operations. Finally in 1906 the Norwegians were successful in their bid for independence.

I am proud to join in the observance of Norwegian Independence Day.

POLICE WEEK

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the work of no other group of Americans has a more direct impact on the enjoyment of constitutional liberties than that of police. The courts and the legislatures can exercise every power at their command to protect these liberties, but the enjoyment of many guarantees of the Bill of Rights rests as a practical matter in the hands of the police.

Traditionally, the American police officer has recognized this grave responsibility and performed his work accordingly. I make this statement recognizing full well that, on occasion, there have been serious deviations from constitutionally acceptable procedures. However, the record as a whole is commendable.

The police have one of the toughest jobs in organized society. They must pit their skills, their knowledge, their wisdom and their courage against men who recognize no rules of the game. Yet the police are charged with following the rules of the game. They would indeed be more than human if they always constrained themselves to the rules. For without exception, these rules increase the difficulty of the policeman's job. However, the alternative to following these rules is tyranny and the responsible police officer is the first to recognize this.

This week has been designated Police Week to commemorate the outstanding public service rendered by our law enforcement officers, Federal, State and local. I would like to take this opportunity to extend to them my heartiest congratulations for a job well done. We as a Nation can never repay the debt owed these men for their efforts and their sacrifices. We can only say "Thank you."

AWARD OF THE ELOY ALFARO INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION TO MR. W. HERBERT LAMB

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have been asked to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the highlights of the proceedings of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, on the occasion when Mr. W. Herbert Lamb, my constituent, received the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross, on May 9, 1962, at the Masonic Club, New York City. This honor was bestowed on him by Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, Mr. Stanley W. Wakefield, American deputy provost, and Mr. H. Clay Waterman. At the ceremony a personal message from Dr. Olmedo Alfaro, secretary general of the foundation, was read.

Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, outlined the aims and purposes of the foundation, and explained why Mr. Lamb had been approved for the highest honor of the foundation.

In conferring the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma, Dr. Bayern said in part:

I have the privilege, pleasure and honor, Mr. Lamb, of conferring upon you the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross, by direction of the board of dignitaries of this foundation, in recognition of your services to mankind and to your efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

Who was Eloy Alfaro? Eloy Alfaro, soldier, patriot, statesman and martyr, was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice and friendship among nations, the self-control and self-sacrifice that marked about one-quarter of a century of unflagging service to his fellow man, extended beyond the confines of his own country, Ecuador. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation was organized to perpetuate and further the political and moral values of the Americas by General Alfaro, for whom the organization was named, and who, from 1895 to 1901 and from 1906 to 1911, was President of Ecuador. The philosophy of General Alfaro, known as the Abraham Lincoln of South America, was based principally on service to his fellow human beings, and to the cause of international peace. The public and private activities of Mr. Lamb come within the framework of this kind of service to mankind. In recognition of this fact, the ruling body of the foundation grants you its highest honor—The Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma.

Others who have been similarly honored in the past include former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower, President John F. Kennedy, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Generals MacArthur, Crittenberger, Devers, and Governors Harriman and Rockefeller.

The award made to Mr. Lamb, includes the motto: "Thus one goest to the stars"—a most appropriate one in this case, which reads as follows:

Eloy Alfaro International Foundation: "Thus one goest to the stars," recognizing the special value of the services rendered by Mr. W. Herbert Lamb, in support of the objectives of this institution, he has been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation.

Mr. Lamb replied:

I am deeply touched and very proud to be included among the distinguished personages who have received this high honor. I shall always cherish this honor and regard it as an inspiration to accelerate my efforts toward promoting the ideals of democracy so well championed by Gen. Eloy Alfaro. Thank you.

HOMESTEAD CENTENNIAL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Sunday, May 20, marks one of the most significant anniversaries in the history of the United States—the signing of the Homestead Act into law by President Abraham Lincoln. While 30 States in the union were in some part settled by homesteaders who moved west and settled on 160 acres or less of free public land, North Dakota is one of the few States that can rightly call itself a product of the homestead movement.

During the past 100 years, 125,000 hardy, rugged individuals settled over 17 million acres of homestead land in North Dakota. Many of these original homesteaders are still living. I think of one in particular, Mrs. Anna Brindle, of Hazelton, N. Dak., who is 100 years old. She and her now deceased husband moved into North Dakota in 1887. There are many men and women like Mrs. Brindle who are still operating the farms they proved up in those days gone by.

We here in America in the 20th century might well learn a lesson from those adventurous homesteaders. The qualities of courage, tenacity, and the eternal optimism could well be applied today.

I want to pay tribute today to these stouthearted individuals who, in order to establish a new start, were willing to risk the uncertainties of a new, raw, sparsely settled region.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Area Redevelopment Administration program has been in operation for less than a year. It is still suffering from growing pains—as any new venture must—but it has made some substantial contributions already in alleviating chronic and persistent unemployment. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of the act and a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which reported the legislation.

In the May 15, 1962, issue of the Bangor Daily News, the distinguished financial reporter, Sylvia Porter, reported on the activities of the Area Redevelopment Administration, particularly in New England. Her article records one of the early substantial loans made in Biddeford, Maine, and points the way toward more effective utilization of the act. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPRESSED AREAS LAW OPERATING; GOVERNMENT LOAN AIDS MAINE PLANT

(By Sylvia Porter)

In Lowell, Mass., a New England area in which unemployment has for years been a sickening 50 to 100 percent above the national average, a new electronics firm recently was formed which will directly employ 110 workers, indirectly provide jobs for almost as many more in services and supplying. The firm was started with $150,000, of which two-thirds came from a Government loan, 20 percent from a local bank, the balance from an industrial foundation.

In Biddeford-Sanford, Maine, another long depressed New England area, a lumber processing operation also was recently set up in a former textile machinery plant. A Government loan provided $433,000 to help finance the purchase of plant and machinery for "finger joining"—a process which converts low-grade lumber into clear lumber. The balance came from banks and a development corporation. The new plant will directly employ 170 workers, indirectly create jobs for 750 more.

In New England alone, there are 16 regions of persistent and substantial unemployment which have been designated as eligible for help under the depressed areas law (the Federal Area Redevelopment Act, or ARA), passed 1 year ago this month.

TO NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIES

In this period, $1 million in ARA loans has gone to New England industries, $100,000 has been granted for research, 1,100 unemployed workers are getting retraining under the law. This is concrete action, says the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston in a scholarly review of the program and the conservative bank concludes:

"One important result of the ARA program is the increased activity and concern the local and State leaders in New England have shown since these new redevelopment weapons have become available. If the New England redevelopment communities continue their activities both within and beyond the framework of the Area Redevelopment Act, it is quite likely that many of these depressed areas will find that they have lost this label that they have held so long."

The ARA has been slow in getting rolling—understandable since it is so new a weapon—but it is speeding up now. By June 30, ARA Administrator William L. Batt, Jr., expects to have approved $60 million for 100 or more projects, enough to create 75,000 jobs. The total authorization for loans and grants under the act is $375 million over a 4-year period.

The New England depressed areas have received a major part of the assistance to date because they have done their homework—organized the local development groups required by law, prepared the necessary "overall economic development program" (OEDP), demonstrated initiative. The ARA assistance breaks down into five key classifications. Specifically:

1. Occupational retraining of workers in new skills. Over 40 percent of the 1,100 New England workers already being trained are getting skills as machine tool operators.

2. Industrial and commercial loans out of a revolving fund of $200 million at 4 percent. The New England regions have received one-third of all ARA loans made so far.

FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

3. Loans and grants for public facilities—sewers, roads, parks. These are primarily for less developed regions than New England.

4. Technical assistance. An example is the $100,000 granted to the New Bedford Institute of Technology Research Foundation for a study of ways to improve the scallop and flounder industry, a big occupation in New Bedford.

5. Urban planning and renewal benefits. Grants for this planning totaling $219,000 have been made to 18 New England municipalities.

This 1961 law represents one milestone on the way to solving the problem of long-term joblessness, the 1962 Manpower Retraining Act represents a second. Now we must really get to the basic answer to the problem—accelerating our economic growth so the millions of jobs needed are created.

DEALING WITH A TOTALITARIAN PARTY IN A DEMOCRACY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, tomorrow I shall speak at Colby College, in Waterville, Maine. The subject of my talk will be "The Problems of Dealing With a Totalitarian Party in a Democracy." Appearing on the same platform will be James Jackson, a prominent official of the Communist Party of the United States and editor of the Worker, the official publication of the Communist Party.

Recently, officials of the Communist Party have engaged in an extensive speaking campaign at our colleges in an effort to sell their line to our young people. This week's Time magazine contains a short article describing these activities. It is with the hope that I can present our point of view effectively and rebut the Communist Party line that I have accepted this speaking engagement.

In this connection, I should like to offer for the consideration of Senators two articles, which were published in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, dealing with the problem of communism. These articles bear on the general problem of the struggle between freedom and communism. One deals with the application of the Internal Security Act and other legislation designed to protect our free society from subversive totalitarian groups.

The first article, entitled "The Communist Party, U.S.A.," was written by Harold H. Martin, an editor of the Post, and describes the present condition of the party in this country. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

(By Harold H. Martin)

The Communist Party in America is having its troubles—and they are not all with the law. In every field where it once was strong it is struggling now to regain its old influence, against the quickened animosity of the American people. Its membership is down to a hard-core cadre of old unshakables who still work with fervent devotion for the party, and they are as dangerous to us as rattlesnakes; but nearly all the intellectuals, who once shared the party's dream of a new heaven and a new earth under socialism, have long since become disillusioned, and the "working stiffs," from whom it drew its basic strength in the old days, no longer respond as they once did to its hackneyed shibboleths. Their attitude now can be summed up in the words of a hard-hat laborer on a Manhattan construction job: "Those people should drop dead. Who needs them?"

The far-right organizations today are attacking the American Communist Party that existed nearly 20 years ago. As World War II ended, the Communist organization in the United States was at the peak of its power and influence. Open membership in the party stood at 85,000; and the concealed Communists, sympathizers and fellow travelers, some of whom held high places in Government, in the unions, and in education, could be numbered in the hundreds of thousands. Since then, congressional investigations and Government loyalty programs have cleaned them out of the Federal agencies—hurting in the process some innocent people. The labor unions have so harshly purged their own ranks that only a few small unions can now be described as Communist-dominated, and most of the teachers who once leaned far to the left have straightened up to a conventional liberal posture. Contrary to rightwing charges, the party never had any significant influence in the churches, nor has it now.

Today, according to Arvo Gust Halberg, the party's general secretary, whose working, or police-blotter, name is Gus Hall, a nose count from coast to coast would show the party's membership to be around 10,000. About a third of these members are concentrated in New York. The others are grimly hanging on in Boston, Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, San Francisco, and Seattle. This enrollment is about the same as it was 3 years ago—an indication that the old hard-core Communists are dying off about as fast as new members are being recruited. J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who next to Mr. Hall knows more about the party's strength than anybody else, agrees that this count checks pretty well with the FBI's own figures.

In fact, Mr. Hoover may know more about the party's numerical strength than does Mr. Hall. He knows how many of Mr. Hall's followers are not Communist at all, but FBI informers, working for Mr. Hoover for a small retainer fee. Mr. Hall obviously does not have this knowledge. If he did, his membership rolls would be even thinner. The American Communists even grin wryly at the current jest that the party at the moment is hopelessly split between its Albanian faction and its FBI faction.

"You can't stop to worry about spies," said Joe Brandt, veteran of the Lincoln Brigade and World War II, and a zealous party hack. "If we spent all our time suspecting each other, we'd never get anything done."

The dreary state of the party at the moment is also reflected in the anemic condition of the Communist press, an indication that the peripheral supporters, who once read the Daily Worker to discover the party line, have fallen away in droves. In the days of the party's greatest strength, the Worker had a circulation of 100,000. Today it is down to two issues a week, and only despairing cries for help keep its circulation floating around the 20,000 mark. On the west coast, the People's World sells about 8,000 copies. Political Affairs, the party's intellectual monthly, has a circulation of 1,045. The National Guardian, which has never been identified as a Communist paper, but which faithfully presents the party line, has a circulation of 30,000. It must be made clear, however, that the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee do not see in these figures an indication of the party's weakness, but of its hidden strength. Estimating that at least two people reach each Communist or Communist-line publication, they come up with a figure of 110,000. This calculation suggests that Mr. Hall was correct when he said that there are thousands of state of mind Communists who do not belong to the party, but who sympathize with its aims.

The party, as always, claims to be in need of funds. Dues start at 15 cents a month for students and the unemployed, rising to $5 a month for members making over $120 a week. Naturally, with such a thin membership, dues collected are not enough to pay fines and lawyers, and to carry out all the agitation and propaganda which the party feels it must keep up. As a result the membership is constantly beseeched for special donations. The Worker is freckled each week with announcements of lectures, seminars, bazaars, rummage sales, suppers, dances, picnics and youth gatherings, at which a call for funds is made. Like the church, which its members despise, the party relies heavily on gatherings at which food is served.

"We try to eat our way into a state of solvency," says Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall, at 51, is a big, cold-eyed, heavy-jawed man of tremendous bounce and vigor, and his person reflects none of the penury which he says afflicts the party. He stands a little under 6 feet and weighs 245 pounds, a state of corpulence which causes him to resemble the Reverend Billy James Hargis, the rotund rightwing crusader. On a salary which he says is only $77 a week, he dresses more like a banker than a Bolshevik, drives a fawn-colored 1962 convertible, and lives in a $30,000 to $40,000 home in Yonkers. He also travels extensively on party business, and never, unless detained by the courts, misses the opening of the deer season in Minnesota, or the trout fishing in upstate New York. It would probably be unfair to him to reveal that he fishes for trout with worms instead of dry flies.

The air of opulence which surrounds Mr. Hall suggests to a suspicious mind that the party, or at least Mr. Hall himself, has financial resources which have not yet been revealed. It has been suggested in some anti-Communist quarters that certain persons in the export-import business may be required to share their profits with the party, in return for the privilege of doing business with the Soviet Union. It has also been hinted, by an apostate Communist once high in party councils, that the party might do a little trading in Wall Street now and then, acting on tips from Mr. Khrushchev that he was planning to dump some commodity on the world market. There is also reason to suspect that Communist countries overseas may be sending a few kopeks, by courier, to their hard-pressed American comrades. No doubt the facts will eventually be revealed in the courts. The Internal Revenue Service is seeking to collect from the party $381,544.83 in unpaid income and excess-profits taxes. It is unlikely that the IRS auditors snatched this figure out of thin air.

THE PARTY'S DEN MOTHER

Whatever the facts may be about the party's financial resources, the party headquarters at 23 West 26th Street, in New York City, exudes an atmosphere of age, dry rot, and shabbiness. The narrow three-story red brick building was once owned by William Astor. Crowded into it are the business and editorial offices of the Worker, the headquarters of the New York party district, and Mr. Hall's own national staff. Even the people who work here have an air of age and mustiness. Among these party elders is Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, aged 71, a motherly looking Irishwoman, whose ample bosom still heaves with emotion at the thought of the bliss we all will know when the rotten capitalistic system finally has fallen.

"I get so tired of being described as the elderly wheelhorse of the party," said Sister Flynn (the Communists in their public meetings now address each other as "Brothers and Sisters" instead of "Comrades"). "Can't you think of something better?"

I asked her if "den mother" of the party would do. She said that would be nice.

Even in Mr. Hall's own hideaway, a penthouse cubbyhole up a winding wrought-iron stair, the only evidence of prosperity is the well-fed, well-tailored Mr. Hall himself. The desk at which he works, beneath a dusty lithograph of Lenin, is plain gray metal, and the table at which the party satraps sit in conference is of unpainted white pine covered with a glass top. Above Mr. Hall's chair the paint has peeled from the plastered ceiling, and the cracked plaster looks as if it might at any moment crash down upon his skull.

TOP REDS ON TRIAL

Mr. Hall, however, has far more to worry about than that. Before the year is out, the full impact of a highly controversial law may descend upon him. After an 11-year legal battle in which the Communist Party fought a bitter rearguard action, the Supreme Court in June of 1961, in a 5 to 4 decision, upheld the constitutionality of the registration provisions of the Internal Security Act popularly known as the McCarran Act. Under the provisions of this law, the Communist Party, U.S.A., is required to register as a Communist-action organization, to reveal its membership lists and the sources of its income. If the party was not so registered by November 20, 1961, the officers of the party were required to register for it by November 30. Failing this, the individual members of the party were required to register for themselves. Nobody registered and Mr. Hall, who had already served 5½ years' imprisonment under the Smith Act, for advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, announced publicly that nobody had any intention of registering. Nothing happened for a while, and rightwing forces began to cry out that Attorney General Robert Kennedy should be impeached for allowing Communists to defy the law. On March 15 the Government moved. Hall and Benjamin J. Davis, the national secretary, were indicted by a Federal grand jury in Washington, arrested in New York, and released under $5,000 bond. On March 30 they were arraigned in Washington. Both pleaded not guilty.

At the arraignment hearing, when Hall was called up to the bench to plead, Davis, an Amherst- and Harvard-educated Negro lawyer whose father was once a prominent Republican leader in Atlanta, Ga., rose to go with him. Davis' lawyer waved him back.

"Discrimination everywhere," said Davis, returning to his seat. "See how they call the white man first?"

With the arraignment hearing, the final battle had begun, after more than 11 years of legal skirmishing. Preliminary motions will be filed in June, and a date for the trials will be set. If Hall and Davis are convicted, and the convictions can be made to stick through the interminable legal maneuvers that are sure to follow, the Communist Party, as a political organization, will have come to the end of its road. Its leaders, one by one, can be safely stowed in jail. Its rank-and-file members, as far down the line as the Justice Department wishes to reveal its undercover agents, can be brought to trial.

There are thousands of Americans, however, who, hating the Communists and all they stand for, believe that the rigid application of the registration act will represent a classic case of burning down the barn to get rid of a few rats. In the process of striking a final blow at the Communist Party, already scorned and rejected by the great mass of the American people, they argue, we also will be striking a crippling blow at our basic liberties. President Truman, in vetoing the original act in 1950, expressed this view when he called the McCarran Act a "clear and present danger to our institutions." Chief Justice Warren, in his dissent from the majority decision in 1961, joined with Justice Brennan in expressing the belief that the act violated the fifth amendment, which holds that no person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself. This same point was made also in the dissent of Justice Douglas.

M'CARRAN ACT UNDER FIRE

Justice Black dissented with fervor. He said, "The Communist Party had never been more than a small group in this country. And its members had been dwindling even before the Government began its campaign to destroy the party by force of law. This was because a vast majority of the American people were against the party's policies and overwhelmingly rejected its candidates year after year. That is the true American way of securing this Nation against dangerous ideas. * * *

"I am compelled to say that I fear that all the arguments and urgings the Communists and their sympathizers can use, in trying to convert Americans to an ideology wholly foreign to our habits and our instincts are far less dangerous to the security of this Nation than are laws which embark upon a policy of repression by the outlawing of minority parties because they advocate radical changes in the structure of government. This widespread program for punishing ideas on the grounds that they might impair the security of the Nation not only sadly fails to protect that security but also diverts our energies and thoughts from the many far more important problems that face us as a nation in this troubled world.

"I would reverse this case and leave the Communists free to advocate their beliefs in proletarian dictatorship publicly and openly among the people of this country, with the full confidence that the people will remain loyal to any democratic government truly dedicated to freedom and justice—the kind of government which some of us still think of as 'the last best hope of earth'."

The Communists' reaction to the dissents was one of approbation. Their reaction to the arraignment of Hall and Davis was, as might be expected, a piercing shriek of rage. The arraignment hearing was held on a Friday. By the following Tuesday a defense committee had been formed and the mimeograph machines had started rolling.

"The arraignment of Gus Hall and Ben Davis," the committee's first handout shrilled, carried the Government's persecution of a minority political party and its spokesmen to a stage that cries out for a new and herculean effort to quash the indictments. The issue has been joined. Shall the McCarran Act—the Bible of the Birch Societies, the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Crusaders, the White

Citizens Councils—be allowed to prevail; or shall the strong winds of the people's indignation blow the ultraright into the ashcan of history?"

To Mr. Hall, the main actor in the coming drama, the trials under the McCarran Act offer a godsent opportunity to get his moribund collection of aging Marxists back into the public eye. They can parade and petition and protest and send up a mighty clamor in defense of the Bill of Rights. They can perhaps win back some of the old liberals who have fallen away. They may even be able to enlist some new members.

A shrewd, pragmatic man, Mr. Hall knows well what the strong winds of public indignation had been blowing into the ashcan of history; it was his aging, querulous Communist Party. In the years since the war, American Communists have been hard put to find an issue. It was difficult to climb on the bandwagon of reform—to cry out for civil rights for Negroes, slum clearance, better housing, medical care for the aged, full employment—when the Government they sought to overthrow was itself battling for these reforms. Mr. Khrushchev's tough talk, his bomb-rattling, his shoe-pounding bad manners at the U.N. also hurt the party sorely. His blunt "We will bury you" stirred the resolve of Americans not to be buried by the Soviet, but to bury instead the Communists closest at hand, the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Ever since 1945, when Moscow ordered the sacking of U.S. Communist leader Earl Browder, the advocate of the soft sell, in favor of the hardline leader, William Z. Foster, internal quarrels have decimated the party's ranks. The desanctification of Stalin and the bloody suppression in Hungary caused many to fall away. The application of the Smith Act, which had put Hall himself in prison, and the Communist Control Act of 1954, frightened the fainthearted and drove old hard-core revolutionaries underground. They were accompanied, it might be noted, by their faithful FBI shadows.

BLUEPRINT FOR TYRANNY

When Hall took over as general secretary in December of 1959, the party was stumbling and muttering to itself like an old, punch-drunk prizefighter. Its only resources were the craftiness learned in years of eye-gouging strife, and the knowledge that it still had the backing of the Kremlin. Hall immediately sought to breathe some of the old life into the withered carcass. A year later he was still struggling. On January 20, 1961, John F. Kennedy stood in a cold-blowing wind to take the oath as President of the United States, and to pledge America's word to the new, free nations of the world that they, who had thrown off their old colonial controls, should not find imposed on them an even more iron tyranny. On the same day, in a shabby hall in snowbound Manhattan, Gus Hall was giving a pep talk to his Communist National Committee and sketching for them a blueprint showing how that tyranny could be imposed upon the United States.

His speech was wrapped in the cotton-wool of Communist double-talk, but the meat of it was this:

The party had let itself drift into a stagnant eddy, out of the mainstream of American life. It had failed to get back into positions of leadership in the labor unions. It had failed to make a place for itself in the drive of the Negro race for their civil rights. "Front" organizations had been allowed to dwindle into impotence. The Communist press had fallen into desuetude, and even the hated, treasonous, counterrevolutionary Trotskyites were luring more of the youth of the country into the Marxist-Leninist fold than were the holders of the true faith.

All this must be changed. There must be a great revival of the party's strength through dedicated, selfless, grassroots work in the unions, in the peace organizations, with Negro groups and among the youth of the country. Fortunately, he told the group with booming confidence, the time was ripe for a change. He had surveyed the nation and had found it in a state of extreme decay—the fate that Marx had predicted would befall all capitalistic countries.

"A small handful of billionaire monopolists oppress the overwhelming majority of the people," he announced cheerfully. "There is a growing unemployment, a new economic crisis, and real hunger and privation for large numbers of our people. There is degeneration of our educational system, our culture and our ethics, and a vast growth of corruption. On top of these severe illnesses there is the undermining of our liberties, the growing destruction of labor's rights, the unabated cruel oppression of the Negro people and the violent denial of their rights. And by no means least, there is the threat of a terrible nuclear holocaust, which big business and big brass are preparing."

WATCHWORD FOR PROGRESSIVES

The seedbed in which communism could take root was being prepared by capitalism itself, he implied. All that was needed was a few more years of "peaceful coexistence" while the Socialist world grew leaner, harder and stronger, and soft capitalistic America sank deeper into its luxury-sodden coma, until finally socialism could triumph without a struggle.

The watchword of all "progressive people," therefore, must be Peace, Peace, and again, Peace.

It was this same peace message which Mr. Hall and certain of his cohorts took to college campuses in the West and Midwest last fall and winter. He was gratified to find himself speaking to audiences ranging in size from 2,000 to 15,000 persons.

"These people weren't Communists," said Mr. Hall, "but they wanted to hear a Communist speak. They had heard the fulminations of the right wing. They wanted to hear the other side. And by inviting me there, and by coming to hear me, they asserted their faith in the first amendment."

Mr. Hall's efforts to revive his ailing party take many forms. The New York School for Marxist Studies, directed by Herbert Aptheker, the party's leading intellectual, enlisted 250 students for its spring term. In the unions, rank-and-filers are urged to "make shoptalk party talk." Every night, somewhere, meetings are being held to further some party project of propaganda or agitation. Some time ago in a public hall on lower Fifth Avenue the party called a meeting to lay its plans for a great May Day celebration in Union Square. Most of those present were past middle age, and their speech was heavily flavored with the accents of Eastern Europe. They were ordered to go back to their unions and their community clubs to herd at least 10,000 people to the Square on May 1, the traditional day of celebration in Communist countries around the world. They seemed less interested in the theme of the demonstration, which was to be "Freedom of the Press," than they were in what police protection would be provided.

"Our safety will be in numbers," one speaker reassured them. "If we turn out 2,000 people, the Fascist hoodlums will overrun us. If we have 10,000 there, we don't care whether the police show up or not."

As the meeting ended, I asked a party functionary how many people had been present.

"Seventy-eight," he said, "including you and one guy we suspect was from the FBI."

A DOLLAR FOR MERCY

That evening a handful of the faithful braved a cold drizzle to attend a "Mercy Party" in a bleak hall on Second Avenue. Its purpose, as advertised in The Worker, was to raise money to buy medicines for Cuba. Admission was $1, and some thirty-five people showed up. Most of them were old merchant seamen now on the beach, who seemed to have only a remote interest in Cuba's need for medicines. They clustered around the bar in the back room, where a Mr. Joe Stack, the organizer of the party, sold eye-dropper-sized drinks for 50 cents a shot, or sat in twos and threes at small tables, reminiscing about long-forgotten waterfront strikes.

The evening lacked gaiety and enthusiasm. Mr. Stack himself introduced the only light note. He was wearing a pair of mottled black-and-white shoes made of calfskin with the hair left on.

"Hiya like these capitalist shoes?" he bellowed, holding up his foot. "Bostonians."

Then after some heavily jocose remarks about how difficult it was to get sailors out of a gin mill, he summoned the drinkers from the back room to hear his plea for Cuba. It was a perfunctory effort, and when he was finished, nobody reached for his pocketbook.

The party members who parade and shout slogans and carry banners and attend these morose little meetings do not greatly concern the FBI. The Bureau knows who they are and what they are doing; their activities, though designed to stir up strife and thwart U.S. policy at every turn, are for the most part futile. They are watched carefully, of course, and they would be jailed immediately if we got into war with Russia; for their goal is the same as that of Mr. Khrushchev: To overthrow the Government of the United States.

The Bureau keeps an even more watchful eye on those who quit the party. Some have truly recanted. When the FBI approaches them, they tell all they know about the party's internal operations. Others tell the FBI agents to go to hell. Some "defectors," we have learned from experience, have not abandoned their beliefs at all. They have dropped out to lie fallow for a while, seeking to purge themselves of the party taint before beginning a new career in some job where they will be able to serve the party surreptitiously or act as low-echelon spies for the Soviet Union.

These are not the dangerous ones, however, for the Soviet espionage apparatus has become far too subtle and crafty to entrust a task of vital importance to a former party member. The danger stems from professional spies, such as Col. Rudolph Abel, or the ideological supporters, such as Harry Gold, who may never have been within a mile of a party meeting. They receive their orders and transmit their intelligence through couriers, who have no contact whatever with Mr. Hall's party, or through Soviet or satellite attachés in the embassies and the U.N. Seventy percent of these "diplomats," the FBI estimates, have some espionage assignment, and keeping them under surveillance is not a simple task. Nor is it made easier by the right wing's charges that there are Communists everywhere. Such exaggeration, the FBI points out, causes excitable people to flood the Bureau with reckless and unfounded charges against anyone whose behavior seems to them suspicious. Every one of these reports must be checked out, and this work places a heavy burden on the investigative staff.

THE DANGER OF SABOTAGE

Of grave concern to the agencies charged with defending the country's security is the fact that there are still some Communists in the unions which serve sensitive industries. There is no reason to believe that Harry Bridges' Longshoremen's Union, or the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, or the United Electrical Workers, or the American Communications Association, which handles much of our diplomatic and military cable traffic, have purged themselves of their Marxist members. In time of crisis, a dedicated

Communist in any of these unions could do great damage to the country through sabotage. There is also an unrelenting campaign, guided by Moscow and supported by the Communists in the United States, to overthrow the republics of Central and South America. It is these danger areas—the threats of espionage, sobatage and subversion of the countries south of the border—which concern us most today. The Communist Party itself is dangerous only to the degree that it can serve these ends.

At the moment, its effectiveness is at a low ebb. Spurned and despised by the masses it purports to serve, hemmed in by the law, its only significance lies in the fact that it still is the willing instrument of the Soviet tyranny; and so long as the two great ideologies, democracy and communism, stand opposed, weak or strong, it will be a danger to us.

Some time ago, in a friendly greeting to the Communists of Cuba, Gus Hall wrote: "Yankee imperialism is an old, blind tiger, and the area in which it can operate grows smaller and smaller. Nevertheless, a tiger remains a tiger to the end, a deadly and dangerous beast of prey."

For "imperialism" read "communism" and you have an accurate description of Mr. Hall's party in the United States today.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the second article, entitled "The Failure of World Communism," was written by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Special Assistant to the President, and will be published this fall as a part of his book entitled "The Politics of Hope." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE FAILURE OF WORLD COMMUNISM

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.)

The autumn and winter of 1948–49 was a moment of transition in the postwar history of American liberalism—a moment when the liberal community was engaged in the double task of redefining its attitude toward the phenomenon of communism and, partly in consequence, of reconstructing the bases of liberal political philosophy.

In the years since, the process of redefinition has been completed: I believe that all American liberals recognize today that liberalism has nothing in common with communism, either as to means or as to ends.

As for the process of reconstruction, this is by its nature continuous: If liberalism should ever harden into ideology, then, like all ideologies, it would be overwhelmed by the turbulence and unpredictability of history—especially in an age when science and technology have made the velocity of history so much greater than ever before. The continuing enterprise of reconstruction has consequently brought new phases of liberal thought to the forefront in the past 13 years.

IDEALISM BETRAYED

So far as communism is concerned, in the confused years immediately after the end of the Second World War, and in spite of Stalin's notable record in the 1930's of internal terror and international betrayal, the Soviet Union retained for some people traces of the idealistic fervor of the Russian revolution. By 1962 it seems safe to say that postwar Soviet policy has extinguished any remaining elements of idealism in the Communist appeal. No one with any knowledge of history can believe in the Soviet Union on the supposition that Communist victory would usher in a generous and beneficent society. Where people believe in the Soviet Union today, it is on quite other grounds: It is basically because they are persuaded that, whether they like it or not, communism is going to win, and that they had therefore better make their terms with a Communist world. The essence of contemporary Soviet policy is to enhance this impression of the inevitability of Communist triumph, to employ every resource of science and politics to identify communism with the future and to convince people everywhere that they must accept the necessity of communism or face the certainty of obliteration. They have addressed this policy especially to the southern half of the world, where the awakening of underdeveloped countries from centuries of oblivion is discharging new and incalculable energies into human society.

OBSOLESCENCE OF COMMUNISM

The irony is that the very eagerness with which intellectuals in emergent nations often embrace communism itself suggests that communism is not the wave of the future and is, if it is anything, a passing stage to which some may temporarily turn in the quest for modernity. Where Marx portrayed communism as the fulfillment of the process of modernization, history seems abundantly to show that, if the world avoids thermonuclear suicide, the modernization process, contrary to Marxist prophecy, will vindicate the mixed society and render communism obsolete.

The Marxist contention has been (a) that capitalism is the predestined casualty of the modernization process and (b) that communism is its predestined culmination. In these terms communism has boasted the certification of history. But history quite plainly refutes the Communist case. It shows (a) that the mixed society, as it modernizes itself, can overcome the internal contradictions which in Marx's view doomed it to destruction and (b) that communism is historically a function of the prefatory rather than the concluding stages of the modernization process.

Marx rested his case for the inevitability of Communist triumph on the theory that capitalism contained the seeds of its own destruction. He argued that the capitalist economy generated inexorable inner tendencies—"contradictions"—which would infallibly bring about its downfall. One inexorable tendency was the increasing wealth of the rich and the increasing poverty of the poor. Another was the increasing frequency and severity of economic crisis. Together these tendencies would infallibly carry society to a point of revolutionary "ripeness" when the proletariat would rise in its wrath, overthrow the possessing classes and install a classless society. Marx saw no way of denying this process, because that capitalist state could never be anything but the executive committee of the capitalist class.

This was Marx's fatal error. The capitalist state in developed societies, far from being the helpless instrument of the possessing class, has become the means by which other groups in society have redressed the balance of social power against those whom Hamilton called the rich and well born. This has been true in the United States, for example, since the age of Jackson. The liberal democratic state has accomplished two things in particular. It has brought about a redistribution of wealth which has defeated Marx's prediction of progressive immiserization, and it has brought about an economic stabilization which has defeated Marx's prediction of ever-worsening economic crisis. What the democratic parties of the developed nations have done, in short, has been to use the state to force capitalism to do what both the classical capitalists and the classical Marxists declared was impossible: to control the business cycle and to reapportion income in favor of those whom Jackson called the humble members of society.

THE TRIUMPH OF LIBERALISM

The champions of the affirmative state, in their determination to avert Marxist revolution, had to fight conservatism at every step along the way. Nonetheless, they persevered; and the 20th century in America and Great Britain saw the rejection of laissez-faire, the subjugation of the business cycle, the drowning of revolution in a torrent of consumer goods and the establishment of the affluent society. The revolutionary fires within capitalism, lighted by the great industrialists in the 19th century, were put out in the 20th by the triumphs of industry—and by the liberal politicians, by Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Such men ignored the dogmatists, the philosophers of either/or, and created the mixed society. Both classical socialism and classical capitalism were products of the 19th century, and their day is over. As a result, capitalism can no longer be relied upon to dig its own grave; and communism, if it ever comes to developed countries, will come, not as a consequence of social evolution, but only on the bayonets of the Red army.

At the same time, history has thrown sharp light on the actual function of communism. Marx, regarding communism as the climax of the development process, prophesied that it would come first in the most developed nations. On the contrary, it has come to nations in the early phases of development, like Russia and China; and it has appealed to activists in such nations precisely because they see it as the means of rapid and effective modernization. Instead of being the culmination of the modernization effort, communism would seem to be a form of social organization to which some countries aspiring to development have resorted in the hope of speeding the pace of modernization. We do not know what will happen to communism in a Communist state which achieves full development; but, if it should then survive in anything like its present form, it would be because of the efficiency of its apparatus of control and terror, not because it is the natural organizational expression of the institutions of affluence.

History thus shows plainly that communism is not the form of social organization toward which all societies are irresistibly evolving. Rather it is a phenomenon of the transition from stagnation to development, a disease (in Walt Rostow's phrase) of the modernization process. Democratic, regulated capitalism—the mixed society—will be far more capable of coping with the long-term consequences of modernization. "The wave of the future," Walter Lippmann has well said, "is not Communist domination of the world. The wave of the future is social reform and social revolution driving us toward the goal of national independence and equality of personal status."

AFFLUENCE IS NOT ENOUGH

If this is so, it emphasizes more than ever the need to keep abreast of history in our own social ideas and programs. We are all indebted to J. K. Galbraith for his demonstration that the affluent society compels a sweeping reconsideration of social and economic policies. The problems of the New Deal were essentially quantitative—problems of meeting stark human needs for food, clothing, shelter, and employment. Most of these needs are now effectively met for most Americans; but a sense of spiritual disquietude remains nevertheless. A full dinner pail turns out to be something less than the promised land. The final lesson of the affluent society is surely that affluence is not enough—that solving the quantitative problems of living only increases the importance of the quality of the life lived. These qualitative problems seem next on the American agenda.

The qualitative aspects of life are only marginally within the reach of government. Yet public policy surely has its contribution to make to the elevation of American civilization. "The great object of the institution

of civil government," said John Quincy Adams in his first message to Congress, "is the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact, and no government, in whatever form constituted, can accomplish the lawful end of its institution but in proportion as it improves the condition of those over whom it is established. Moral, political, intellectual improvement are duties assigned by the Author of Our Existence to social no less than to individual man. For the fulfillment of those duties governments are invested with power, and to the attainment of the end—the progressive improvement of the condition of the governed—the exercise of delegated powers is a duty as sacred and indispensable as the usurpation of powers not granted is criminal and odious."

A central issue of contemporary domestic polity is a variation on the question which concerned Adams—that is, the question of the balance between the amount of our national wealth we reserve for private satisfaction and the amount we dedicate to public need. In the thirties "recovery" was the catchword of our national economic philosophy; in the forties, "full employment"; in the fifties, "economic growth"; in the future it is likely to become "allocation of resources." No one would argue that steering more resources into the public sector would cure the spiritual ailments of the affluent society; but it seems possible that the resulting improvements in opportunities in education, medical care, social welfare, community planning, culture, and the arts will improve the chances for the individual to win his own spiritual fulfillment.

THE TROUBLE WITH IDEOLOGY

The impending shift from quantitative to qualitative liberalism emphasizes once again the hazards involved in the degeneration of liberalism into ideology. By tradition American liberalism is humane, experimental, and pragmatic; it has no sense of messianic mission and no faith that all problems have final solutions. It assumes that freedom implies conflict. It agrees with Madison, in the 10th Federalist, that the competition among economic interests is inherent in a free society. It also agrees with George Bancroft, who wrote: "The feud between the capitalist and laborer, the house of have and the house of want, is as old as social union and can never be entirely quieted; but he who will act with moderation, prefer fact to theory, and remember that everything in the world is relative and not absolute, will see that the violence of the contest may be stilled."

Its empirical temper means that American liberalism stands in sharp contrast to the millennial nostalgia which still characterizes both the American right and the European left—the notion that the day will come when all conflict will pass, when Satan will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and mankind will behold a new heaven and a new earth. José Figueres, the Latin American patriot, calls his finca in the Costa Rican uplands "La Lucha San Fin"—the struggle without end. Freedom is inseparable from struggle; and freedom, as Brandeis said, is the great developer; it is both the means employed and the end attained. This, I believe, states the essence of the progressive hope—this and the understanding that the struggle itself offers not only better opportunities for others but also a measure of fulfillment for oneself.

EULOGY OF SISTER MIRIAM THERESA OF MARYLHURST COLLEGE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tribute in eulogy of the late Sister Miriam Theresa, of Marylhurst College, prepared by the distinguished senior Senator of Oregon [Mr. MORSE], be printed at this point in my remarks, together with a tribute to Sister Miriam Theresa delivered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Oregon on July 28, 1959.

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

A TRIBUTE TO SISTER MIRIAM THERESA

(Prepared by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon)

In Oregon, yesterday, funeral services were held for an honored pioneer worker in the field of minimum wage legislation. Sister Miriam Theresa, of the Sisters of the Holy Names Order, in 1913, almost 50 years ago, when she was Miss Caroline J. Gleason, saw her efforts for social justice for working women and children in my State brought to a triumphant climax through the enactment by the State of Oregon of the first enforcible wage-hour law in the Nation.

I am deeply proud that I had the honor of knowing and talking with this great lady. Her life both before and subsequent to her entrance into her order gives witness to all of us that it is the human values which count and that the great spiritual teachings are symbolized by dedication such as hers to these values.

On July 28, 1959, on the floor of the Senate, I had occasion to pay to this wonderful woman tribute for her services to humanity. As I did so, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] joined with me in honoring her for her patient, faithful and honest work. It can truly be said that the work of Sister Miriam Theresa in Oregon was the foundation of the development of minimum wage laws in other States and a notable forerunner of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act.

For each of us there will come a time when the account books are closed and the balance is struck. Insofar as mortal judgment can tell, a life such as that of Sister Miriam Theresa, which was an inspiration to her contemporaries, will rank equally high with that of other dedicated pioneers in the field of social justice in the long chronicle of historic achievement. It is not true to say that she will be missed, because the light she has given to so many will keep her constantly with us.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1959]

SISTER MIRIAM THERESA AND OREGON'S WAGE-HOUR LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most wonderful women in my State is Sister Miriam Theresa. There recently appeared in the Oregon Labor Press a very beautiful tribue to the great pioneer work she did 46 years ago in connection with the passage of the first minimum-wage law in the United States.

Mr. President, the article starts out by stating that—

"Forty-six years ago—in 1913—Oregon became the first State to enact an enforcible wage-hour law to protect women and minors who work for a living. Oregonians are proud of this distinction. But few of them know the erect and graceful woman who, more than any other individual, was responsible for it.

"Her name then was Miss Caroline J. Gleason. Her name today is Sister Miriam Theresa. She is head of the department of social sciences at Marylhurst College, on the west bank of the Willamette River, near Portland."

It may be of interest to the Senate to note that in the course of this article there is this paragraph:

"The validity of her work was proved when an employer challenged the new law in the courts. (The employer was the owner of the paper box factory where Miss Gleason took her first industrial job.)"

In fact, Mr. President, the article is entitled, "She Worked in Sweatshops To Win Oregon Wage Law."

The article goes on to say:

"A brilliant young lawyer named Louis Brandeis came out from the East to volunteer his services in defense of the law. Brandeis used Caroline Gleason's survey as a basis of his defense before the State supreme court. He won. The court upheld the law.

"Both Louis Brandeis and the Oregon wage-hour law went on up to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court upheld the law's constitutionality. And Brandeis later became one of the great liberal Justices of the highest Court in the land."

Mr. President, as the senior Senator from Oregon, I am proud to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article about Sister Theresa. I do it as a way of paying my very high tribute and my sense of great obligation to this wonderful woman who recognizes that, after all, it is human values that count and great spiritual teachings are symbolized by such dedication to human values.

The article she is writing for the Oregon Historical Society on the background of Oregon's pioneer minimum-wage law is eagerly awaited by all of us who are interested in this matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was very much impressed with the statement of the Senator from Oregon because it happened that as a young instructor, almost 43 years ago, I went to the State of Oregon and took part in the second rulings of the minimum-wage commission in the State of Oregon. Miss Gleason had just left and had entered the sisterhood, of which she is now a most eminent member. They missed her very much, but her work lived after her.

At that time the chairman of the commission was the Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, who later became a bishop in the Catholic Church. Bishop O'Hara and I had a most happy relationship together. We were successful in increasing the minimum wage for women, and it was really one of the experiences of my life which I think helped to develop me more than anything else. I am very happy to know that Sister Miriam Theresa is still living and that she is teaching. I think the whole country is indebted to this noble woman.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for paying this public tribute to her and for bringing the attention of the Nation to this patient, faithful, honest work which the then Miss Gleason did under the leadership of Father Edwin V. O'Hara.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the comments of the Senator from Illinois.

I am glad the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made reference to the part he played in the development of the Oregon minimum-wage law, because one of the reasons he is beloved in the State of Oregon goes back to that work and to his work when he was at Reed College in our State. He contributed to the development of what has become known as the Oregon system or the Oregon idea.

Mr. President, this work of Sister Theresa really was the forerunner and the foundation for the development of minimum-wage laws in other States and ultimately for the development of a Federal Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. In fact, Sister Theresa is quoted in the article as saying, "Looking back to 1912, I never, never dreamed that I would live to see a Federal minimum-wage law."

I close my remarks about Sister Theresa's great work in the field of fair labor standards, more commonly known as minimum-wage laws, by saying that the best tribute which can be paid to this noble woman is for us to make sure, before adjournment this summer, that we improve the Federal minimum-wage law to which she refers in the article by the adoption of a series of much-needed amendments.

As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], who is sitting in the Chamber, well knows, we are in the process, within the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of seeking to reach an agreement which will make it possible for us to bring before the Senate minimum-wage amendments which are worthy of the name. I am not at all interested, as a member of that committee, Mr. President, in voting for empty gestures in the committee, because we would not be paying tribute to the noble work of Sister Theresa if we did not accomplish something in 1959, considering all the background of experience and data now existing which she did not have when she pioneered in this field. We would not be paying fitting tribute to her if we did not bring before the Senate, before we adjourn, some long-overdue minimum-wage law amendments.

I wish to say to the people of the State of Oregon and to Sister Theresa that, so far as I am concerned, I intend to continue to do what I can to bring before the Senate some minimum-wage law amendments which will apply the social justice for which Sister Theresa fought in 1913 for the women in the State of Oregon to all workers in the United States who can possibly under law qualify for Federal minimum-wage protection, because, in my judgment, as a matter of social justice we cannot justify exemptions to a Federal minimum-wage law. We cannot justify as a matter of social justice exempting from this code of social justice in 1959 any group of workers, whether they be laundry workers, hotel workers, telephone workers, or any of the other groups of workers which selfish interests in this country would have us continue to exempt.

Mr. President, we shall bring before the Senate a bill which will still continue some exemptions, because the legislative process is what it is, but I am very hopeful we will at least report to the Senate within the next few days a bill which will cut down the exemptions and which will extend coverage to many millions of workers who today are being put upon by selfish interests and who are being required to work for less than a wage of health and decency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the article from the Oregon Labor Press of July 24, 1959, to which I have referred regarding Sister Theresa.

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

"SISTER MIRIAM THERESA: SHE WORKED IN SWEATSHOPS TO WIN OREGON WAGE LAW

"(By Emsie Howard)

"Forty-six years ago—in 1913—Oregon became the first State to enact an enforcible wage-hour law to protect women and minors who work for a living. Oregonians are proud of this distinction. But few of them know the erect and graceful woman who, more than any other individual, was responsible for it.

"Her name then was Miss Caroline J. Gleason. Her name today is Sister Miriam Theresa. She is head of the department of social sciences at Marylhurst College, on the west bank of the Willamette River near Portland.

"Sister Miriam Theresa's eyes are full of wisdom and kindness. And these eyes twinkle with merriment when she recalls some of the methods she used almost half a century ago to achieve her goals of social justice for women workers.

"Looking back to 1912 she says, 'I never, never dreamed that I would live to see a Federal minimum-wage law.'

"It was in 1912 that Miss Gleason directed a survey of the wages and working conditions of women working in Oregon stores, factories, canneries, and industrial plants.

"To assure the accuracy of the survey, she herself went to work in some of the worst factories. This took courage. The work was hard and dirty—and many employers considered her an enemy and a spy.

"Miss Gleason was appointed to make the survey by the Oregon Consumers' League, a group of citizens struggling to bring some kind of social justice to women who were being cruelly exploited in factories and stores. She herself was a member of the league's board of directors. When the challenge came to make the pioneering survey, she did not refuse.

"The completed survey was so devastating, so accurate, so appalling that the 1913 session of the legislature passed Oregon's first wage-hour law.

"The law established the industrial welfare commission and made it unlawful to pay women wages lower than those needed to maintain decent standards of health. It gave the commission authority to set those standards and to set a maximum workweek for women.

"The first weekly minimum was set by the commission at $8.25 for a 54-hour week—slightly less than 16 cents an hour.

"Sister Miriam Theresa recalls that organized labor opposed the law, fearing that it would hamper the growth of unions.

"The wage-hour bill was introduced on the opening day of the 1913 legislative session. Employers descended on the legislature to lobby vigorously against this outrageous, socialistic measure.

"'It will drive industry from the State. * * * It will reduce the wages of men. * * * It will throw women out of work because, if they are forced to pay higher wages, employers won't hire so many women.' These were some of their arguments.

"Hot on their heels to lobby just as vigorously, but more effectively, came Caroline Gleason.

"Employers were claiming that the conditions revealed in her survey simply do not exist.

"Miss Gleason quietly replied: 'If you would like the names and addresses of the firms where these conditions prevail, I shall be glad to give them to you.'

"Silence. No one asked for the names.

"Miss Gleason had the facts. She got them the hard way. She had worked in the plants.

"Her first job during the survey was in a paper box factory in Portland. Sister Miriam Theresa remembers:

"'Our job was to paste labels on the ends of shoeboxes. We sat at a long table with a huge gluepot in the center. A gas jet burned under the pot to heat the glue. The resulting odors were something less than pleasant.

"'After two or three labels our hands were covered with glue and had to be washed. But there was no hot water. We carried 5-gallon pails to another part of the plant where live steam was pouring from a pipe. We held our pails under the pipe until the steam had heated the water.

"'You must remember that this was piecework and all these preparations took time. In 3 days I earned $1.52.'

"During her lunch hour Miss Gleason wandered casually through the plant to observe the appallingly unsanitary conditions and fire hazards.

"This was the way the survey was made. This was how Oregon's pioneering wage-hour law was born.

"Caroline Gleason was well equipped to direct the survey. A graduate of the University of Minnesota, she came to Oregon in 1908 to teach Latin and English. But her compelling interest in social conditions took her to the University of Chicago in 1910 for graduate work in social studies. This interest had been stimulated earlier by social work in Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, and other large industrial centers.

"She speaks with sincere modesty of the survey. 'Compared to the scientific methods employed in similar studies today, our survey seems a very small effort,' she says. 'But we had the facts.'

"The validity of her work was proved when an employer challenged the new law in the courts. (The employer was the owner of the paper box factory where Miss Gleason took her first industrial job.)

"A brilliant young lawyer named Louis Brandeis came out from the East to volunteer his services in defense of the law. Brandeis used Caroline Gleason's survey as a basis of his defense before the State supreme court. He won. The court upheld the law.

"Both Louis Brandeis and the Oregon wage-hour law went on up to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court upheld the law's constitutionality. And Brandeis later became one of the great liberal Justices of the highest Court in the land.

"Another notable contribution made by Miss Gleason was a housing survey in Portland. Again the Oregon Consumers League called upon her to direct the survey. She trudged on foot many miles a day to inspect the living conditions of working people. The frightful conditions disclosed in her survey resulted in a new city ordinance based on the model tenement housing law of the Housing Association of New York.

"Before this survey was completed, Miss Gleason became a Roman Catholic nun. 'I knew from the time I was a girl that some day I would enter the church,' she said. Her conviction that education of youth was one of the best means of achieving improved social conditions was decisive. In 1916 she entered the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, a teaching community.

"Sister Miriam Theresa's interests are by no means limited to the classroom. Of unions she has this to say: 'I certainly believe in the trade union philosophy. Without unions, the conditions of working people would be almost indescribable.'

"The complete background of Oregon's first minimum-wage law will be available to students when Sister Miriam Theresa finishes the article she is now writing for the Oregon Historical Society.

"It will be one of the proudest chapters in the history of our State."

PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this year, for the first time, we celebrate Police Week and in my own State of Rhode Island, this day has been proclaimed by Governor Nottee as Peace Officers' Memorial Day. It is, indeed, fitting that we pay tribute to the many brave peace officers throughout our Nation who have been killed or disabled in the line of duty. All too often we tend to take for granted the protection which our peace officers afford us. Their working conditions leave much to be desired and in all

too many instances they are badly underpaid.

As a grateful citizen, I am pleased to have this opportunity to call attention to those who have lost their lives or suffered disability in the performance of their most important duty.

THE LATE GERALD M. KERR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is with regret that I inform the Senate of the passing of a distinguished civil servant, a native of Richmond, Utah, a man widely known in the West, who faithfully served in key positions in the Federal service over the long period of 44 years.

I refer to the late Gerald M. Kerr who, until his death on Monday, was Assistant Director for Range and Forest Management of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; responsible for a program affecting 30,000 livestock ranches in the West.

Mr. Kerr, a graduate of Utah Agricultural College, now Utah State University, joined the Geological Survey in 1917. In 1934 he joined the original staff of the Grazing Service and was instrumental in the initial establishment and operation of the grazing districts under the Taylor Grazing Act.

After a period as regional supervisor of the Service at Salt Lake City, Utah, Mr. Kerr joined the headquarters staff of the Grazing Service, now the Bureau of Land Management in Washington, D.C. Over the years he served in positions of increasing scope and responsibility, leading to his appointment in 1961 as Assistant Director for Range and Forest Management in charge of conservation and land use activities on 170 millions of acres of public lands in the West.

In 1954, Mr. Kerr was granted the highest award of the Department of the Interior, its distinguished honor award, in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the management and uses of public lands.

Mr. Kerr has appeared many times as a Department witness before committees of this body.

Members of the Senate who knew Gerry Kerr will join with me in noting the passing of this good and faithful public servant, who by his work has added stature to our country's civil service, and integrity to his chosen profession in his life's work of conservation of our public lands and resources.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is House bill 10788, Calendar 1304, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Debate on that bill is subject to the unanimous-consent agreements entered into on yesterday.

The pending question is on agreeing to the Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH CARE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday a committee of physicians reported that an advertisement supporting the administration's health care program had been rejected by the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Caldwell B. Esselstyn, a member of the Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security, criticized the Journal of the American Medical Association with these words:

> This stand is consistent with the policy of protecting the American Medical Association membership from any exposure to an unemotional presentation of facts proving the necessity and the need for financing certain basic costs of the aged through social security.

Strange as it may seem, I happen to be involved in this issue, in an indirect way.

Last year, I wrote to the editors of the Journal of the American Medical Association to offer a factual article under my own byline on the program of health insurance for the elderly which would be established by the Anderson-King bill.

I have long been interested in this proposed legislation, since I was one of the early sponsors of a bill in Congress, starting in 1949, and have been every 2 years since that time, to bring persons aged 65 and older under the terms of social security for the provision of hospital and nursing home care. This has been a long-term effort of mine. Therefore, I was pleased when the Journal of the American Medical Association accepted my article. It was published in the September 9 edition of the magazine.

Today I wish to repeat my appreciation to the Journal of the American Medical Association for publishing that article. It was printed without any editing or critical comment. I was pleased that the tens of thousands of American doctors who read the Journal were given this detailed statement on the Anderson-King program.

The American Medical Association, responding to Dr. Esselstyn's complaint about the rejected advertisement, said:

> The ad was refused because it was misleading and deceptive.

The statement also denied that the Journal refused to present both sides of the issue of the Anderson-King bill, basing that denial on the fact that my article was published on September 9.

Mr. President, I would hope that my article in the Journal of the American Medical Association will not be used as a continuing excuse by the editors to close the pages of the Journal to the many physicians who support social security financing of health insurance for the elderly.

My own article, I believe, was effective. I tried to make it as effectual and objective a presentation as possible. After its publication, I received letters from many doctors throughout the Nation who reported they had not known many of the facts of the health care issue until they had read the article. Many wrote to me that they had never really known what the provisions of the Anderson-King bill are.

But that one article which I was privileged to write, and which the American Medical Association Journal published, does not justify a continuing blackout of the viewpoint which favors the Anderson-King program. This legislation is a continuing issue, under continuous discussion throughout the Nation. It deserves continuing, responsible discussion in the Journal of the American Medical Association and all other news media—I should think above all in the American Medical Association Journal.

Mr. President, a full and accurate understanding of the facts of President Kennedy's medical program, known as the Anderson-King bill, by America's physicians is important. The Journal of the American Medical Association is probably read by America's physicians more than any other publication. I may add that it is an excellent professional journal.

The Journal has its own distinct viewpoint, one of opposition to the Anderson-King bill. It is the Journal's right to express that viewpoint as effectively as it is able.

But I suggest that the Journal has a responsibility to its readers, the physicians of America—who, by the way, pay for the Journal—to give the opposite viewpoint more than just one chance of expression on its pages.

I considered the publication of my article on health care in the Journal evidence of the fairness of that magazine. I hope that the Journal's editors will reconsider the rejection of the advertisement submitted by Dr. Esselstyn's committee of doctors, who are fully accredited according to the professional standards of the American Medical Association, and thus add continuing evidence to its claim for continuing fairness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "AMA Rejects Ad for Kennedy Bill," published in the New York Times for today, Thursday, May 17, 1962, and a reprint of my article which was published in the Jour-

nal of the American Medical Association for September 9, 1961.

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

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1962]

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION REJECTS AD FOR KENNEDY BILL—PHYSICIANS' GROUP PROTESTS—PRESIDENT DETERMINED

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—A group of physicians charged today that the Journal of the American Medical Association had refused to run their advertisement supporting the Kennedy medical-care-for-the-aged program.

The charge was made by the Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security, which is actively supporting the administration bill. The American Medical Association opposes the proposed legislation.

Meanwhile, there was new evidence today that President Kennedy planned to press hard for passage of the King-Anderson bill this year.

"I want to tell you the President has the bit in his mouth about medicare," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, said after a White House meeting today.

Mr. HUMPHREY said that Mr. Kennedy was "kindly and soft hearted" on the steel price case "compared with his determination to get action on the medical care program."

If the House committee fails to act, the Senator said, a Senate bill on medical care will be added to some House-passed measure to force a joint Senate-House conference.

ADVERTISEMENT REJECTED

Discussing the advertising ban, Dr. Caldwell B. Esselstyn, of Hudson, N.Y., spokesman for the committee, said the American Medical Association had refused to carry the advertisement in the Journal for June 2.

He produced a letter asserting that the Department of Advertising Evaluation of the American Medical Association had concluded that the advertisement "does not conform to our standards."

The advertisement showed a picture of Mr. Kennedy meeting with the 40 original members of the physicians' committee outside the White House this spring. It also asked for contributions to push the fight for the bill which would finance care for the aged through the social security system.

The American Medical Association in a brief statement, acknowledged that "the ad was refused because it was misleading and deceptive."

The organization denied that it had refused to present both sides of the issue. It said its Journal last September 9 published a two-page statement by Senator HUMPHREY, in support of the medical care bill.

In his protest Dr. Esselstyn said:

"This stand is consistent with the policy of protecting the American Medical Association membership from any exposure to an unemotional presentation of facts proving the necessity and the need for financing certain basic costs of the aged through social security."

Dr. Esselstyn said that the action was also consistent with the American Medical Association's stand against allowing any "voice of dissent" in the news columns of its Journal.

"We know the walls of Jericho didn't go down the first time and we'll continue to try to put the facts before the American Medical Association membership," Dr. Esselstyn said.

He said that the physicians' committee was now supported by nearly 1,000 doctors, most of them members of the American Medical Association.

[From the American Medical Association Journal, Sept. 9, 1961]

HEALTH CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senator HUMPHREY asked for an opportunity to present in the Journal his views on health care under social security. The American Medical Association disagrees with Senator HUMPHREY in principle, and specifically with many of the statements which appear in this communication. In deference to him, however, his manuscript is reproduced without critical comment or annotation.

(A summary of the testimony on the King bill, H.R. 4222, by Dr. L. W. Larson was published in the August 12, 1961, issue of the Journal.)

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

The White House Conference on the Aging was an eye opener for many of the delegates who came to Washington early this year. They learned for the first time that reasonable, responsible citizens—who are completely opposed to socialized medicine—can support social security financing of health care for elderly Americans. I want to emphasize the word "financing." As President Kennedy declared: "This is not a program of socialized medicine. It is a program of prepayment of health costs with absolute freedom of choice guaranteed. Every person will choose his own doctor and hospital."

Too often, members of the medical profession foresee bureaucratic controls and Federal redtape interfering in their freedom, lowering the high quality of medical care, and imposing dismal mediocrity on America's doctors. As I pointed out in my television debate with Dr. Edward Annis, I have a high regard for the American Medical Association and for the contributions of American medicine to the health and welfare of the American people. I know that American doctors contribute a great deal of work for which they get no compensation. Therefore, I have been deeply concerned about the widespread misunderstanding that I have encountered among my friends in the medical profession on the subject of social security financing of health care for aged people.

I give full credit to the wonders of modern medical science and to the medical profession for the startling increases in the proportion of our population over 65 years of age. We now have about 17 million Americans over 65, and by 1970 this number may reach 20 million. These elderly people spend twice as many days a year in hospitals and have 2 to 3 times as great an incidence of illness as the rest of the population. Less than half have any kind of health insurance.

What about the Kerr-Mills program? Doesn't it meet the need of low-income elderly people for health insurance? This program increases Federal payments to the States to expand existing public assistance medical care programs, and it sets up a new program, authorizing Federal payments on a matching (formula) basis to the States, to help people over 65 who cannot afford adequate medical care, even though they are not on the public relief rolls. There is no limit on the Federal liability under the Kerr-Mills program. If all the States took advantage of this law, the cost to the Federal Government would go sky high—and it would all come out of general taxes, out of the Federal budget. This is the worst kind of fiscal irresponsibility. Furthermore, the Kerr-Mills program fails to include the vitally important principle of freedom of choice, a principle I supported last year during the debate on this program. The Senate adopted my freedom of choice proposal this year, but, unfortunately, the joint Senate-House conference committee dropped this amendment to the Kerr-Mills program. I might add that the freedom of choice protection for doctor and patient is specifically included in our social security health care program. The Federal Government puts up 50 to 80 percent of the money under the Kerr-Mills Federal-State program. Even with this inducement, the program has stalled because most States simply cannot afford this added cost. They cannot or will not put up the necessary matching money.

This does not mean that I regard the Kerr-Mills program as completely useless. On the contrary, I believe it can supplement the social security health care program. If health care for the vast majority of elderly people is financed through social security, the Kerr-Mills program can be used to pay for medical services to needy people who are not eligible for social security retirement benefits.

Can private insurance solve the health cost problems of our elderly citizens? Unfortunately the answer is "no." Premium costs are high because aged people are poor health risks. Policies are often canceled, cancellable, or not available for people over 65. And for those who do have some kind of health insurance, protection is too often inadequate or hedged about with restrictive limitations. A typical health policy for a person over 65 costs $6.50 a month, but offers only $10 a day for 31 days in the hospital, a $200 maximum for surgery, and a $100 maximum for other expenses. This premium is too high for the average oldster whose monthly social security check is less than $75, and the benefits are certainly not adequate when serious, disabling, long-term illness strikes.

Let me outline the social security health care program which I am sponsoring with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON on behalf of the Kennedy administration. This program will provide hospitalization, nursing home, and home nursing services to the 14 million men and women aged 65 and over who are receiving social security retirement benefits. The plan includes hospital outpatient diagnostic services, but it does not pay for physicians' services in the home or office, and it does not include fees for surgery. A hospital patient could get up to 90 days of hospital care for each illness, but he would have to pay $10 a day for the first 9 days, with a minimum payment of $20. Skilled nursing home services—up to 180 days—would be available after a patient is discharged from a hospital, and up to 240 days of visiting nursing services in the home. There is a maximum of 150 units of benefits with 1 unit equal to 1 day of hospital care, 2 days of nursing home care, and 2⅔ days of home care. This legislation establishes the policy that less expensive nursing home and home care services shall be utilized whenever possible in lieu of hospitalization.

To reassure those who fear Federal controls, I want to quote from the opening statement of our proposal, where we state that these health benefits will be provided to elderly people "in a manner consistent with the dignity and self-respect of each individual without interfering in any way with the free choice of physicians or other health personnel or facilities by the individual, without the exercise of any Federal supervision or control over the practice of medicine by any doctor or over the manner in which medical services are provided by any hospital."

If the burden of hospital expenses is eased for our elderly citizens, I am convinced that they will be in a better position to pay the remaining expenses of doctors' fees for consultation, diagnosis, treatment, or surgery. Thus, social security financing for hospitalization and related services will improve the prospects for payments to physicians and will virtually eliminate the need for unpaid

charity care of elderly people by America's doctors.

How will we pay for these health benefits? The same way we pay for social security retirement benefits. We will use the time-tested, proven principles of social insurance to spread the costs of retirement benefits over the citizens' working, earning years. Congress has been scrupulously careful to keep payments for social security benefits in line with income of the social security trust fund over the past 25 years. Here is what Mr. Marion S. Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, said last August about the social security system:

"The record of Congress in the past 25 years in maintaining the system on a sound basis has been good. The latest estimates indicate that the present system is, for all practical purposes, on a sound actuarial basis. That is to say, the cost of benefits now provided as projected ahead over a long period of years is about in balance with contributions as presently scheduled and likewise projected."

Thus, we have already the records, the statistics, the administrative know-how, and the trained personnel to set up the health insurance program under social security without great expansion of administrative costs. These costs come to less than 2 percent of the present social security program. Private insurance carriers are fortunate if administrative costs are as low as 5 percent, and they often reach 10 or 20 percent of benefit payments.

We propose to raise the base income in which social security taxes are paid from $4,800 to $5,000. Furthermore, we propose to increase the tax rate paid by employers and employees by one-quarter of 1 percent, raising the total payroll contribution by one-half of 1 percent. Self-employed people covered by social security would pay only three-eighths of 1 percent. These two changes will bring $1,500 million a year into the trust fund. With these two small changes, the social security trust fund will be actuarially sound. There is no danger that outgo will exceed income. We have carefully limited and delayed benefits to make sure that this program will be properly financed with an adequate reserve on sound insurance principles.

This program will lift an enormous burden from private commercial and nonprofit insurance plans and enable them to provide health insurance for younger people with lower health risks at lower cost. Furthermore, local welfare agencies, hospitals, and private charities—not to mention doctors—now providing so much free service for elderly people will also be relieved of serious financial sacrifices. If the major costs of hospitalization and nursing home care are met by social insurance, these elderly people will be in a better position to meet necessary costs of physicians' services. Similarly, the Federal Government, which now spends more than a third of a million dollars a year on health care for the aged under public assistance and veterans' programs, would save substantial sums from its general tax revenues.

I hope that I have made it clear that a program of health benefits for the elderly is not socialized medicine. Our proposal for social security financing of these benefits is designed to minimize the need for unpaid charity by putting the major costs of health care for the elderly within a soundly financed, proven social insurance program. By so doing, we will enhance the dignity and freedom of America's medical profession.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Senator from Minnesota seen the advertisement referred to?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; but it is discussed in the article.

Mr. CURTIS. But the Senator from Minnesota has not seen the advertisement, then?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I have not.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator from Minnesota believe that any publication should be compelled to publish an advertisement which, in the opinion of the editors of that publication, is misleading?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that my plea to the Journal is that the doctors who are members of its own association and who pay for the Journal should be given an opportunity to have their point of view presented. The doctors who have prepared this advertisement are accredited, respectable, honorable, outstanding members of the medical profession; and I cannot believe that they would be any more deceptive in their advertisement than they would in their practice of medicine; and in their practice of medicine they are very honorable.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not suggesting that they were willfully deceptive. My question is, Should this publication be compelled to publish an advertisement if the editors of the publication are of the opinion that the advertisement is misleading?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, they should not; if the advertisement is misleading, of course it should not be published in any publication. As a matter of fact, if it is misleading, the Federal Trade Commission should examine it, just as it does all other advertisements that are believed to be misleading. But the question of whether an advertisement is misleading can be determined only by application of the professional and scientific standards on the part of those who prepared the advertisement and on the part of those who then are asked to accept the advertisement, and, finally, by an instrumentality of the Government of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Senator from Minnesota suggesting censorship of advertisements?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly I am not. However, I am suggesting that honor and truth in advertising have been established by the Congress, by public law; and every day of the week the Federal Trade Commission examines to determine whether the public is being deceived by improper advertising.

I do not believe in public censorship, or private censorship, either.

Mr. CURTIS. But should not the publication determine, before the advertisement is published, whether it is misleading?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The publication has a right to determine whether the advertisement is misleading; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. And it also has a right to turn it down, does it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, to turn it down.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is a very fine publication; and the doctors who are members of the association, and who prepared the advertisement, are very outstanding men; and my point is that I believe that, in fairness, the Journal should publish the advertisement.

I am not suggesting that there be forced or required publication or censorship, either public or private; but I do not want word to get out that the Journal of the American Medical Association is unfair—because I do not think it is. I want that made quite clear; and I also want it made quite clear that when the American Medical Association Journal accepted my article, it made no complaint, it made no criticism, and it did no editing. But I feel that the views of members of the American Medical Association might carry more weight on such matters than the views of a Member of the Senate; and my plea to the American Medical Association Journal is to reconsider; my plea is that it will do no harm, and may help establish for the Journal a continuing reputation for complete fairness; and I am of the opinion that it will do a great deal to prove to the public that the Americal Medical Association and its Journal are taking an objective view of this issue.

I may state here that the editors of the Journal are certainly entitled to express their own view as vigorously and as effectively as they can—and their view is one of opposition. But I hope they will permit freedom of expression on the pages of their Journal.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment sponsored by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. President, if the Congress of the United States is to embark upon a program of special protection for one agricultural industry, cotton, it behooves the Congress to consider other farm industries similarly hurt by unfair competition from abroad.

The Mundt amendment would require the executive branch to invoke the same protectionism in regard to American beef and beef products, pork and pork products, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, fresh and frozen lamb, timber, and timber products, as the President invokes with regard to American cotton.

In the case of cotton, the pending bill empowers the President to negotiate trade agreements with cotton exporting countries who are not now parties to the 19-nation cotton-textile agreement.

It is a protectionist remedy, one which gives the President carte blanche power

to deal with imports from certain countries which our cotton interests fear could flood the U.S. market and further depress our cotton industry.

The Mundt amendment provides that no cotton agreements shall go into effect until the President has negotiated agreements with foreign nations limiting in like manner their exports to the United States of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, timber and timber products.

I understand the amendment has just been modified to include a provision stating in effect that if the President does negotiate in a bona fide manner, but still is unable to reach an agreement, the textile agreement can go into effect.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Or if the President makes a finding that imports of such commodities do not seriously affect producers, then the cotton agreement may go into effect.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, this amendment does not prohibit imports of the enumerated farm commodities. It only gives to the President the power to reach an agreement with foreign exporting nations on these additional products which will prevent the destruction of our American farmers.

Members of Congress are keenly aware of the plight of cotton growers and textile producers in our Nation. It has been one contributing cause of our persisting high unemployment.

Certainly, I am in agreement with the general proposition that our first duty as a nation is to our domestic industries and to our American workers.

H.R. 10788 is in accord with that principle, but it is limited only to cotton, whereas other agricultural industries in different parts of the country are today facing a similar predicament.

Let us extend the same protectionist features provided for cotton to these other hard-hit farm industries.

In Hawaii, the people of our State face special problems in regard to foodstuffs as well as to all consumer products, for we import two-thirds of the food we eat and more than 90 percent of all other consumer goods.

We are heavily dependent on imports from the mainland and from abroad.

We are seeking to reduce our dependence upon outside products in regard to basic foodstuffs, so that our people will not suffer whenever our sources of supply are denied us through shipping tieups or through some other emergency.

We are increasing our truck-farm products. We are trying to build our beef cattle industry, to build up our poultry and poultry products industries, to build our pork and our lamb industries, to build up our dairy industry.

Beset by high costs because feedstuffs must be imported, these industries face further difficulties stemming from low-cost foreign competition.

There is some question whether some of Hawaii's domestic farm industries can continue to survive in the face of such competition.

In the case of beef, for example, the national figures show in 1958, total imports of beef and beef products constituted 8.6 percent of total beef and veal production. In 1959, these total imports again were 8.6 percent. In 1960, they declined somewhat to 5.9 percent; and in 1961, they were 7.9 percent.

In Hawaii, the sale of foreign beef within the past 5 years has increased from slightly less than 5 percent of all the beef sold in Hawaii to approximately 25 percent. In other words, the importation of foreign beef into the State of Hawaii is more than 300 percent greater than the national average of 7.9 percent.

So alarming is Hawaii's domestic beef situation that the Legislature of the State of Hawaii in April of this year adopted a concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to instigate a Federal study on imports of foreign beef and to consider imposing a quota on beef imports. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Hawaii State Legislature's resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to ask for a further study of the problem of foreign beef importation

Whereas the increased importation of foreign frozen beef has been causing undue hardships to cattlemen in Hawaii who must compete with foreign beef not measured or regulated according to U.S. standards; and

Whereas Honolulu, Hawaii, the closest and highest priced American port, is the favorite market for "down-under" beef; and

Whereas in 1960, 24 percent of Hawaii's market supply came from "down-under," compared to only 1.7 percent for the entire United States; and

Whereas a certain limited amount of foreign beef in the Hawaiian market is welcomed, but sale of such beef within the past 5 years has increased from slightly less than 5 percent to approximately 25 percent, and if this trend is allowed to continue, the cattle industry in Hawaii will soon be thoroughly ruined; and

Whereas Hawaii's cattle industry is an important part of the island economy, it is of vital necessity that it be preserved, not only to help stabilize the general economy, but to insure local self-sufficiency of beef as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the first State legislature, budget session of 1962 (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to ask an appropriate department of the Federal Government to give further study to the importation of foreign beef to the United States ports and to consider the advisability of imposing a quota on the importation of beef, equal in total to the present importation level, with periodic adjustments therein to be determined; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG and the Honorable OREN E. LONG, Senators to Congress from Hawaii, and to Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, Representative to Congress from Hawaii.

W. H. HILL,
President of the Senate.
JAMES H. KAMO,
Clerk of the Senate.
ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
——— ———,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the heart of the resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the increased importation of foreign frozen beef has been causing undue hardships to cattlemen in Hawaii who must compete with foreign beef not measured or regulated according to U.S. standards; and

Whereas Honolulu, Hawaii, the closest and highest priced American port, is the favorite market for "down-under" beef; and

Whereas in 1960, 24 percent of Hawaii's market supply came from "down-under," compared to only 1.7 percent for the entire United States; and—

Mr. President, "down-under" refers to New Zealand and Australia—

Whereas a certain limited amount of foreign beef in the Hawaiian market is welcomed, but sale of such beef within the past 5 years has increased from slightly less than 5 percent to approximately 25 percent, and if this trend is allowed to continue, the cattle industry in Hawaii will soon be thoroughly ruined; and

Whereas Hawaii's cattle industry is an important part of the island economy, it is of vital necessity that it be preserved, not only to help stabilize the general economy, but to insure local self-sufficiency of beef as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the first State legislature, budget session of 1962 (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to ask an appropriate department of the Federal Government to give further study to the importation of foreign beef to the U.S. ports and to consider the advisability of imposing a quota on the importation of beef, equal in total to the present importation level, with periodic adjustments therein to be determined. * * *

It is a little-known fact outside of Hawaii that our beef cattle industry is a long-established one, which for more than a century has comprised an important source of meat for our dinner tables and has furnished employment and income for many Hawaii citizens.

Next to our two main farm commodities, sugar and pineapple, whose value exceeds more than $100 million a year each, beef cattle ranks as a leading agricultural industry, alternating with our dairy industry in third or fourth place. Last year beef cattle had a total retail value of $15 million. In that year 30 million pounds of beef were produced in Hawaii.

One of our fine ranches, the Parker Ranch on the Island of Hawaii, is the second largest cattle ranch in the world, covering 262,000 acres. It has the largest herd of whitefaced Herefords in the world, numbering more than 36,000 head.

Hawaii has 410 ranches, with more than a million acres in all devoted to beef production. More than 168,000 head of cattle are supported on our island ranches.

Slightly more than half of all beef consumed in Hawaii is home-produced. About 25 percent is imported from

foreign sources. The remainder is obtained from our sister States.

Mr. President, we in Hawaii are doing our best to cope with a difficult food supply situation. We are trying to devise means to protect the needs of consumers, workers, producers, and processors in Hawaii and to obtain a better balance between local supplies and local demand.

Consumers need protection not only regarding the price of beef, lamb, pork, poultry, and dairy products, but also regarding a dependable supply of these foods. Our workers need protection so that they may have jobs on farms, ranches, in processing plants, and all the related fields of employment. Our industries need protection so that they may provide jobs.

But, the sovereign State of Hawaii cannot, without Federal legislation and technical assistance of Federal agencies, cope with the serious problem of increasing imports of farm products from abroad.

All that we supporters of the Mundt amendment are asking is that the protection extended to cotton be extended similarly to livestock, poultry, and timber, which are important industries in various parts of our Nation.

Certainly, livestock, poultry, and timber are basic industries in the U.S. economy, employing thousands of people and feeding and sheltering millions of Americans.

In the case of Hawaii, our only Island State, we have a particular and urgent need to expand and strengthen our agricultural production and employment, which are fundamental to a stable and healthy economy.

The Mundt amendment will materially aid our statewide efforts to develop and diversify our farm economy. I therefore ask the adoption of the Mundt amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield some time to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. CURTIS. Five minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Hawaii for a clear and forceful statement. His is a viewpoint which is taken in the interest of our country and all the States thereof.

I also congratulate and commend my distinguished colleague [Mr. HRUSKA] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for proposing their amendment and for the leadership they have given to it.

Mr. President, the production of food is something that, in the main, should be encouraged near the point of consumption. Our country can relieve starvation in far places by shipping food there, but it is cumbersome, costly, and oftentime involves deterioration of food. Every country of the world should be encouraged to be self-sufficient in the production of food.

Imports of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products have not only been too great—they have been on the increase. This is true when there is a general policy of curtailment on the part of American agriculture imposed by the Government. While this curtailment in acreage has been related to grains, cotton, and like crops, nevertheless the program of land retirement, at a cost of millions of dollars, has been aimed at the reduction of the supply of agricultural products in this country.

How can we justify the Government of the United States paying millions of dollars to prevent the production of food in this country and then not turning a hand to prevent the production of food outside the United States and its importation to and sale in this country?

Many of the problems of price in the entire field of agriculture could be solved, or partially solved, by a curtailing of imports. Many of the problems of the U.S. Government in discouraging production, with the great expense connected therewith, could be solved, or partially solved, by curtailing the importation of food into the United States. Why should Uncle Sam, with all his wealth, be a purchaser of food from abroad when so much of the rest of the world is hungry? We should not be importing that food into this country; we should be producing our own food. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me about 2 minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I only wish to commend the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from South Dakota for proposing their amendment. Also, I think the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has ably and eloquently stated the case.

In the first place, I see no justification whatsoever for putting cotton and textiles in a special category, and not including some other products and raw materials from farms in a category of concern. I think that is what the amendment by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] does.

Unfortunately, in the negotiations respecting the Common Market we have observed our negotiators under this administration sweep the agricultural problem under the rug, meanwhile attempting to negotiate on industrial products. It is high time that the administration realized there is a farm or agricultural situation which has to be dealt with practically and realistically.

I only wish to say, without taking more time, I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by the Senators from Nebraska and South Dakota. Again I congratulate them for offering it, and I thank them for their interest.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for offering the amendment to the proposed legislation. I think it points up a problem with which we shall be confronted as we attempt to deal with future trade programs in respect to the Common Market and other countries.

I have had grave concern, because I think we are in great danger, from an agricultural standpoint, of being outtraded in the Common Market and in other markets.

I have no criticism of the cotton people or any who have already reached international agreements, but I am concerned about the fact that there was a rather extensive round of negotiations with the Common Market representatives in Paris in January of this year.

Representatives of our State Department and other top officials of our Government were at the negotiations. They were able to negotiate agreements on cotton and some noncompetitive farm crops.

I noticed—and I say this with great regret—that at these negotiations action was deferred on feed grains and wheat, which represent a substantial part of our exports not only to the Common Market countries, but also to other countries.

It appears to me that today at least we should serve notice on the State Department and on our own negotiators that we expect them to protect the interest of agriculture as they get into future negotiations. If we do not, the farmers of this Nation may be traded down the river as the United States goes into a new trade program.

I would not for one moment wish to have anybody believe that I am not sympathetic toward a trade program with Common Market countries and with other nations. I think we must trade in the world in which we live at the present time. I am concerned, however, about some of the commodities coming into this Nation at the present time.

The Kansas Livestock Association, at its annual convention in Wichita, Kansas, recently expressed concern and adopted a resolution suggesting that every effort should be made to protect the U.S. producers against the ever-increasing imports of farm commodities, particularly livestock and livestock products, which are affecting our markets at this time.

Mr. President, there are some favorable prospects for trade with the Common Market countries, particularly in regard to cotton, as has been mentioned, and hides, skins, tallow, and certain fruits and vegetables but there are some questionable projects. These questionable projects cover items which make up approximately 30 percent of our agricultural exports. Included in the group are wheat, flour, feed grains, rice, poultry, and meat. We sold to the European Economic Community over $300 million worth of these products in 1960.

Mr. President, I think it is timely that the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is before the Senate, though I do not think it goes far enough. I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has offered an amendment which certainly is very

mild in character. It merely points up a problem which will confront the Congress and the Nation as we consider future trade programs. We must write proper trade legislation in this session of Congress, or there will be some serious effects on the agricultural production of our Nation by 1970.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding me this time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, first I wish to say that my colleague [Mr. ERVIN] asked me to express his regret that he could not be present to speak in respect to the proposed legislation this morning. I am sure Senators join me in extending sympathy to my colleague and to his family, since this morning his brother's wife is being buried in his native town. Otherwise he would be present.

Mr. President, the textile problem has been before the Senate and before the executive branch of the Government ever since I have been a Member of Congress. It is one of the problems of long standing in America. The industry is one of the largest employers of people, and it affects a great many. As a Senator pointed out yesterday, this industry is rated as the number two manufacturing defense industry of the United States, in the event there should be a war and a need to supply our troops, as well as our allies, as we supplied them in the last war.

The Pastore committee was appointed by legislation. The committee made an exhaustive study of the problems of the textile industry. That inquiry did not pertain only to cotton, but included the whole textile industry. Hearings were held in New England, all over the South, and wherever textiles were being manufactured and were a major part of the economy. I attended some of the hearings myself. All the information which could possibly be obtained was gathered. Japanese witnesses, who were interested in what might be done by legislation which would affect imports from Japan, were heard. Representatives from other nations came before the committee to be heard. New England, the South, and every other area was represented in the hearings.

After much study and many hearings the committee made a report, which was partially implemented this year and last year by agreements which were reached in Geneva, after many trips by members of the Commerce Department and of the State Department, in an endeavor to work out some kind of mutual agreement which would not upset world trade but which would at the same time protect the textile industry of the United States.

A voluntary agreement was finally reached with 18 other nations. Including the United States, 19 different countries, the major producers of textiles in the world, made the agreement.

When the negotiations started, the textile industry wished to include all textiles: wools, manmade fibers, and silk, as well as cotton. It was finally determined it would be impossible to reach an agreement on all forms of textiles, because it was difficult enough to reach an agreement on one phase of textiles.

Wool, for instance, plays an important part in the economic life of some foreign countries. I do not know of any industry in the United States which is in worse shape than the wool industry. I know of one plant owned by the Burlington Mills Corp.—the Peerless Woolen Mills plant, the largest woolen mill in the United States—which was liquidated in the last year because it could not effectively compete with foreign textiles.

I am told that the imports of woolen goods into this country now equal about 50 percent of the woolen goods consumed in the United States. The American wool industry is in serious trouble.

Manmade fibers increasingly are getting into trouble due to foreign competition.

The American Textile Institute, representatives of the Commerce Department, representatives of the State Department, and representatives of all other agencies involved, working together, found it would be impossible to negotiate an agreement on all types of textiles at one time, so it was agreed to negotiate the agreement in respect to cotton only; that is, cotton yarns, cotton fabrics, and manufactured finished cotton garments.

On a short-term basis 18 nations have entered into an agreement, which will end the latter part of this year. A 5-year agreement was negotiated which will go into effect at the end of the short-term agreement. Those agreements have been fairly well lived up to. One of the countries has considerably overshipped its agreed quota. The Department of Commerce has taken steps to see that the situation is remedied promptly. About 2 months ago one of the other nations that entered into the agreement far exceeded the amount it had agreed it would ship into this country. The Department of Commerce immediately took hold of that situation, and the goods were not even permitted to land in the United States.

The countries that signed the agreement were Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, India, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom—also representing Hong Kong—the United States, and the member states of the European Economic Community, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

Those countries produce 90 percent of the free world trade in textiles. Those agreements are now in effect. They are operating reasonably well, and will continue to operate satisfactorily.

However, very recently a problem developed which was not contemplated at the time the agreement was made. Israel, Egypt, Taiwan—that is, Formosa—and Colombia, which were never, to any extent, exporters of textiles into the United States prior to the agreement, have now become major exporters of textiles into the United States.

Some strong evidence exists that perhaps one or two of the countries that entered into the agreement, pursuant to which they promised they would not ship more than their quota into the United States, are now shipping goods to one of the countries I named, from which they are then transshipped into the United States. In other words, in the agreement we might have left the back door open. If the situation should continue, the countries that have entered into the agreement might feel that they are not being treated fairly. Their reaction could completely wreck the voluntary agreement that has now been established. All we are asking through the proposed legislation is that areas that are not covered under the voluntary agreement be brought in by law. The President has authority to negotiate with them and prevent such countries from abusing the objects sought.

I am thoroughly in sympathy with the desires of my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and other cosponsors of the amendment. I know full well that industries in their States need protection. I also know that a great many other products need protection. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the producers of wood products, whose problems have been discussed. At one time North Carolina was a large producer of plywood veneer. Importations of that particular product have almost completely wrecked that industry in North Carolina. I should be glad to support any kind of legitimate proposed legislation which would protect those people, because they need protection.

As the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] said, our farm products and other commodities will need protection, and we must see that they receive it.

North Carolina, like other States on the eastern seaboard, produces a large amount of fish meal and fish oil. Those products are of vital importance to the economies of those States. That market has been almost completely wrecked by the importation of fish meal. That is another product that we should study. There are many others.

Last week I discussed on the floor of the Senate the importation of mirrors. The mirror industry in the United States is a large one. The largest mirror factory in the United States is situated in North Carolina. A number of smaller factories producing mirrors are also located in my State. Those factories are threatened with being put completely out of business unless they get some protection in the way of tariff quotas or some similar relief later.

Mr. President, I do not think those commodities should be added to the proposed legislation now before the Senate. To add them would completely stifle the effort that is being made by the administration to take care of the one product named at this time.

I reiterate that when another measure which is appropriate is offered, I shall be glad to join my good friends in helping them to have the commodities in which they are interested added, because I know that they, too, need protection. But I do not think the amendment should be added to the present bill, because it would not help the products that Senators are trying to help, and the amendment would probably ruin the negotiations that have been carried on

and the agreements that have been entered into with respect to cotton textiles. The agreement is now already set up and is operating.

All we need to do is to close the back door, through which many of the commodities are coming in. If we do not do so, the operations of the volunteer agreements that are now covered by the Geneva agreement might be affected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. What the Senator has said would appeal to me much more if the bill related to cotton textiles, but it does not. It covers the whole gamut, because it would amend section 204. There is no provision in the bill that I can see that states anything about textiles. I know as a practical fact that the only agreements that have been negotiated relate to textiles, but the bill goes far beyond that point. It seems to me that in view of the comprehensive nature of the bill, it would be entirely proper to cover other commodities than only textiles. In fact, I believe that probably is the intention behind the amendment offered by the distinguished majority whip, which seeks to cover more than textiles.

If the bill were amended to cover textiles specifically, I would be somewhat persuaded by what the Senator from North Carolina has said. But in view of the way the bill is now drawn, so that it would cover everything that section 204 embraces, it seems to me that it would be entirely appropriate to bring in other commodities than textiles.

Mr. JORDAN. The Mundt amendment reads, in part:

Provided, however, That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities:

Negotiations for the textile agreement have been proceeding for at least 4 years. That much time has been required to bring the agreement to where it is now. If we were required to go back and negotiate with reference to all the different products now named with foreign nations, years might pass before the present agreements with the countries that are in effect and those that could be brought in under the bill which is being introduced could go into effect. During that time the countries that are now bringing into our country commodities that are not covered by the agreement could completely wreck the agreement that has already been set up. I do not wish to see the statement made, "You shall not do these things until certain other things are done."

I am fully in sympathy with the producers of beef. Incidentally, North Carolina is a large beef-producing State. We do not raise too many sheep. However, I know that those producers need protection, too. I am willing to assist in anything that can be done to see that those industries are protected, because they need protection.

I do not believe the pending bill is the one to which this amendment should be attached, because it simply would hamstring what has been done.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE Is it not fair for me to say that the Mundt amendment is punitive in nature? It says, in effect, "We realize it is true that you people have worked out a multilateral agreement, which cannot be perfected under the present language of section 204 of the act because it is not a bilateral agreement. We realize all that. We realize that you have made a great struggle for 4 years. You have made this effort and you have brought this matter to the attention of a Republican administration at first, and then later to the attention of a Democratic administration. We realize all that. Furthermore, you have not only done all that, but back in 1958 a resolution was introduced creating a committee to make a thorough study of the textile industry. You have done all that. In 1959 that committee issued a report. In 1961 it issued another report. Then still another report was issued by the committee in 1962. We realize that you went to all that trouble and what is more, you brought 19 nations together with whom you negotiated a multilateral agreement. However, we are saying to you now that you cannot do anything about it until you go out and get one of these agreements for us."

I say to the proponents of the Mundt amendment that that is unfair. If the proponents were to say, "We too have an agreement, and we want to be included," that would be another matter entirely. That would be equitable. That would be all right with us.

However, they are saying, "We realize the fact that you have a multilateral agreement, but you cannot implement that agreement so that it becomes effective, even though you represent an industry in trouble, until you go out and get one of these agreements for us also. If you do not do that for us, you cannot get the help you want, and you must be allowed to die." And we do not want to die.

If the proponents were to take the position taken by the proponents of the amendment submitted by the majority whip, which has been mentioned here earlier, and were to say, "We feel that the cattle industry is in bad shape, too, and you ought to give us a chance to try to negotiate one of these agreements for us," that would be all right. That would not stop us.

The proponents of the Mundt amendment are being somewhat punitive. I think it is absolutely unfair on their part to take that attitude. That is the fault I find with the Mundt amendment, that it is punitive. I do not believe they should do that to the textile industry.

They are saying, "We know you are in a very difficult situation with respect to textiles, and we recognize that many people have been thrown out of work, and that you went to the trouble of going to the White House, and you did all that, whereas we did not do any of that, but you can't do anything about this until you get one of these agreements for us."

We did take action 4 years ago. At that time we took the matter to President Eisenhower, and later we took it to President Kennedy. We brought representatives of industry and of labor to Washington and went to the White House. The proponents of the Mundt amendment have not done that. Now they come to the floor and say, "You cannot do this until you get an agreement for us."

How unfair can anyone be?

Mr. JORDAN. As the Senator well knows, because he conducted hearings, before any of these agreements were reached, we had reached a kind of voluntary agreement with Japan. Is that not correct?

Mr. PASTORE. We had a voluntary agreement.

Mr. JORDAN. That was prior to reaching the multilateral agreement.

Mr. PASTORE. We had reached an agreement with Japan on a 5-year basis. That was a voluntary agreement. It limited exports to this country from Japan to the tune of 235 million yards of cotton cloth. Then 2 years before the agreement expired they asked for an amendment to the agreement, and it was increased to limit exports to 247 million yards of cloth. Then the agreement ran out. That would have meant that we would have been faced with disaster if we were unable to work out some kind of agreement.

That is what we have done, Mr. President. That is all we have done. We have had to close down 800 mills in this country. Four hundred thousand people have lost their jobs. At the present time we have 2,100,000 people employed in the textile industry.

If the bill is not passed as we have presented it we will jeopardize the future of those families.

I remind Senators that I have voted for support programs in the agricultural field, for programs which meant little or nothing to the State of Rhode Island. We have been on the floor helping the interests of the States represented by the sponsors of the Mundt amendment. I ask them not to punish us today. That is what they are doing. They are punishing us today because they have not received relief. I say to them, "Go out and get your relief. I will help you get it, but do not kill us off."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that we from New England approached the former occupant of the White House, and then also the present occupant of the White House on this problem. Then we worked this matter out as a group, regardless of partisanship. This effort has been made over a number of years.

Mr. PASTORE. Since 1958. I have just said that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We went to work on that problem, because we have seen the textile industry in New England handicapped by inability to get new ma-

chinery, handicapped by foreign imports, and by lower prices. We have seen mills close down and workers lose their jobs. The bill would help the industry continue to live, at least to remain in existence.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I would like to say also that we had before our committee the largest manufacturer of woolen products in the country. These woolen people have been in our ranks, and that is why I am surprised by this move on the part of the supporters of the Mundt amendment. This manufacturer said to me, "God forbid that we should have a major conflict tomorrow and the country be compelled to call up 10 million boys and put them into the armed services of the country. If we had to do that, we wouldn't have the cloth in this country, and we would not have the machinery in this country, and we would not have the mills in this country to make the clothes and the blankets to keep these boys warm." That is how bad it is. We are trying to help that situation. We negotiated agreements with countries that are exporting 90 percent of the textile goods that come into this country. Of course, there will always be loopholes. We know that there are three or four countries that have not been brought into these agreements, because they were not exporting at the time. The minute these countries begin to export, it will throw the whole thing off, and it will become lopsided. That is why we are trying to protect the agreement, so that these other countries cannot come in through subterfuge or a loophole and take advantage of the situation. That is what we are trying to do. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Rhode Island mentioned wool. Is it not true that we worked out an agreement with Australia a number of years ago with relation to subsidies on wool that came in from Australia, so that our woolgrowers in the western part of the country would be able to compete and continue in the business of raising sheep and producing wool?

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We worked on that from the point of view of New Englanders helping the sheep-growing industry in the western part of the country. At the same time we permitted bringing in Australian wool where it was helpful to do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. We made that kind of agreement against our own self-interest, too, because domestically produced wool is more expensive by reason of the differential in the pay rates. We know that for the time being it is always a little attractive to buy cheaper. In the long run, however, what are we doing? How is anyone going to buy anything if he does not have a job? How can a man buy anything when he does not have a job that pays him something?

This is not a political question. The very genesis of the bill comes from a Republican mind. This is not a Democratic movement. The Senator who submitted the resolution was the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. He stood on the floor of the Senate with former Senator Payne, of Maine, and they suggested that perhaps I would make a good chairman of a committee to study this whole matter. That task was assigned to me. I say with considerable pride that I believe we have done a respectably good job.

We called in witnesses from every facet of the textile industry, and we listened to all of them. We went to the White House. We went to the places where the mills are located, and we talked to the workers and to management. We went to the White House to see President Eisenhower. He appointed what is known as an interagency committee. We asked him to appoint a permanent one, but he appointed an ad hoc committee. That did not work out. Then President Kennedy came into office, and we took the matter up with him. He appointed a Cabinet Committee, and it restudied the subject.

Then it was suggested that possibly it would not be right and would not be in keeping with our system to provide for mandatory quotas. He said:

> Let us try voluntary quotas.

This was done. In May 1961 he issued his seven-point program.

Among the points was point 6, which had to do with calling a conference in Geneva of all the nations in the world which were exporting textiles to the United States. We sat down with those people. We faced a hard task. Do Senators think we got the best of it? Of course we did not. We achieved a little limitation. They wanted to gage the program according to the imports of 1960, which was a bloated year. We said that that would be unfair. Finally we agreed upon fiscal year 1961. So the agreement is based on the imports of fiscal year 1961. Our industry is not happy about that. I am not particularly happy about it. Nevertheless, it is an accomplishment, and we are trying today to do what is necessary to preserve that small accomplishment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. HRUSKA addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think I have the floor; but if I have the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in commending the Senator from Rhode Island for what he accomplished as chairman of the committee. We worked, first, on a voluntary basis, because our negotiations were principally with Japan. When it was found that that arrangement would not work because of the activities of other countries, then we sought to reach a multilateral agreement in Geneva, and in accomplishing that the Senator from Rhode Island had much to do.

That agreement will not work unless we have the pending amendment agreed to today. It will mean so much for so many of our people in New England who work in the textile industry.

Mr. PASTORE. More than that, when we began this crusade—and I use the word advisedly, because it was a crusade—Japan exported 75 percent of all the textile imports into this country. But then the picture began to change, because Hong Kong came into it, and Hong Kong began to export to the United States. Japan's 75 percent of the entire quantity which came to the United States dropped to 38 percent—only in percentage; in quantity, it was even more. That gives an idea of how bad the situation became. Finally the United States became inundated with imports, and our mills began to close. Something had to be done. This is a national problem, not merely a local one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not correct to say that Hong Kong undercut Japan?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. Then the Philippines came into the picture; now Egypt has come into it. Everybody is fighting for his share of the market of the American consumers. I say "Look out; do not kill the goose that laid the golden egg."

Mr. JORDAN. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Rhode Island, because he was the chairman of the committee which conducted the hearings. Under the arrangement, Japan made a voluntary agreement with the United States that it would export to the United States so many yards of cotton cloth. As the Senator stated, the amount was later raised. What wrecked the Japanese arrangement was that although the Japanese lived up to their agreement, other nations began to ship their products to the United States. But originally, the Japanese were the principal exporters to the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but that 5-year voluntary agreement on the part of Japan expired on June 30, 1961. That is why it is necessary to enter into the agreement now proposed.

Mr. JORDAN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That is why I said the floodgates have all been opened.

Certainly the Senators from the agricultural States deserve relief and attention; but there is a way to get it. Please do not work against us.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is the point about which I wish to speak.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JORDAN. As much time as the Senator wishes.

Mr. MILLER. In response to the comments of the Senator from Rhode Island about why we from the agricultural States have not gone to the White House

to try to obtain some relief for agriculture, things are a little different today from what they were in the days when the White House was occupied by President Eisenhower. We say that the responsibility is now that of the other party, and since the administration now is under the control of the Democratic Party we expect Senators of that party to go to the White House and intercede for agriculture. We did the same thing for them with respect to textiles when President Eisenhower was in the White House.

Mr. PASTORE. Has the Senator from Iowa ever asked me to go? Let him ask me to go, and I will go.

Mr. MILLER. We expect the administration, through the Department of Agriculture, to take such action. But when we write to the Department of Agriculture and point out the impact that imports are having on domestic production, to the harm of our agricultural products, does the Senator know what response we get? We are told that the condition is not serious; therefore, we get no relief.

Mr. PASTORE. Has the President ever told the Senator that?

Mr. MILLER. We hope the Senator from Rhode Island will help us to get some action with respect to our problem, if not through the Department of Agriculture, then through the White House.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall be glad to do what I can. Only yesterday was it called to my attention for the first time.

The Senator speaks of a different occupant of the White House. Mr. Kennedy has been there only since January 1961. Do not tell me that this problem has grown up only as of then. It has been with us a long time. Where was the Senator when Mr. Eisenhower was in the White House?

Mr. MILLER. I was not even here then.

Mr. PASTORE. But the Senator's colleagues were.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa wishes the Senator from Rhode Island to know that the Senator from Iowa is in sympathy with his problem and wants to do something about it; but I point out that one reason for the Mundt amendment is that agriculture has been ignored, so far as the present administration is concerned, when it comes to the impact of imports on our surpluses.

Men who are far more expert in agriculture than I ever will be have told me that if we had not been importing such large amounts of foodstuffs from other countries, we would not have the problem of surpluses.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. I am not quarreling. I am simply asking Senators not to kill us off because they have a problem. Their action today is rather punitive. They are saying that the textile industry is in trouble; that they realize we have a multilateral agreement; but that we cannot do anything about it until we get them such an agreement. I ask, Why proceed in that way?

Mr. MILLER. With respect to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]——

Mr. PASTORE. I shall support it.

Mr. MILLER. That is exactly why I I am concerned about the situation. That amendment is meaningless because it provides, "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers." Obviously, the President has made a judgment long ago that the imports do not seriously affect domestic producers.

Mr. PASTORE. When did the President of the United States make the judgment which the Senator from Iowa just stated? Tell me the time and place of the judgment.

Mr. MILLER. The President's own Secretary of Agriculture made it.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator said the President of the United States made it. When did the President make that judgment?

Mr. MILLER. The Secretary of Agriculture speaks for the President on these questions.

Mr. PASTORE. The Secretary of Agriculture cannot speak for the President on this question, because the language provides that the President of the United States shall make the judgment. Let us not shift from one argument to another.

As I said before, the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota is a fair, frank, equitable amendment. It puts the problem right in the lap of the President of the United States, where it should be.

Mr. MILLER. I think it would be much better, more effective, and more satisfactory, if it were in the lap of Congress rather than in the lap of the President. That is the objection I have to the Humphrey amendment.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I simply wish to make a point with respect to some of the inquiries and statements made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

First, it is said that this is a crusade, that it is not a political question, that all cotton folk seek to do is to protect their gains. It is said that it is not a political question because the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] started this movement some 3 or 4 years ago. He did. All that the representatives of the so-called cotton and cotton textile States wish to do is to protect their gains; that is all, it is said.

Mr. President, all we who support the Mundt amendment seek to do it to make these gains, which are granted by the President of the United States under section 204, available to the rest of the agricultural States and agricultural sectors.

It is said that the Mundt amendment is a punitive measure; that it is obstructive and will not permit the cotton textile industry to go forward after years of negotiations in reaching the agreement to which reference is made in the original Mundt amendment. That is not true, because, as modified, there are two additional alternatives which the President may turn to in order to put the cotton textile agreement into effect. First, he can enter into similar agreements with respect to other commodities, or make a bona fide effort to negotiate such agreements. If he fails, he may then put the cotton textile agreement into effect. Or, if he makes a finding that the imports of commodities listed in the bill do not seriously affect domestic producers, then he may put the cotton textile agreement into force.

It is not obstructive. It is a reasonable way of asking the President to exert on behalf of the rest of agriculture the same solicitude and compassion, that he has exerted on behalf of cotton. And here is where we get to the politics of the matter——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. After I make my next point.

Mr. PASTORE. Very well.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is said that the other agricultural producers did not go to the White House; that they did not appoint a commission and did not exert all of the efforts to secure this same protection as the cotton people are getting. But, actually, we have been making such efforts for years. It is a matter of record, not only in the Tariff Commission, but also in the Department of Agriculture and here in Congress.

I shall state where we were not when this happened. We were not a member of the group about which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yesterday spoke of as follows:

> As realists we are all more or less familiar with what has happened. The textile industry is a powerful industry. Senators and Representatives represent textile districts in New England, the Middle States, and now the Southern States as well. In order to placate them and get them to support trade expansion, the Department of State and the Department of Commerce negotiated agreements with the European Economic Community and with other areas.

The congressional representatives of the other agricultural areas did not join this group in trading their votes for the trade expansion bill as the senior Senator from Illinois alleges, this in order to get Executive clemency of this kind. This Executive compassion and solicitude was accorded only one selected industry within the field of agriculture. I say that is where we were not. We were not trading our votes for the trade expansion bill in order to get the Executive to agree to a protectionist measure that out-McKinleys McKinley.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that the Senator from Nebraska is indulging in an assertion, not the statement of a fact. There has been no trade. I do not know whether he has read the reports of our committee. We issued the first one on February 4, 1959; we issued the second one in April 1961; and we issued the last one in April 1962.

In my own State of Rhode Island, 45 percent of our entire economy came from the textile industry when I was

Governor of the State; but now it has slumped down to 15 percent. So when the Senator from Nebraska states that what we are doing is "cementing our gains," I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Nebraska has not read the record. What we are trying to do here is preserve our very life.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further time to me?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Let me say that I did not make the statement attributed to me. I did not say that those in this industry are attempting to cement their gains. I did not say that a "deal" was made by the congressional representatives of the cotton-textile producing States. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made those statements.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true; but the making of the statement does not establish that as a fact, because regardless of whether the Senator from Illinois or anyone else made such a statement, I am saying categorically that it is not the truth.

Mr. HRUSKA. Succeeding events, when we take up the trade expansion bill, will prove whether it is the truth.

Mr. PASTORE. And we shall wait and see.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think we are gradually clearing up the issues involved in this discussion.

Let me say that some of the Senators on the opposition side have left the floor; but some of them are still on the floor, so I shall address myself first to exactly what concerns us here today.

First, let me say there is nothing even remotely punitive about the proposal we have submitted—an amendment to provide for agriculture generally the consideration which it is now proposed to give to the textile industry. I state frankly that if because the proponents say it is the wise thing to do, or if because the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was correct when he said commitments have been made and vote trades have been concluded, or if for any other reason they succeed in excluding the rest of the agricultural industry from the benefits of this protective measure, as one Senator I shall still vote for the measure, because the textile industry is in trouble and I am not going to assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude. But I do not think this is wise legislation or prudent legislation or proper legislation.

I think the correctness of that statement is illustrated rather clearly by the alternative which has been offered us by means of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been proposed to my amendment by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute would not add one scintilla of authority or power, I submit, to what the President now has; it would not change the picture in any way, shape, or form. In my opinion the amendment in the nature of a substitute is simply what could be called a robber-baron amendment—an amendment to rob the Senate of the opportunity to do its duty through voting on the amendment submitted by my associates and myself—an amendment which would broaden this measure and would extend it to all segments of agriculture. Ours is a meaningful amendment, the substitute amendment is meaningless.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from South Dakota has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I understand that Senators on the other side of the aisle who are vitally interested in the textile industry and who are also vitally interested in the problems of the poultry industry and the cattle industry and the dairy and timber industries—and the timber industry is in just as bad a situation, as I pointed out statistically yesterday, as is the textile industry—would like to find some convenient way to becloud the issue, so as to be able to tell their people back home, "I did something for the rest of you." The Humphrey-Morse amendment is a device to achieve this purpose.

So I think the issue should be made crystal clear in the public print, so that those who read it later, in the agonizing moments when they face vanishing profits and bankruptcy, because their particular industry has not been protected, although the textile industry has been protected, will know just what the situation here is. I say without fear of the possibility of successful challenge or contradiction that the Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute does not add 1 ounce of authority to the authority the President already has—authority which he could have exercised last year or yesterday in the absence of the Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute. Nothing new is being added by the substitute proposed.

So the question is whether we really want to do something for any other segment of the agricultural industry which is suffering from imports, except the textile industry; and I say this as one who, if we are defeated, still will vote in favor of protecting the textile industry. Then we shall observe the vote of this body as the Senator from Nebraska has recommended, when the roll is called, several weeks from now, on the question of passage of the President's proposal to strip the Congress and the Tariff Commission of any authority to deal with these tariffs, and we shall then watch to see whether Senators will justify the charge which has been made by the Senator from Illinois or whether by their votes they will repudiate it. That will be the test of the correctness of what the Senator from Illinois has said—which, as of now, is merely an allegation. When the votes are cast at that time, we shall be able to determine definitely whether the rest of agriculture is being sold out to free trade and ruinous imports, in order to protect temporarily, and in only a minor degree, the textile industry as proposed in the committee bill before us.

I know what the problems of the timber industry are; and we can do something about them today; or we can vote for this "robber baron" amendment in the nature of a substitute, which has been submitted, and thus do nothing about the problems of the timber industry.

I know something about the problems of the dairy and poultry industries. The Members of Congress who come from States producing these products have been busy; they have been walking on the same paths and knocking on the same doors and making their requests and offering their suggestions; but they have not been offering to make any trades for votes. And they have failed.

Today they have a chance to do something effective to help their constituents by voting for my amendment.

I confess that as my amendment originally stood, as was pointed out by the Senator from Florida and one or two other Senators, it might be considered that there was something obstructionist and punitive about it. And so, in a spirit of conciliation, in an effort to help the textile industry and the other industries at the same time, with no obstructionism involved, we got together later yesterday afternoon and remodified the amendment. We changed it, and eliminated any possibility of its being considered punitive or obstructionist, because we simply now seek to provide, ultimately, that we shall at least have an opportunity to do for the rest of the agricultural industry, the timber, poultry, cattle, sheep, pork, and dairy product producers, and the rest, something similar to what it is proposed we do now for the textile industry, because we leave the textile protecting language intact. We simply say that this agreement shall not be made operative until agreements have been negotiated on "beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, timber and timber products, and dairy products." Those products have been brought into the picture, or we say, because we do not want to be obstructionist, "until the President has exerted bona fide efforts to negotiate such agreements as to those commodities and has failed therein."

This provision will not hold up action. The President can get the interested parties together to negotiate within a week's time. The textile people would still have what they want to have, but they would not have it by ruling out the rest of the agricultural industry. Then, to be completely fair, to be completely cooperative, to be sure we are not holding up needed relief for the textile industry, we added another modification, another provision, which says:

> Or [when the President] makes a finding that imports of such commodities do not seriously affect domestic producers.

He has made an adverse finding on some of these products several times, through the Department of Agriculture. As the Senator from Iowa believes I think he was wrong. But if the President makes such findings, and signs them, and stands by them, textile producers can have their textile protective relief while the rest of the country goes free trade. Our amendment would not destroy his authority to act.

That is the issue involved. Do we want to do something about it? The case of the Burlington Mills has been cited. I do not think they are going to get help, because they are "kaput" now. As the Senator from North Carolina said, silk and wool, and manmade fabrics have been excluded from the act. So it gets down to cotton and textiles.

I read the statistics in the RECORD yesterday relating to the Simpson Lumber Co. of Washington, pointing out the problems it has involving imports. We propose to give the Senate an opportunity to do something for the timber industry, and not only for the Northwest, but for American timber generally because there is a timber industry in other parts of the country. We do not happen to produce Douglas-fir, but we happen to raise a lot of ponderosa pine. We are faced with some import problems also.

The question arises, Do we want to single out the textile industry for tariff protection, since we are about to be asked to vote for an international trade policy which puts complete, unchallengable control in the hands of the President, and leave out the dairy people, the livestock people, and the timber people? I think this is the only chance we will have to do something about these products. We are told the votes are available to strip the power from Congress to regulate international trade. This may be the last chance any Senator has to protect his industry. Here it is. We want to do it without hurting the cotton people. We want to do it through action that has nothing punitive or obstructionist in it. We think our amendment will achieve these results.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My committee has been holding a series of hearings, both here and in the field, on the timber situation.

Mr. MUNDT. In my remarks of yesterday. I quoted from the presentation made in the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have not completed the hearings, but I think we are pretty well informed as to the problems. The facts are not disputed at all. There are several facets of the problem. One is transportation costs. Another is the problem of stumpage practices, which are different in Canada from what they are in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. One is the wage rate differential.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is not much difference in the wages paid.

Mr. MUNDT. The testimony seemed to indicate there was.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, actually, there is none.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator, who represents a State with a great timber industry, says that the wage differential does not affect the industry in his State, I point out that it does in my State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well. That may be one facet of the problem, but it is not the major one. The real problem is that Canada has again devalued its dollar, so that we are working under a 7½-percent difference. The Senator from North Carolina, as a very successful and able businessman, knows that a 7½-percent differential makes the difference between whether a business can compete in any line of endeavor and cannot. The question of quotas or tariffs, and matters of that kind, also is one problem. Our serious problem is the fact that the Canadians have usurped our domestic market in the East.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I have an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington. Perhaps the Senator from North Carolina can yield him 2 minutes. Then we both can listen to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Ninety percent of the timber that is shipped east goes by rail. So there is a transportation rate problem involved. The other timber is shipped by water, where we have the question of the Jones Act and chartered foreign ships. The basic problem is the usurpation of the eastern market for western lumber. It goes as high as 55 or 60 percent. I will put the figures into the RECORD later.

Mr. MUNDT. I put them in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I quote from the report:

> The bill would authorize the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204—

And I add there my own words that forestry and timber have apparently been declared to be agricultural products.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that question is still in doubt. We discussed it in great detail in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We have not been able to get a satisfactory definition.

Mr. JORDAN. I am going to help the Senator there, because we ought to have one.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I continue to read from the report:

> The bill would authorize the President to limit the importation of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement.

Is Canada in or out of the agreement?

Mr. MUNDT. Canada is in the agreement.

Mr. JORDAN. Canada is in the textile agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So Canada would be involved in this particular matter?

Mr. MUNDT. No, because the agreement deals only with textiles. That is the only commodity as to which we have the multilateral agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How would the Senator's amendment give some comfort to the Senator from Washington in the hope that we could get at the problem of importation of lumber from Canada to the eastern market?

Mr. MUNDT. It would then be possible for the President to make it mandatory; really, for him to try to get multilateral agreements, and would give him the power, if he gets them, to provide safety insurance, which I think the President needs. This provides that when there is a multilateral agreement, if a country which has not signed it wants to move in and violate it, the President has an opportunity to stop it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. This would be for the benefit not of cotton only but all agriculture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As is true of the Senator from South Dakota, I have gone through these textile problems before. My committee has studied them. As he believes, I, too, think something should be done.

We also have a problem with respect to lumber. This is primarily a Canadian-United States problem. Even if the Congress can solve some of the problems in respect to it, there will remain the 7½-percent differential.

Mr. MUNDT. That will not be the case if the amendment is agreed to, as the Senator from Nebraska and I and other Senators have offered it. The President then would have the authority to say to Canada, "Look, if you are going to devalue your currency we will increase the tariff to compensate for such action." It would have nothing to do with the railroad rates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that quotas would be better than tariffs. Would the President have authority in that field?

Mr. HRUSKA. If the amendment which has been proposed and which we hope will be adopted is agreed to, yes. Negotiations would not be conducted on the basis of tariffs alone. Nontariff restrictions could also be considered. Tariffs are outmoded. They are no longer the principal consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, in many respects tariffs are outmoded.

Mr. HRUSKA. They are outmoded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. In further answer to the question of the Senator from Washington as to how the timber industry could be helped by the Mundt amendment, I suggest it could be helped in this way: The Mundt amendment merely provides that the cotton textile agreement would not go into force and effect until one of three things happened.

A similar agreement could be entered into on other agricultural products.

Recognizing that this might take considerable time and might be obstructive in nature, another alternative is provided whereby the President can make

a bona fide attempt to enter into such agreements and fail in this attempt.

The third alternative is that the President could find that the importation of such commodities is not causing serious injury to domestic producers.

This is not an obstructive proposal. It is constructive. We want to provide the other sectors of agriculture with the same benefits the proposed bill would give to one particular industry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Timber would be within the category of agricultural products?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes. There is no question about it.

Mr. MUNDT. We spell that out in the amendment, which includes "timber and timber products." We do not rely on an indefinite definition, but spell it out specifically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Has my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded has expired. The Senator has 40 minutes remaining. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. How much time does the Senator from North Carolina have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Since I have more time, I yield.

Mr. JORDAN. I did not wish to ask the Senator to yield on his time, if he is short of time.

Mr. MUNDT. For a brief question I am glad to yield.

Mr. JORDAN. The point we may be overlooking is that the cotton textile industry already has an agreement with 90 percent of the textile-producing people of the world. The 10 percent, which no one thought was even worth negotiating with, can wreck the whole program. Egypt was not shipping any yarn until the last year, and neither was Israel. Israel is now becoming an exporter. The same is true with respect to Formosa. The United States has been exporting cotton to Formosa in order to clothe the soldiers there, yet now Formosa is shipping cotton to this country.

Our competitors get cotton at 8½ cents a pound less than we do. A lot of it comes under Public Law 480. What we are attempting to do is to provide that the 10 percent shall not wreck the agreements which have been made.

Mr. MUNDT. As I said earlier, I can understand why the proponents of the legislation wish to insure success of the program, and I do not blame them. I point out that what the Senator from North Carolina has said demonstrates the great problem with which we are confronted in respect to the other agricultural areas.

From the standpoint of the dairymen and the poultry people, because of a succession of activities by Republican and Democratic administrations, I point out, the cotton textile industry already enjoys an advantage and a privilege which is not available to others, because the President, the Department of State, and the Department of Agriculture have gotten busy and have negotiated agreements multilaterally for the textile industry, which they have not done for the other farm industries. That is one difficulty.

Now the textile industry is asking the Congress to pyramid the privileges enjoyed by the textile industry, by saying, "In addition to that which we have enjoyed, the advantage of receiving this kind of service and getting a multilateral agreement, we now ask the Congress to pass a special bill"—that is, the bill before the Senate—"which will keep out the 10 percent of imports from those countries who are on the fringes, who did not sign the voluntary agreement."

As I have said, I can understand that desire, but it magnifies the problem. The textile industry is asking the Congress to pyramid its special privileges. The industry had one privilege, and it would like to have another. The cotton industry would tell the other sectors of agriculture, "Sit out in the anteroom; we will get to you some time."

Other agricultural industries would like to have some consideration now. They do not want to stop the textile program. They are for it. I shall be for it. I hope my associates in this legislative effort will also vote for it. This is probably the only opportunity, however, the Senate will have to do something effective for other suffering segments of our agricultural and timber economy.

We who sponsor the amendment modified it, after listening to the arguments yesterday, in a desire to be helpful and in an effort to be compliant and conciliatory, in the hope that there would not be a "dog in the manger" position supported by the textile industry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if it is true that one of the great areas which is now being damaged, which has been damaged in the past 2 or 3 years, is the area which produces sheep and lambs, because of the importation of lambs from various other countries?

I well recall that more than 2 years ago the lamb and sheep people made an application to the Tariff Commission under the peril point clause of the tariff laws. They were totally unable to get any recognition of the fact that they were being irreparably damaged, that prices were being deflated. Those prices are reflected in today's lamb market and sheep market throughout the United States.

Those of us who come from that part of the country where sheep and lambs represent a critical part of the agricultural economy bear the brunt of being left out of agreements such as the one which has been negotiated in respect to cotton.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Colorado asked me a question, and I should like to answer.

The Senator is correct. As is well known to this body and to the Senators who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am sure, the situation in respect to the importation of wool got so bad that there was great damage to the textile industry. As the Senator from North Carolina pointed out, one of the great woolen mills folded up, and perhaps others have done the same.

The situation in respect to wool got so bad that, for many years before the situation became serious with respect to cotton, the wool people came to the Congress asking for the same kind of tariff protection consideration and the same kind of results which are now asked to be given to the cotton people. It was then said, "No, you can't exclude foreign wool imports, because we need them for peaceful negotiations with the other countries of the world and our good-neighbor policy." Therefore, the Congress passed a special National Wool Act, so that the taxpayers now have to pay for the fact that there is not a protective tariff from the standpoint of protecting the wool industry.

The tariff protection was not provided for the wool industry; yet it is sought to be done for the cotton industry.

Tariff protection is not provided now with respect to the frozen carcasses which are coming in from New Zealand and from Australia, flooding the market and cutting down prices.

All we ask our good friends on the other side of this argument to do is to give us an opportunity now, when they are doing something good for cotton to include the other suffering farm products. We ask them not to hurt us, but to help us while they are helping themselves.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I observe on page 3 of the hearings held by the committee of the other body that the importation of cotton textiles in 1960 amounted to 6 percent of the consumption in the 50 States. We should consider what the percentage of imports is in the field inquired about by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MUNDT. Wool?

Mr. HRUSKA. Lambs and mutton.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. In 1959 imports of lamb and mutton from other countries were 14.4 percent of the total consumption. In 1960 imports were 11.5 percent, and in 1961 they were 12.1 percent. Those imports were approximately twice as much as the imports of cotton and cotton textiles.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. I thank him for that information.

I should like to address another question to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

While the measure primarily affects agricultural products, I would feel remiss if I did not point out at this time that in the field of mining our country has been as derelict in protecting our industry. That has been demonstrated by the repeated attempts of the lead and zinc producers to obtain relief from the Tariff Commission under the peril point clause or the escape clause of the tariff laws. They have been repeatedly denied substantial relief in that area.

For example, today the combined price of lead and zinc in this country is approximately 20 cents. I have been looking for the present quotations, but I cannot find them. Lead and zinc cannot be produced in this country for less than 30 cents. Yet one lead and zinc industry in Colorado has been closed down and is a dead industry because of a failure to act. Nevertheless, we shall be asked at this session of Congress to act in the broad general area with relation to reciprocal trade negotiations. The Senator from Nebraska pointed out very well the other day in his remarks that the present measure is the first step away from a piece of legislation that we have not even yet enacted, but which the President has requested. Does not the Senator agree that the question we are considering with reference to agricultural products will also recur again and again, particularly with respect to the mining industry?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. Of course, we are talking about agricultural products and not the mining industry. We wonder if there is any validity to the blunt charge made by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that this committee textile protective proposal was a part of a tradeoff program. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has charged that votes from the textile industry are being traded in support of the President's new tariff proposals in order to give a pyramiding of privilege and concession in return for promises that Senators will vote for the President's program on tariffs generally and take away from Congress for all time hereafter control over tariff legislation.

I do not know whether there is anything to that statement or not. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was made by a highly reputable distinguished member of the majority party, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is in "on the know" on a great many things. The truth of that charge will be documented or refuted in the voting record of the Senate when we read first the rollcall today and then the rollcall a few weeks or a few months from now, when the President's tariff proposal is before us. Anyone with a lead pencil and a pair of bifocal glasses, with the two CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS before him at that time will know whether the trade was made or not and who made it, because the fact will be recorded for all time to come. If such a trade was made, of course, the lead and zinc people will be hurt, as will many others.

Mr. JORDAN. If there has been any trading of votes, the word has not yet reached me. I have not heard anything about it.

Mr. MUNDT. I have merely repeated the accusation made by a Democratic colleague of the Senator. I was surprised to read it. I am deeply disappointed. I shall look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for verification or refutation when the votes on these proposals are eventually recorded.

Mr. JORDAN. I was surprised to hear that the statement was in the RECORD. I am surprised that the Senator made such a statement. As I said before, I am thoroughly in sympathy with what the Senator from South Dakota proposes. He and I have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We have fought for those engaged in agriculture. We know of the needs of that industry. They need all the help they can get. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota and I know that while lamb was being imported into our country, the Government was also buying lamb and stockpiling it. I know that such action was wrong, and have said so.

Mr. MUNDT. The identical thing is being done now with respect to dairy products. The Government is purchasing dairy products and stockpiling them.

Mr. JORDAN. I think it is perfectly silly. One of the first statements that I made on the floor of the Senate was with reference to textiles. I said that the Government should enter into a quota system, not only in respect to textiles, but also lead, zinc, copper, and every other commodity whose need is filled in this country. In my opinion, quotas are the only final remedy. The remedy is not tariffs. An equitable tariff cannot be established on any commodity today. For example, textile workers in Portugal receive about 9 or 10 cents an hour. That is their wage scale. Workers in Hong Kong receive even less than that amount. The wage in Japan is about 20 cents an hour, in England 60 cents, and in France and Belgium about 60 cents. We cannot establish a tariff that would be equitable everywhere. It would be impossible. The final remedy, in my opinion, should be the establishment of quotas on all the commodities needing them. More of those commodities cannot be brought into our country, for we cannot absorb them. Our industry cannot live under the pressure.

The proposal is a voluntary thing. I do not wish to hurt any industry named in the amendment. I think too much of the Senators who are interested, and know what they are trying to do. I am thoroughly in sympathy with what they are trying to do.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with what the Senator has said with reference to handling imports by establishing higher tariffs. I recognize the validity of his argument that quotas work more effectively. As a friend of agriculture generally, I recognize that the Senator has worked with us on these problems. I do not quite buy the concept that we cannot keep out the cheap loin-cloth-produced competitive products with tariffs. If one would take a pencil and multiply fast enough, he would see that we could make the tariff high enough to do the job. We might have to get it up to a 200-percent tariff, a 500-percent tariff, or a thousand-percent tariff. As countries reduce the value of their currency by rigging it, we must increase tariffs. Of course, quotas would be an easier way to achieve the objective. I appreciate the expression of sympathy by the distinguished Senator, but there is the question of timing. We are confronted with the question whether we shall do something when we have the opportunity, or indefinitely delay action to an unknown time, which perhaps will never arrive.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I fully agree with the objective of the Senator from South Dakota, and commend him the action being taken.

It never made sense to me to import some commodity that we already had in great abundance in this country, particularly a commodity with respect to which there is a Government program to help an industry, a farmer, or some other segment of our economy. To pile up surpluses of the kind we have and at the same time to import the same commodities never has made sense to me.

Four or five years ago when we passed the Soil Bank Act I thought the proposed program might be helpful in curtailing surpluses. I thought if we kept on importing farm products without limit, the program would do no good whatever. Senators will recall that I offered an amendment to the bill relating to the Soil Bank. The amendment was simple. It would limit the importation of any commodity in surplus to the average of the previous 3-year period. The amendment included also byproducts of any farm commodity such as cotton. The textile producers became interested in it. The amendment lost, but only by 1 or 2 votes.

Now we have an even worse problem in the Midwest. Lambs are a good example. The price has been ruined. Sheep producers have not been making money. Most of them are losing money. I believe the sheep population in the United States is at the lowest point in our history, even though there is a wool price support program. So the problem is very serious. I do not think it will ever be solved unless Congress itself solves it. I do not think we can depend on the Tariff Commission to do it for us, nor can we depend on delegating our authority to some other body that is more internationally minded than domestically minded.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution.

In conclusion, the facts are pretty clear. In the United States we are importing large quantities of farm products. We wrestle around the difficulties involved. Scandals have grown out of the maladministration of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Our get-rich-quick Wallingfords are operating in the Sol Estes case in Texas. That is a consequence of the fact that we have a serious surplus farm problem, which to a great extent, and possibly in total, we are importing from abroad, by bringing in competitive products while asking farmers in this country to reduce their production.

Now we have an opportunity to do something about the problem. We can at least try to establish some kind of protective mechanism against the importation of farm products instead of only the importation of cotton. That is the purpose of our proposal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield, if the Senator obtains the necessary time from his side of the aisle.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida from the time available to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Will the Senator indicate what efforts, if any, have been made in behalf of the livestock operators to have steps taken similar to those that have been taken in the field of textiles?

Mr. MUNDT. I would be happy to relate them, but the Senator's 28 minutes would expire before I even had a chance to start. We have been dealing with this problem for a long time. It has been taken up with all the big organizations, such as the National Beef Association and the Sheep and Lamb Producers Association. They have been interceding over the years with every available authority, including the White House, especially on the importation of frozen carcasses. They are constantly being told that it is not a serious problem. But it is a very serious problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as livestock is concerned, without any reference to lambs, about which I know very little——

Mr. MUNDT. Lambs are included in livestock.

Mr. HOLLAND. From the standpoint of the producers of beef, the president of the National Cattlemen's Association lives in my State. I brought him before the committee, of which the Senator from South Dakota is a member, and I presented the president of that association to the committee. He happens to be a long-time, intimate friend of mine. I had a long conversation with him while he was in the city. I have yet to hear the first word about any effort having been made by the producers of beef to set up an arrangement similar to that which has been set up with reference to textiles. I am willing to help in establishing such an arrangement. But I must say to the Senator from South Dakota that I know of no effort in even the slightest degree that has been made in that regard.

The proposal of the Senator from South Dakota, in effect, would nullify the only effort that has been made over a period of years, because it would not allow some relief to be given—and I think it would be real relief—to an industry which has felt the greatest impact from importations from sources where we ourselves have furnished the mills and have furnished the low-priced cotton, textiles of various classes have been poured back into this country.

Incidentally, the 6 percent does not indicate the critical nature of this problem in respect to certain classifications of textiles.

It seems to me that the Senator from South Dakota must recognize that the cattle raisers have made no effort at all in this field. In effect, they are holding up their brethren in the textile field and in the cotton field by the effort they are making. I hope the Senator will reconsider his situation.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, the Senator from Florida must expand his definition of livestock a little, because I am talking about sheep, and he is talking about cattle. I have gone to the national associations with this problem. I did not do so currently, but over the past decades I have done so because they have suffered seriously. We have made great efforts in the past. The current effort with regard to livestock is being made primarily from the standpoint of the lamb industry.

I say to my good friend from Florida that lambs are included in the livestock definition. The Senator apparently feels that the livestock industry does not need relief because the cattlemen have not asked for it recently.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been speaking about the producers of beef and beef products, which is stated in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the group that I was talking about. He also refers to pork and pork products. I have yet to be approached for the first time on this question by any pork producers. I am not too well acquainted with the situation with respect to lambs, because lambs are not produced in our State. I have not been approached by anyone in the lamb industry, either. Of course, there would be very little occasion for them to approach me; they would no doubt approach Senators from the States that produce lambs.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator would like to be included among Senators who have been approached by representatives of the lamb industry, I shall be glad to introduce some of those people to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. No one has worked harder for giving preferred status under the price-support program to the producers of sheep and lamb than has the Senator from Florida. No one has worked harder than the Senator from Florida in behalf of special tariff grants on tariffs collected on wool imported from abroad, to subsidize the production of sheep and products of that kind in that field.

I am just as willing to go all out in the matter before us now. I do not believe the Senator is on sound ground in insisting that this be done in the way it is proposed to be done. These people have worked for years to solve this problem. The Senator has supported this effort in committee. He was a member of my subcommittee. He did not oppose the granting of special funds to a Commission to investigate the textile industry; to the contrary, he supported it.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore I cannot understand the Senator's position now.

Mr. MUNDT. I never suspected that the result would be the exclusion of everything but cotton textiles. Even so, I will vote for the bill. While it may be a selfish step, it is a step in the right direction. I am afraid, though, that it will come back to plague us. We cannot do something like this for one segment of agriculture and not for the rest of the farming community. However, I will vote for it, because these producers of cotton and the textile mills are in trouble.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that he will support the bill. I hope he will vote for it after his amendment has been rejected, because his amendment would cut the very heart out of the effort that is being made in the bill to allow some force and effect to be given to certain agreements, one a temporary agreement, and the other a more permanent agreement for 5 years, which will begin to run in the fall. The Senator's amendment would cut the very heart out of both agreements.

Mr. MUNDT. I fear the Senator is not reading the right amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. The original amendment has been modified. Now, the amendment identified as "5-16-62—C" has some additional alternatives included in it. It originally provided that the textile agreement would not go into force and effect until agreements were effected with respect to other commodities. However, two other alternatives have been added; namely, in the event that the President makes a bona fide effort to negotiate similar agreements as to other commodities, and fails therein, or secondly if he finds that a commodity is not being imported in sufficient quantity to seriously affect domestic producers. It is not obstructive in any way, or punitive. It empowers the President, under section 204, where he gets this absolute power, to give as much consideration and solicitude to other sectors of agriculture as he does to cotton.

It is said that the other sectors of agriculture have not expended as many efforts as have the people in the cotton field. That is probably true. However, they cannot come here. That is not where the power resides. The power resides in the White House. Does that mean that when the President is vested with unrestricted power, which he possesses under section 204, or which he is seeking in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, he has the right to say, "I now have this power. The only way I will exert it on behalf of any sector of American industry is to have interested parties build up a terrific reservoir of pressure of a political nature and have their Senators and Representatives knock at the door of the White House to present their petition. Then I will say, 'Yes; I will give that relief, because you have shown up here in sufficient numbers to get it. However, there is a little bill in the Senate and in the House for which I seek approval. I will use some of this power you have previously given me if you on your part will vote this way or that way on a legislative measure which I desire.' "

That was stated by the senior Senator from Illinois yesterday. If that is true I wonder if that is what we are facing if the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is to be passed. I do not conceive of section 204 as representing a situation in which we are called upon to go as supplicants to the White House and say, "Mr. President, there are X numbers of Senators and Representatives here; please give us relief," and have him close his eyes to the merits of the situation, of which he is fully aware through his Secretary of Agriculture.

Not a week goes by when the Secretary of Agriculture does not draw attention to the difficulties of American agriculture. One of the biggest obstacles to its prosperity and stability is the import picture. The President has been given unrestricted and unlimited power. Shall he use it in response to political pressures, or on the basis of merits of situations as he knows of them through his Secretary of Agriculture?

The purpose of the Mundt amendment is to call the attention of the President to a serious condition and ask him, "Will you not make the same amount of effort in the other fields that you did in the case of cotton?"

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad that these amendments have been offered to the Senator's amendment. I was conversant with that fact before the Senator raised the point. It does not seem to me that they meet the situation at all, because they would hold, for instance, that the agreement now in force could not be supplemented by quotas against certain nations until after some time had elapsed. Who would be the judge as to whether the President had exerted bona fide efforts to negotiate agreements with respect to certain commodities?

Mr. HRUSKA. The President.

Mr. HOLLAND. With respect to livestock, I have not heard the first word in connection with beef and beef products, and whether any effort has been made in that connection. The Senator from Florida, who represents, in part, a large beef-producing State, has not heard a word of that sort.

Mr. HRUSKA. Only 2 years ago the beef producers submitted two petitions to the Tariff Commission. They revised the first one and submitted another. Preliminary hearings were held, and out of hand they were turned down. Similarly the lamb and sheep industry went before the Commission. Testimony was presented under the peril-point clause. They, too, were rejected virtually out of hand on the ground of the impossibility of submitting proof under the peril-point clause which would be sufficient to carry their burden imposed by the Tariff Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina inform the Chair whose time is being used now?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, an agreement was made that the time consumed by the Senator from Florida would be charged to the time of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding was that I had been yielded time by the Senator from North Carolina. If that is not the case, I regret it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time remains to both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has 13 minutes remaining; the Senator from South Dakota has 26 minutes left.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, by way of preliminary summary, yesterday and today we were confronted with a curious spectacle on the floor of the Senate. A large number of liberal trade advocates, advocates of free trade, and trade expansion, have been contending for the passage of the most highly protectionist measure that has been before the Senate during my service in Congress. It out-McKinleys McKinley. McKinley was an old-fashioned soul. All he had to contend with was the question of high tariffs to implement his efforts in the field of imports. Now we are considering the case of cotton imports. We find, first, that the Government subsidy being paid to exporters of cotton is 8½ cents a pound. Then we find that arrangement supplemented by an agreement among 19 nations, of which this country is 1, to limit imports, an international cartel in violation of the very essence of free trade and antitrust principles.

Now in H.R. 10788 we come to a further proposal, namely, to give the President more power, so that he can limit imports and even prohibit them from nonagreement countries.

Of course, H.R. 10788 is a far cry from free-trade doctrine—as far as a cry can be from that kind of doctrine—because it is based upon an international cartel which is very severe and restrictive indeed.

Section 204 gives the President the power to negotiate agreements such as the 19-nation agreement; there is no question about it. Whether that is wise or not is beside the point; the power was exercised.

As I have previously said, the objective of the Mundt amendment is to obtain from the President the same grace, the same compassion, and the same solicitude for other agricultural products as he extended to cotton and its related industries. The Mundt amendment is not an obstructive or punitive measure; it is a measure which gives the President three alternatives before the cotton textile agreement can be adopted. One alternative is that the President negotiate similar agreements, and in like manner, as to other commodities. Or if he makes a bona fide effort, an effort in good faith, to make such agreements, but fails, then he can proceed to execute the cotton textile agreement. Or if he makes a finding that the imports of such commodities as are named in the Mundt amendment do not seriously affect domestic producers, he may put the cotton textile agreement into force. Those alternatives are added for the purpose of giving the President some leeway and with that thought in mind.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we are nearing the end of the time allotted under the voluntary agreement to terminate the debate at 2:30 o'clock. I believe there are one or two Senators on our side of the question, and perhaps Senators on the other side of the question, who are not aware of that. I suggest that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side. If that be agreeable, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, all debate is to be terminated at 2:30 o'clock.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. But the time for the quorum call would not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the quorum call would have to be divided equally.

Mr. MUNDT. That would be all right. We understand the reason for that.

Mr. JORDAN. Under the ruling of the Chair, the time for the quorum could consume all the remaining time.

Mr. MUNDT. I suggest a quorum call of 3 or 4 minutes, to give warning to Senators in their offices; then the quorum call could be discontinued.

Mr. JORDAN. How would the time for the quorum call be charged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the vote will come at 2:30 o'clock; therefore, the time for a quorum call would be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. JORDAN. Does the Senator from South Dakota suggest that 2 minutes would be sufficient for a quorum call?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I would not object to a quorum call which would continue for 2 minutes and then be called off, the time for the quorum call to be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, how much of my 5 minutes remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The point is made by some Senators that some sectors of agriculture other than the cotton industry have not made diligent effort to obtain the same kind of treatment which the cotton industry is now getting. This point should be viewed in the light of the fact that under section 204, under which this power was exercised by the President, no guidelines or procedures of any kind are prescribed. Unrestricted, unlimited power is granted to the President. Any power exercised under that section is exercised only according to the conscience of the President. Any request for exercise of his power thereunder must be addressed to him.

The purpose of the Mundt amendment is to bring to the attention of the President the fact that commodities other than cotton are in dire straits; that they need attention; and that the same efforts should be exerted in their behalf under section 204 as we have witnessed in respect to cotton.

It has been said several times that this measure is not a political football. On the score that it is not a partisan football, I suppose that statement is true, because the cotton industry and the textile industry have no regard for political or State lines. However, the only reason why cotton has received the preferred treatment it has received is that there has been joint political action. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] put it this way yesterday:

> What we face in the Senate is that the textile group is a very powerful group, centered not only in New England and the Middle States, but also in the Southern States. In a very genteel fashion they have held a pistol at the head of the President and said, "There will be no trade expansion bill unless you take care of cotton and wool." I suppose that is exactly what happened, and under that pressure the poor man could not hold out.

I do not know what the fact is in that regard, because what I have just read is not my language.

I sincerely hope that things like that did not happen and are not a fact.

But if Congress is to provide unrestricted Presidential power and if it is to be exercised only if political pressure from the Congress is brought to bear upon the President, and that only then will he exercise that power, and that then there will be a quid pro quo, then we shall be in a bad situation, indeed; because then the conscience of the Nation, as reposed in the President, will be exercised, not on the basis of merit, not on basis of the needs and the distress of the various segments of agriculture, but only in response to political pressure.

Again I raise this question: If the Senate passes the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which contains provisions granting the President much power, and if thereafter there prevails the concept that such power will be used only in response to political pressures generated from the Congress, then the only advantage of such a bill will be that the logrolling which heretofore has occurred on the floors of the Senate and House on an item-by-item tariff bill will be transferred from the Congress to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. I sincerely believe that would not be of benefit; in fact, it would be of great detriment to the national interest.

So I repeat that the Mundt amendment should be adopted, because it is not punitive, but helpful. It is an effort to call attention to this problem and to provide for three alternatives before the cotton-textile agreement will go into effect. Certainly the Mundt amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the many difficulties with which our domestic textile industry is faced have been the subject of extensive study by the Special Textile Study Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member. The other members of the subcommittee are the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I may say that both Senator PASTORE and Senator COTTON, as members of the subcommittee, have rendered magnificent service to our country.

Our subcommittee has issued reports in 1959, in 1961, and again this year. It became evident to anyone who took the time to study our reports that the domestic textile situation was deteriorating rapidly, and that unless some definite remedial steps were taken, the domestic textile industry was in danger of virtual collapse.

I may say that the evidence adduced during the hearings conducted by the Special Textile Study Subcommittee showed that textiles rank second only to steel, as regards the national defense. So the textile industry is an essential one, not only from the standpoint of that segment of our economy, but also from the standpoint of the national defense and the very survival of our Nation.

The studies revealed that from the end of World War II through 1961, employment in the United States in the textile industry had decreased drastically. There was a loss of more than 268,430 jobs. More than 926 textile mills were forced to close their doors during the same period.

Definite recommendations were made by the Special Textile Subcommittee, but these were only partially implemented. The supplemental reports filed subsequent to the initial report of 1959 provide clear evidence that the situation is growing worse, rather than better, as time passes.

The long-term textile agreement which has been negotiated by the 19 participating nations in Geneva will, if signed, provide the tools which will make it possible to give relief to our domestic industry. The 19 nations participating there produce about 90 percent of the world's total textile manufactures. However, in order to insure the success of the agreement, it is necessary to control imports from nonparticipating nations. It is for that purpose that the pending bill is before us.

Mr. President, although I am in sympathy with the purpose of the Mundt amendment, as a practical matter it would nullify what was striven for in Geneva. Although it is readily apparent that some relief must be had in the areas covered by the Mundt amendment, certainly it would not be wise to penalize the textile industry by postponing the effective date of the Geneva agreement until such time as similar agreements in regard to the several areas mentioned in the amendment had been negotiated or begun with other countries. For that reason, Mr. President, I feel that I must vote against the Mundt amendment.

However, I wish to repeat that I am in sympathy with the principles embodied in the Mundt amendment; and I shall be pleased to cooperate with the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and other Senators in seeking to have protection provided under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 for the segments of our economy which are covered by the Mundt amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I shall be happy to yield to the able Senator from New Hampshire, if the Senator from North Carolina will yield time for that purpose.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator from North Carolina; and now I yield with pleasure to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I shall not take long.

I wish to compliment the Senator from South Carolina on the very clear and forthright statement he has made.

It has been a great privilege to serve with him during the past few years on the Special Textile Subcommittee. I have admired the steadfastness and the singleness of purpose with which he has worked in behalf of the welfare of the textile industry. I am sure that anyone who knows him has full confidence in his assurance that he—like the Senator from New Hampshire—stands ready to cooperate with our friends in dealing with the problems they have; that there will be no idea of betraying their interests for the interests of the textile industry; but that simply because of the peculiarly desperate situation the textile industry is in, we are asking that this bill be passed without delay and without any mutilating amendments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the able and distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his kind words; and I desire to state that in discussing the bill and the Mundt amendment he has expressed my own sentiments exactly and he is eminently correct in the position he takes. I certainly desire to see relief granted for the other agricultural fields which are so badly in need of relief.

I want to say again that I do not know of any subcommittee that has worked harder or has been under more able leadership than the committee on which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] have served or one that has accomplished more in bringing its reports to the attention of the Senate and the proper agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I notice that an amendment has been offered since we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement last evening. Does that mean that all debate on all amendments must cease by 2:30 for the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement provides that debate on the Mundt amendment and all amendments thereto shall close at 2:30.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I did not hear all the Chair's response to the question from the Senator from Rhode Island. I direct the Chair's attention to the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement also allocates 30 minutes to the Miller amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is to be after disposition of the Mundt amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

May I ask the Chair how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time there are 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the so-called Humphrey-Morse substitute for the so-called Mundt amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The first vote, therefore, will be on the substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon and myself last evening. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on that amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are two fundamental differences between the Mundt amendment and the Humphrey substitute. First of all, the substitute provides that the negotiations that have already been had relating to textiles shall not be interfered with. The Mundt amendment, despite the additions of last evening, still does not so provide.

Second, the Humphrey substitute provides that after the negotiations on textiles have been completed, the "President shall negotiate agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export of the United States from foreign countries to the following commodities: beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, timber and timber products."

But that amendment also provides what I consider to be a vital function of the executive branch, when it says that it shall be done "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers."

It seems to me we have an obligation, in light of the negotiations that have taken place thus far at Geneva, to complete action on the textile matter. It also appears to me that, if there is evidence demonstrating that other commodities are threatened with serious injury due to imports, and if the President is so convinced, he should take action——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator used the word "after" textile agreements have been completed. The words are "in addition to."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right. I do not want to get the Senate in the situation of interfering with what are important negotiations that have been undertaken and which are ready to be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Furthermore, if the Mundt amendment is adopted, the Senate can rest assured that the countries with whom we have been negotiating will feel this is a delaying tactic, and we are likely to lose everything we have gained thus far.

I do not think we need any amendment to this bill, but if evidence of injury can be shown to other commodities—which, by the way, are numerous, as they affect the State of Minnesota—then the President shall take action similar to that taken under the textile provision. I think the proposal is fair and legitimate and would protect the legitimate interests of all those products, and at the same time not play havoc with those interested in the textile industry.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is saying that if conditions merit the President's attention to beef and beef products, dairy and dairy products, and timber and timber products, and so forth, because the condition seriously affects domestic producers, then the President shall consider for those products the same kind of multilateral agreements as he has considered in the case of textiles. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; without interfering with all that has been done on textiles. Any further delay on textile negotiations is likely to wreck the result of negotiations had thus far.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not see how any good, warmblooded American can be against the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator's amendment mentions only the agreement with respect to cotton and cotton textiles. It seems to me that under the wording of the amendment, if it is adopted as a substitute, it will rule out completely the President's authority to negotiate agreements for wool and manmade fabrics in the textile field, because the bill as it now reads leaves the matter completely open. The Senator mentions beef and beef products, and so forth, but he does not say a word about textiles other than cotton textiles.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose of my amendment was to replace the Mundt amendment. It does not affect any other part of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. It does not affect in any way textiles other than cotton textiles?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, because the Mundt amendment relates to cotton and cotton textiles.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

What the Senator from Minnesota has just said is precisely what is worrying me. The echoes from his words are still reverberating through the Chamber, that the legislative purpose of the Humphrey amendment is to replace the Mundt amendment. That is exactly what it would do, but it would replace it with nothing. It would replace it with a void. It would leave it in a vacuum. Let me read what is in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. The Humphrey amendment really restates what is in it. It has been basic law since 1956. It provides that the President is authorized to negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom, including textile and textile products.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in my time?

Mr. MUNDT. We cannot assume that some President would be stupid enough to negotiate for some product or industry that was not in trouble.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator say there is no difference between the words "authorize to negotiate" and the words "shall negotiate"? Will the Senator give me the benefit of his legal opinion?

Mr. MUNDT. It reminds me of the old curse of Sisyphus, whose task was to roll a huge stone up to the top of a hill. As the stone constantly rolled back, his work was incessant. All the Humphrey amendment does is to provide the curse of Sisyphus with jet propelled motion that makes it move up and down fast enough to break the sound barrier. It runs up the hill and down again. All the authority is taken away when it is provided, as an out for the President "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers." Those words can be found in section 204.

I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he is willing to modify his amendment, to make it more effective. I cannot change it. I wish to make an amendment to it, but it would be in the third degree. Would the Senator be willing to strike out everything after the word "products" on line 10?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to my colleague, it is too late in the consideration of the proposal to make that kind of patchwork addition to my amendment which the Senator made to his amendment last night.

Mr. MUNDT. It is not too late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment is before the Senate. The Senate can vote on the amendment. It will give the Senator from South Dakota an opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. MUNDT. Am I correct in the assumption that the Senator from Minnesota has used the long way around to say "no"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. And on the Senator's time, may I say.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the answer in the negative or in the affirmative?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is this still on the Senator's time?

Mr. MUNDT. It is on my time. I hope the Senator will answer in monosyllables.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was trying to say to the Senator that it is too late for the type of patchwork additions added last evening to the Mundt amendment, which I thought did little to help the amendment and might only do something to injure it. I do not wish to have the architects and the carpenters of the Mundt amendment patch up my amendment.

The answer is "No."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, in approximately one-half a minute I wish to point out that at the appropriate time, when no Senator will have been shut off from debate, I shall move to lay on the table the Humphrey substitute, because it would do nothing, and would do nothing the long way around, much like the manner in which I got an answer to the question which I asked, calling for a "yes" or "no" answer.

Madam President, I now yield a minute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, without doubting the sincerity of the Senator from Minnesota or of the Senator from Oregon, and with an appreciation of the needs of the textile industry for some further protection, regardless of whether the Mundt-Hruska amendment should be agreed to or not, I must say that after reading the Humphrey amendment I find it would give to the dairy people, to the livestock people, and to the timber people of this country absolutely no protection which they do not have at the present time, because it relates to judgment. I quote three words from the Humphrey amendment, "in his judgment." It says that the President, "in his judgment," must find that imports seriously affect domestic producers.

In the judgment of the President the livestock people, the dairy people, and the timber people do not need any further protection, or the President would have taken the same steps to protect them that he has taken to protect the textile industry. Therefore, the Humphrey amendment is completely meaningless except as a means of shunting aside an amendment which would mean something, whether one is in favor of it or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Which Senator yields time now?

Mr. HUMPHREY. How much time remains, Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 2 minutes, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota demonstrate some further eloquence in respect to the measure, since he has such an abundance of time.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I am perfectly willing to comply with the request of my good friend the Senator from Minnesota, unless there is some other Senator on my side who would like to speak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, would the Senator be willing to yield for a quorum call, each side reserving 1 minute to summarize, and to yield back the remainder of the time?

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, so that all Senators can hear, the request is with respect to a willingness to yield back the time, conserving a minute for a concluding argument on each side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. If no Senator wishes to talk, there is no reason why we should repeat the same arguments over and over again. I am willing to do that, unless some Senator on either side of the argument wishes to speak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Shall we yield back all the remaining time? That is agreeable to me.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to explain for at least a minute the reason why I think the Senator's amendment should be tabled.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us reserve 1 minute on each side, or perhaps 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. For the purpose of obtaining a clarification in respect to the bill, may I ask the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] or the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] whether there is any intention, in respect to the proposed legislation, that what the Senate is doing today is inconsistent with the Trade Agreements Act or with the trade development assistance bill which is now pending in the Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Iowa spoke to me privately about this, very considerately. I think there is nothing in the pending bill or in the amendment, at least, which would be in conflict with the other measures. I speak for myself.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. For my part, I can best answer the question of the Senator by asking him a question. What in the proposal would contravene the Reciprocal Trade Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minute which has been yielded has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, what is the time situation now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has four minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

In answer to the Senator's question, I wish to say that the Senator from Iowa does not know of anything which would to him appear to contravene the other provisions. As I pointed out to the Senator with respect to the Miller amendment, which is on the desk and which will receive consideration following action on the pending amendment, I think the Senate should make it absolutely clear that there is not to be anything which would contravene those provisions. In other words, if there is to be an interpretation of the proposal by lawyers some time in the future, I think it would be helpful for those lawyers to know that the three acts are to be construed exactly alike.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. This is absolutely a voluntary arrangement entered into by the countries which are signatory to the agreement. For that reason, there can be no contravention on the part of this proposal with respect to the laws of any sovereign government. What is being done is being done by unanimous consent.

There is nothing more than an agreement which has been entered into by 19 countries. What we are attempting to do is to implement that agreement. There is nothing which is inconsistent with our reciprocal trade policy or fair trade policy.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield a half minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes remain of the time of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I wish to make it clear that I am in favor of the bill in its present form. I am against the Mundt-Hruska amendment. I shall also vote against the substitute amendment of the Senator from Minnesota and of the Senator from Oregon.

I should like to see the bill pass as it stands, in the form in which it came from the House. I do not wish to make it necessary for the bill to go to a conference.

The bill has a single clear purpose of taking care of the textile situation. I want to help defeat the Mundt amendment, and I want to do it in a frontal assault and not by some circuitous tactic which will clutter up the bill and send it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield a minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I feel much like the Senator from New Hampshire feels, but I am a realist. I am a practical man. I want something to be done by the Congress which will be of value. I fear that if we do not accept the substitute amendment we shall not succeed.

I am practical enough to know that many Senators on both sides of the aisle have felt the political impact involved in respect to the Mundt amendment and, for various reasons, do not wish to be placed in the position of turning their backs on the economic plight of producers in their own States. I recognize that, as I said before. That is the reason why I shall support the amendment.

I shall support the substitute amendment for the simple reason that many Senators in this Chamber feel we are forced to recognize publicly the fact that the meat producers of this country are in trouble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining. The Senator from South Dakota has 2 minutes remaining.

What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I shall consume my 2 minutes, and the opposition can consume its 1 minute.

I now yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, 30 years ago the predominant word I encountered in farm terminology was the word "parity." Parity means equality. In my book parity is not limited to equality, what the farmer is paid as distinguished from prices he must pay for what he buys. Parity should include parity of treatment as well in the whole farm and trade domain.

It occurs to me that what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is asking is a parity of treatment for other commodities as well as for cotton and cotton textiles. For that reason I hope the Senate will see fit to vote down the Humphrey proposal and to support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I think the argument can be summarized as follows: If Senators wish to pass a textile bill, which I should like to do, they should vote for the Humphrey substitute amendment. The Humphrey substitute amendment in no way would interfere with the proposed legislation.

For the benefit of those Senators who are deeply concerned about other commodities, referred to in the Humphrey substitute amendment, that substitute amendment would direct the President, when there is a serious injury to those domestic producers, to take action similar to that which was taken in respect to textiles. This merely means negotiations, the attempt to arrive at an agreement. As the Senator from Rhode Island said, it is a voluntary thing. I believe the substitute amendment would not injure the purposes of the bill, and would do them good.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One-half minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, since the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has refused to strike from his proposed substitute the language, "When in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers", the amendment means nothing and it adds nothing. As I said earlier, it is merely a robber-baron device to destroy the opportunity of the Senate to vote the Mundt amendment up or down. That amendment encompasses all agricultural products. I sincerely hope that the Humphrey-Morse substitute amendment will be rejected so that we may have a vote on a meaningful amendment. We should vote my amendment up or down and then vote on final passage of the bill.

Madam President, I move that the Humphrey-Morse substitute amendment be tabled, and on my motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to table the Humphrey-Morse substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFICER. The question is on the motion to table the Humphrey-Morse substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On his vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Aiken	Dirksen	Murphy
Allott	Dworshak	Pearson
Bennett	Fong	Prouty
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Hruska	Tower
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Mundt	

NAYS—63

Anderson	Hill	Moss
Bartlett	Holland	Muskie
Beall	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bible	Jackson	Pastore
Burdick	Javits	Pell
Bush	Jordan	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Kefauver	Robertson
Cannon	Kerr	Russell
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Saltonstall
Clark	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Long, La.	Sparkman
Douglas	Magnuson	Stennis
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Gore	McCarthy	Talmadge
Gruening	McClellan	Thurmond
Hart	McGee	Wiley
Hartke	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hickey	Morton	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Butler	Eastland	Johnston
Capehart	Ellender	Monroney
Carroll	Ervin	Morse
Chavez	Fulbright	Smathers
Church	Goldwater	

So Mr. MUNDT's motion to table the Humphrey-Morse substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in the nature of a substitute for the so-called Mundt amendment, as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called

Humphrey amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the so-called Mundt amendment, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Anderson	Gruening	Long, Mo.
Bartlett	Hart	Long, Hawaii
Beall	Hartke	Long, La.
Bible	Hayden	Magnuson
Burdick	Hickey	Mansfield
Bush	Hill	McCarthy
Byrd, Va.	Holland	McClellan
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	McGee
Cannon	Jackson	McNamara
Case, N.J.	Javits	Metcalf
Clark	Jordan	Morton
Cooper	Keating	Moss
Dodd	Kefauver	Muskie
Douglas	Kerr	Neuberger
Engle	Lausche	Pastore
Pell	Scott	Thurmond
Proxmire	Smith, Mass.	Wiley
Randolph	Sparkman	Williams, N.J.
Robertson	Stennis	Yarborough
Russell	Symington	Young, Ohio
Saltonstall	Talmadge	

NAYS—23

Aiken	Dirksen	Murphy
Allott	Dworshak	Pearson
Bennett	Fong	Prouty
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Hruska	Tower
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—15

Butler	Eastland	Gore
Capehart	Ellender	Johnston
Carroll	Ervin	Monroney
Chavez	Fulbright	Morse
Church	Goldwater	Smathers

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the Mundt amendment, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the scheduled yea-and-nay vote now would be upon the same item as that on which the Senate has just voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been suggested that unanimous consent be asked to vacate the order of the yeas and nays on the Mundt amendment, as amended. However, some Senators have indicated that they wish to register an objection both to the Mundt and the Humphrey amendments.

I make the request that the order for the yeas and nays be vacated, but in the full knowledge that there are Senators who will wish to vote against the proposal as it is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORTON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do I correctly understand that the Senate is now about to vote on the exact text of the amendment as previously voted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the same language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That does not necessarily mean, does it, that the issue is the same? The question previously voted upon was one of preference; whether the Senate wished to substitute the language of the Humphrey amendment for the language of the Mundt-Hruska amendment. Now, that decision having been made, the question is whether the Senate desires the Mundt amendment, as amended, or nothing. Is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona]Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 24, as follows:

[No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Anderson	Gore	Long, Mo.
Bartlett	Gruening	Long, Hawaii
Beall	Hart	Long, La.
Bible	Hartke	Magnuson
Boggs	Hayden	Mansfield
Burdick	Hickey	McCarthy
Bush	Hill	McClellan
Byrd, Va.	Holland	McGee
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	McNamara
Cannon	Jackson	Metcalf
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Moss
Clark	Kefauver	Muskie
Dodd	Kerr	Neuberger
Douglas	Kuchel	Pastore
Engle	Lausche	Pell

Proxmire	Smith, Mass.	Wiley
Randolph	Sparkman	Williams, N.J.
Robertson	Stennis	Yarborough
Russell	Symington	Young, N. Dak.
Saltonstall	Talmadge	Young, Ohio
Scott	Thurmond	

NAYS—24

Aiken	Dirksen	Morton
Allott	Dworshak	Mundt
Bennett	Fong	Murphy
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Prouty
Cooper	Javits	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Keating	Tower
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—14

Butler	Eastland	Johnston
Capehart	Ellender	Monroney
Carroll	Ervin	Morse
Chavez	Fulbright	Smathers
Church	Goldwater	

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the vote by which the amendment, as amended, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, what part of the unanimous-consent agreements applies at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreements, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is entitled to submit his amendment, if he wishes to do so, under a 30-minute limitation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before that is done, Madam President, I should like to yield 1 minute to myself, in order that I may yield to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 applies to "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom."

I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether it is the intent of his amendment to give the same relief which is provided in his amendment to the products and commodities which are spelled out in section 204, in the language I have just now read.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I reply to the Senator from Maine by stating that the amendment which has been adopted is an amendment to section 204—the difference being that in this amendment the word used is "shall," whereas in the remainder of section 204 the word used is "authorized." I hope that will be interpreted in such a way that where injury is done to a domestic producer, the President will enter into these multilateral negotiations.

Mr. MUSKIE. I express the hope that if there is any doubt of it in the legislation, it will be corrected in the conference on the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I notice that the time on this item, and final passage of the bill, is to be under the control of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am told, since I am the ranking member present, that I should substitute for the Senator from Louisiana, which I shall be glad to do, or turn that responsibility over to the acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senator from Florida will take control. I should like to have lunch.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I do not believe that much time need be spent on the Miller amendment. However, in view of the action of the Senate in adopting the last amendment by the Senator from Minnesota, it is necessary to perfect my amendment.

I ask the clerk to read my amendment as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, as modified, will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Add the following at the end of the bill: "Action taken under this Act shall be consistent with all other Trade Agreement Acts and all agreements negotiated thereunder."

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I asked the question yesterday, at the time we were debating the main bill, whether or not there was any intention that there be any inconsistency of action under this bill or under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 as against other trade agreement acts, and particularly as against the Trade Development Assistance Act of 1962, which is now pending before the Congress. I received a reply last evening that we did not know. Then today I believe that the senior Senator from Minnesota replied that there was no intention that there be any inconsistency.

Let me say that I understand so far the only trade agreements that have been negotiated under section 204 are those relating to textiles, but this bill goes far beyond textiles; it relates to all agricultural commodities, as does section 204.

I want to make sure, and it seems to me every Member of the Senate would want to make sure, that what we are doing today will result in no danger in the future of our being inconsistent in our trade agreement acts. We are giving the President a great amount of discretion under the bill. He has a great amount of discretion under section 204. He will have a great amount of discretion under any trade agreement act. We must have consistency in our foreign trade policy. All this amendment does is make it very clear that any action taken under this bill will be consistent with our trade agreement acts.

I shall be very happy to yield for questions.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have been reading the Senator's amendment. I agree we must not do anything that would be inconsistent with the trade agreement acts, because, after all, when we make agreements with foreign nations, we in the United States pride ourselves on never breaking the agreements. I am beginning to wonder what far-reaching impact the amendment may have. If the Senator will tell us what he has in mind, we will be in a better position to answer the question. My own feeling is that we are legislating on the floor of the Senate on a broad subject. We are using words the full consequence of which we cannot know. Let me read the language proposed to be added to the bill: "Action taken under this act shall be consistent with all other trade agreement acts."

Will the Senator elucidate as to what he fears included in the measure would be inconsistent with the trade agreement acts and all other agreements negotiated thereunder? What does that mean?

We may be in the position of putting words in the bill, the possible far-reaching consequences of which, even the author does not know. I say that with all respect to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that question. I want to make it very clear that the Senator from Iowa does not know what far-reaching ramifications there may be, but the Senator from Iowa knows one thing, that we ought to be consistent in our foreign trade policy, and whether we have one or two or five acts, we ought to be consistent. This is particularly so when we are giving so much discretion to the President. I have no particular objection to any President having discretion to negotiate during an agreement, but when we have a bill which states that if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under authority of this section amoung countries accounting for a significant part of world trade, I do not know what "significant part of world trade" means. It is up to the President to determine that. When he makes the determination, I want to be sure that determination is going to be consistent with a similar determination made under any other Trade Agreement Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am merely thinking out loud. I am confronted with this situation suddenly, without having had time to study it. Would the Senator agree to a modification such as this: "Action taken under this act shall be consistent with our trade agreement acts policy"?

It does not mean a great deal. I will subscribe to that. But, if I understand correctly, the Senator wants to make sure that, in what we are acting on today, we shall do nothing that will reflect upon or be in contravention of our trade agreement acts. The Senator ad-

mits—and I admire him for saying so—that at the moment he cannot see all the repercussions that might flow from this amendment. If I were on the conference, I would agree to take it to conference and see what agreement we could reach on it. But I am not on the conference. Personally, I would not want to oppose it or vote for it. I think I should tell the Senator that I shall move to table the amendment, not because it is a reflection on the amendment or the Senator, but because it is too nebulous for us to vote on it at this time.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator be good enough to repeat the modification he suggested a moment ago?

Mr. PASTORE. My suggestion was: "Action taken under this act shall be consistent with our trade agreement acts policy."

Mr. MILLER. With all other trade agreement acts policy?

Mr. PASTORE. I am taking the words of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Is the word "act" singular or plural?

Mr. PASTORE. It is plural in the amendment. That is the way I use it. If the Senator wants the amendment to go to conference and see what they will do about it, that is satisfactory with me; but that is up to the committee. I do not think we ought to be doing anything that is inconsistent with the foreign policy of our country, whether it relates to trade or any other policy.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the consideration of the Senator from Rhode Island. I have no premium on draftsmanship in this matter. The Senator has been responsive to my concern when we talk about possible inconsistency in our policy. I will accept the modification of my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I shall be happy to yield. May I say I will accept the modification. If we can have some agreement on it, we can dispose of it without having to bother with a rollcall.

Mr. PASTORE. I want to say at this time that this is just contemporaneous thinking on my part, and I realize that the bill will have to go to conference, because it has been amended. I would not object in any way if the conference saw fit to consider the amendment. I do not have any pride of authorship in the modification. I merely suggested it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Acting for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who will be the chairman of the conference, I am willing to take this amendment, with the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, with this view—that I think what we are all trying to do if we take that action is to provide that actions taken under the particular measure which we are voting on today shall not be taken if they will contravene our trade agreement policy.

In conference, if we find there is some "bug" in respect to it, we would feel free to omit it. If we find the idea could be perfected by better language, we would feel free to change the language. I think we should take it to conference in that form, and I am willing to do so.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for his statement. With that understanding, Madam President, I move the adoption of my amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield back all remaining time against the amendment. It is my understanding that we are agreed upon the adoption of the amendment for the purpose of taking it to conference in the restated form suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. That is the understanding of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "article" and to insert "articles."

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, this is merely a grammatical correction. The bill of the Senate had the plural "articles." The bill of the House had the singular form "article." This is merely a grammatical correction. I do not think there should be a dispute. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COTTON. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the question of passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, because the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent from the Chamber and wishes to speak on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield first?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I withdraw my suggestion, Madam President.

Mr. COOPER. A parliamentary inquiry, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COOPER. Has the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa been voted on as it was modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa, as modified, has been agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Before a vote is taken on the bill I should like to ask some questions of the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, after the quorum call, when the Senator from South Dakota is present, since I shall control the time in favor of the bill I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I defer my questions until after the quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, on the time of the Senator from South Dakota, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, all time has elapsed unless the bill has been read the third time. May I ask the Presiding Officer whether the bill has been read the third time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been read the third time. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10788) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, we have 15 minutes on each side in which to debate the proposed legislation. I do not expect to consume very much of my time. After I have concluded my remarks I shall be happy to yield to other Senators, or to yield back the remainder of the time. I wish to summarize the situation as I see it.

First, I express my appreciation for the many manifestations of sympathy and pledges of support given to us by supporters of the proposed legislation, who rejected our effort to do something effective for other branches of agriculture today by adding an amendment to the textile protective tariff bill. We got no helpful action. We got a great array of adjectives, and I hope that some day we can cash in on these good intentions.

I should be more optimistic about the situation in that regard were it not for a famous statement by Elbert Hubbard at one time, that the hot place way down under is at the end of a road paved by good intentions.

I am sorry that we did not succeed in getting concurrent action. I voted against the Humphrey amendment because, as I said in the debate, it would add positively nothing to the power already existing. It would not grant the President any additional authority. It

might be construed by some, who continue to resist efforts to help other branches of agriculture, as a convenient excuse for doing nothing.

I think we should not accept that kind of adjectival statement in lieu of action which is so desperately needed.

As I said on the floor also, I shall vote for the bill on the question of passage. I shall do so for two reasons.

I shall do so because the textile industry and cotton producers of this country are in serious straits, though perhaps no worse than those of the timber people, of the dairy people, or of other segments of the farm economy. At least they have succeeded, through machinations yet to be disclosed and yet to be confirmed, in getting favored treatment for a favored few.

Second, this group needs the help, and certainly I shall not vote to resist that help merely because other groups were not able to get similar help in other areas.

Like many in this Chamber, I was curious as to where the senior Senator from Illinois got his documentation for the fact that what we are witnessing today is a trade of tariff concessions for future votes on tariff legislation. I hope that is not true, yet I respect the senior Senator from Illinois enough to believe that he would not merely fabricate the charge. All we can do is to study the call of the roll record when it is made to determine the result on Mr. Kennedy's demand that Congress delegate to him all future tariff regulating authority.

It seems to me that those who are vitally interested in the protective tariff system as it applies to cotton must come to recognize that the same protective mantle has a part to play when it comes to lambs, when it comes to poultry products, and when it comes to other agricultural products as well as to timber and timber products.

It may have a part to play when it comes to manufactured products in other areas as well. I recognize that we must constantly revise our tariff policies. We must live in a competitive world and engage in international exchange. But I do not think we can long continue as the great Nation that we are, or that we can enduringly continue the job of shoring up the finances of 80 foreign countries, if we adopt tariff policies designed to pauperize great segments of our own economy.

It is well that the cotton segment of our economy is receiving privileged relief today. But I regret that the same reasoning has not been applied to other segments of agriculture which are suffering similarly. There is no hope for us under the Humphrey amendment, because it does not change the situation. It is a gesture in futility. But there is hope for us in the expressions of sympathy, concern, compassion, and cooperation made by so many Senators on the floor of the Senate during the course of the debate. I hope the result may be support which will make it possible to pass some kind of effective legislation that will protect the "Little Orphan Annies" on the farm who have been left out of consideration in this bill today.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, but in order that his question may be answered, I have sent for the Senator in charge of the bill. He will be in the Chamber in a few minutes. If time is to be taken on the other side, or even on this side, I would rather yield for that purpose, reserving the time I agreed to yield to the Senator from Kentucky until that Senator arrives.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask my question, for perhaps some member of the committee can answer it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. I ask him how much time he desires.

Mr. COOPER. Four minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. My concern about the bill goes to the question of the policy it expresses. As it came before the Senate, the bill was limited to textiles and textile products, by its reference to multilateral agreements concluded under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. It would have the effect of authorizing the President to limit the importation of cotton textiles from the countries which are not partners to the agreement.

The Senator from Minnesota offered an amendment, which has been agreed to, which would direct the President to negotiate—the words used in the amendment are "the President shall negotiate." The amendment directs the President to negotiate agreements with other nations respecting a broad range of agricultural products, including timber and timber products.

My question goes only to the matter of policy. The President of the United States has sent to the Congress a trade message. He has asked the Congress to authorize him to reduce tariffs on all classes of items, rather than specific items, by 50 percent, and to reduce beyond 50 percent tariffs on those items in which the United States and the Common Market countries account for 80 percent of world exports. He asked us to authorize him to reduce all tariffs. Of course, the principle applies also to textiles and textile products, on which the agreement to limit exports to the United States has been negotiated. I would like to know whether this bill is consistent with the President's proposal. It seems to me that it is not, particularly since the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota has been agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maine as much time as he desires.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I am not sure that I can personally answer the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

First, the President has not proposed a free trade policy. We have not had free trade in this country from the outset. The tariff bill was either the first or second piece of legislation enacted by the First Congress of the United States in 1789. Ever since that time, as a part of our trade policy, we have had some form of adjustment provision. International trade inevitably involves adjustment.

Sometimes the adjustment is made in the private sector of our economy. Sometimes it is made by virtue of Government policy. The President's Trade Expansion Act itself contains provisions for the purpose of enabling import-impacted industries to adjust to the objective of trade expansion. So I think it is consistent with the objective of trade expansion to provide for trade adjustment policies in certain areas which public policy justifies.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 states:

> The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries.

The Humphrey amendment would emphasize or reemphasize that language in current law. The language of the Humphrey amendment, which is quite clear, would direct the President to undertake to negotiate such agreements "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers."

I point out to the Senator from Kentucky that negotiation requires and implies agreement by the other countries involved as well as ourselves. The Humphrey amendment would not authorize unilateral action. Section 204 itself does not authorize unilateral action.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be brief. The Humphrey amendment is pretty weak. It provides that the President shall take action when "such imports seriously affect domestic producers." I cannot get away from my belief that, despite the Senator's historical argument, on the one hand, the President is asking the Congress to give him freedom and authority, and on the other hand, the Congress is now attempting to restrict and limit that authority. We would direct him to take that action. I would not raise the question with respect to the textile industry because agreements for that industry have been negotiated with, but not yet signed by 19 countries, I do say that the amendment adopted represents a conflict of policy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the Senator from Kentucky given consideration to the question whether the factual exemption that has been given to rugs, carpets, and rolled glass comes within the principle that he has implied in his question?

Mr. COOPER. I am asking questions. I know that all kinds of exceptions are

being made. I view that as another exception.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we should give special exemption to textiles, rugs, carpets and glass, upon whom would fall the burden of the proposed general reduction in tariffs? If we grant an exemption to some, will we not necessarily have to place a greater burden on those who will not be exempt? That is the question that has been bothering me about the three specific exemptions that have been granted thus far.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island as much time as he desires.

Mr. PASTORE. To understand what we are attempting to do, we must go into the historical background of the events that have transpired which have brought us to our present position.

First, to appreciate what we are attempting to do, I invite the attention of Senators to the resolution introduced by my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire in 1958, which called upon Congress to make an investigation of the decline in the textile industry.

We proceeded to investigate. On February 4, 1959, we made 11 specific recommendations to the President after conducting exhaustive hearings not only in Washington but in localities of the country which were interested in textile production. Among the recommendations that we made, we strongly recommended to the President that he institute mandatory quotas against the importation of certain textile products. The President rejected that recommendation. I suppose he rejected it because he thought that instituting mandatory quotas would be inconsistent with our trade policy as a whole. We had never done a thing like that before, except in the case of certain agricultural products, and for the obvious reason that we have large surpluses in America. That point is understood throughout the world.

Insofar as other products are concerned, we had never instituted mandatory quotas. Therefore, the President suggested that possibly it might be a solution of this problem if we called together all the nations of the world in conference, those nations that were exporting or producing textiles. That is what we did. These nations all sat around the table in Geneva in the early part of 1961 and negotiated this temporary agreement.

We must realize that there cannot be any inconsistency in this policy, because we are doing it with the consent and the acquiescence and the approbation of the countries involved.

The only thing that confuses this picture is that, after we entered into this agreement with all the countries which at that time we thought were in the textile business, two or three other countries have now gone into that business.

Our whole international trade policy has concerned itself with tariff walls; it has never concerned itself with quotas. These are voluntary quotas.

The dilemma in which we find ourselves is that the agreement we have achieved, which has now developed into a 5-year agreement beginning with October 28 of 1962, actually places us in the position where our friends have agreed not to export to this country in excess of a certain amount. That is with their consent. It is a reciprocal arrangement. For that reason we have this situation which is consented to by all the countries.

In the meantime, Egypt and one or two other countries are beginning to export in large quantities. That fact vitiates the effect of this whole agreement.

Under present law the President of the United States cannot move in where bilateral agreements are in existence. At the time the law was passed no multilaterial agreements were contemplated. That creates more or less an ambiguity or a hiatus in the law. In order to cure that situation, the Commerce Department felt that the President would need this authority in order to more or less limit the loophole so as to make this agreement effective.

Mr. COOPER. I understand perfectly the situation with respect to the textile agreement. That was negotiated under the authority of section 204. The President can do that. My question goes to the Humphrey amendment. We have changed section 204, as I understand it, and we are now telling the President that he must negotiate with respect to agricultural products.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe this is being misunderstood. I am one of those who are willing to admit that we have done nothing here. We have merely recodified existing law. We picked out meat products, and we have said to the President, "You can do with relation to this what you have already done for the textile industry."

We are giving him authority which he already has. There is nothing more than that involved. If it were any different, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield such further time as the Senator from Rhode Island may need.

Mr. JAVITS. Does section 204 cover the products referred to in the Humphrey amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; every one of them, and it goes beyond that. What we have said is that the President can do what he already has the right to do.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope these questions will clarify the situation. The words that trouble me are those which refer to "seriously or adversely affects."

Mr. HOLLAND. "Seriously affect domestic producers."

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the President's judgment.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. Does that in any way materially change the criterion set forth in section 204?

Mr. PASTORE. No. All that the President can do is not shut anything off when he finds it seriously injures anyone. All he can do is negotiate with the countries on a multilateral agreement, in like manner as he did with respect to the cotton textile industry. He can invite these people to sit down to negotiate.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator does not feel that it materially expands or changes the basic authority contained in section 204. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. If we had not done it, the situation would be the same.

Mr. MORTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If I have any time remaining, I am glad to yield time to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. MORTON. I wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for bringing this matter into focus. What disturbed me about the amendment was the reaction that it might have with some of our friends, our needed friends, around the world. What would they think in Auckland or Sydney about this amendment? That is what disturbed me. I believe the Senator has straightened this out by showing that we have not really given the President any authority that he does not have already under existing law, and that this does not mean that we will set up quotas on foreign agricultural products.

Mr. PASTORE. If anything happened that concerned Australia or Argentina, all the President could do would be to call in the representatives of those countries, together with our representatives, and see if they could work out an agreement which would be acceptable to both sides, if there is a serious injury to a domestic industry. We have called upon the President, in fact, to invite these people to sit down to see if we can work out an agreement.

Mr. MORTON. That is under section 204?

Mr. PASTORE. It could have been done anyway.

Mr. MORTON. Under section 204?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. That is why we did it in the textile industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the time of the Senator from South Dakota expired?

Mr. CURTIS. If there are no further requests, I am directed by the Senator from South Dakota to yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes remain of the time allotted to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been yielded back or has expired. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Allott	Hickey	Neuberger
Anderson	Hill	Pastore
Bartlett	Holland	Pearson
Beall	Hruska	Pell
Bennett	Humphrey	Prouty
Bible	Jackson	Proxmire
Boggs	Javits	Randolph
Burdick	Jordan	Robertson
Bush	Keating	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Kerr	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Scott
Cannon	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Case, N.J.	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Long, La.	Stennis
Clark	Magnuson	Symington
Cotton	Mansfield	Talmadge
Curtis	McCarthy	Thurmond
Dirksen	McClellan	Tower
Dodd	McNamara	Wiley
Dworshak	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fong	Morton	Yarborough
Gruening	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Murphy	

NAYS—3

Cooper	Douglas	Gore

NOT VOTING—17

Butler	Church	Fulbright
Capehart	Eastland	Goldwater
Carroll	Ellender	Hayden
Chavez	Ervin	Johnston
Kefauver	Monroney	Smathers
McGee	Morse	

So the bill (H.R. 10788) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the corresponding Senate bill, S. 3006, will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MUNDT the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the next order of business is the call of the calendar, which the clerk will proceed to call.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2801) to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend for 2 years the time during which a certain definition of the term "obsolete vessel" shall be used, was announced as first in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request, I ask that Calendar No. 1284, Senate bill 2801, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I also ask, by request, that Calendar No. 1285, Senate bill 2829, amending title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as regards war risk insurance; and Calendar No. 1286, Senate bill 2800, amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as regards the differential subsidy, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, these bills will be passed over.

REPEAL OF SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING ELIGIBLE PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS

The bill (H.R. 7477) to repeal section 409 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, requiring the submission of a report to the Congress concerning eligible public building projects was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 819) to provide for suitable works of art in Federal buildings was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

ACCEPTANCE BY PERSONNEL OF U.S. GOVERNMENT OF DECORATIONS, PRESENTS, AND DONATIONS BY CERTAIN COUNTRIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2919) to authorize certain retired personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain countries, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, at the designated places, to insert the following:

a. On page 40 insert the following additional medal for Admiral Arleigh A. Burke:

		"Germany.	Distinguished Service Cross with Star.	Token of good will."

b. On page 41 insert the following additional medal for Vice Admiral Howard E. Orem:

		"Germany.	Grand Merit Cross with Star.	Token of good will."

c. On page 42, immediately below "Shaw, James C. 77130", insert:

"Peltier, Eugene, J. 77434.	Feb. 1, 1962.	Brazil...	Order of Naval Merit (Commander).	Token of good will."

d. On page 43, immediately below "McElroy, John H. 62661", insert:

"Wiesner, Frederick C. 62979.	Oct. 1, 1957.	Germany.	Distinguished Service Cross.	Token of good will."

e. On page 43, immediately below "Ribble, George B., Jr. 70671", insert:

"Archer, Stephen M. 71396.	Mar. 1, 1962	Greece..	Royal Order of George I (Commodore).	Token of good will."

f. On page 44, immediately below "Gerber, Marvin L. 113084", insert:

"Whichard, Rogers D. 117575.	Nov. 1, 1961.	France..	Academic Palms Medal (Academic Officer).	Token of good will."

g. On page 44, immediately below "Baczenski Frank J. 77368", insert:

"Kelley, George A., Jr., 77431.	June 1, 1955	Peru....	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (Knight Commander) Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will"

h. On page 45, immediately below "Manning, George C. 8685", insert:

"Reynolds, Raymond M. 104485.	July 1, 1961	Brazil...	Order of Aeronautical Merit (Commander).	Token of good will.
Mallek, Robert A. 108497.	Oct. 1, 1961	Brazil...	Order of Naval Merit (Officer).	Token of good will."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate is a routine omnibus foreign decorations bill. Every 4 years the Department of State is required to compile and submit to Congress a list of retired employees of the U.S. Government for whom it is holding decorations, orders, medals, or presents tendered them by foreign governments. Congressional approval for these persons to receive such items is required by article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution which provides:

* * * No Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under * * * [the United States] shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

The last omnibus bill of this nature enacted by the Congress was Private Law 85-704, approved August 27, 1958. The current bill is identical to it, except for the names of the recipients and the type of award involved. Let me say—and I believe this matter will be of particular interest to Members of the Senate—that among the recipients are our distinguished retired colleagues, Theodore Francis Green and H. Alexander Smith. Also included is former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter. The great bulk of the list is made up of retired members of the Armed Forces, ranging from generals and admirals to sergeants and enlisted men.

The committee amendments add to the list persons whose names were omitted from the original list, due to the recent receipt of the awards or lack of information concerning retirement dates.

In view of the fact that all persons concerned have retired from the Government, the committee perceives no objection to enactment of this bill.

I wish to refer now to an amendment which I propose to offer, authorizing Gen. Douglas MacArthur to accept and wear a decoration tendered him by the Emperor of Japan. This language was proposed in a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army to the Vice President, dated April 19, 1962, and is approved by the Department of State and the Budget Bureau.

Unlike the persons listed in section 1 of S. 2919 General MacArthur is not retired, and can, therefore, not be included in that list. Similar authorization for nonretired generals was enacted in 1959 concerning medals received by General MacArthur and Generals Marshall and Bradley. The decoration involved in the proposed new section 2 was conferred upon General MacArthur on May 17, 1960, and therefore could not be included in the earlier legislation.

I now ask that the committee amendments be laid before the Senate and be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment relating to the award to General MacArthur, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of law, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is authorized to accept and wear the Grand Cordon of the Order of the Rising Sun with Paulownia Flowers, which has been tendered him by his Majesty, the Emperor of Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, 4-25-62—B, and ask to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 31, at the end of the table entitled "Department of the Army" to insert the following under the appropriate column headings:

Master sergeant O'Reilly, Hugh F., RA6710523.	Feb. 28, 1962.	Japan...	Order of the Sacred Treasure, 6th class.	Reason for award unknown

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following-named retired personnel of the Government of the United States are hereby authorized to accept and wear such decorations, orders, medals, emblems, presents, and other things as have been tendered as of the date of approval of this Act by the foreign government or foreign governments immediately following their names, and that the consent of Congress is hereby expressly granted for this purpose as required under clause 8 of section 9, article 1, of the Constitution of the United States:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Green, Theodore Francis	Jan. 3, 1961	Greece	Cross of Grand Commander of Our Order of the Phoenix.	Reason for award unknown.
Smith, H. Alexander	Mar. 1, 1960	Greece	Cross of Knight Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	Reason for award unknown.
Vorys, John M	Jan. 3, 1959	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	Reason for award unknown.
Wolverton, Charles A	Jan. 3, 1959	Greece	Cross of the Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	Reason for award unknown.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Fox, Paul S	Nov. 25, 1960	Bolivia	Condor de Los Andes, Grade of Official.	Reason for award unknown.
Reed, Horace G	Dec. 31, 1961	Morocco	Order of Ouissam Alaouite, Grade of Commander.	Reason for award unknown.
Walker, Dr. Marion N	Aug. 31, 1960	Haiti	Order of Honor and Merit, Degree of Chevalier.	Reason for award unknown.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Englund, Raymond E	Jan. 31, 1958	Sweden	Knighthood of the Royal Order of the North Star.	Reason for award unknown.
Deering, Dr. Arthur L	June 30, 1957	Portugal	Commander of the Military Order of Christ.	Reason for award unknown.
Marsh, Raymond E	Jan. 1, 1951	Finland	Order of the White Rose of Finland, Knight First Class.	For valuable contribution to Finnish forestry in a study which he made for Finland.
Morse, True D	Jan. 20, 1961	U.S.S.R	Gold Medal	Presented by Mr. Evgeniy Chekmenev, Soviet Vice Minister of Agriculture and Chairman of the Soviet Animal Husbandry Party.
Termohlen, William Dewey	July 28, 1959	France	Commander of the Legion of Agricultural Merit.	For distinguished service to the advancement of the poultry industry in France.
		France	Order of Merit of Agriculture	For distinguished service to the advancement of the poultry industry in France.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Randall, Robert H	July 11, 1960	Dominican Republic.	Pablo Duarte Order of Merit	For assistance and contributions in the science programs of that country.
		Brazil	Order of the Cruzeiro do Sul	In recognition for fostering of inter-American activities in the fields of history and geography.

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Crawford, Charles H	May 31, 1960	Panama	Order of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa	Fostering cordial relations between Panama and the United States.
Garrett, Whitman P	Feb. 29, 1960	Panama	Order of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa	Fostering cordial relations between Panama and the United States.
Hall, Casey J	Sept. 5, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa	Fostering cordial relations between Panama and the United States.
Marshall, James	Jan. 20, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa	Fostering cordial relations between Panama and the United States.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Cabell, Lt. Gen. Charles	Jan. 31, 1962	Denmark	Danish—Kommandor, First Grade Dannebrogs.	Reason for award unknown.
		France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	Reason for award unknown.
		Iran	Boukhara rug, 7 feet x 4 feet 9 inches	Token of good will.
		Iran	Boukhara rug, 7 feet 2 inches x 4 feet 8 inches.	Token of good will.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Harrison, Robert H	July 31, 1960	Peru	Engraved Silver Plate	Farewell token of appreciation from officials with whom he worked.
Judge, John J	Oct. 31, 1961	France	Ordre du Mérite Commercial (Chevalier).	Important contributions to the development of economic relations between France and the United States.
Miller, Clyde	Mar. 31, 1959	France	French Cross of Commercial Merit (Croix du Mérite Commercial).	In appreciation of efforts and activity in connection with the "France Comes to You" exhibit.
Russell, William	Sept. 30, 1961	Italy	Award of Cavaliere in the Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana.	No information of record.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Szymczak, M. S	June 1, 1961	Belgium	Order of the Crown, Degree of Commander.	Awarded in recognition of his assistance to Belgium during the war.
		Poland	Commander's Cross with Star, Order of Polonia Restituta.	Awarded in recognition of his interest in Poland and cooperation in developing closer relations between Poland and the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Brand, Alonzo	Mar. 1, 1960	Thailand	Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand, Third Class.	Reason for award unknown.
Sebrell, William H., Jr	Aug. 1, 1955	Haiti	Officer de la Sante Publique	Reason for award unknown.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Speer, George Archibald	Sept. 30, 1959	Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of the Phoenix.	For services in the field of international housing.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Arpaia, Anthony F	Mar. 15, 1960	Italy	Stella della Solidarieta Italiana di 2a Classe.	Reason for award unknown.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Epstein, Fritz T	Aug. 31, 1960	Germany	Cross of Merit, First Class, of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany.	Reason for award unknown.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Deignan, Herbert G	Jan. 31, 1962	Thailand	White Elephant (Fourth Class)	Reason for award unknown.
		Thailand	Santimala (Peace) Medal	Reason for award unknown.

The following, tendered to personnel of the Department of State, were given as tokens of good will by the donor governments:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bonbright, James C. H	Apr. 30, 1961	Great Britain	Silver Jubilee Medal
Daniels, Paul C	Dec. 31, 1953	Bolivia	Condor de los Andes, grade of officer
Denby, James O	Apr. 30, 1951	France	Legion of Honor, Chevalier
Gray, Cecil W	Oct. 31, 1960	Mexico	Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle
Henderson, Loy W	Jan. 31, 1961	Lithuania	Lithuanian Order of Gedeminas
		Lithuania	Lithuanian Independence Medal
		Latvia	Order of the Three Stars
		Saudi Arabia	Silver tea set presented by H.R.H. Crown Prince Saud Alsaud of Saudi Arabia.
		Saudi Arabia	Robe, with case, presented by King
		Saudi Arabia	Gold watch, presented by King
		Iran	Sword, presented by the Shah
		Iran	Rug, presented by the Prime Minister.
		Iran	Rug, presented by the Shah
Herter, Christian A	Jan. 20, 1961	Germany	Grand Cross, First Class, of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany.
		Belgium	Order of Leopold
		United Arab Republic.	Sculptured Egyptian head from Saroite Okacha, Minister of Culture and National Guidance, Egyptian Region, Cairo, United Arab Republic.
		Iran	Silver urn and two small silver dishes from Doctor Ameli, escort officer in Teheran.
		Turkey	Four silver pieces (tray, two dishes, pitcher) from Foreign Minister Zorlu.
		Turkey	Rug from President Bayar
		Brazil	Silver commemorative medal
		U.S.S.R	Large handpainted vase from Minister Dimitri S. Polyansky, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.
		Spain	Rug from Fernando Mariá Castiella y Maiz, Minister of Foreign Affairs.
		Uruguay	Bronze and wood plaque commemorating visit of President Eisenhower in 1960 from National Councilor Eduardo Victor Haedo.
		Brazil	Silver base from Foreign Minister Lafer.
		U.S.S.R	Large oriental rug from Chairman Khrushchev.
		Iran	Oriental rug from Prime Minister Eqbal.
		U.S.S.R	Vase, approximately three feet high, from Chairman Khruschchev.
		U.S.S.R	Large lacquer box from Chairman Khrushchev.
		Mexico	Gold and silver cigarette case from President Lopez Mateos.
		Cambodia	Sterling silver jewel box from Foreign Minister Son Sann.
		U.S.S.R	Cloisonné liqueur set (decanter, tray, and six goblets) from First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers F. R. Kozlov.
		U.S.S.R	Gold and silver jewel box from First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers F. R. Kozlov.
		Saudi Arabia	Robe, with case, from King Saud
		Saudi Arabia	Gold watch from King Saud
Lacy, William S. B	Oct. 31, 1961	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau, degree of officer.
Murphy, Robert D	Oct. 31, 1959	Saudi Arabia	Robe, with case
		Japan	Pearl cuff links and tie bar
Patterson, Jefferson	Apr. 4, 1958	Italy	Officer of the Order of the Crown of Italy.
Reynolds, Eugene S., Jr	Dec. 10, 1949	El Salvador	Six silver coffee spoons
Simmons, John F	Jan. 31, 1957	Greece	Grand Cross of the Order of Phoenix
		Germany	Grand Cross of Merit
		Guatemala	Orden del Quetzal
Thibodeaux, Ben H	Jan. 31, 1960	France	Order of Agricultural Merit
Trueblood, Edward G	Aug. 31, 1958	Bolivia	Official of Order of Condor de los Andes.
Tuckerman, Gustavus	July 23, 1961	Poland	Gold Cross of Merit
		U.S.S.R	Camera (35-millimeter Zorki-5) from Commercial Counselor of Soviet Embassy Vladimir S. Alkhimov.
Turkel, Harry R	May 31, 1961	Cuba	National Order of Merit Carlos Manuel de Cespedes, Officer, from President Mendieta as token of his Government's appreciation in connection with negotiation of trade agreement.
Warner, Percy	Dec. 31, 1961	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit
Warren, Fletcher	Dec. 31, 1960	Nicaragua	Presidential Medal of Merit

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

U.S. COAST GUARD

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Rear Admiral				
Perkins, Henry C. (1097)	July 1, 1960	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Ulchi, with Silver.	For service as chief adviser to the Korean Coast Guard, which is now the Republic of Korea Navy.
		Italy	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Commendatore).	For meritorious service in connection with rescue operations following collision between steamship *Andrea Doria* and steamship *Stockholm* in the Atantic Ocean, July 26, 1956.
Captain				
Davis, Harry E. (1387)	Oct. 1, 1958	Greece	Gold Naval Medal, First Class	For distinguished services rendered to the Greek merchant marine.
Davis, Kenneth S. (1268)	July 1, 1959	Italy	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Cavaliere Ufficiale).	For meritorious service in connection with rescue operations following collision between steamship *Andrea Doria* and steamship *Stockholm* in the Atlantic Ocean, July 26, 1956.
McGowan, Gordon P (1267)	July 1, 1959	Korea	Order of Military Merit Ulchi	For service as adviser to the Korean Coast Guard, which is now the Republic of Korea Navy.
Commander				
Henthorn, John R (1346)	May 1, 1958	Portugal	Gold Medal of Courage, Abnegation, and Humanity.	In recognition of services during the rescue of the crew of the Portuguese schooner *Gaspar* during a gale off Newfoundland Banks on Sept. 18, 1948.
Johnson, Vaino O. (1396)	July 1, 1959	Portugal	Gold Medal of Courage, Abnegation, and Humanity.	In recognition of services during the rescue of the crew of the Portuguese schooner *Gaspar* during a gale off Newfoundland Banks on Sept. 18, 1948.
Lieutenant Commander				
Weber, John A. (3294)	Nov. 1, 1958	Norway	Norwegian Medal of Merit	For meritorious service in connection with the rescue of an injured seaman.
Lieutenant (j.g.)				
Kieffer, James W. (6447) (222-328)	Oct. 1, 1959	Italy	Al Valor di Marina	For meritorious service in connection with rescue operations following collision between steamship *Andrea Doria* and steamship *Stockholm* in the Atlantic Ocean July 26, 1956.
BMC(AN)				
Klingensmith, John E	Aug. 1, 1958	Haiti	Brevet de Merite	For outstanding service in training crew of the Haitian Coast Guard vessel *Vertieres* (GC-6) June 11-21, 1952.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

Holmes, Rubert E	Oct. 31, 1960	China	Order of the Cloud and Banner	In recognition of services rendered during Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's visit in the United States during 1943.
Nelsen, Reuben L	Aug. 31, 1958	Norway	St. Olav Medal	In recognition of services rendered during assignment to the protection of Her Royal Highness the Crown Princess Martha and the royal family during their stay in the United States during World War II.
Nicholson, Henry J	Sept. 30, 1958	Norway	Knight Cross, Second Class, of the Royal Order of Saint Olav.	In recognition of services rendered in a supervisory capacity during assignment to the protection of Her Royal Highness the Crown Princess Martha and the royal family during their stay in the United States during World War II.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Hager, Alice R	July 31, 1957	Brazil	Order of the Southern Cross	For services to the Government of Brazil in the field of aviation.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Cook, Dr. Robert C	Dec. 15, 1958	Philippines	Legion of Honor, Degree of Officer	Exceptionally meritorious and outstanding services to the Republic of the Philippines, during assignment at the Veterans' Administration regional office, Manila, Philippines.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Erskine, Gen. Graves B., USMC	Military, July 1, 1953 Civilian, Oct. 31, 1961	Thailand	Prathamabhon (Knight Grand Cross of the Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant).	Presented in the name of the Kingdom of Thailand.
		Greece	Royal Order of King George I	Presented by His Highness Crown Prince Constantine of Greece.
		Burma	Bronze statuette	Statuette of General Van Boola presented by Prime Minister of Burma.
		Thailand	Tiger skull	Presented by Prime Minister and Minister of Defense P. Pibulsonggram.
Cushing, Dr. E. H	Aug. 4, 1961	Philippines	Legion of Honor, rank of Commander	Token of good will.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
General				
Collins, J. Lawton, O5247	Mar. 31, 1956	Argentina	Order of General San Martin, degree of Grand Officer.	Received Argentine Minister of War in May 1948 and discussed with him matters pertaining to standardization of arms and other matters of joint interest to Argentina and the United States.
		Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Grand Officer.	Assisted the Brazilian Minister of War in conferences in matters of joint interest to both Brazil and the United States during the Brazilian Minister's visit to the United States in April 1949.
		Chile	Medal of Military Merit, First Class	For distinguished services rendered to the Chilean Army, per citation dated June 2, 1949.
		Chile	Military Medal, First Class	Reason for award unknown.
		Cuba	Order of Military Merit	Reason for award unknown.
		Iran	Order of Homayoun, First Class	Reason for award unknown.
		Mexico	Military Merit Medal, First Class	In recognition of his military virtues and outstanding activity in defense of democracy.
Hodes, Henry I., O12845	Apr. 1, 1959	Chile	Military Medal, First Class	Reason for award unknown.
Magruder, Carter B., O15155	June 30, 1961	Korea	Order of Merit for National Foundation Tanjang.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and meritorious service while serving as Commander in Chief, United Nations Command, Commanding General, United States Forces Korea, and Eighth United States Army from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1961.
Schuyler, Courtlandt V.R. O14905	Oct. 31, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	Reason for award unknown.
White, Isaac D. O15080	Apr. 1, 1961	China	Order of the Cloud and Banner, Second Class.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service from July 1957 to February 1961 as Commander in Chief, United States Army, Pacific.
		Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, Second Class	For services rendered to the Japanese Government while serving as Commanding General, United States Army Forces, Far East, and Eighth United States Army.
		Korea	Order of Merit for National Foundation Tanjang.	In recognition and appreciation of the services rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving as Commanding General, X Corps, Commanding General United States Army Forces, Far East, and Eighth United States Army, and Commander in Chief of the United States Army, Pacific.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service while serving as Commanding General, United States Army Forces, Far East, and Eighth United States Army during the period July 25, 1955, to June 30, 1957.
		Thailand	Knight Grand Cross of the Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	In recognition of his valuable services rendered to the Ministry of Defense of Thailand.
Wyman, Willard G., O12356	Aug. 1, 1958	Chile	Grand Star of Military Merit	For distinguished services rendered to the Army of Chile.
		Mexico	Medal of Military Merit, First Class	For his brilliant work in promoting a better understanding and a strengthening of the good relations existing between the armies of Mexico and the United States.
Lieutenant General				
Arnold, William H., O15558	Feb. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Collier, John H., O12388	Oct. 1, 1958	China	Chinese Armored Force Combat Badge.	Being admired by the officers and soldiers of Chinese Armored Force for his glorious activity as a combat commander in ground combat against an armed enemy of Allied Nations during the period of 1942–1945 in the European theater.
		Mexico	Order of Military Merit, First Class	In recognition of his high military qualities and his praiseworthy actions in behalf of closer relations between members of the Mexican Army and members of the Fourth Army of the United States of America.
Harrison, William K., Jr., O5279	Feb. 28, 1957	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of Commander.	For services rendered while serving as Commander in Chief, Caribbean Command, and in the interest of furthering good international relationship between Brazil and the United States.
		Chile	Military Medal of the Army, First Class.	For distinguished services rendered to the Chilean Army.
		Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of Grand Officer.	For services rendered while serving as Commander in Chief, Caribbean Command.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Grand Officer.	Given in recognition of his position as commander in chief, Caribbean Command, and to express the gratitude of the Peruvian Government for courtesy shown the Minister of War during his recent visit to the Caribbean Command.
Harrold, Thomas L., O16051	June 30, 1961	Chile	Estrella al Merito Militar	For services rendered while serving as the commanding general, USARCARIB.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	For services rendered while serving as the commanding general, USARCARIB.
		Paraguay	Orden Del Merito Militar, grade of Gran Oficial.	For services rendered while serving as the commanding general, USARCARIB.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Commander.	For services rendered while serving as the commanding general, USARCARIB.
Lawton, William S., O14924	June 1, 1960	China	Order of Cloud and Banner	In recognition of his meritorious service to the Government of the Republic of China.
Mathewson, Lemuel, O14980	Apr. 30, 1958	Denmark	Knight Commander of the Order of Dannebrog, First Class.	Reason for award unknown.
Read, George W., Jr., O12603	Aug. 1, 1960	Greece	Grand Cross of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	For services rendered to Greece while serving as commander, Allied Land Forces Southeastern Europe from July 21, 1955, to Aug. 22, 1957.
Swing, Joseph M	Jan. 5, 1962	France	Officer of the Legion of Honor	Reason for award unknown.
		Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of Grand Officer.	For his enlightened understanding of the needs of the armies of the Western Hemisphere in orienting the training of various Brazilian officers and by his participation in the effort for united defense of the democratic world.
Young, Robert N., O15068	Sept. 30, 1957	Chile	Medal of Military Merit, Second Class.	For distinguished services rendered to Chile.
Major General				
Biddle, William S., O15180	Nov. 1, 1960	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For superior service to the Republic of Korea during the period May 1 to Oct. 30, 1959, while serving as senior member, United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission.
Binns, John J., O15207	Nov. 1, 1959	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For distinguished service rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving as chief of staff, United States Army Forces, Far East, and Eighth United States Army, from Feb. 9, 1956, to May 1, 1957.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Cooney, James P., O17338	Sept. 1, 1960	France	Medal of Honor of the Military Health Service in Vermeil.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as Deputy Surgeon General, Washington, D.C.
Dasher, Charles L., Jr., O15634	Aug. 1, 1960	Spain	Military Merit Medal with white distinctive.	Reason for award unknown.
Farrand, Edward G., O16788	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, Degree of Commander.	In recognition of services rendered to the Brazilian Government.
Gard, Robert G., O12247	Dec. 1, 1959	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	Reason for award unknown.
Hains, Peter C., 3d, O15657	June 1, 1961	Mexico	Mexican Order of Military Merit, First Class.	For his magnificent labor in strengthening the bonds of friendship between members of the Mexican Army and members of the Fourth Army of the United States of America.
Harmony, John W., O15240	Nov. 1, 1959	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea while serving as chief of staff, United States Army Forces, Far East, and Eighth United States Army, from Oct. 3, 1955, to Feb. 8, 1956.
Harper, Joseph H., O15083	Dec. 1, 1959	Ethiopia	Grand Cordon of the Distinguished Order of the Star of Ethiopia.	As "a further token of happy relations which exist between our two governments and our respective armed forces."
Hays, Silas B., O17803	Aug. 1, 1959	France	Gold Medal of Honor of the Military Medical Service.	For services rendered while serving as Director of the Medical Services of the United States Army.
Hendrix, Raleigh R., O15897	Oct. 1, 1961	Japan	Third Class Order of the Rising Sun	In recognition of services rendered while serving as chief of staff of the United States Forces in Japan.
		Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, grade of Commander.	In recognition of rescue and relief operations of the United States Military Relief Organization during the flood in Holland in February 1953.
Johnson, Harry W., O16391	Feb. 1, 1961	China	Chinese Armored Force Combat Badge.	Being admired by the officers and soldiers of Chinese Armored Force for his glorious activity as a combat commander in ground combat against an armed enemy of Allied Nations during the period of 1942–45 in the European Theater.
		France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	"As deputy commander of the ComZ for more than one year, you have been able to establish a most favorable climate for excellent Franco-American cooperations. The active part you played during the Normandy landing and the subsequent battles for the freedom of Europe in the years 1944 to 1945."
Lindquist, Roy E., O18125	July 1, 1960	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix.	Reason for award unknown.
Mason, Stanhope B., O17295	Sept. 1, 1961	Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For distinguished service rendered to Korea while serving as commanding general, Twenty-fourth Infantry Division.
McClure, Robert A., O6785	May 31, 1956	Iran	Iranian Merit Decoration Grade I, Type I.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period May 30, 1953, to May 15, 1954.
McGaw, Edward J., O12631	Mar. 1, 1961	Iceland	Order of the Falcon with Star, grade of Grand Commander.	Reason for award unknown.
Mead, Armistead D., O15767	July 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious services to the Republic of Korea while serving as Assistant Division Commander, Third Infantry Division, Nov. 10, 1950, to Oct. 15, 1951.
Medaris, John B., O39554	Feb. 1, 1960	Argentina	Order of General San Martin, degree of Commander.	Served as United States aid and tour director for the Argentine Minister of War during his visit to the United States in April and May 1948, and, as such, was constantly with the Minister for a period of approximately two months.
Olmsted, George H., O199581	Apr. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	Reason for award unknown.
Partridge, Richard C., O12630	Mar. 1, 1959	Chile	Insignia of Military Professor	As a token of gratitude to officers of the United States Army who have acted or are acting as teachers of Chilean officers.
		Chile	Military Medal, First Class	Reason for award unknown.
		Mexico	Merito Militar, First Class	For his meritorious work as a soldier in the struggle for democracy.
Phillips, James H., O12331	Sept. 1, 1958	Iran	Royal Order of Crown, grade three	For participation in the burial ceremonies of the late Reza Shah.
Robinson, Bernard L., O12652	Oct. 31, 1957	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Ryan, Cornelius E., O7375	June 30, 1957	France	Cross of the Commander of the Legion of Honor.	For services rendered from May 1946 to August 1947 in Berlin.
Ryan, Patrick J., O17363	Oct. 31, 1958	France	Chevalier de la Legion d'Honneur	For outstanding services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Schow, Robert A., O12180	Oct. 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Commander	In recognition of services rendered to the French Government while serving as Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Commander.	For meritorious service. As recognition by the Government of Peru of his merits.
		Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, first class	In appreciation of services rendered to the Portuguese Government.
		Spain	Grand Cross of the Order of Military Merit with white badge.	In recognition of the merits of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, United States Army, to reward his services to Spain.
		Thailand	Knight Grand Cross of the Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	In high recognition of the valuable service rendered to Thailand in strengthening the relationship between the United States and Thailand and the assistance and guidance in the training of officers in the Royal Thai Army.
Timberman, Thomas S., O15328	Apr. 1, 1960	Thailand	Order of the White Elephant, second class.	Reason for award unknown.
		Thailand	Santimala (Peace) Medal	Reason for award unknown.
Tulley, David H., O16075	May 1, 1961	Chile	Star of Military Merit	For the distinguished services rendered to the Army of Chile.
		Japan	Second Order of the Sacred Treasure	In recognition of services rendered while serving as commanding general, United States Army, Japan.
Willems, John M., O16176	Dec. 31, 1961	Italy	Military Order of Italy, degree of Cavalier.	As artillery commander and then as chief of staff of a higher unit during the Italian campaign, he showed outstanding capacity of command and conspicuous talent for organization and tactics. By his brilliant qualities, displayed in many confidential missions, and proved to be a valuable element for a higher unit headquarters. He unremittingly developed efficient action for the reorganization of the Italian Army, per citation in diploma dated May 29, 1949.
		Iran	Decoration of Merit, First Class, First Type (Liaghat).	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service as chief of mission.
		Iran	Homayun Decoration, Second Grade	He rendered services of exceptional value to the Iranian Army while serving as Chief, United States military mission with the Imperial Iranian Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Brigadier General				
Ammerman, James F., O18165	Aug. 1, 1960	China	Special Collar Order of the Cloud and Banner.	In recognition of his outstanding contribution to the Government of the Republic of China during the bombardment of Chinese Communists upon the Kinmen complex.
		Italy	Order of Malta, First Class	Reason for award unknown.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Grand Officer.	In the performance of duty, demonstrating a high degree of cooperation and friendship toward the Peruvian Armed Forces, contributed immeasurably to the strengthening of the prevailing links of solidarity between the Peruvian and the United States Armed Forces.
		Portugal	Military Merit Medal, First Class	In the performance of duty while serving as Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.
Zimmerman, Wayne C., O12436	Jan. 31, 1956	Iran	Decoration of Honour, First Grade	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period May 6, 1951 to May 2, 1953, while serving as chief, United States military mission with the Imperial Iranian Army.
Berry, John A., O18473	July 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service rendered to Republic of Korea Army from Jan. 24, 1959, to Feb. 22, 1960, as deputy chief of staff for administration, Eighth United States Army.
Bethune, Philip H., O18449	Aug. 1, 1961	Mexico	Military Merit, First Class	For services rendered while serving as United States Army attaché to Mexico
Broom, Thad A., O18246	July 1, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal, Gold Star.	For distinguished service for his assistance in the development of the Republic of Korea Army during his period of assignment as quartermaster, Eighth United States Army.
Brown, Robert Q., O18520	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For meritorious service in Korea during the period Aug. 27, 1956, to Dec. 1, 1957, while serving as commanding general, I Corps (Group) Artillery.
Colby, Joseph M., O17562	Oct. 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of France.
Coleman, Frederick W., III, O19216.	Sept. 1, 1958	France	Medaille de la Reconnaissance Francaise.	Reason for award unknown.
Coolidge, George W., O17599	Aug. 1, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious performance of duty as assistant division commander, First Cavalry Division, during the period Dec. 17, 1957, to Jan. 21, 1959.
Eastwood, Harold E. O8202	July 31, 1952	Korea	Presidential Medal	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally praiseworthy service while serving as executive officer of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency from Dec. 1, 1953, as its Deputy Agent General from May 16, 1956, and as Administrator of the Agency from Sept. 15, 1958, to Mar. 26, 1960.
Fields, Kenneth E., O18957	Apr. 30, 1955	Iran	Decoration of Merit, Second Class, First Type.	In recognition of services rendered.
Hannigan, James P., O17531	July 31, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service to the Republic of Korea while serving as commanding general, Eighth United States Army Support Command, and concurrently as assistant chief of staff, G4, Eighth United States Army, during the period June 11, 1957, to Aug. 31, 1958.
Hardenbergh, Elmer P., O38940	Dec. 28, 1960	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Chevalier	For meritorious service rendered while serving as chief of control service in the American Army in Europe.
Hughes, Oliver W., O14974	Aug. 31, 1954	Greece	Greek War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Jewett, Richard L. O18339	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea from Aug. 15, 1959, to July 30, 1960, while serving as Engineer officer, Eighth United States Army, in Korea.
Kreidel, Francis A., O39553	June 30, 1957	Iran	Lyaghet (Merit), Second Degree, Type One.	As assistant of the chief of the advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie for exceptional performance of outstanding service during the period May 30, 1948, to Mar. 20, 1950.
McAnsh, Andrew T., O38667	June 1, 1960	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Officer.	Cooperated intellectually and materially in a highly efficient manner while serving with the United States military mission with the Staff College from July 19, 1951, to Mar. 30, 1954.
		Korea	Taeguk Distinguished Military Service Medal.	As deputy chief of staff for administration. Eighth United States Army, during period Jan. 23, 1957, to Oct. 12, 1957.
McNally, Edward J., O17629	Aug. 1, 1959	Greece	Knight's Order of Phoenix	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Munson, Frederick P., O16505	July 31, 1956	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Commander.	For services rendered while serving as United States Army attaché.
O'Connor, William W., O16348	June 30, 1956	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, First Class	As a member of the United States Army mission to Guatemala, in appreciation of the personal merit and as a demonstration of the bond and accord between the United States Army and the National Army of the Revolution of Guatemala, in virtue of the importance and efficiency of the services rendered to the armed institution.
Schewe, Marion W., O39748	July 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service to the Republic of Korea while serving as special assistant to the acting chief of staff, Eighth United States Army, during the period June 19, to July 1, 1957, and as deputy chief of staff, plans and operations, Eighth United States Army, from July 2, 1957, to Oct. 1, 1958.
Sladen, Fred W., Jr., O17677	Aug. 1, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For exceptionally meritorious service to the Republic of Korea as Chief of Staff, I United States Corps (group) during the period July 12, 1956, to Sept. 25, 1957.
Smith, C. Coburn, Jr.	Aug. 1, 1961	France	Commander of the Legion of Honor	In recognition of services rendered while serving as military attaché to France.
Van Wagoner, Lou G., O41668	Apr. 1, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For exceptionally meritorious services rendered to Korea.
Vogel, Herbert D., O15520	Aug. 31, 1954	Thailand	Order of the Crown of Thailand	Reason for award unknown.
Whipple, William, O18024	Aug. 1, 1960	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For services rendered to the French Government.
Woodward, William R., O18582	Oct. 31, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For promoting Franco-American relations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel				
Allcorn, Ford E., O51544	Aug. 1, 1961	Turkey	Aeronautical Badge	For successfully completing eight hundred and twenty hours and twenty-one weeks of pilot training. Served as the American adviser to the Turkish Government in the organization and conduct of the aviation school during the period Aug. 3, 1950, to July 29, 1952.
Allison, Daniel W., O29071	Oct. 31, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Anderson, Woodrow W., O40220	July 1, 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, second class	For important services rendered to the armed forces of Ecuador.
Barschdorf, Milton P., O21085	Aug. 1, 1959	Bolivia	Condor of the Andes, grade of Commander.	Rendered valuable services to the National Army, and helped to strengthen the relations between the North American and Bolivian Armies during his period of service in this country.
Baya, George E., O29817	June 1, 1960	Venezuela	Cross of the Ground Forces of Venezuela, second class.	For excellent work performed as the head of the North American military mission.
Belanger, Gerard A., O19333	Dec. 1, 1959	Greece	Gold Cross of the Royal Order of George I.	Reason for award unknown.
		Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Benner, John G., O19571	Mar. 31, 1957	Paraguay	National Order of Merit	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Paraguay, while assigned as assistant chief of the military mission to Paraguay.
Boatwright, John R., O6927	Nov. 30, 1946	Philippines	Distinguished Conduct Star	For acts of conspicuous courage and gallantry during World War II in the Philippines while commanding the Fifty-third Infantry Regiment, Fifty-first Division.
Bowman, Alfred C., O56777	Apr. 1, 1960	San Marino	Degree of Knight Grand Officer of the Equestrian Order of St. Agata.	Reason for award unknown.
Boyd, Harry R., O18102	Aug. 1, 1960	France	Chevalier of the Legion of Honor	In recognition of services rendered while serving in Europe.
Branch, Goodman S., O51014	Mar. 1, 1959	Paraguay	National Order of Merit	In recognition of services rendered to the Paraguayan Government.
Brinkley, Thomas M., O12189	Aug. 31, 1954	Guatemala	La Cruz del Merito Military de la Clase.	In recognition of his timely and effective collaboration as head of the mission of the United States of America in Guatemala and his outstanding personal merits.
		Guatemala	Citation in General Orders of the Bronze Star.	Reason for award unknown.
Brophy, Francis J., O39723	Aug. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Cavalier.	Reason for award unknown.
Brown, J. Trimble, O16666	Mar. 31, 1956	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, Third Class.	In appreciation for his outstanding services rendered to the National Safety Agency of Japan.
Brown, Sidney G., Jr., O18393	Aug. 1, 1960	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, First Class	For duties performed as chief of the SHAPE mission to Portugal during the period Mar. 10, 1953, to May 17, 1955.
Brownlee, Laurance H., O17583	Aug. 31, 1959	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For services rendered while serving as a member of the United States military advisory group to the Republic of Korea during the period Oct. 18, 1952, to Feb. 6, 1954.
Bruce, Charles O., O20542	May 31, 1959	Panama	National Order of Manuel Amador Guerrero, rank of Knight Commander.	For distinguished services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Panama.
Buie, Walter D., O12863	Aug. 31, 1954	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For rendering competent invaluable services as a member of the American military mission in Greece.
Burnett, John W., O42578	July 7, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of Officer.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Brazil.
Caldwell, Ross R., O51111	Dec. 1, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Carlson, Gunnard W., O18347	Jan. 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Knight	Reason for award unknown.
Channon, James A., O29044	Dec. 1, 1958	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Chilson, Francis A., O318792	Aug. 31, 1960	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, III Class	For enthusiastic and effective work performed at Escuela Politecnica and Escuela de Artilleria, Guatemala.
Chotas, Matthew E., O317045	Oct. 31, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	Reason for award unknown.
Cole, James V., O12397	May 31, 1955	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Officer.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Peru while serving as chief of mission.
Courser, Malcolm W., O42211	July 21, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For performance of exceptionally meritorious service during the period May 1955 to Aug. 20, 1956, while serving as commanding officer of the Ascom City Area Command and the Fifty-Fifth United States Quartermaster Depot.
Cowen, Edward T., O51042	July 31, 1959	Thailand	Knight Commander of the Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	Reason for award unknown.
Dalton, Kenneth W., O297636	Apr. 30, 1960	Italy	Croce al Merito di Guerra	Reason for award unknown.
Davis, Ray L., O418102	Nov. 3, 1960	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau with the Swords, grade of Commander.	For services rendered to the Government of the Netherlands.
Davisson, Henry L., O29612	Sept. 1, 1961	Greece	War Cross Class C with Crown	For services rendered during the Greek revolution from May 1948 to May 1949 while serving as adviser to the Greek X Mountain Division.
Dawson, Gordon E., O29587	Aug. 1, 1961	Italy	Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy, grade of Officer.	For services rendered as United States Army attaché, Rome, Italy, from July 8, 1953, to July 10, 1956.
		Italy	Cross of Military Merit with Crown, First Class.	For services rendered as United States Army attaché, Rome, Italy, from July 8, 1953, to July 10, 1956.
Dedi, Charles A., O358539	Sept. 30, 1960	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of Officer.	Reason for award unknown.
Dorn, George W., O41979	July 1, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	For outstanding and meritorious service during the period Nov. 23, 1956, to Feb. 28, 1958, while serving as assistant chief of staff, G4, I Corps (Group).
Dueker, Fred E., O32051	Dec. 31, 1960	Iran	Medal of Honor, Third Grade	For satisfactory services in the gendarmerie.
Dyer, Fred C., O220739	Nov. 30, 1957	Iran	Decoration of Merit, Second Class, First Type.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period from May 6, 1950, to Apr. 6, 1952.
Edmunds, James B., O10848	June 30, 1953	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of Officer.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Brazil.
Finley, Glenn S., O7177	Aug. 31, 1954	Greece	Cross of the Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	In recognition of his service rendered to Greece, while serving as chief of staff of the United States military mission to Greece.
		Greece	Knight's Order of Phoenix	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel—Continued				
Goodwin, Arthur C., Jr., O18179	Apr. 1, 1960	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, First Class	In recognition of services rendered while serving as chief of SHAPE training mission to Portugal for the period May 2, 1955, to May 5, 1958.
Gray, Ernest R., Jr., O363031	Jan. 31, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For outstanding and meritorious service in the development of the Republic of Korea Army during the period Nov. 15, 1956, to Feb. 24, 1958, while serving as secretary of the general staff, headquarters, I Corps (Group), United States Army.
Greeley, Brendan Mck., O17740	Aug. 1, 1959	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Officer.	Reason for award unknown.
Greene, Alphonse A., O18400	Aug. 1, 1959	Chile	Estrella al Merito Militar	For distinguished services rendered to the Army of Chile while serving as chief, United States Army missions, United States Army Caribbean.
Grizzard, Harry M., O16521	July 31, 1956	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Hale, Maurice W., O17333	Oct. 31, 1956	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, degree of Commander.	Reason for award unknown.
Haley, Charles L., III, O21226	Sept. 1, 1959	Venezuela	Cross of the Venezuelan Ground Forces, Second Class.	In recognition of his services as Army attaché to Venezuela during the period Nov. 17, 1952, to July 6, 1955.
Hallaren, Mary A., L115009	July 1, 1960	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Chevalier	As a token of gratitude for the eminent services she rendered to the Allied cause during the last World War and for her faithful friendship to France.
Harper, Neal W., O30262	Sept. 1, 1960	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Knight	For services rendered to the Republic of France.
Harris, Edward M., O19819	Oct. 1, 1961	Spain	Medal for Military Merit, Third Class with White Distinctive.	For services to Spain.
Hoover, Warren H., O18418	Aug. 1, 1961	Cuba	Distinguished Service Medal	For acts and accomplishments rendered to the Government of the Republic of Cuba, while assigned as chief of the United States Army mission to Cuba.
Janairo, Maximiano S., O18098	Aug. 20, 1960	Philippines	Legion of Honor, degree of Commander (First Bronze Anahau Leaf).	For exceptionally meritorious service in the Philippine Army as assistant chief of staff, G-4, from Mar. 31 to Oct. 20, 1945, and for valuable services to the Filipino people as operations officer, Construction Corps of the Philippines, United States Army, from October 1945 to the early part of 1947.
Kane, O'Neill K., O18150	June 30, 1954	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	As chief of the United States mission to Ecuador for two years, rendered important services to the Ecuadorean Armed Forces.
Kidwell, Francis E., O15563	July 31, 1954	Greece	Knight's Order of Phoenix	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
King, Archibald, O3323	Aug. 31, 1942	Brazil	Order of Military, Legal Merit	In recognition of services rendered to the Brazilian Government.
Kouns, Charles W., O22129	Sept. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of Cavalier.	Organized, completed administrative details for, and acted as tour director for the official visit of Major General Estillac Leal, Minister of War of Brazil, during the period May 2-20, 1951.
Leslie, Robert C., O18993	Oct. 1, 1959	Mexico	Decoration of Military Merit, Second Class.	For outstanding contribution as an English instructor at the Mexican War College.
Lindley, Ara G., O31427	Mar. 1, 1961	Belgium	The Military Cross, First Class	In recognition of services rendered to the Belgian Army within the domain of MAAC-BELUX.
Loomis, Frederick H., O29889	Oct. 31, 1961	Greece	Greek War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Mabee, Richard W., O23241	Dec. 31, 1960	Finland	Order of the White Rose, grade of Commander.	For services rendered while serving as Army attaché.
Martin, Paul M., O14659	June 30, 1954	Belgium	Order of Leopold, grade of Officer	As a token of good will.
Matthewson, Merton K., O910326	Mar. 28, 1955	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
McAfee, Broadus, O29053	Jan. 31, 1959	Netherlands	Commander in the Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords.	For services rendered while serving as Army attaché.
McBride, Clyde R., O18424	Aug. 1, 1961	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Officer.	Reason for award unknown.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Commander.	For performance of duty, demonstrated in a high degree of cooperation and friendship toward the Peruvian armed forces and have thereby contributed immeasurably to the strengthening of the prevailing links of solidarity between the Peruvian and the United States Armed Forces.
McClelland, Charles B., Jr., O17558.	Aug. 1, 1959	Iran	Medal of Merit, Second Grade, First Class.	For commendable services rendered in guidance and reorganization of the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.
		Iran	Decoration of Honor, Second Class	For services rendered while serving as chief of the United States advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie and adviser to the commanding general of the Imperial Gendarmerie.
		Iran	Pas (Reward) Medal, Third Class	In recognition of meritorious services while serving as chief of the advisory mission.
		Iran	Taj Decoration, Third Grade	For services rendered while serving as chief of the American advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.
McGrath, Albert W., O389029	Apr. 30, 1961	Greece	War Cross, Third Class	As a member of the American military mission in Greece, rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
McNaul, Winfield H., O410151	Apr. 5, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	For meritorious service during the period July 20, 1956, to Nov. 28, 1957.
Mills, John V., O28816	Aug. 31, 1955	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Moore, Harold H., O335728	June 30, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the United States Expeditionary Forces in Greece, rendered valuable services to the Greek Army.
Morrison, John T., O168816	Dec. 31, 1957	France	Chevalier de l'Ordre de la Santa Publique.	For services rendered while serving as administrator of public health, Maryland.
Morse, Henry P., O338673	Nov. 30, 1960	Greece	War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Neal, Ralph M., O15359	May 31, 1954	Belgium	Military Cross, First Class	In recognition of services rendered to the Belgian Army within the domain of MAAG-BELUX.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel—Continued				
Olson, Clarence H., O201092	May 1, 1960	Philippines	Legion of Honor, degree of Officer	In recognition of exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Republic of the Philippines while serving as assistant director of the American Legion National Legislative Commission from 1950 to 1959.
O'Neill, John T., O30166	May 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	For meritorious service in positions of the highest trust and responsibility while serving as deputy commander, Eighth United States Army Support Command and later as commanding officer, United States Army Seoul Area Command from May 24, 1957, to Mar. 14, 1958.
Owen, Jack S., O363845	July 31, 1961	Greece	Order of Phoenix	For services rendered to the Greek Army and in furthering the good relations between the two armies.
Palmer, Raymond D., O15942	Aug. 31, 1954	Cambodia	Officer of the Order of Agricultural Merit.	For services rendered as assistant director of the construction project, National Highway No. 4.
		China	Order of the Cloud and Banner	For services rendered while serving as United States Army attaché in Thailand during the period April 1953 to November 1954.
Peddicord, Everett D., O17245	Jan 31, 1958	Greece	Military Cross, Class A	For his vigilant interest which contributed immeasurably to the glorious success of A Corps, which has liberated Grammos from the bandits and relieved Greece from their malicious intentions.
Penniman, Charles D., O29616	Nov. 30, 1961	France	Knight of the Legion of Honor	In recognition of the services rendered while serving as commanding officer, Eleventh Transportation Terminal Command from Oct. 2, 1956, to Aug. 8, 1959.
Pierce, James R., O14979	June 3, 1958	Iran	Lyaghet (Merit), Second Degree, Type One.	As chief, United States military advisory mission to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie for exceptional performance of outstanding service during the period June 25, 1948, to Mar. 20, 1950.
Poinier, Norman E., O17581	July 31, 1959	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Officer.	For rendering advice and assistance to the staff of the Brazilian Command and General Staff School and to the Brazilian War College.
Pumpelly, James W., O51384	Mar. 31, 1957	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, Second Class	Reason for award unknown.
		Panama	Orden de Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Panama.
Reed, Charles B., O30193	Aug. 1, 1960	Mexico	Military Merit, Second Class	For services rendered while serving as United States representative of Joint Mexico-United States Defense Commission, an instructor at the Mexican War College and assistant Army attaché, also for his efforts in furthering closer relations between the Mexican Army and the Army of the United States.
Roller, Harry G., O18597	July 31, 1957	Greece	Greek War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Roy, Paul A., O18153	July 31, 1960	Belgium	Cross of Officer of the Order of Leopold.	In recognition of exceptional services rendered to the Belgian Army while serving as Army attaché from 1954 to 1957.
Sanders, Walter C., O51246	Oct. 1, 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	Reason for award unknown.
Schenken, Carlton G., O39609	Mar. 1, 1959	France	Silver Medal of Reconnaissance Francaise.	For services rendered from May 15, 1950, to December 1951 in the European Theater of Operations at which time had frequent contact with various officials in the French Government.
Schiele, George C., O281767	Mar. 2, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	Colonel Schiele distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the Republic of Korea during the period from Feb. 13 to Aug. 16, 1953, as the senior Adviser of the Twenty-First Republic of Korea Infantry Division.
Schmelzer, John F., O19270	Aug. 1, 1961	Panama	Lieutenant Colonel Alfredo Lezcano Gomez Medal.	For meritorious services to the National Guard, Republic of Panama.
Schull, Herman W., Jr., O16752	July 31, 1957	Peru	Order of Ayacucho, degree of Officer	Reason for award unknown.
Schultheis, Leo J., O29555	June 1, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
		Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of George I	Reason for award unknown.
Sharp, John R., O183351	Dec. 18, 1957	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the United States Army group in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof.
Shoemaker, Paul S., O29348	Aug. 9, 1957	Costa Rica	Distinguished Service Medal	Distinguished himself by his excellent spirit of cooperation and by his advice has performed distinguished services for the Police Force of Costa Rica.
Shore, Moyers S., O29589	Sept. 1, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of Commander.	For distinguishing himself in war action in Australia, New Guinea, and on Luzon, and entry of the Armed Forces of the United States into the occupation of Japan. He also won esteem in difficult and important tasks, while assigned to the investigations department in Panama.
Shuder, Russell M., O348543	Sept. 1, 1961	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	Distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Republic of Korea during the period Dec. 13, 1954, to Feb. 16, 1956, while serving as Chief, Communications Division, Office of the United Nations Economic Coordinator for Korea.
Slade, Todd H., O18789	Aug. 1, 1958	Mexico	Cross and Plaque Lieutenant General Ignacio Comonfort.	For distinguished services.
		Mexico	Military Merit, First Class	For his enthusiastic, active, and effective work of bringing the Army of the United States and the Army of Mexico closer together.
Smith, Philip E., O278533	Jan. 31, 1960	Iran	Decoration of Merit, Third Class, First Type.	In recognition of servics rendered the Iranian Army.
Smith, Philip J., O21719	Dec. 31, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	For service rendered to the Republic of Korea during the period Nov. 20, 1955, to July 4, 1956.
		Sweden	Swedish Red Cross in Silver	In recognition of his meritorious service on behalf of the Swedish Red Cross.
Spangler, Richard S., O18457	Aug. 1, 1961	Iran	Decoration of Merit, Third Class, First Type.	In recognition of the services rendered to the Iranian Army.
Stanley, John B., O19549	Dec. 31, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	For meritorious service during the period April 1953 to Feb. 15, 1958, while serving as commanding officer of the United States Army Command Reconnaissance Activities Pacific Command.
Steinbeck, Paul W., O17670	Aug. 22, 1959	Bolivia	Condor de Los Andes, Degree of Comendador.	In recognition of his services as United States military attaché in La Paz, and for his aid to Bolivia during the Trinidad flood of 1947 in which he participated in several hazardous airplane flights ascertaining conditions in the flood areas, per letter dated Nov. 24, 1948, from the United States military attaché, La Paz, Bolivia.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel—Continued				
Stelzenmuller, William B., O21422	July 1, 1960	Iran	Decoration of Honor, Third Grade	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Jan. 2, 1952, to Dec. 6, 1953, per citation.
		Iran	Decoration of Honor, Second Grade	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Jan. 2, 1952, to June 8, 1953, while serving as engineer adviser to the Imperial Iranian Army.
Stevens, Vernum C., O15526	July 31, 1954	Iran	Decoration of Merit, Second Grade, First Type.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Sept. 13, 1952, to June 8, 1953, while serving as chief of staff and deputy chief of United States military mission with the Iranian Army, per citation.
		Iran	Merit Decoration, Second Class, Type I, Second Award.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in performance of service during the period June 9, 1953, to May 15, 1954, while serving as chief of staff and deputy chief of United States military mission with the Iranian Army.
Stodter, John H., O15018	June 30, 1954	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	In recognition of the important services rendered to the Ecuadoran National Army as chief of the military mission of the United States Army to Ecuador, per decree dated July 12, 1949, signed by Galo Plaza, President of the Republic of Ecuador.
Taylor, James B., O463474	Apr. 30, 1956	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Taylor, William N., O18168	Oct. 1, 1960	Italy	Order of Merit of the Italian Republic, degree of Officer.	For services rendered while serving as assistant chief of staff for logistics and administration of the headquarters of the Allied Ground Forces of South Europe.
Timmerman, Fred, O328688	Sept. 30, 1954	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Titus, George F., O38604	Mar. 31, 1956	Greece	Military Cross	Reason for award unknown.
Trail, Harry E., O30206	Apr. 1, 1961	Cuba	Order of Military Merit, Second Class	Rendered meritorious services to the benefit of our country and particularly to the Army, cooperating for the closer existing friendly relations of both governments.
Troxler, Paul D., O41693	Aug. 1, 1960	Greece	Gold Cross of George I	Award made on Mar. 30, 1949, in recognition of services rendered in the construction and expansion of military and civil airfields in Greece, per letter dated Apr. 1, 1949, from the Office of District Engineers, Grecian District, Athens, Greece.
Truly, Merrick H., O18614	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For outstanding performance in a position of great trust and responsibility as assistant chief of staff, G2, Army Forces Far East, and Eighth United States Army during the period Jan. 27, 1956, to Apr. 19, 1957.
Vincent, Stewart T., O15021	Aug. 31, 1954	Colombia	Orden de Boyaca, grade of Commander.	As chief of the United States Army mission to Colombia, in the accomplishment of his mission contributed with exemplary brilliancy, intelligence and devotion to solving the important military problems and the training of many officers of the Colombian Army, for whom his advice and teachings have been of great benefit. Per decree from the President of the Republic of Colombia and signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in charge of the War Office.
Vivas, Joseph R., O22704	June 1, 1959	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Officer.	Reason for award unknown.
Wallace, Herbert C., O323441	July 23, 1958	Iran	Decoration of Honor, Third Class	In recognition of his services while a member of the United States military mission, Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.
Webber, Donald B., O18392	Aug. 1, 1961	Argentina	Order of General San Martin, degree of Commander.	As assistant military attaché to Argentina, he has been the main contact between the United States military attaché and the Argentine Minister of War because of his command of Spanish and his excellent personal relations with Argentina. He was assistant tour director with the Argentine Minister of War during the latter's visit to the United States in April and May 1948.
Williamson, William E., O50970	Jan. 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor, rank of Chevalier	In recognition of services rendered while serving as military attaché assistant to Ambassador of the United States in Paris.
Wilson, Conson D., O147583	July 31, 1954	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, grade of Officer.	Reason for award unknown.
Wirak, Louis R., O18342	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	For outstanding service and exceptionally meritorious achievement as the engineer, Eighth United States Army in Korea, from May 1, 1957, to July 27, 1958.
Wood, Lincoln, O29116	Aug. 1, 1959	Iran	Medal of Eftekhar, Second Grade	Reason for award unknown.
Lieutenant Colonel				
Anestos, Tash P., O384014	Apr. 30, 1961	Greece	Battalion of King George I, Gold Cross of Knight without Swords.	For services rendered to Greece.
Barton, Dorsey, O888955	Aug. 31, 1956	Greece	Greek War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Bennett, Arden L., O366931	Nov. 30, 1958	Brazil	Honoris Causa	For important services rendered to the Chemical Warfare Department, as director of the courses for Brazilian officers given in the Chemical Corps School in 1947, 1948, and 1949, per diploma dated Aug. 28, 1952.
Biersteker, Nicholas C., O338847	Feb. 1, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Booth, Maynard B., O395521	Nov. 30, 1960	Japan	Japan Ground Self-Defense Force Aviation Badge.	For services rendered in training of Japanese Ground Self-Defense Force pilots.
Brugger, Vernon W., O39966	Apr. 1, 1959	Thailand	Santimale (Peace) Medal	In appreciation of the services rendered to Thailand by his cooperation and assistance during the war, per letter dated Oct. 31, 1949, from the Royal Thai Embassy.
Bush, Weaver L., O278697	Aug. 1, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel—Continued				
Cassidy, Frank P., O1101222	Feb. 28, 1957	Colombia	Order of Boyaca	For services rendered in connection with the Colombian geodetic mapping program during the period July 5, 1949, to Apr. 1, 1953, per decree No. 411 dated Feb. 19, 1953.
Chiaramonte, Julio, O348151	Feb. 1, 1961	Greece	Greek Military Cross	"Because being liaison officer with the Army Quartermaster branch, he did, with unsparing effort, the best he could to meet the shortages in equipment. Because during the Grammos operations, he has shown courage and bravery by being in continual action within the division area, and he has exposed his life several times to danger." (Citation in Greek order of the day, dated Nov. 27, 1948, signed by Major General TH Pentzopoulos.)
Clark, Carroll H., O232382	Oct. 31, 1957	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Chevalier	In recognition of the great and distinguished services rendered by Colonel Clark who was always present on the battlefields during the war 1939–1945 and in whom France found under all circumstances a true and devoted friend.
Coeyman, William M., O51316	July 1, 1960	Greece	Greek War Cross Class II	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Collin, Jonas E., II, O1299205	Aug. 1, 1961	Greece	War Cross Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Condon, John F., O39972	May 1, 1960	France	Reconnaissance Francaise	Two documents dated Oct. 31, 1951, and Nov. 2, 1951, for outstanding services rendered to France.
		Iran	Decoration of Merit (Leyaghat) Class two, Type one.	For the appreciation of his services to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie during the period from July 5, 1947, to June 20, 1949. Per citation signed by Brigadier General Golpira, commanding general, Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie.
Cranford, James R., O325470	July 31, 1960	Greece	Gold Cross of Our Order of King George the First.	For services rendered in promoting cordial relations between the United States and Greece while serving as assistant Army attaché.
Cundiff, Paul L., O321678	June 30, 1960	Belgium	Military Cross, First Class	For rendering great services to the Belgian Army with his special competence in the field of ordnance, per decree dated Dec. 2, 1954.
Davis, James A., O1633794	June 30, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Decker, Frederick J., O497542	Apr. 30, 1957	Iran	Merit Decoration, Type I, Grade III	In recognition of the services rendered while serving with the United States mission with the Imperial Iranian Army from Oct. 8, 1952, to Apr. 4, 1954.
Dever, Bernard A., O40827	Feb. 28, 1958	Greece	Military Cross, Class C	Because acting as liaison of the Allied mission attached to X Mountain Division renedred valuable services for the successful outcome of the Grammos operations, having risked many times their lives. (Citation in Greek order of the day, dated Dec. 31, 1948, signed by Lt. Gen. T. H. Tsakalotos, commanding general, A Army Corps.)
Dodge, Howard D., O51550	Dec. 1, 1959	Iran	Lyaghet (Merit), Third Degree, Type One.	As personnel adviser to the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie for exceptional performance of outstanding service during the period Aug. 25, 1948, to Mar. 20, 1950, per citation in general orders dated May 14, 1950, signed by Major General Coupal, Commander Imperial Iranian Gen darmerie.
Ford, Edgar, O332936	Nov. 30, 1959	Greece	War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
		Greece	War Cross, Third Grade	Reason unknown.
Forsythe, Erwin F., O451952	Aug. 1, 1960	Iran	Iranian Honor Medal Third Class, First Grade.	For services rendered while serving as assistant United States Army attaché in Iran.
Freeman, Gerald M., O1001133	Nov. 30, 1960	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, Second Class.	During the period Sept. 23, 1952, to Oct. 1, 1953, Colonel Freeman contributed greatly to the improving of the production of ordnance items in Portugal, increasing good relations between the Portuguese and American Governments and strengthening the comradely ties existing between the two Armies.
Fry, Thomas C., O384200	Mar. 31, 1960	Italy	Cross for War Merit	For service rendered with the Eighty-eighth Division in Italy during World War II, per letter dated Jan. 4, 1949, from the chief of the Italian economic mission in Trieste.
Garton, Edward R., O32945	May 31, 1961	Belgium	Military Cross, First Class	For services rendered to Belgium.
Gray, Jack K., O1168257	May 1, 1959	Philippines	Legion of Honor (Officer)	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the Armed Forces of the Philippines particularly to the Fourteenth Battalion Combat Team, Philippine Expeditionary Force to Korea, as commanding officer of the One Hundred Sixtieth Field Artillery Battalion, Forty-fifth Infantry Division, United States Army.
Greer, Harold E., O2054014	July 1, 1961	Thailand	Royal Thai Army Airborne Badge and Ranger Fourragere.	For service rendered while serving as adviser to First Army of Thailand from May 1, 1954, to May 17, 1956.
Hall, Graham S., O468208	Jan. 31, 1957	Iran	Merit Decoration, Third Class of the First Type.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in performance of service rendered to the Iranian Army. Major Hall served as the Adviser to Transport Department of the Iranian Army.
Harvey, Murray L., O38833	July 1, 1961	Germany	German Parachute Qualification Badge.	For qualifying as a German parachutist.
Hay, James, O308968	Oct. 31, 1954	Mexico	Military Merit, Second Class	For meritorious service rendered to the Government of the Republic of Mexico.
Hess, Frederick W., O1175157	June 1, 1961	France	Honorary Corporal of the French Army Artillery.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as chief, United States Army liaison group to CCFFA, July 1957 to July 1960.
Holmes, Lester L., O245978	June 1, 1961	Greece	Greek Military Cross	"Because during the operations in Roumeli and until now, following continuously their units in order to insure the necessary assistance by personal appreciation of the situation, they proved to be valuable advisers and they have shown the same interest they would have shown for their own armies. They always advanced as far as the most advanced fighting elements in order to transmit their experiences to the fighting forces representing always a touching self-sacrifice and disregard of the constant danger. By their behavior they have acquired the love of all the soldiers and officers of the units. For all these services to our country." (Citation in Greek order of the day, dated Sept. 16, 1948, signed by commanding general, A Army Corps.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel—Continued				
Huckins, John H., O51290	Apr. 1, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service as civil affairs officer I Corps (Group), United States Army, during the period Feb. 10, 1957, to Apr. 25, 1958.
Huggins, Edward J., O1544222	Dec. 31, 1960	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Cavalier.	No information available as to the exact reason why the Governor of Brazil decorated Major Huggins. Diploma dated Feb. 18, 1952.
Hutchison, Aubrey D., O516262	July 31, 1960	Thailand	Order of the White Elephant, Third Class.	Reason for award unknown.
		Thailand	Santimala (Peace) Medal	Reason for award unknown.
Izquierdo, Osvaldo M., O349023	Mar. 1, 1960	Chile	Military Medal, Third Class	Reason for award unknown.
Janota, Erwin J., O1585668	Oct. 31, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the organization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Johnson, Kenneth A. L., O295950	Jan. 31, 1957	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For rendering competent invaluable services as a member of the American military mission in Greece, per diploma dated Jan. 22, 1952.
Kim, Youn P., O544054	July 1, 1961	Korea	Chungmu, Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	For exceptional and outstanding meritorious service while serving as a member of the Army Security Agency, Far East, during the period Nov. 1, 1950, to July 17, 1952.
LeVey, Arthur E., O348696	Nov. 30, 1958	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Officer.	Diploma dated Dec. 9, 1951, for merits mentioned in par "a" of art. 40 of Register of the Order of the Decoration of Military Order of Ayacucho.
Lewis, James W., O1103752	Nov. 30, 1960	Brazil	Order of Military Merit	For services rendered to the Brazilian Government while Major Lewis was a member of the Joint Brazilian-United States Military Commission from July 1948 to March 1951.
Lishness, Arthur R., O1106286	Nov. 13, 1958	Mexico	Military Merit, Second Class	Awarded to him for his magnificent cooperation in the military cartographic works carried out in Mexico.
MacIntyre, John K., O330663	Aug. 30, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service in Korea during the period Mar. 6, 1957, to May 20, 1958, while serving as commanding officer, United States Army Seoul Area Command.
McDaniel, Oliver H., O292637	Dec. 24, 1960	Greece	War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Martorani, William, O386859	May 31, 1960	Paraguay	National Order of Merit, grade of Commander.	For rendering outstanding services to the Armed Forces of the Nation and is deserving of the national gratitude, per decree dated Apr. 17, 1953.
Melton, Eugene P., O1280016	Aug. 31, 1954	Iran	Iranian Decoration of Merit, Third Class, First Type.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service as finance adviser to the Iranian Army and as such rendered services of exceptional value to the Iranian Army.
Milam, Robert M., O336043	Jan. 31, 1960	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, Second Class	For his military merits, his constant valuable and efficient cooperation in the military training of Guatemalan troops in the artillery branch and as a demonstration of admiration and recognition to the Armed Institution of Guatemala.
Miller, Clifford L., O22149	Oct. 1, 1960	Iran	Decoration of Merit	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period from Nov. 5, 1948, to Apr. 16, 1952, while serving as adviser to the Cavalry School, per citation.
Mix, Stanley M., O399259	Jan. 31, 1961	Venezuela	Cross of the Venezuelan Ground Forces, Third Class.	In recognition of services rendered to the Venezuelan Army while serving as adviser to the Venezuelan Infantry School.
Moore, Russell R., O1010955	July 1, 1961	Greece	War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Moushegian, Richard, O22109	Jan. 23, 1960	Iran	Honor Decoration, Third Class, Grade I.	For services rendered while serving as assistant United States Army attaché in Iran during the period Jan. 6, 1953, to Jan. 2, 1955.
Mullane, Walter R., O23987	May 1, 1960	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Officer.	For services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Peru.
Muratti, Jose A., O368534	June 30, 1960	Chile	Military Medal, Second Class	For rendering distinguished services to the Army of Chile.
Nielsen, Ray, O1111271	Aug. 31, 1958	Colombia	Order of Merit, Jose Maria Cordoba, grade of Officer Insignia of Service.	For services rendered while serving as officer in charge of the Colombia project, Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
Pacheco, Edward F., O1100714	Nov. 30, 1960	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes, grade of Calallero.	Per citation dated Oct. 19, 1952, for his meritorious service as engineer instructor. Diploma for civil engineer dated Feb. 13, 1951, from the Ministry of National Defense, for successful completion of civil engineer course at the Military School of Engineering.
Phair, Tom S., O23520	Aug. 1, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service during his tour of duty in Korea from Aug. 15, 1953, to Mar. 30, 1959, while serving as Chief of Korean Desk, J-2, United Nations Command, and later serving as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Seventh United States Infantry Division.
Poynter, Vernon L., O1030606	Feb. 29, 1960	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, grade of Officer.	For his meritorious exemplary, and humanitarian service as chief of the Army helicopter unit that assisted during the 1953 flood crisis in the Netherlands.
Pratt, Sherman W., O2006846	Dec. 31, 1959	Iran	Iranian Honor Decoration, Grade II, Class II.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Nov. 3, 1953, to May 11, 1954, while serving as adviser of mountain warfare, Imperial Iranian Army.
		Iran	Merit Decoration, First Class, Grade 2	Reason for award unknown.
Raleigh, Robert C., O23287	Mar. 1, 1961	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	He distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service during the period June 10, 1955, to May 1, 1956, while serving as Deputy Chief of Staff and as Staff Secretary of the United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission.
Rettagliata, John B. O402553	June 30, 1961	Italy	To the Merit of the Italian Republic, degree of Officer.	In recognition of services rendered to the Italian Government.
Samdahl, Leo B., O453676	Aug. 1, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For exceptionally outstanding service in connection with military operations against enemy espionage activities in Korea during the period Aug. 6, 1956, to Oct. 10, 1957.
Sanders, Charles A., O346343	Aug. 31, 1956	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	In recognition and appreciation of his exceptionally outstanding and meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea during the period Oct. 25, to Oct. 27, 1950 while serving as adviser to the Tenth Republic of Korea Regiment, Eighth Republic of Korea Division.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel—Continued				
Sanders, Henry I., O42096	Nov. 1, 1960	Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho grade of Officer.	Diploma dated Mar. 31, 1952, for meritorious services, mentioned in clause "b2 of art. 40 of Register of the Order."
Scott, Thomas M., Jr., O52544	July 1, 1960	Iran	Decoration of Merit, First Class, Third Grade.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of service during the period Nov. 6, 1952, to Aug. 29, 1953, per citation.
Sikes, Glenn A., O20353	July 1, 1960	Colombia	Shield of the War College	Decree dated Dec. 13, 1952; for rendering efficient services as adviser and professor at the War College.
Spencer, Robert D., O327426	Nov. 1, 1961	Greece	War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 2, 1950.
Steffey, William G., O30404	June 30, 1961	Paraguay	National Order of Merit, grade of Commander.	For services rendered to the armed forces of Paraguay while serving as assistant chief of the United States Army mission.
Sweeney, James L., O31457	July 1, 1961	Jordan	Independence Medal	In recognition of services rendered while serving as United States Army tour director for the United States visit of Prince Mohammed during the period Feb. 29, to Mar. 31, 1960.
		Jordan	Independence Medal, Third Class	Do.
Tallackson, Emanuel F., O920878	Mar. 30, 1956	Iran	Third Class Honor Decoration	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of services rendered to the Iranian Government while serving as the mission motor officer and assistant motor transport adviser for the Iranian Army.
Thompson, Nathan P., O350077	July 1, 1960	Greece	War Cross, Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Tillinghast, Lewis G., O1555143	Mar. 22, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For rendering competent invaluable services as a member of the American military mission in Greece, per diploma dated Jan. 22, 1952.
Towery, Luther E., O1168952	June 1, 1960	France	Honorary Conductor First Class of the French Sixth Regional Company of Transportation.	In recognition of his work and public relations with the French Headquarters at Metz from March 1957 to November 1959.
Vigil, Fred, O1798629	May 1, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez of Balboa, grade of Commander.	In recognition of services rendered while serving as instructor in tactics to Panamanian students at USARCARIB School.
		Peru	Military Order of Ayacucho, grade of Knight.	For the promotion of good relations between the United States and Peru.
Wachholz, Paul F., O451259	Sept. 30, 1961	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Cavalier.	Reason for award unknown.
Waggoner, Clinton A., O42552	Aug. 28, 1959	Greece	Golden Cross, Order of King George I.	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Whitman, Orlando O., O1170248	Mar. 31, 1957	France	Chevalier de l'Ordre des Palmes Academiques.	For services rendered while serving as chief of public information with Headquarters, USAREUR, Communications Zone.
Whitmore, Ralph L., O422201	Oct. 1, 1960	Sweden	Medal of Merit of the Swedish Red Cross in Silver.	In recognition of his meritorious services on behalf of the Swedish Red Cross.
Wood, George W., O44203	Feb. 1, 1961	Italy	Cross for War Merit	For services rendered with the Eighty-eighth Division in Italy during World War II, per letter dated Jan. 4, 1949, from the chief of the Italian economic mission in Trieste.
Wyse, Ralph M., O451866	June 30, 1957	Iran	Third Class Merit Decoration, Grade one.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct, untiring efforts, willingness, attention to duty and cooperation rendered to the Iranian Army, while serving as Armored school adviser to the Iranian Army during the period Sept. 9, 1948, to Mar. 5, 1951.
Major				
Anderson, Brooks D., O35664	May 1, 1961	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of Commander.	For services rendered in connection with military police activities in Panama.
Appling, Robert K., O1100858	Feb. 29, 1960	Italy	Star of Italian Solidarity, Second Class.	For his contribution to the reconstruction of Italy.
Bonaventura, Charles M., O1314429.	Aug. 1, 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	For services rendered while serving as Chief of the Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
		Ecuador	Parachutist Insignia	In consideration of his ample collaboration with the mechanized and parachute school to carry out in a successful manner the first course in parachuting.
Carroll, Winton A., O1014648	Oct. 31, 1959	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, grade of Chevalier.	For his contribution to the Netherlands flood disaster operation.
Colson, Guy L., O269193	Mar. 30, 1959	Philippines	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service rendered to the Armed Forces of the Philippines, particularly to the Fourteenth Battalion Combat Team Philippine Expeditionary Force to Korea.
Flint, George, O44970	Aug. 31, 1956	Greece	War Cross Class III	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Fries, Josephine, N1894	June 30, 1960	Norway	Medal of Merit	For services rendered while serving as an Army nurse in the European Theater of Operations during World War II.
Hilliard, Emerson E., O1010578	Mar. 1, 1961	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For invaluable services to the Armed Forces of Greece as a member of the American military mission, per citation dated Jan. 22, 1952.
Johnson, Robert E. L., Jr., O1554762	Mar. 27, 1957	Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Cavalier.	Reason for award unknown.
Joyce, Robert J., O1824871	Apr. 21, 1961	Greece	Cross of Officer of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	The Greek decoration was conferred upon him by His Majesty the King of the Hellenes, in recognition of the efficient assistance he gave His Majesty during his recent visit to Austria.
Kohl, William A., O1587378	Oct. 31, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and invaluable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Martin, John J., O395521	Mar. 31, 1961	Japan	Japan Ground Self Defense Force Aviation Badge.	For services rendered in training of Japan Ground Self Defense Force pilots.
Quesada, Antonio, O443967	Nov. 30, 1960	Nicaragua	Meritorious Service Award	For efficient work and valuable cooperation given to the cadets and officers of the National Army during the courses of military specialty, per Special Order No. 96, Military Academy of Nicaragua, dated Sept. 26, 1952.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Major—Continued				
Russell, William E., O1797012	Jan. 31, 1961	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service in connection with military operations against enemy intelligence activities in Korea during the periods Apr. 22, 1952, to Apr. 4, 1953, and Feb. 17, 1956, to Jan. 20, 1957.
St. Onge, Joseph A., O1690964	Feb. 28, 1959	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, Second Class	In recognition of services rendered to the educational, cultural, and military progress of the Republic of Ecuador.
Stawinsky, Johann, O1181149	Oct. 31, 1960	Korea	Chungmu Distinguished Military Service Medal with Silver Star.	In recognition and appreciation of his outstanding and exceptionally meritorious service rendered to the Republic of Korea during the period Sept. 15, 1958, to Aug. 1, 1959.
Torres, Jose M., O417060	Jan. 21, 1957	Nicaragua	Meritorious Service Award	For efficient work and valuable cooperation given to the cadets and officers of the National Army during the courses of military specialty, per Special Order No. 96, Military Academy of Nicaragua, dated Sept. 26, 1952.
Vasquez, Ricardo V., O1285342	Nov. 1, 1960	Nicaragua	Meritorious Service Award	For efficient work and valuable cooperation given to the cadets and officers of the National Army during the courses of military specialty, per Special Order No. 96, Military Academy of Nicaragua dated Sept. 26, 1952.
Captain				
Kieffer, Charles F., O1171224	Nov. 30, 1960	Nicaragua	Honorary Wings of Military Pilot	In appreciation of his meritorious collaboration and approach work on behalf of the Air Force of Nicaragua.
Marquez, Victor, O1340673	Nov. 30, 1960	Nicaragua	Meritorious Service	For efficient work and valuable cooperation given to the cadets and officers of the National Army during the courses of military specialty, per Special Order No. 96, Military Academy of Nicaragua, dated Sept. 26, 1952.
Ruiz, Luis, O940758	Nov. 30, 1958	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, grade of Knight.	For important services rendered to the Government of the Republic of Panama.
Chief Warrant Officer				
Campbell, George L., W2145715	May 1, 1961	Korea	Award for Defense	Awarded medal for this assistance as Company commander of Six Hundred and Ninth Ordnance Company, in directing the evacuation and rescue of over seven hundred and fifty civilians at Heunde, Pusan, on Sept. 17, 1959. Also in recognition of other community assistance projects.
Casas, Guillermo, W2151636	Sept. 1, 1960	Colombia	Military Cross Antonio Narino	In recognition of services rendered to the Colombia Government.
King, Paul W., W2101930	May 31, 1960	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, Second Class	For invaluable service to the Instituto Geografico Militar during the period of his assignment by the Government of the Republic of Ecuador.
Stille, Walter H., W2141458	June 30, 1959	China	Piliang Medal (Class B)	For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of staff duty in Taiwan during 1958.
Tippit, James H., W2147671	July 27, 1960	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, Third Class	For distinguished services rendered with his signal specialities, while a member of the United States Army mission to Ecuador, per Ecuadorian general orders dated July 17, 1953.
Warrant Officer				
Hungerford, Charles F., W2205351	Mar. 31, 1961	Korea	Wharang Distinguished Military Service Medal with Gold Star.	For exceptionally meritorious service as helicopter pilot during the period Feb. 27 to Mar. 5, 1956.
Master Sergeant				
Bass, Charles W., RA6255805	June 30, 1955	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Busbee, Howard L., RA39439929	June 30, 1960	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	As a member of the American military mission in Greece has rendered precious and valuable service to the Greek Army and has contributed greatly to the reorganization and training thereof, per Greek royal decree dated Feb. 8, 1950.
Horning, Russell O., RA6983841	June 1, 1960	Indonesia	Cigarette box, lighter, and certificate	In appreciation from the Indonesian Army, attesting to the outstanding professional ability and splendid spirit of cooperation of the team (ordnance mobile training team).
Maksymiec, Myroslaw A., RA20140533.	July 31, 1961	Ethiopia	Gold Medallion	As a token of appreciation of his work. Given by His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia.
Rohde, William G., RA7071033	June 30, 1961	Mexico	Medal of Military Merit, Third Class	In recognition of outstanding services to the survey department of the Mexican Armed Forces while assigned to United States Army Inter-American Geodetic Survey.
Sergeant Major				
Malone, Thomas J., RA6283028	June 30, 1960	Argentina	Honoris Causa	For services rendered as a member of the United States Army mission to Argentina, assigned to duties which caused him to work closely with the Armored School of the Argentine Army.
Sergeant First Class				
Hook, Bob J., RA25700128	Aug. 31, 1954	Iran	Decoration of Merit Third Grade, First Type.	For exceptional meritorious conduct in performance of service as assistant adviser to the arsenal department of the Imperial Iranian Army during the period July 12 to Sept. 10, 1953.
Master Sergeant				
O'Reilly, Hugh F., RA6710523	Feb. 28, 1962	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, Sixth Class.	Reason for award unknown.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

General				
Cook, Orval R., 36A	May 31, 1956	France	Legion of Honor (Grand Officer)	For meritorious service.
		Italy	Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Grande Ufficiale).	For meritorious service.
Partridge, Earle E., 33A	July 31, 1959	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun	For services as commander, Far East Air Forces.
		China	Cloud and Banner Medal	For services as commander, Far East Air Forces.
		Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit, grade of Grand Officer.	For meritorious service.
Twining, Nathan F., 10A	Sept. 30, 1960	Lebanon	De L'Ordre National Du Cedre, Grand Officer.	For meritorious service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
General—Continued				
White, Thomas D., 22A	June 30, 1961	France	Air Force Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Chile	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
		Sweden	Great Cross of the Order Swedish Sword.	For meritorious service.
		Belgium	Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold II.	For meritorious service.
		Paraguay	Order of Military Merit, Grand Official.	For meritorious service.
		Colombia	El Canciller de la Orden de Boyaca	For meritorious service.
		Colombia	Cruz del Merito Aeronautico Antonio Ricaurte (Gran Cruz).	For meritorious service.
		Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, First Class	For meritorious service.
		Uruguay	Air Force Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Ecuador	Order of Aeronautical Merit (Commander).	For meritorious service.
		Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
		Colombia	Honorary Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		China	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
		Italy	Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana.	For meritorious service.
		Chile	Medalla Militar de Primera Clase	For meritorious service.
		Philippines	Legion of Honor (Commander)	For meritorious service.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with Gold Star.	For meritorious service.
		Peru	Cruz Peruana al Merito Aeronautico	For meritorious service.
Lieutenant General				
Asensio, Manual J., 324A	Jan. 31, 1960	Colombia	Cruz del Merito Aeronautico Antonio Ricaurte (Gran Cruz).	For meritorious service.
Barcus, Glenn O., 87A	July 31, 1960	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For meritorious service.
Craigie, Laurence C., 61A	June 30, 1955	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Lindsay, Richard C., 476A	Apr. 30, 1960	Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix	For meritorious service.
		Greece	Royal Hellenic Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
		Italy	Gran Commandatori de Repubblica	For meritorious service.
		Italy	Italian Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
		Turkey	Air Force Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		France	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Lynn, Roy H., 492A	Aug. 31, 1959	Korea	Military Merit Taeguk Medal	For meritorious service.
Myers, Charles T., 37A	July 31, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Picher, Oliver S., 540A	May 11, 1960	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of George I.	For meritorious service.
Samford, John A., 377A	Nov. 23, 1960	Italy	Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana (Commander).	For meritorious service.
		Thailand	Dvitiyabhern (Knight Commander) Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant.	For meritorious service.
		France	Legion of Honor, Officer	For meritorious service.
Todd, Walter E., 361A	July 31, 1961	Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk	For meritorious service.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with Silver Star.	For meritorious service.
		Japan	Order of the Rising Sun Class	For meritorious service.
		Thailand	Dvitiyabhorn (Knight Commander) Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	For meritorious service.
Tunner, William H., 374A	May 31, 1960	Saudi Arabia	Ornamental Sword and Dagger	Token of good will.
		Italy	Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana, Grande Ufficiale.	For meritorious service.
		Thailand	Air Force Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Yates, Donald N., 524A	Mar. 31, 1961	Brazil	Ordem do Merito Aeronautico	For meritorious service.
Major General				
Agee, Walter R., 413A	Apr. 30, 1959	Greece	The Order of Phoenix, Cross of Grand Commander.	For meritorious service.
		Israel	Honorary Flyers Wings	Token of good will.
Anderson, Alvord V. P., Jr., 371A	Nov. 30, 1960	Brazil	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
Armstrong, Harry G., 209A	Aug. 31, 1958	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
		France	Air Force Medical Service Medal of Honor.	For meritorious service.
		Chile	Military Air Medal	For meritorious service.
Benson, Otis O., Jr., 19046A	June 15, 1961	Thailand	Dvitiyabhorn (Knight Commander) Most Noble Order of the Crown of Thailand.	For meritorious service.
		France	Air Force Medical Service Medal of Honor.	For meritorious service.
Burnside, Merrill D	Sept. 30, 1958	Korea	Military Merit Ulchi Medal with Gold Star.	For meritorious service.
Deichelmann, Matthew K., 331A	Apr. 30, 1959	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Taeguk	For meritorious service.
Douglas, Robert W., Jr., 46A	Feb. 28, 1957	Italy	Military Order of Italy	For meritorious service.
Glantzberg, Frederic E., 405A	Sept. 12, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, Grade Commander	For meritorious service.
Grussendorf, Richard A., 543A	Aug. 31, 1960	Greece	Knight Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix.	For meritorious service.
Hale, Dudley D., 431A	Feb. 28, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For meritorious service.
		Korea	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Hood, Reuben C., Jr., 498A	June 30, 1959	Peru	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Ecuador	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Nicaragua	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Cuba	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Chile	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Peru	Aviation Cross, First Class	For meritorious service.
		Chile	Military Medal, First Class	For meritorious service.
		Mexico	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
		Bolivia	National Order Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
		Venezuela	Cross of the Venezuelan Air Force	For meritorious service.
		Uruguay	Honorary Military Aviator	Token of good will.
		Paraguay	Honorary Pilot Aviator	Token of good will.
		Paraguay	National Order of Merit	For meritorious service.
		Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa grade of Gran Oficial.	For meritorious service.
		Colombia	Aeronautical Cross of Merit	For meritorious service.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	For meritorious service.
		Honduras	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Major General—Continued				
Kennedy, William L., 517A	Sept. 20, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For meritorious service.
O'Hara, John J., 463A	July 31, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, grade of Officer	For meritorious service.
Persons, John W., 418A	Aug. 31, 1959	Argentina	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Ruestow, Paul E., 548A	June 30, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Military Merit Medal with Gold Star.	For service as commander, Far East Air Logistic Forces.
Smith, George F., 380A	July 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor	For meritorious service.
Brigadier General				
Cassady, George S., 994A	Aug. 31, 1961	Portugal	Military Medal, First Class	For service as commander of MATS, Azores.
Gregory, Hollingsworth F., 496A	Oct. 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor, Officer	For meritorious service.
		France	Medaille de L'Aeronautique	For meritorious service.
Hamilton Pierpont M., AO900788	Sept. 30, 1959	France	Legion of Honor	For meritorious service.
Israel, Robert S., Jr., 354A	July 31, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Johnson, Bertrand E., 809A	Mar. 15, 1961	Korea	Ulchi Military Merit Medal with Gold Star.	For meritorious service.
Keeler, George E., Jr., 466A	July 31, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward the liberation of France during World War II.
Lee, William L., 430A	July 31, 1959	France	Aviation Badge (Pilot)	Token of good will.
Matheny, William A., 428A	July 31, 1959	Greece	Distinguished Service Medal	For meritorious service.
Morse, Winslow C., 515A	Nov. 30, 1959	Honduras	Meritorious Decoration	For meritorious service.
Nuckols, William P., 534A	Nov. 15, 1957	Monaco	Order of Saint Charles, Degree of Officer.	For meritorious service.
Ross, Stoyte O., 531A	Mar. 31, 1960	Greece	Order of Phoenix, Cross of Commander.	For meritorious service.
Schweizer, John M., Jr., 920A	Oct. 31, 1959	China	Air Force Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Greece	Commander of the Royal Order of King George I.	For meritorious service.
		Italy	Commendatore of the Order of Merit	For meritorious service.
		Belgium	Order of Leopold II	For meritorious service.
Smith, Harold L., 564A	June 30, 1960	Portugal	Medal of Military Merit, First Class	For meritorious service.
		Portugal	Medal of Gold for Distinguished Services.	For meritorious service.
Colonel				
Banks, Amberse M., A0222523	Mar. 31, 1955	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Barber, Rex T., 5198A	Mar. 31, 1961	Colombia	Cruz del Merito Aeronautico Antonio Ricaurte, grade of Comendador.	For meritorious service.
Bates, Earl E., Jr., 1581A	Feb. 28, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Bell, Maynard W., 2515A	Feb. 28, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Biddlecome, Bruce D., 7405A	Aug. 31, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Blauer, Clinton E., AO338854	Feb. 25, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Brause, Jacob L., AO176682	July 31, 1954	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, Third Class	For meritorious service.
Brown, Bryan W., Jr., 5248A	June 30, 1961	Peru	Flying Cross	For meritorious service.
Burns, Edgar J., 2222A	June 30, 1958	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes Medal.	For meritorious service.
		Bolivia	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Burroughs, Orval N., 2302A	June 26, 1956	Greece	Royal Order of George I	For meritorious service.
Carleton, Bert M., 4596A	June 15, 1959	China	Order of the Cloud and Banner	For meritorious service.
Cassidy, Charles F., Jr., AO432047	Mar. 31, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Clark, James N., AO204560	July 31, 1954	China	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Cooper, Elven R., 19596A	Apr. 30, 1961	Philippines	Legion of Honor, degree of Officer	For meritorious service.
Covington, William E., Jr., 1237A	May 31, 1957	Lebanon	De L'Ordre National Du Cedre, Officer.	For meritorious service.
Cox, Robert B., 4407A	July 31, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Daniel, James L., Jr., 350A	Oct. 14, 1958	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	For meritorious service.
Dietze, Herman V., 2441A	May 31, 1960	Brazil	Ordem de Merito Aeronautico, grade of Comendador.	For meritorious service.
		Brazil	Order of Military Merit, degree of Officer.	Reason for award unknow.
Edris, Gordon L., 4629A	June 30, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Fagan, Franklin K., AO265877	Mar. 15, 1960	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Fawbush, Andrew T., AO311769	June 30, 1961	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit, grade of Commander.	For meritorious service.
		Brazil	Mechanic Wings	Token of good will.
Fletcher, Eugene B., 1720A	Aug. 31, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Freeman Edmund F., 3150A	July 31, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For meritorious service.
		Vietnam	National Order of Vietnam	For meritorious service.
		France	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
		Laos	Royal Order of the Million Elephants and White Parasol.	For meritorious service.
		Cambodia	Royal Order of Cambodia, Degree of Commander.	For meritorious service.
Glassford, Pelham D., Jr., 1131A	June 30, 1961	France	La Croix de Chevalier du Merite Social.	For meritorious service.
Green, George B., 19077A	Feb. 28, 1961	France	Air Force Medical Service Medal of Honor.	For meritorious service.
		France	Flight Surgeon's Wings	Token of good will.
Gurney, Samuel C., Jr., 1352A	July 31, 1961	Israel	Air Force Badge	Token of good will.
Hagins, Newton D., 2799A	Dec. 31, 1958	Peru	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Hamilton, McHenry, Jr., 3438A	Oct. 31, 1958	Peru	Aviation Cross	For meritorious service.
Haney, George W., 3174A	July 31, 1960	Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of Phoenix	For meritorious service.
Hanley, Paul T., 1068A	July 31, 1961	Italy	Order of Merit of the Italian Republic, Grade of Officer.	For meritorious service.
		Italy	Honorary Pilot	Token of good will.
		Korea	Ulchi Order of Military Merit with Silver Star.	For meritorious service.
Harris, Lester S., 1155A	July 31, 1961	China	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Hild, Fred E., 1604A	June 30, 1961	Italy	Honory Military Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Hills, John De P., 1070A	July 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Hinnman, Harvey M., AO393128	Nov. 22, 1946	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Hunter, Anthony G., 578A	Sept. 14, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Colonel—Continued				
Hutchinson, Richard C., 1939A	Feb. 28, 1961	Guatemala	Cross of Military Merit, Second Class	For meritorious service.
Kime, Duane L., 1787A	Mar. 31, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Lampley, Harmon L., Jr., 3353A	July 31, 1961	Mexico	Military Merit Medal	For meritorious service.
		Mexico	Air Force Wings and Defensores de la Republica Mexicana y sus Descendientes.	For meritorious service.
McCartney, John F., 447A	Aug. 24, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
McKinnon, Samuel H., 3338A	July 31, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
McShane, Joseph B., AO257465	June 30, 1960	Netherlands	Order of the Orange Nassau with Swords.	For meritorious service.
Mangum, Cledous M., AO293149	June 30, 1959	Korea	Chungmoo Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For meritorious service.
Massion, John W., 3430A	July 31, 1961	Paraguay	Gran Maestro de la Orden Nacional del Merito, Otorga el grade de Gran Oficial.	For meritorious service.
Moore, John W., 2238A	Aug. 31, 1958	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
Mobley, Thomas L., 434A	July 31, 1959	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	For meritorious service.
		Argentina	Aviator Militar Honoris Causa	Token of good will.
Ott, Frederick W., 348A	July 31, 1958	El Salvador	Emblem, Staff Officer's School	Token of good will.
		El Salvador	Honorary Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Palmer, Sumner C., Jr., AO129832	Sept. 30, 1956	France	Medal of Aviation	For meritorious service.
Parham, Harry C., 2356A	Jan. 28, 1960	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during WorldWar II.
Parsons, Charles E., Jr., 4490A	Aug. 31, 1961	China	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Perkins, Charles L., AO560214	Jan. 31, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Perkins, Nicholas T., 1217A	June 30, 1961	Yugoslavia	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Peters, Frederick I., 2436A	May 31, 1960	Korea	Military Merit Chungmoo Medal with Gold Star.	For meritorous service.
Pillet, Frederick A., 410A	Mar. 31, 1959	Greece	Cross of the Commanders of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	For meritorious service.
Preston, William D., 19129A	Oct. 31, 1961	China	Flight Surgeon's Wings	Token of good will.
Ramage, Edwin M., 1765A	Aug. 31, 1958	Chile	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Richer, Marcel A., 2837A	July 31, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, Order of Knight	For meritorious service.
Russell, Joseph G., 1116A	July 31, 1961	China	Cloud and Banner, Sixth Class	For meritorious service.
		China	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Searles, Frederick W., 3196A	Apr. 30, 1960	Korea	Ulchi Military Merit Order with Silver Star.	For meritorious service.
Smith, Richard H., 631A	July 31, 1961	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Stefansson, Ragnar, 2683A	Sept. 30, 1960	Iceland	Knight's Cross of the Order of the Icelandic Falcon	For meritorious service.
Stepp, Richard D., 3807A	July 31, 1961	Peru	Aviation Cross, First Class	For meritorious service.
Stoltz, Albert E., 979A	Dec. 31, 1958	France	Legion of Honor	For meritorious service.
Taylor, Henry J., 2567A	July 31, 1961	Italy	Ufficiale al Merito della Repubblica, Knight Officer.	For meritorious service.
Taylor, Richard, 8469A	Jan. 31, 1961	Norway	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Thompson, Glen C., 1135A	July 31, 1961	Bolivia	Condor de los Andes	For meritorious service.
		Bolivia	Pilot wings	Token of good will.
Wadman, John F., 838A	July 31, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Ward, Thomas N., AO478403	Dec. 17, 1958	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
Ware, Everett H., 2003A	July 31, 1961	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau with Swords	For meritorious service.
Whitney, Robert, AO479379	Jan. 31, 1956	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Will, Ray J., 1692A	July 31, 1960	Vatican	Benemerenti Medal	For meritorious service.
Williams, Ernest F., 576A	June 30, 1961	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit	For meritorious service.
Williams, Francis W., 2308A	June 30, 1961	Chile	Military Medal, Second Class	For meritorious service.
		Brazil	Ordem do Merito Aeronautico, Comendador.	For meritorious service.
Winstead, Joshua T., Jr., 1588A	Dec. 31, 1958	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	For meritorious service.
		Ecuador	Honorary Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Wood, Randolph L., 1140A	July 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Woodworth, Lynn F., AO472436	Sept. 30, 1955	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Lieutenant Colonel				
Albaugh, Harry M., 4815A	Nov. 30, 1960	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa, Grade of Grand Master.	For meritorious service.
Benson, Kenneth B., AO42975	June 30, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Bondurant, Wiley M., AO4311645	July 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge, Observer	Token of good will.
Bostick, John, 2364A	Feb. 29, 1960	Peru	Aviation Cross	For meritorious service.
Brodzinsky, Philip, AO574040	July 31, 1961	Greece	Silver Cross of the Royal Order of George I.	For meritorious service.
Chamberlin, Carlton A., AO391689	Jan. 1, 1953	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Chick, Lewis W., Jr., 5921A	Sept. 30, 1958	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Clark, Linwood L., AO269717	July 1, 1960	China	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Korea	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Colling, James H., AO789545	Apr. 30, 1961	Iran	Merit Medal, Third Class, First Type	For meritorious service.
Cox, Thomas L., AO2045333	May 31, 1961	Iraq	Gold medal	For meritorious service.
		France	Navigator Badge	Token of good will.
DeGroot, Edward B., Jr., 2386A	Jan. 31, 1960	France	Gold Medal of Physical Education and Sports.	For meritorious service.
Fallon, Robert B., AO1644310	Aug. 31, 1961	China	Honorary Insignia of the Combined Service Forces.	Token of good will.
Fandel, William H., 4204A	July 31, 1961	Iran	Merit Medal, Third Class, First Type	For meritorious service.
Grier, John C., Jr., AO394326	Oct. 31, 1960	Brazil	Silver Medal, Merito Santos Dumont	For meritorious service.
		Norway	Haakon VII Liberation Cross	Reason for award unknown.
Hardeman, Milton L., AO344152	June 30, 1959	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Hearn, Bunn, Jr., 3967A	July 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Heintz, Adam J., 1864A	Jan. 31, 1961	Colombia	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Cruz de Merito Aeronautico Antonio Ricaurte, Grade of Comendador.	For meritorious service.
Henry, Noel P., AO803980	Jan. 31, 1961	Belgium	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		China	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Holmquist, George W., 4667A	July 31, 1961	France	L'Ordre Franco-Outremerien	For meritorious service.
Johnson, Russell T., AO421752	Oct. 2, 1958	France	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Lieutenant Colonel—Con.				
Klapper, David D., AO285620	June 30, 1959	China	Cloud and Banner	For meritorious service.
		China	Ivory Name Stamp	Token of good will.
Korona, Wilson B., AO665050	Oct. 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Laborde, Edward, AO475877	Mar. 1, 1958	Spain	Cruz de Segundo Clase del Merito Aeronautico con Distintivo Blanco.	For meritorious service.
		Argentina	Aviador Militar Honoris Causa	Token of good will.
LaBuda, Joseph E., 2419A	Apr. 30, 1960	Chile	Military Medal, Third Class, and Engineer Wings.	For meritorious service.
Little, John E., AO407105	May 31, 1959	Iran	Merit Decoration, Third Class	For service as air adviser, Technical School.
Marshall, Leonard S., 8951A	Jan. 31, 1961	Nicaragua	Military Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Moench, Carroll J., AO417045	Jan. 31, 1961	Korea	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Moynahan, Francis V., AO217758	Oct. 31, 1961	France	Medaille de L'Aeronautique	For meritorious service.
Munger, Paul O., AO740254	Jan. 31, 1961	Belgium	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Paulin, Harold D., Jr., 3455A	July 31, 1961	France	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Plummer, Harry W., AO789594	Nov. 2, 1959	France	Aviation Badge, Pilot	Token of good will.
Prentiss, Vernon, 4454A	June 30, 1961	China	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Ridenour, George F., AO322524	Aug. 31, 1957	Norway	Haakon VII Liberation Cross	For meritorious service.
Ruhe, Harry A., AO270130	July 31, 1957	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Smith, Joseph C., 3870A	July 31, 1961	Norway	Knights Cross, First Class, of the Royal Order of St. Olav.	For meritorious service.
Smith, Robert N., 3501A	Oct. 31, 1960	Paraguay	National Order of Merit	For meritorious service.
		Paraguay	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Weigle, Graham, AO662995	June 5, 1958	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Wolfe, George W., Jr., AO863220	Apr. 30, 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon	For meritorious service.
Major				
Anderson, Truman F., 7963A	May 31, 1960	Colombia	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Beck, Charles D., AO417933	Jan. 31, 1961	Brazil	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Breece, Jean R., AO521580	Mar. 31, 1961	Thailand	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Fair, Gene R., AO2044905	Feb. 28, 1961	Chile	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Fallon, Edward, 6805A	Dec. 31, 1960	Thailand	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Frank, Louis, III, AO666915	Mar. 31, 1960	France	Croix de Guerre with Palm	For outstanding contributions toward liberation of France during World War II.
Garza, Hector J., AO687026	Oct. 31, 1960	Argentina	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Henry, Oscar J., AO1544757	Sept. 30, 1960	Belgium	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		China	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
McIntee, Patrick G., AO2233792	Mar. 5, 1959	France	Order of the Black Star, grade of Officer.	For meritorious service.
Montgomery, Douglas M., 7874A	Jan. 31, 1961	Uruguay	Air Force Wings	Token of good will.
Moomaw, Lowell A., AO2099549	Oct. 31, 1961	China	Medal of Pao Ting	For meritorious service.
Nash, William J., AO799617	June 30, 1959	China	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Nichols, Donald, AO956185	Apr. 2, 1958	Korea	Army and Navy Decoration for Meritorious Service.	For meritorious service.
		Korea	Honorary Rank of Colonel in Republic of Korea Air Force.	Token of good will.
		Korea	Master Parachute Wings	Token of good will.
Quinones, Alphonse D., 13110A	July 31, 1960	Nicaragua	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
		Argentina	Pilot Wings	Token of good will.
Scafidi, Anthony, AO570085	Feb. 27, 1961	Italy	Observers Wings	Token of good will.
Watley, James D., AO660942	Apr. 30, 1960	Nicaragua	Honorary Pilots Wings	Token of good will.
		Bolivia	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
		Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Captain				
Aly, Joyce, AO686876	July 31, 1961	Netherlands	Order of the Orange Nassau	For meritorious service.
Gibson, John E., AO590382	June 30, 1961	Belgium	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
Molland, Leo M., AO3004818	Mar. 7, 1961	France	Navigator Badge	Token of good will.
Morin, Robert E., AO694796	Aug. 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge, Observer	Token of good will.
Reichard, Richard, AO1911123	Aug. 31, 1961	France	Aviation Badge	Token of good will.
First Lieutenant				
Vanderbank, Harry E., AO739231	May 31, 1961	Greece	Silver Cross of the Order of the Phoenix.	For meritorious service.
Chief Warrant Officer				
Rader, Robert N., 953061E	July 31, 1959	Chile	Medalla Militar de Tecera Clase and Miembro Honoris Causa de la Fuerza Aerea de Chile.	For meritorious service.
Flight Officer				
Chitwood, Royce R., T149529	June 27, 1961	Iraq	Gold Medal	For meritorious service.
Master Sergeant				
Barker, James N., AF6298874	Oct. 31, 1960	Venezuela	Air Force Cross	For meritorious service.
Cronick, Albert, AF6847969	July 31, 1958	Iraq	Gold Medal	For meritorious service.
Cunningham, Orville R., AF6395153.	Feb. 28, 1957	Bolivia	Aviation Mechanic Badge	Token of good will.
Garcia, Anthony P., AF6903205	Aug. 31, 1958	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Livingston, Dwain E., AF17002338	Sept. 30, 1960	Iran	Homayoun Medal	For meritorious service.
Parker, Robert M., Jr., AF6383813	Nov. 30, 1958	Mexico	Aircrew Badge	Token of good will.
Plowman, Ralph M., AF6859833	June 30, 1959	Bolivia	Order of the Condor of the Andes	For meritorious service.
Prioreschi, Angelo V., AF6255512	Sept. 30, 1959	Brazil	Aircraft Mechanic Wings	Token of good will.
Ruskowsky, Elton L., AF6725279	July 31, 1961	Norway	Haakon VII Liberation Medal	For meritorious service.
Technical Sergeant				
Bourgeois, Curtis M., AF6971151	Jan. 31, 1960	Italy	Solidarity Star, Third Degree	For meritorious service.
Britton, William W., AF36721137	Aug. 25, 1958	Korea	Hwarang Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For meritorious service.
Charlton, John E., AF6297354	Feb. 28, 1961	Norway	Medal of Valor	For meritorious service.
Wouralis, James G., AF11041062	July 8, 1958	Greece	Gold Medal of the Royal Order of George I.	For meritorious service.
Staff Sergeant				
McNamara, Alexander T., AF12328443.	Apr. 14, 1960	Italy	Solidarity Star, Third Degree	For meritorious service.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Admiral				
Low, Francis S., 9018	Jan. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, Commander	Token of good will.
		Italy	Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana, Grand Officer.	Token of good will.
Wright, Jerauld, 17066	Mar. 1, 1960	Italy	Grand Officer of the Order of Merit	Token of good will.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Officer, Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
		Netherlands	Grand Cross in the Order of Orange-Nassau.	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
		Belgium	Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold II.	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Grand Cross of the Order of Boyaca	Token of good will.
		Portugal	Great Cross of Avis	Token of good will.
		Morocco	First Order, Grand Cross of the Order of Ouissam Alaouite Cherifien.	Token of good will.
Hanlon, Byron Hall, 17669	Oct. 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
Holloway, James L., Jr., 34695	Apr. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
		Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, First Class	In recognition of distinguished service.
Good, Roscoe F., 20478	Mar. 1, 1958	Japan	Order of the Double Rays of the Rising Sun.	Token of good will.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with Silver Star.	For services rendered the Korean Navy.
Briscoe, Robert P., 34560	Jan. 1, 1959	Italy	Knight of the Great Cross of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic.	Token of good will.
		Greece	Grand Cross of the Royal Order of King George the First.	Token of good will.
		Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, Second Class	For service as Commander Naval Forces Far East.
Hopwood, Herbert G., 55954	Sept. 1, 1960	China	Medal of Pao Ting with Grand Cordon.	During the Taiwan crisis of 1958.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with Gold Star.	Token of good will.
		Philippines	Philippine Legion of Honor, Commander.	Token of good will.
		Peru	Naval Cross of Merit	For services rendered to the Peruvian Navy.
Burke, Arleigh A., 57951	Aug. 1, 1961	Ecuador	Order of Abdon Calderon, First Class	Token of good will.
		Japan	First Class of the Order of the Rising Sun.	Token of good will.
		Portugal	Grand Cross of the Military Order of Avis.	Token of good will.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with Gold Star.	Token of good will.
		Argentina	Grand Master of the Order of May for Naval Merit, Grand Cross.	Token of good will.
		Brazil	The Grand Cross of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
		Chile	Medalla Militar de la Armada de Primera Clase.	Token of good will.
		Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, First Class	Token of good will.
		France	Grand Officer of the Legion of Honor	Token of good will.
		Greece	Grand Cross of the Order of George I	Token of good will.
		Italy	Cavaliere di Gran Croce dell' Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana.	Token of good will.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Cross, Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
		Spain	Grand Cross of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
		Thailand	Most Exalted Order of the White Elephant, First Class, Knight Grand Cross.	Token of good will.
		Sweden	Grand Cross of the Royal Swedish Order of the Sword.	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Naval Order for Services of Distinction.	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Grand Cross of the Order of Boyaca	Token of good will.
		Belgium	Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold II.	Token of good will.
		Mexico	Special Merit	Token of good will.
		Paraguay	Order of Military Merit, Grand Officer.	Token of good will.
		Denmark	Grand Cross of the Order of Dannebrog.	Token of good will.
		Norway	Grand Cross of Olav	Token of good will.
		Netherlands	Great Cross of the Order of Orange-Nassau.	Token of good will.
		Philippines	Legion of Honor, Chief Commander	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Naval Order Almirante Padilla Grand Officer.	Token of good will.
		Germany	Distinguished Service Cross with Star	Token of good will.
Will, John M., 58283	July 1, 1958	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau with Swords, Commander.	For cooperation with the Dutch Navy operating out of West Australia.
Vice Admiral				
Bledsoe, Albert M., 17147	Sept. 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Officer.	For service as commandant, Fifteenth Naval District.
		Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa	For service as commandant, Fifteenth Naval District.
		Chile	Military Medal, First Class	Occasion of a visit to Santiago, Chile.
Moore, Walter E., 23333	Mar. 1, 1959	Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk	For service as commander, Amphibious Task Force 90.
		Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix, Knight Commander.	For service as chief of Navy section, Joint United States Military Air Group to Greece.
Callaghan, William M., 34540	Mar. 1, 1957	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, Second Class	For service as commander, Naval Forces, Far East.
		Korea	Order of Military Merit Taeguk with Silver Star.	For service as commander, Naval Forces, Far East.
von Heimburg, Earnest H., 34574	July 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Grand Officer	For service as chief United States Naval Mission to Brazil.
Roper, John W., 34599	May 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
Combs, Thomas S., 56057	Apr. 1, 1960	Spain	Order of Naval Merit, Grand Officer	Token of good will.
Ingersoll, Stuart H., 56869	July 1, 1960	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Officer, Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
		China	Grand Cordon of the Order of the Precious Tripod.	For service as commander, Seventh Fleet, Commander of the United States Taiwan Defense Command.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Grand Officer	Token of good will.
		Portugal	Military Merit, First Class	Token of good will.
Hickey, Robert F., 57064	July 1, 1959	Japan	Order of the Rising Sun, Third Class	Token of good will.
Sabin, Lorenzo S., 57170	Mar. 1, 1961	Korea	Military Merit of Taeguk with Silver Star.	For services during the Korean conflict.
		France	Legion of Honor, Commander	For his participation, Operation Passage to Freedom in Indochina.
Schindler, Walter G., 57173	Oct. 1, 1959	Chile	Military medal	For services rendered as chief of naval mission to Chile.
Jarrett, Harry B., 57619	July 1, 1959	China	Collar Order of the Cloud and Banner	For service as senior military attaché at the United States Embassy at Taiwan.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Vice Admiral—Continued				
Orem, Howard E., 57700	Dec. 1, 1961	Liberia	Star of Africa, Grand Commander	Token of good will.
		Germany	Grand Merit Cross with Star	Token of good will.
Sanders, Harry (n), 58212	May 1, 1957	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	Token of good will.
Gillett, Robert M., 58318	Mar. 1, 1958	Denmark	Danish Red Cross Medal	For service with the Danish Red Cross in Korea.
Hedding, Truman J., 58928	Jan. 1, 1959	China	Cloud and Banner Medal	For service as chief of staff to commander in chief, Pacific Fleet.
Kivette, Frederick N., 59408	Oct. 1, 1961	China	The Medal of Pao Ting	For service as commander, Seventh Fleet.
		China	Order of the Precious Tripod	Reason for award unknown.
Marshall, William J., 59713	May 1, 1959	Italy	Order of Merit of the Italian Republic	For services to the Italian Navy.
		Brazil	War Service Medal	For outstanding performance as captain of an escort vessel.
Moore, French R., 60583	Dec. 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, commander	For service as medical officer to the United States naval mission to Brazil.
Sears, Harry E., 62111	Aug. 1, 1958	Spain	Order of Naval Merit, Third Class	Token of good will.
Rear Admiral				
Stone, Ellery W., 11405	Feb. 1, 1958	Italy	Grand Officer of the Order of the Crown of Italy.	Communication assistance rendered during Balboa flight in 1933 as a civilian.
		Italy	Gold Medal to Protectors of Public Health.	Token of good will.
Halloran, Edward R., 117774	Jan. 1, 1958	Panama	La Estrella de la Fundacion Internacional Jose Gabriel Duque.	Token of good will.
Hartman, Charles C., 20282	Apr. 1, 1960	Mexico	Special Merit	Token of good will.
		Argentina	Grand Master of the Order of May for Naval Merit, Grand Officer.	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class, 1955	Token of good will.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
		Ecuador	National Order for Merit, rank of Commander.	Token of good will.
Glass, Richard P., 20375	June 1, 1958	Greece	Royal Order of George I, Knight Commander.	For service as chief of United States naval mission.
Pihl, Paul E., 56859	Mar. 1, 1958	Finland	Officers' Cross of the White Rose	For service as United States naval attaché.
Kelley, Marion R., 56895	June 30, 1950	Italy	Order of Merit	Token of good will.
Kniskern, Leslie A., 57641	Apr. 1, 1958	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit, Grand Officer	Token of good will.
		France	Legion of Honor, Commander	Token of good will.
		Chile	Military Medal for Distinguished Service, Second Class.	For service to the Chilean naval mission.
Solomons, Edward A., 57758	Apr. 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Officer, Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
Davis, Burton, 57986	Aug. 1, 1957	China	Order of Cloud and Banner	Token of good will.
Withington, Frederic S., 58289	Apr. 1, 1961	Japan	The Second Order of the Sacred Treasure.	For assistance in developing the maritime self-defense force.
Latimer, Samuel E., 58715	Sept. 1, 1958	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
		Chile	Military Medal of the Navy, Second Class.	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Parks, Lewis S., 59326	July 1, 1960	Chile	Medalla Militar de la Armada de Primera Clase.	Token of good will.
Champlin, Jackson S., 59497	July 1, 1955	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
Walker, Edward K., 59561	Nov. 1, 1958	Chile	Military Order, Second Class	Token of good will.
Hogan, Bartholomew W., 59745	Mar. 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Officer.	Token of good will.
		France	Medal of Honor	Token of gratitude from the medical service of the French Navy.
Strauss, Lewis L., 60014	Feb. 1, 1956	Belgium	Order of Leopold, Grand Officer	Token of good will.
Clarke, Ralph S., 60253	July 1, 1961	China	The Medal of Pao Ting	Token of good will.
Dudley, Paul L., 60354	July 1, 1961	Saudi Arabia	Gifts—Arab ceremonial robe and gold Longine wristwatch.	Token of good will.
Fullinwider, Ranson, 60382	Sept. 1, 1959	Argentina	Order of the Liberator San Martin, Knight Commander.	United States naval attaché at Buenos Aires.
Greytak, John J., 60391	June 30, 1957	France	National Order of the Legion of Honor, Chevalier.	Token of good will.
Stelter, Frederick C., Jr., 60521	Feb. 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Briggs, Harold M., 61082	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
		Ecuador	Abdon Calderon de Primera Clase	Token of good will.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Officer.	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Naval Order Almirante Padilla, Grand Officer.	Token of good will.
		Colombia	Order of San Carlos, Grand Officer	Token of good will.
		Mexico	Special Merit	Token of good will.
Harris, William S., 61414	June 30, 1957	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon de Primera Clase	Token of good will.
Banister, Alan B., 62009	July 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Knight Commander.	Token of good will.
Keeler, Frederick S., 62544	July 1, 1959	Colombia	Order of Boyaca, Commander	For service to the Colombian Navy.
Coffin, Harry N., 62658	July 1, 1959	Chile	Military Medal, Second Class	Token of good will.
Howerton, Charles C., 63257	Oct. 1, 1959	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit	United States naval attaché and naval attaché for air.
		Argentina	Piloto Aviador Naval Honoris Causa	United States naval attaché and naval attaché for air.
Adkins, James A., 63364	Nov. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Officer	Token of good will.
Foster, Walter M., 63380	Nov. 1, 1959	Chile	Military Medal, Second Class	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Sanchez, Henry G., 63398	Nov. 1, 1959	Spain	Cross of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
Andrews, Richard S., 70044	Nov. 1, 1959	Brazil	Medal of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Marechal Souza Agnior	Token of good will.
Hunter, Raymond P., 70074	Nov. 1, 1959	Netherlands	Order of Orange Nassau, Commander	Token of good will.
Norvell, William C., 70122	Sept. 1, 1959	Japan	Third Order of the Sacred Treasure	Token of good will.
DeMetropolis, George (n), 70192	Nov. 1, 1959	Greece	Royal Order of George I, Officer	Token of good will.
Johnsen, William H., 70260	Nov. 1, 1959	Liberia	Order of the Star of Africa, Commander.	Presidential inaugural ceremonies, 1952.
Walpole, Kinloch C., 70269	Nov. 1, 1959	Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix, Commander.	For service rendered to the Royal Hellenic Navy.
Roscoe, David L., 70278	Nov. 1, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	Token of good will.
Sheeley, William R., 70788	Aug. 1, 1961	Italy	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
Jukes, Herbert L., 71354	Nov. 1, 1959	Greece	Royal Order of George I	For services as technical engineer officer with United States naval mission.
Garrison, Malcolm E., 71389	Nov. 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Haskins, Enrique D., 72381	Jan. 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor, Knight	For service as United States naval attaché, Paris, France.
De Florez, Luis, 72841	Sept. 1, 1955	Spain	Grand Cross of the Order of Naval Merit, Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
Fleck, Francis E., Jr., 73551	Nov. 1, 1959	Japan	Order of Merit, Third Class	Member of the staff, Commander, Naval Forces, Far East.
DuBois, Thomas H., 73560	Apr. 1, 1958	Colombia	Naval Order Admiral Padilla, Officer	Token of good will.
Ashley, James H., Jr., 73627	Nov. 1, 1959	Korea	Military Order of Merit, Ulchi with Gold Star.	For service as Chief, United States Naval Advisory Group, Korea.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Rear Admiral—Continued				
Coffin, Albert P., 73645	Nov. 1, 1959	Chile	Military Medal of the Navy, Third Class.	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Shaw, James C., 77130	Feb. 1, 1958	Netherlands	Order of Orange-Nassau, Commander.	Token of good will.
Peltier, Eugene J., 77434	Feb. 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit (Commander)	Token of good will.
Benitez, Rafael C., 82557	July 1, 1959	Cuba	Order of Naval Merit	Token of good will.
		Chile	Naval Military Medal, Third Class	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Bull, Carl E., 83674	Nov. 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Captain				
Mabley, Louis C., 60437	July 1, 1961	Sweden	Royal Order of the Sword	Token of good will.
Gjoerloff, George O., 60794	Mar. 1, 1959	Ethiopia	Star of Ethiopia, First Class	Token of good will.
McMillan, Carl H., 61047	Oct. 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	For service as medical officer to the United States naval mission to Peru.
Sullivan, Emmett J., 61275	June 30, 1957	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Enright, George P., 62036	July 1, 1958	Greece	Cross of Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix.	For service as United States naval attaché to Greece.
Wakeman, Philip F., 62132	Aug. 1, 1958	Colombia	Naval Order Almirante Padilla	Token of good will.
Whiteford, William R., 62192	May 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
McElroy, John H., 62661	July 1, 1959	France	Legion of Honor	Token of good will.
Wiesner, Frederick C., 62979	Oct. 1, 1957	Germany	Distinguished Service Cross	Token of good will.
Fuetsch, Bernhart A., 63263	July 1, 1960	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Briner, Richard R., 63288	July 1, 1960	France	Cross of the Legion of Honor, Officer	Rescue assistance.
Koepke, Lyle L., 63313	July 1, 1960	Panama	Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa	Token of good will.
May, Leo G., 63376	July 1, 1960	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, Third Class.	Token of good will.
Harris, David A., 63421	July 1, 1960	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander, Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
Ellis, Edward B., 66416	Sept. 1, 1960	Lebanon	Honorary Gold Medal for Merit	Token of good will.
Gurnette, Byron L., 70017	July 1, 1961	Monaco	Order of Saint Charles, Commander	Token of good will.
Robertson, Edward L., 7072	May 1, 1959	Colombia	Order of Naval Almirante Padilla	For services as professor in the Colombian Naval War College.
		Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, Second Class	Token of good will.
Vredenburgh, James C., 70133	July 1, 1960	Japan	Order of the Sacred Treasure, Third Class.	For assistance in developing the Maritime Self-Defense Force.
Cooper, Robert W., 70135	June 1, 1961	Chile	Medalla Militar de la Armada de Tercera Clase.	For service to the Chilean Navy.
		Finland	Order of the White Rose, Commander	Token of good will.
Wilber, Donald T., 70239	July 1, 1961	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure.	Token of good will.
		Greece	The Cross of Brigadiers of the Order of George I.	Token of good will.
Payson, Harold, Jr., 70288	July 1, 1961	Cuba	Distinguished Service Medal	Token of good will.
Foster, Edward L., 70334	July 1, 1960	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Williams, Henry, Jr., 70346	Jan. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Ribble, George B., Jr., 70671	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Air Wings	Token of good will.
Archer, Stephen M., 71396	Mar. 1, 1962	Greece	Royal Order of George I (Commodore).	Token of good will.
Gates, Thomas S., 139669	Dec. 1, 1953	Spain	Grand Cross of Naval Merit	In rendering service to Spain.
		Argentina	Grand Master of the Order of May for Naval Merit, Grand Cross.	Token of good will.
		Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Grand Cross, Distintivo Blanco.	Token of good will.
		Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Grand Officer	Token of good will.
Johnson, John H. S., 71305	July 1, 1960	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure.	Token of good will.
Roudebush, Jack, 71351	Sept. 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Pitts, Ray M., 71458	Oct. 1, 1960	Venezuela	Francisco de Miranda	For service as Chief of United States naval mission to Venezuela.
Munson, Henry G., 71515	Mar. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
Moncure, Samuel P., 71588	Jan. 1, 1962	Portugal	Order of Prince Henry, Grand Officer	Token of good will.
Williams, Paul D., 71563	July 1, 1960	Italy	Order of Merit of the Republic, Chevalier.	Token of good will.
Arthur, Lionel A., 71616	July 1, 1960	Chile	Military Medal of the Navy	For service as a member of United States naval mission to Chile.
Shook, Kenneth S., 72362	Dec. 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Brittan, Theodore H., 72499	July 1, 1960	China	The Medal of Cloud and Banner	During the Formosa Straits crisis.
Foster, Everett J., 72575	July 1, 1960	Chile	Al Merito Bernardo O'Higgins, Commander.	For service as Chief, United States naval mission to Chile.
		Chile	Military Medal, Third Class	Token of good will.
Johnson, Joseph E., 73820	Jan. 1, 1959	Brazil	Naval Merit of Honor, Officer	For service with the Brazilian Navy Communication Service.
Eppes, Marion H., 74803	July 1, 1961	Greece	Golden Cross of the Royal Order of George I.	Token of good will.
Sullivan, William A., 74835	July 1, 1961	Greece	Order of King George I	Tour of duty at Athens, Greece.
McDonald, Harold W., 74905	July 1, 1961	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure.	Token of good will.
Austin, Marshall H., 75015	July 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Knight Commander.	Token of good will.
Parunak, Aram Y., 75914	July 1, 1961	Japan	The Third Order of the Sacred Treasure.	Token of good will.
McElrath, Robert W., 77018	July 1, 1961	China	The Medal of Cloud and Banner	For services in the Taiwan Strait area.
Holman, William G., 77073	Feb. 1, 1961	Netherlands	Orange-Nassau Medal	For service as assistant naval attaché.
		Belgium	Order of Military Cross, First Class	For service as assistant naval attaché.
Oelheim, Bennett C., 77214	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Officer	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Scheve, Carl J., 78433	July 1, 1960	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Officer	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Putman, Charles F., 78668	Aug. 1, 1961	Spain	Cross of Naval Merit, Third Class, with white distinctive.	Token of good will.
Brantley, William L., 78818	Aug. 1, 1960	Chile	The Military Medal, Second Class	Token of good will.
Nylund, Harvey R., 82792	Jan. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Officer	Token of good will.
Butcher, Harry C., 83754	Dec. 1, 1953	France	Medal of Liberation of France	For service as war correspondent during World War II.
Daly, George K., 84604	June 1, 1960	France	Croix de Guerre with Silver Star	Token of good will.
Oard, Harry C., 86763	July 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of the Order of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Gerber, Marvin L., 113084	Aug. 1, 1961	Argentina	Order of Naval Merit, Commander	Token of good will.
Whichard, Rogers D., 117575	Nov. 1, 1961	France	Academic Palms Medal (Academic Officer).	Token of good will.
Lowther, Robert D., 118046	July 1, 1961	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Enzweiler, Joseph M., 146892	Feb. 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Officer	For service to the Peruvian Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Commander				
Sears, Richard D., Jr., 40173	Nov. 1, 1957	France	Legion of Honor, Chevalier	Token of good will.
Chapman, George H., Jr., 68173	July 1, 1960	Philippines	Legion of Honor, Officer	Token of good will.
Bailey, Benjamin F., 71680	July 1, 1960	Greece	Royal Order of George I, Officer	Token of good will.
Thomas, Robert H., 72052	July 1, 1960	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Ulchi	Token of good will.
Bierer, Howard T., 72604	July 1, 1960	Greece	Gold Cross of the Order of George I	Token of good will.
Atherton, Harry S., 72450	Sept. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Officer	Member of naval mission to Brazil.
Bartlett, Wilson R., 74986	July 1, 1961	Chile	Military Medal, Third Class	For service to the Chilean Navy.
Shilling, Samuel G., 77107	July 1, 1960	Cuba	Order of Naval Merit, Second Class	Token of good will.
Baczenski, Frank J., 77368	Nov. 1, 1956	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	For service to the Peruvian Navy.
Kelley, George A., Jr., 77431	June 1, 1955	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (Knight Commander) Distintivo Blanco.	Taken of good will.
Michels, Ralph J., 78143	July 1, 1960	Venezuela	Order of Francisco de Miranda, Second Class.	For service as chief, United States naval mission to Venezuela.
Winiecki, Frank G., 78231	Apr. 1, 1959	Greece	Royal Order of King George I, Officer	For service to the Royal Hellenic Navy.
Cooper, Thomas V., 78568	Mar. 1, 1957	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Chung Mu with Gold Star.	Token of good will.
Fey, William L., Jr., 78654	June 1, 1960	Thailand	Order of the White Elephant	Token of good will.
Bates, Langford W., 81753	July 1, 1960	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, First Class	Token of good will.
Heine, Heinrich, Jr. (n) 82258	June 1, 1961	Philippines	Legion of Honor, Officer	Token of good will.
Miller, Steward C., 84761	Jan. 1, 1958	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, Second Class	Token of good will.
Smith, Roger F., 85257	July 1, 1960	Argentina	Medal and Antarctic Insignia of the Argentine Navy.	For service as naval adviser to the Argentine Naval War College.
James, John C., 85734	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Officer	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Baker, Wayne D., 90031	July 1, 1960	China	The Medal of Pao Ting	Crisis in the Taiwan Straits.
Smith, Ralph C., Jr., 95725	July 1, 1961	Greece	Royal Order of the Phoenix, Officer	Token of good will.
McIntyre, Arthur G., 100263	July 1, 1959	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Knight Commander.	Token of good will.
Brown, Pride C., Jr., 100418	Mar. 1, 1961	France	Legion of Honor, Chevalier	Token of good will.
Johnson, Donald H., 112085	July 1, 1961	Spain	Order of Naval Merit, Second Class	Token of good will.
Taylor, Harold A., 390058	Aug. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Knight	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Lieutenant Commander				
Manning, George C., 8685	June 30, 1939	Brazil	Brazilian Naval Order for Services of Distinction.	Token of good will.
Reynolds, Raymond M., 104485	July 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Aeronautical Merit (Commander).	Token of good will.
Mallek, Robert A., 108497	Oct. 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Nava Merit (Officer)	Token of good will.
Wannemacher, Charles R., 189528	June 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of the Order of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Snook, Norman A., 201901	Mar. 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Knight	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
O'Connor, James V., 263280	July 1, 1960	Greece	Royal Order of George I, Member	Token of good will.
Walker, John B., 284496	Mar. 1, 1958	Peru	Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit, Commander.	Token of good will.
Beer, James H., 300348	Mar. 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Knight	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Jones, Forrest M., 309750	June 1, 1960	Philippines	Legion of Honor, Officer	Token of good will.
Reynolds, Bruce H., 309915	Jan. 1, 1962	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Chevalier	Token of good will.
Bailey, Ira V., 319631	July 1, 1960	China	Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal A, Second Grade.	Rescue assistance.
Epps, Edward W., 355590	Feb. 1, 1960	China	Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal A, Second Grade.	Rescue assistance.
Horn, Leslie E., 355684	July 1, 1959	Koreo	Order of Military Merit, Chung Mu with Silver Star.	Token of good will.
Burt, Robert A., Jr., 487266	Dec. 1, 1960	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Knight	For service to the Brazilian Navy.
Enlisted				
Symmes, Clifton C., 2014765	Mar. 1, 1961	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, Third Class	Token of good will.
Carlisle, Judd F., 3755777	July 1, 1960	Ecuador	Abdon Calderon, Third Class	Token of good will.
Civilian				
Malanot, Elmer W	Feb. 29, 1960	Jordan	Longines watch and photograph of King Hussein.	For service in transferring a shipment of United States Army equipment to the Jordan Arab Army at Aqaba.
Wood, Gilbert J	May 31, 1958	Jordan	Longines watch	For service in transferring a shipment of United States Army equipment to the Jordan Arab Army at Aqaba.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Major General				
Jerome, Clayton C., O3799	July 1, 1958	Chile	Al Merito, Grade of Grand Official	For service as aide to the President of Chile during his visit to United States in early 1950.
Jack, Samuel S., O4252	July 1, 1961	Korea	Order of Military Merit, Taeguk	For service to Republic of Korea as Commanding General, First Marine Air Wing, Sept. 22, 1955, to June 30, 1956.
Brigadier General				
South, Hamilton D., Jr., O3815	Apr. 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Grade of Commander.	For service as assistant naval attaché and assistant naval attaché for air, naval aviator and administration officer at the Office of the Naval Attaché, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, September 1948 to November 1949.
		Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For service as assistant chief of staff, G-1, First Marine Air Wing, July 28, 1955, to June 8, 1956.
Taxis, Samuel G., O4656	Nov. 1, 1959	Syria	Syrian Merit Medal, First Class	For service to the Republic of Syria as Chairman, Israeli-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, May 10, 1951, to Apr. 6, 1953.
Freuler, Herbert C., O4683	June 1, 1959	Korea	Ulchi Distinguished Military Service Medal.	For service to Republic of Korea while serving as assistant chief of staff, G-4, First Marine Air Wing, Sept. 12, 1955, to June 8, 1956.
Kirgis, Howard G., O5367	Nov. 1, 1959	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit	For service rendered to the Brazilian Navy during his tour of duty as the Marine Corps member of the United States naval mission to Brazil.
Shofner, Austin C., O5641	Nov. 1, 1959	Peru	Cross of Naval Merit, grade of Commander.	For services as United States naval attaché and United States naval attaché for air, Lima, Peru, March 1947 to June 1949.
Colonel				
Hayden, Reynolds K., O4953	Feb. 1, 1960	Thailand	Knight Commander of Crown of Thailand, Second Class.	For service to the Republic of Thailand as United States naval attaché and United States naval attaché for air, Bangkok, Thailand, Oct. 1, 1952, to Aug. 19, 1954.
McGlashan, Robert C., O5379	Sept. 1, 1958	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, degree of Commander.	For service to Brazilian Navy as amphibious adviser to Brazilian Naval War College, United States naval mission to Brazil, December 1951 to January 1954.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS—Continued

Name	Date of retirement	Donor government	Award	Remarks
Meek, Harold B., O5507	Feb. 1, 1961	Brazil	Naval Medal for Distinctive Service	For service rendered the Brazilian Navy during his tour of duty as Marine Corps member and Marine Corps adviser to Brazilian War College, United States naval mission to Brazil.
King, Howard E., O6211	Mar. 1, 1960	Spain	Cross of Aeronautical Merit, Second Class, Distinctive White.	For service in connection with flood relief operations conducted by Marine helicopter units from the United States ship *Lake Champlain* at Valencia, Spain, Nov. 22, 1954.
Smith, Sherman A., O6984	June 1, 1961	Brazil	Order of Naval Merit, Grade of Officer	For service rendered to the Republic of Brazil.
Stonecliffe, David W., O5430	July 1, 1961	Thailand	Crown of Thailand Medal, Second Class.	For service as United States naval attaché and naval attaché for air, Bangkok, Thailand, Sept. 21, 1950, to Oct. 5, 1952.
Lieutenant Colonel				
Donnell, John L., O6712	July 1, 1961	Philippines	Legion of Honor, Officer	For service as commanding officer, marine barracks, United States Naval Base, Olongapo, Zambales, July 5, 1952, to July 8, 1954.
Captain				
Brockman, William A., O27147	June 1, 1961	China	Air Force Pilot Wings	For service during Operation Hunger, a Taiwan flood relief action, Aug. 10-20, 1959.
CWO-4				
Davis, Perry W., O19886	July 1, 1960	Haiti	Order of Honor and Merit	For service as adviser to the recruit depot and rifle range instructor of the Armed Forces of Haiti.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of law, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is authorized to accept and wear the Grand Cordon of the Order of the Rising Sun with Paulownia Flowers which has been tendered him by His Majesty the Emperor of Japan.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries."

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL

The bill (H.R. 8916) to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1834) to further amend the act of August 7, 1946, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 6 of the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, is amended (1) by striking out "$40,730,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$41,105,000" and (2) by striking out "June 30, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "on the last day of the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT TO ACT TO AUTHORIZE COMMISSIONERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO REMOVE DANGEROUS AND UNSAFE BUILDINGS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3011) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous and unsafe buildings," and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 4 of the Act of March 1, 1899 (30 Stat. 923), as amended (sec. 5-504, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is hereby amended (a) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 4"; (b) by inserting "any dead, dangerous, or diseased tree, or part thereof," after "excavation," in the first sentence; (c) by striking "excavation" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "excavation, or any dead, dangerous, or diseased tree, or part thereof,"; (d) by striking "or parts thereof, or miscellaneous accumulation of material or debris" in such second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "or parts thereof, any miscellaneous accumulation of material or debris, or any dead or dangerous tree, or part thereof, or the removal or spraying of any diseased tree"; (e) by adding at the end of such section 4(a) the following sentence: "Within the meaning of this section, a dead tree shall be any tree with respect to which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent have determined that no part thereof is living, a dangerous tree is any tree or part thereof, living or dead, which the said Commissioners or their designated agent shall find is in such condition and is so located as to constitute a danger to persons or property on public space in the vicinity of such tree; and a diseased tree shall be any tree on private property in such a condition of infection from a major pathogenic disease as to constitute, in the opinion of the said Commissioners or their designated agent, a threat to the health of any other tree.", and (f) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The authority conferred on the Commissioners under subsection (a) with respect to the removal of dangerous and diseased trees constituting a nuisance shall be exercised by the Commissioners only after every reasonable effort has been made to abate such nuisance other than by the removal of any such tree, or part thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

REDUCTION IN WORKWEEK OF FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3086) to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "an", to strike out "annual average workweek of not to exceed forty-eight hours" and insert "average workweek of not to exceed fifty-two hours during an administratively established workweek cycle which the Commissioners are hereby authorized to establish from time to time"; after line 17, to insert:

(b) Paragraph (c) of subsection (a) of section 2 of such Act approved June 19, 1948, as amended, and redesignated as paragraph (3) by this section, is amended by striking therefrom the period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents may, whenever the exigencies of the Fire Department require temporary or short-term services of one or more officers or members, order such officer, officers, member, or members to perform such services."

On page 3, line 14, after the word "average", to strike out "annual" and insert "established"; on page 4, line 4, after "(1)", to strike out "Four and eight-tenths" and insert "Five and two-tenths"; in line 7, after "(2)", to strike out "Seven and five-tenths" and insert "Eight"; in line 10, after "(3)", to strike out "Nine and six-tenths" and insert "Ten and four-tenths"; in line 15, after the word "a", to strike out "four-fifths" and insert "thirteen-fifteenths"; in line 17, after the word "for", to strike out "four-fifths" and insert "thirteen-fif-

teenths", and on page 6, line 1, after the word "than", to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty-six", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (a) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Act entitled 'An Act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 498), as amended (sec. 4–404a(a), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Beginning with the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than one hundred and twenty days after enactment of this amendatory subsection or which begins on or after July 1, 1962, whichever is later, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to establish a workweek for officers and members of the Firefighting Division of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which will result in an average workweek of not to exceed fifty-two hours during an administratively established workweek cycle which the Commissioners are hereby authorized to establish from time to time: *Provided,* That no workweek shall exceed seventy-two hours."

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraphs (b), (c), (d), and (e) of subsection (a) of section 2 of such Act approved June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 498), as amended (sec. 4–404a(a), D.C. Code, 1961 edition), are hereby redesignated as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(b) Paragraph (c) of subsection (a) of section 2 of such Act approved June 19, 1948, as amended, and redesignated as paragraph (3) by this section, is amended by striking therefrom the period and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents may, whenever the exigencies of the Fire Department require temporary or short-term services of one or more officers or members, order such officer, officers, member, or members to perform such services."

SEC. 3. Clause (E) of subsection (b) of section 405 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 76), as amended (sec. 4–821, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"(E) In the case of the Firefighting Division of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia—

"(i) a biweekly rate shall be divided by two to derive a weekly rate;

"(ii) the weekly rate shall be divided by the number of workdays in the average established workweek to arrive at a daily rate;

"(iii) a daily rate shall be divided by two to derive a one-half daily rate; and

"(iv) an hourly rate shall be determined by dividing the daily rate of pay by twelve, except for the purpose of computation of holiday pay."

SEC. 4 (a) In lieu of the annual leave to which officers and members of the Firefighting Division of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia are entitled under the provisions of section 203(a) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679), as amended, such officers and members shall be entitled to annual leave which shall accrue as follows:

(1) Five and two-tenths hours for each full biweekly pay period in the case of officers and members with less than three years service;

(2) Eight hours for each full biweekly pay period in the case of officers and members with three but less than fifteen years service;

(3) Ten and four-tenths hours for each biweekly pay period in the case of officers and members with fifteen years or more service.

(b) Accumulated annual leave to the credit of each officer and member of such Firefighting Division shall be adjusted by applying a thirteen-fifteenths factor so that each officer and member of such Firefighting Division shall be given credit for thirteen-fifteenths of a day of leave for each day of such accumulated annual leave, and thereafter accumulated annual leave credited to him pursuant to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended, shall be similarly adjusted when an officer or member is transferred to the Firefighting Division from another agency or from another division of the Fire Department.

(c) When an officer or member of such Firefighting Division is transferred to another agency or to another division of the Fire Department, whose employees are entitled to annual leave with pay pursuant to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended, the reverse of the formula in subsection (b) shall be applied for the purpose of adjusting accumulated annual leave.

(d) For computation on an hourly basis, all adjusted days of annual leave or fractions thereof, as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, and days of sick leave shall be multiplied by twelve to determine the number of hours of annual or sick leave to which each such officer or member of such Firefighting Division shall be entitled, and the number of hours of annual or sick leave shall be divided by twelve to determine the number of days, or fraction thereof, of annual or sick leave to which such officer or member of such Firefighting Division shall be entitled.

(e) Notwithstanding any provision in any other law, the amount of annual leave accumulated on the effective date of this Act, if thirty days or more, shall, upon conversion to the new total in accordance with this section, be the maximum accumulation authorized: *Provided,* That if the amount of annual leave accumulated before the conversion is less than thirty days on the effective date of this Act, then, after conversion to the new total, leave which is not used shall accumulate for use in succeeding years until it totals no more than twenty-six days at the beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period.

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins not less than one hundred and twenty days after its enactment, or on or after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1962, whichever is later.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY OF ARMY DISTAFF FOUNDATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2838) to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 3, line 13, after the word "all", to insert "real property", and after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The tax exemption authorized by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the fiscal year next following the completion of construction by the Army Distaff Foundation of facilities necessary to carry out the purposes of the foundation as described in its certificate of incorporation: *Provided,* That such exemption shall, in no event, be applicable to any fiscal year prior to the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1963.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VIRGINIA, OWNED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9699) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "value", to insert "to Prince William County, Virginia, or to a nonprofit corporation designated by the board of supervisors of such county".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

The bill (H.R. 7752) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

The bill (S. 2793) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1121; sec. 40–603(a), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking "issuance and revocation of operators' permits" and inserting in lieu thereof "issuance, suspension, and revocation of operators' permits and the suspension and revocation of operating privileges, including rules and regulations assessing reasonable fees to reimburse the District for the cost of restoring suspended or revoked operators' permits and privileges, such fees not to exceed the amount of $5 per restoration".

REGULATION OF CREDIT LIFE, ACCIDENT, AND HEALTH INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2357) to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and

credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act, regulating credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia may be cited as "The Act for the Regulation of Credit Life Insurance and Credit Accident and Health Insurance".

(b) All life insurance and all accident and health insurance in connection with loans or other credit transactions of less than five years duration in the District of Columbia shall be subject to the provisions of this Act. Such insurance written in connection with a loan or other credit transaction of five years duration or more shall not be subject to the provisions of this Act, nor shall such insurance be subject to the provisions of this Act if the issuance of the insurance is an isolated transaction on the part of the insurer not related to a plan or regular course of conduct for insuring debtors of the creditor.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia;

(b) "Credit life insurance" means insurance issued on the life of a debtor pursuant to or in connection with a specific loan or other credit transaction;

(c) "Credit accident and health insurance" means insurance against the disability of a debtor which provides indemnity for payments on a specific loan or other credit transaction;

(d) "Creditor" means the lender of money or vendor of goods, services, or property, including a lessor under a lease intended as a security, for which payment is arranged through a loan or other credit transaction, and includes any successor to the right, title, or interest of any such lender, vendor, or lessor;

(e) "Debtor" means a borrower of money or purchaser of goods, services, or property, including a lessee under a lease intended as a security, for which payment is arranged through a loan or other credit transaction;

(f) "District" means the District of Columbia;

(g) "Indebtedness" means the amount payable by a debtor to a creditor in connection with a loan or other credit transaction; and

(h) "Superintendent" means the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia.

FORMS OF CREDIT LIFE INSURANCE AND CREDIT ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE

SEC. 3. Credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance shall be issued only in the following forms:

(a) Individual policies of life insurance issued to debtors on the term plan;

(b) Individual policies of accident and health insurance issued to debtors on a term plan or disability provisions in individual life policies to provide such coverage;

(c) Group policies of life insurance issued to creditors providing insurance upon the lives of debtors on the term plan;

(d) Group policies of accident and health insurance issued to creditors on a term plan insuring debtors or disability provisions in group life policies to provide such coverage.

AMOUNT OF CREDIT LIFE INSURANCE AND CREDIT ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE

SEC. 4. (a) The amount of credit life insurance shall not exceed the initial indebtedness however the indebtedness may be repayable, nor, in the case of any group policy, shall such amount exceed the maximum amount specified in section 10(2)(d) of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, as amended (48 Stat. 1164; sec. 35–710(2)(d), D.C. Code, 1951 ed.). In cases where an indebtedness is repayable in substantially equal installments, the amount of insurance shall at no time exceed the scheduled amount of unpaid indebtedness in the case of any individual policy or the actual amount of the unpaid indebtedness in the case of any group policy.

(b) The amount of indemnity payable by credit accident and health insurance in the event of disability, as defined in the policy, shall not exceed the aggregate of the periodic scheduled unpaid installments of indebtedness; and the amount of each periodic indemnity payment shall not exceed the original indebtedness divided by the number of periodic installments.

TERM OF CREDIT LIFE INSURANCE AND CREDIT ACCIDENT AND HEALTH INSURANCE

SEC. 5. The term of any credit life insurance or credit accident and health insurance shall, subject to acceptance by the insurance company, commence on the date when the debtor becomes obligated to the creditor, except that where a group policy provides coverage with respect to existing obligations the insurance on a debtor with respect to such indebtedness shall commence on the effective date of the policy. Where evidence of insurability is required and such evidence is furnished more than thirty days from the date when the debtor becomes obligated to the creditor, the term of the insurance may commence on the date on which the insurance company determines the evidence to be satisfactory, and in such event there shall be an appropriate refund or adjustment of any charge to the debtor for insurance. The term of such insurance shall not extend more than fifteen days beyond the scheduled maturity date of the indebtedness except when extended without additional cost to the debtor. If the indebtedness is charged due to renewal or refinancing prior to the scheduled maturity date, the insurance in force shall be terminated before any new insurance may be issued in connection with the renewal or refinanced indebtedness. In all cases of termination prior to scheduled maturity, a refund shall be paid or credited as provided in section 8.

PROVISIONS OF POLICIES AND CERTIFICATES OF INSURANCE; DISCLOSURE TO DEBTORS

SEC. 6. (a) All credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance shall be evidenced by an individual policy, or in the case of group insurance by a group policy and individual certificates of insurance.

(b) Each individual policy or certificate of credit life insurance, each individual policy or certificate of credit accident and health insurance, and each individual policy or certificate of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance shall, in addition to other requirements of law, set forth the name and home office address of the insurance company, and the identity by name or otherwise of the person insured, the rate or amount of payment, if any, by the debtor separately in connection with credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance, a description of the coverage, including the amount and term thereof (which in the case of group insurance may be by description rather than stated amount and term), any exceptions, limitations, or restrictions, and shall state that the benefits shall be paid to the creditor to reduce or extinguish the unpaid indebtedness and, whenever the amount of insurance may exceed the unpaid indebtedness, that any such excess shall be payable to a beneficiary, other than the creditor, named by the debtor or to his estate.

(c) Except as hereinafter provided, an individual policy or certificate of insurance shall be delivered to the insured debtor at the time the indebtedness is incurred.

(d) If a debtor makes a separate payment for credit life or credit accident and health insurance and an individual policy or certificate of insurance is not delivered to the debtor at the time the indebtedness is incurred, a copy of the application for such policy or a notice of proposed insurance shall be delivered at such time to the debtor by the creditor. The copy of the application for or notice of proposed insurance shall be signed by the debtor and shall set forth the identity by name or otherwise of the person insured; the rate or amount of payment by the debtor separately for credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance; and a statement that within thirty days, if the insurance is accepted by the insurance company, there will be delivered to the debtor an individual policy or certificate of insurance containing the name and home office address of the insurance company, and a description of the amount, term, and coverage including any exceptions, limitations, and restrictions. The copy of the application for, or notice of, proposed insurance shall refer exclusively to insurance coverage, and shall be separate and apart from the loan, sale, or other credit statement of account, instrument, or agreement unless the information required by this subsection is prominently set forth in such statement of account, instrument, or agreement. If a debtor does not make a separate payment for credit life or credit accident and health insurance, an application need not be taken or a notice of proposed insurance given. In any case, upon acceptance of the insurance by the insurance company, and within thirty days of the date upon which the term of the insurance commences, the insurance company shall cause the individual policy or certificate of insurance to be delivered to the debtor. Said application or notice of proposed insurance shall state that, upon acceptance by the insurance company, the insurance shall become effective as provided in section 5.

FILING, APPROVAL, AND WITHDRAWAL OF FORMS

SEC. 7. (a) All forms of policies, certificates of insurance, notices of proposed insurance, applications for insurance, binders, endorsements and riders delivered or issued for delivery in the District and the premium rates pertaining thereto shall be filed with the Superintendent by the insurance company, in such manner and together with such supporting information as the Superintendent may reasonably require. In any case where a group policy is made for a group in the District and the policy is neither delivered nor issued for delivery in the District, the form of policy and all other forms and premium rates referred to in the preceding sentence shall be filed with the Superintendent by the insurance company.

(b) The Superintendent may, within thirty days after the filing of any form of policy, certificate of insurance, notice of proposed insurance, application for insurance, binder, endorsement or rider, disapprove any such form if the premium rates charged or to be charged appear by reasonable assumptions to be excessive in relation to benefits paid or to be paid, or if the form contains provisions which are unjust, unfair, inequitable, misleading, or deceptive. In determining whether to disapprove any such form the Superintendent may give due consideration to past and prospective loss experience within and outside the District, to underwriting practice and judgment to the extent appropriate, and to all other relevant factors within and outside the District, and he may take into account the experience of the individual company.

(c) If the Superintendent notifies the insurance company that the form does not comply with the requirements of this Act,

it shall be unlawful thereafter for such insurance company to issue or use such form. In such notice, the Superintendent shall specify the reason for his disapproval and state that a hearing will be granted promptly upon request in writing by the insurance company. No such policy, certificate of insurance, notice of proposed insurance, application for insurance, binder, endorsement, or rider shall be issued or used until the expiration of thirty days after it has been so filed, unless the Superintendent shall give his prior written approval thereto.

(d) The Superintendent may, at any time after a hearing, held after not less than twenty days' written notice to the insurance company, withdraw his approval of any such form if it does not meet the requirements of this Act.

(e) The insurance company shall not issue such forms or use them after the effective date of such withdrawal of approval.

(f) The insurance company may revise such forms and the premium rates pertaining thereto from time to time, and such revised forms and premium rates shall be filed with the Superintendent and shall be subject to all the preceding requirements of this section, in like manner as though they were original filings with the Superintendent.

REFUNDS

SEC. 8. (a) Each individual policy or certificate of credit life insurance or credit accident and health insurance shall provide that in the event of termination of the insurance prior to the scheduled maturity date of the indebtedness, any refund of an amount paid by the debtor for insurance shall be paid or credited promptly to the person entitled thereto: *Provided,* That the Superintendent shall prescribe a minimum refund and no refund which would be less than such minimum need be made. The formula to be used in computing refunds shall be filed with the Superintendent who may disapprove such formula if he finds that it is unjust or unreasonable.

(b) If a creditor requires a debtor to make a payment in connection with credit life insurance or credit accident and health insurance and an individual policy or certificate of insurance is not issued, the creditor shall promptly give written notice to such debtor and shall promptly make an appropriate credit to the account.

(c) The amount charged to a debtor for credit life or credit accident and health insurance shall not exceed the premium rate charged by the insurance company at the time the charge to the debtor is determined.

CLAIMS

SEC. 9. (a) All claims shall be paid either by draft drawn upon the insurance company or by check of the insurance company to the order of the claimant to whom payment of the claim is due pursuant to the policy provisions, or upon direction of such claimant to one specified, and every insurance company shall be held to strict settlement of all such claims.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any creditor, having received any such check or draft from such insurance company, to fail to correctly credit the account, pay to or upon the direction of, or otherwise correctly account to the claimant to whom payment is due for the full amount of such check or draft, less any lawful deductions therefrom.

(c) No plan or arrangement shall be used whereby any person, firm, or corporation other than the insurance company or its designated claim representative shall be authorized to settle or adjust claims. The creditor shall not be designated as claim representative for the insurance company in adjusting claims, nor, in the case of an individual creditor, shall the spouse of such creditor or any relative of the creditor or spouse within the third degree of consanguinity be so designated, nor shall any officer or employee of a corporate creditor or any spouse or relative of such officer, employee, or spouse within the third degree of consanguinity be so designated: *Provided,* That a group policyholder may, by arrangement with the group insurance company, draw drafts or checks in payment of claims due to the group policyholder subject to audit and review by the insurance company.

EXISTING INSURANCE—CHOICE OF INSURER

SEC. 10. When credit life insurance or credit accident and health insurance is required as additional security for any indebtedness, the creditor may not require that the insurance be written through any particular insurance company or any particular agent, and the debtor shall, upon request to the creditor, have the option of furnishing the required amount of insurance through existing policies of insurance owned or controlled by him or of procuring and furnishing the required coverage through any insurance company authorized to transact an insurance business within the District.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 11. (a) In the case of any violation of this Act by an insurance company, agent, solicitor, or broker, the Superintendent shall have authority to proceed in accordance with the provisions of sections 6 and 27 of the Act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1121 and 1140; secs. 35–405 and 35–426, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), and sections 3 and 36 of the Act approved October 9, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1066 and 1079; secs. 35–1306 and 35–1340, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.).

(b) In the case of any violation of this Act by a creditor or by any other person not licensed in the District as an insurance agent, solicitor, or broker, regardless of the fact that such creditor or other person is not required by law to be so licensed, the penalties and the procedure for their imposition shall be as set forth in section 43 of the Act approved October 9, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1082; sec. 35–1347, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 12. Any insurance company, agent, solicitor, or broker aggrieved by any order or action of the Superintendent under this Act may contest the validity of such order or action by appeal or through any other appropriate proceeding, in accordance with the procedures prescribed by sections 44 and 45 of the Act approved October 9, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1082; secs. 35–1348 and 35–1349, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.): *Provided,* That any such insurance company, agent, solicitor, or broker which is licensed in the District under the Life Insurance Act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1127, et seq.; sec. 35–301, et seq., D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), may contest the validity of such order or action by appeal or through any other appropriate proceeding in accordance with the procedures prescribed by such Act approved June 19, 1934.

EFFECT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NUMBERED 5 OF 1952

SEC. 13. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. This Act shall take effect ninety days after its approval.

AMENDMENT TO ACT TO INCORPORATE THE HUNGARIAN REFORMED FEDERATION OF AMERICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 699) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America", approved March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1226), is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "to provide all types of benefits which are now or hereafter may be authorized by the laws of the District of Columbia relating to fraternal benefit associations."

SEC. 2. Section 755 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189), is amended by striking out "which shall not exceed fifty-five years, and that medical examinations are required of applicants for life benefits,".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

USE BY COLLECTING OR PRIVATE DETECTIVE AGENCIES OF NAME, EMBLEM, OR INSIGNIA CONVEYING IMPRESSION OF BEING AN AGENCY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2795) to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which tends to convey the impression that such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person engaged in the business of collecting or aiding in the collection of private debts or obligations, or engaged in furnishing private police, investigation, or other private detective services, shall use as part of the name of such business, or employ in any communication, correspondence, notice, advertisement, circular, or other writing or publication, the words "District of Columbia", "District", or "Municipal", the initials "D.C.", or any emblem or insignia utilizing any of the said terms as part of its design, in such manner as reasonably to convey the impression or belief that such business is a department, agency, bureau, or instrumentality of the municipal government of the District of Columbia or in any manner represents the District of Columbia. As used in this Act, the word "person" means and includes individuals, associations, partnerships, and corporations.

SEC. 2. Any person who violates this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $300 or by the imprisonment for not more than ninety days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. All prosecutions for violations of this Act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants. As used in this Act the term "Corporation Counsel" means the attorney for the District of Columbia, by whatever title such attorney may be known, designated by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to perform the functions prescribed for the Corporation Counsel in this Act.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL WOMAN'S RELIEF CORPS, AUXILIARY TO GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2250) to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 78 years old, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 3, line 10, after the word "contained", to insert "It shall be the duty of the persons named in this section, jointly and severally, to file with the Superintendent of Corporations of the District of Columbia a copy of this Act within fifteen days after the date of its enactment."; on page 7, after line 15, to strike out:

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation and notice to or service upon such agent shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process, notice, or demand for the corporation, and service of such process, notice or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon the corporation may be served upon such agent. The corporation shall file with the Superintendent of Corporations of the District of Columbia a statement designating the initial and each successor registered agent of the corporation immediately following any such designation. As used in this Act the term "Superintendent of Corporations of the District of Columbia" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or any agent designated by them to perform the functions vested by this Act in the Superintendent of Corporations.

On page 9, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 15. (a) The financial transactions of the corporation shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balance or securities held by custodian shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 15. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such independent audit shall be submitted to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit was made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, sources and application of funds, and the financial results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

On page 11, line 15, after "Sec. 16.", to strike out "On or before March 1 of each year" and insert "Not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year", and on page 12, after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 19. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation, shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the council of administration and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation, and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 19. Upon any dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, its assets shall be applied and distributed as follows:

(a) All liabilities and obligations of the corporation shall be paid, satisfied, and discharged, or adequate provision shall be made therefor;

(b) Assets held by the corporation upon condition requiring return, transfer or conveyance, which condition occurs by reason of the dissolution, shall be returned, transferred or conveyed in accordance with such requirements;

(c) Assets received and held by the corporation subject to limitations permitting their use only for charitable, religious, eleemosynary, benevolent, educational, or similar purposes, but not held upon a condition requiring return, transfer or conveyance by reason of the dissolution, shall be transferred or conveyed to one or more domestic or foreign corporations, societies, or organizations engaged in activities of a charitable, religious, eleemosynary, benevolent, educational, or similar purpose, pursuant to a plan of distribution adopted as provided in this Act;

(d) Other assets, if any, shall be distributed in accordance with the provisions of the articles of incorporation or the bylaws to the extent that the articles of incorporation or bylaws determine the distributive rights of members, or any class or classes of members, or provide for distribution to others;

(e) Any remaining assets may be distributed to such persons, societies, organizations or domestic or foreign corporations engaged in activities not for profit, as may be specified in a plan of distribution adopted by the council of administration of the corportation in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal, State, and District of Columbia laws applicable thereto.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following persons, to wit:

President: Mabel R. Ginder, Toledo, Ohio;

Senior vice president: Jessie Johnston, Cheyenne, Wyoming;

Junior vice president: Irene Randolph, Minneapolis, Minnesota;

Secretary: Bessie K. Coughlin, Providence, Rhode Island;

Treasurer: Ocie M. Tumey, Springfield, Illinois, executive officers;

Legislative committee: Laura I. Smith, chairman, 16 Temple Street, Providence, Rhode Island; Ethel Ferris Hasenbuhler, Washington, District of Columbia; and Marie Morgan, Indianapolis, Indiana;

Past national presidents: Cora M. Davis, Nehalem, Oregon; Catherine McBride Hoster, Indianapolis, Indiana; Annie Poole Atwood, Wollaston, Massachusetts; Beatrice J. Tyson, DeBary, Florida; Lizetta Coady, Detroit, Michigan; Mary J. Love, Louisville, Kentucky; Ida Heacock Baker, Parsons, Kansas; Elizabeth L. Kothe, Parkersburg, Iowa: Grace Houlette Hahn, Miami, Florida; Louise Haider, Santa Barbara, California; Anne Anschutz, Saint Louis, Missouri; Laura I. Smith, Providence, Rhode Island; Alice F. Larson, Minot, North Dakota; Grayce L. Vedetta, Brooklyn, New York; Harriette G. McCollough, Des Moines, Iowa; Eula M. Nelson, Springfield, Illinois; Daisy Heinemann, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Grace L. Johnson, Toledo, Ohio; Ruth E. Johnson, Bellflower, California; Lucille V. Rand, Worcester, Massachusetts; Gertrude M. Edwards, Iroquois, South Dakota; Bessie K. Coughlin, Providence, Rhode Island; Elizabeth Jeans, Saint Louis, Missouri; and Josephine E. Parkhurst, Pulaski, New York, and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the National Women's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic (hereinafter referred to as the corporation), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations and restrictions herein contained. It shall be the duty of the persons named in this section, jointly and severally, to file with the Superintendent of Corporations of the District of Columbia a copy of this Act within fifteen days after the date of its enactment.

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act, acting in person or by written proxy, are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be: To perpetuate the memory of the Grand Army of the Republic, as we the National Women's Relief Corps are their auxiliary and were organized at their request in 1883, and of men who saved the Union in 1861 to 1865; to assist in every practicable way in the preservation and making avail-

able for research of documents and records pertaining to the Grand Army of the Republic and its members; to cooperate in doing honor to all those who have patriotically served our country in any way; to teach patriotism and the duties of citizenship, the true history of our country, and the love and honor of our flag; to oppose every tendency or movement that would weaken loyalty to, or make for the destruction or impairment of, our constitutional Union; and to inculcate and broadly sustain the American principles of representative government, of equal rights, and of impartial justice for all.

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

(2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) to choose such officers, as the corporation may require;

(5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws; not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grants, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State, (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State; and

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property.

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designation of classes of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide. Eligibility for membership in the corporation shall be women, who are the wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters of Union soldiers, sailors, and marines and other loyal women, who have not given aid or comfort to the enemies of the United States of America.

SEC. 6. The supreme governing authority of the corporation shall be the national convention thereof, composed of such officers and elected representatives from the several States as shall be provided by the rules and regulations: *Provided,* That the form of the government of the corporation shall always be representative of the membership at large and shall not permit the concentration of the control thereof in the hands of a limited number of members or in a self-perpetuating group not so representative. The meetings of the national convention may be held in any State or in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. (a) During the intervals between the national convention the executive officers shall be the governing board of the corporation and shall be held responsible for the general policies, program, and activities of the corporation.

(b) Upon the enactment of this Act the membership of the initial executive officers of the corporation shall consist of the executive officers of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, the corporation described in section 18 of this Act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified members of said executive officers, to wit: Mabel R. Ginder, Jessie Johnston, Irene Randolph, Bessie K. Coughlin, Ocie M. Tumey, Mary J. Love, Laura I. Smith, Ethel Ferris Hasenbuhler, and Marie Morgan.

(c) Thereafter, the council of administration of the corporation shall consist of not less than seven members elected in the manner and for the term as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

SEC. 8. The officers of the corporation shall be a national president, senior vice national president, junior vice national president, secretary and treasurer (which latter two offices may be held by one person), and such other officers as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws. The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties and titles as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

SEC. 9. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Springfield, Illinois, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, and the District of Columbia, of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process, notice, or demand for the corporation, and service of such process, notice or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon the corporation may be served upon such agent. The corporation shall file with the Superintendent of Corporations of the District of Columbia a statement designating the initial and each successor registered agent of the corporation immediately following any such designation. As used in this Act the term "Superintendent of Corporations of the District of Columbia" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or any agent designated by them to perform the functions vested by this Act in the Superintendent of Corporations.

SEC. 10. (a). No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them, during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subjection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the council of administration of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to the officers. Any member of the council of administration, who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or member of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

SEC. 11. The corporation and its officers and agents as such shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

SEC. 12. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 13. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

SEC. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its national convention. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 15. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such independent audit shall be submitted to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit was made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, sources and application of funds, and the financial results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

SEC. 16. Not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year the corporation shall report to the Congress on its activities during the preceding fiscal year. Such report may consist of a report on the proceedings of the national convention covering such fiscal year. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

SEC. 17. The corporation and its subordinate corps shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name, the National Women's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic. The corporation shall have the exclusive and sole right to use, or to allow or refuse the use of, such emblems, seals, and badges as have heretofore been used by the Illinois corporation described in section 18 and the right to which may be lawfully transferred to the corporation.

SEC. 18. The corporation may acquire the assets of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of Illinois applicable thereto.

SEC. 19. Upon any dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, its assets shall be applied and distributed as follows:

(a) All liabilities and obligations of the corporation shall be paid, satisfied, and discharged, or adequate provision shall be made therefor;

(b) Assets held by the corporation upon condition requiring return, transfer or conveyance, which condition occurs by reason of the dissolution, shall be returned, transferred or conveyed in accordance with such requirements;

(c) Assets received and held by the corporation subject to limitations permitting their use only for charitable, religious, eleemosynary, benevolent, educational, or similar purposes, but not held upon a condition requiring return, transfer or conveyance by reason of the dissolution, shall be transferred or conveyed to one or more domestic or foreign corporations, societies, or organizations, engaged in activities of a charitable religious, eleemosynary, benevolent, educational, or similar purpose, pursuant to a plan of distribution adopted as provided in this Act;

(d) Other assets, if any, shall be distributed in accordance with the provisions of the

articles of incorporation or the bylaws to the extent that the articles of incorporation or bylaws determine the distributive rights of members, or any class or classes of members, or provide for distribution to others;

(e) Any remaining assets may be distributed to such persons, societies, organizations or domestic or foreign corporations engaged in activities not for profit, as may be specified in a plan of distribution adopted by the council of administration of the corporation in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal, State, and District of Columbia laws applicable thereto.

SEC. 20. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 6967) to provide for the incorporation of certain nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2965) to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO ADMIT CERTAIN CITIZENS OF BELGIUM TO U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The resolution (S.J. Res. 175) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit, within eighteen months after date of enactment of this joint resolution, two persons, citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, to be admitted for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland; but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Navy such persons shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy appointed from the United States; but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Navy by reason of their graduation from the United States Naval Academy.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject such persons to the provisions of section 6959 of title 10 of the United States Code.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TO ADMIT CITIZEN OF THAILAND TO U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The resolution (S.J. Res. 129) authorizing the Secretary of the Air Force to admit a citizen of the Kingdom of Thailand to the U.S. Air Force Academy was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, within one year after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to admit Prabaddh Riddhagni, a citizen and subject of the Kingdom of Thailand, to the United States Air Force Academy for the purpose of receiving instruction at such Academy if the Secretary find the said Prabaddh Riddhagni to be mentally and physically qualified; but the United States shall not be subject to any expense on account of such instruction.

SEC. 2. Except as may be otherwise determined by the Secretary of the Air Force the said Prabaddh Riddhagni shall, as a condition to receiving instruction under the provisions of this joint resolution, agree to be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Air Force Academy appointed from the United States; but the said Prabaddh Riddhagni shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Air Force by reason of his graduation from the United States Air Force Academy.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to subject the said Prabaddh Riddhagni to the provisions of section 9348 of title 10 of the United States Code.

LOAN OF ARMED FORCES EQUIPMENT TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA FOR 1963 WORLD JAMBOREE IN GREECE

The bill (H.R. 9752) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in Greece in 1963, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2719, Calendar No. 1325, be indefinitely postponed, it being identical with H.R. 9752, Calendar No. 1324, just passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2719 will be indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 8355) to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The bill (S. 2806) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 26, 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 68), is further amended by amending the proviso to read as follows: "*Provided,* That the total amount which may be so expended for any one project, including the site, shall not exceed $100,000, and that where the project is for the joint use of the customs service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the combined cost of the project, including the site, shall be charged to the two appropriations concerned."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3099) to authorize an adequate White House Police Force, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3123) to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FURNISHING OF COURT QUARTERS WHERE REGULAR TERMS OF COURT ARE AUTHORIZED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3156) to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to furnishing court quarters and accommodations at places where regular terms of court are authorized to be held, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works; with an amendment; on page 2, line 1, after the word "authorized", to insert "by law", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 142 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such section the following: "The foregoing restrictions shall not, however, preclude the Administrator of General Services, at the request of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, from providing such court quarters and accommodations as the Administrator determines can appropriately be made available at places where regular terms of court are authorized by law to be held, but only if such court quarters and accommodations have been approved as necessary by the judicial council of the appropriate circuit."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SITES FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3157) to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 481; 40 U.S.C. 607 (b) and (c)) are hereby redesignated as subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of such section.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress asembled, That subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 481, 40 U.S.C. 607(a)) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 481; 40 U.S.C. 607 (b) and (c)) are hereby redesignated as subsections (a) and (b), respectively, of such section.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State of Alaska, to undertake studies and surveys relative to a highway construction program for Alaska, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the bill is not calendar business. I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

IMPROVEMENT OF LAND TENURE PATTERNS OF FORT BELKNAP RESERVATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1316) to improve the land tenure patterns of the Fort Belknap Reservation, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Indian", to strike out "Community Council" and insert "community"; in line 8, after the word "authorized", to insert "subject to the provisions of the constitution of the community"; in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "the community" and insert "the Fort Belknap Indian community", and on page 2, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "trust for the individuals concerned and the instruments of conveyance shall be construed to have the same force and effect as a trust patent issued pursuant to section 5 of the Act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. 388), as amended and supplemented." and insert "trust for the individuals concerned and such lands shall have the same status as other trust lands held by individual Indians on the Fort Belknap Reservation. The title to lands conveyed to the community shall be held by the United States in trust for the community."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of improving the land tenure patterns on the Fort Belknap Reservation of the State of Montana for the mutual benefit of the Fort Belknap Indian community and the individual members thereof, the Fort Belknap Indian community, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized, subject to the provisions of the constitution of the community, to (1) sell and convey to individual members of the Fort Belknap Indian community any tribal lands or interests therein within such reservation; and (2) exchange any tribal lands or interests therein within such reservation for other lands or interests therein situated within the reservation in which any interest is now or hereafter held in trust by the United States for an Indian, or is now or hereafter owned by an Indian subject to restrictions against alienation or taxation.

SEC. 2. The title to lands conveyed to individual members of the community shall be held by the United States in trust for the individuals concerned and such lands shall have the same status as other trust lands held by individual Indians on the Fort Belknap Reservation. The title to lands conveyed to the community shall be held by the United States in trust for the community.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall have authority to execute such instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to convey titles transferred pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and he is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CORRECTION OF DESCRIPTIONS OF CERTAIN LAND HELD IN TRUST

The bill (S. 2696) to correct certain land descriptions in the act entitled, "An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santa Domingo, Cochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso certain public domain lands" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso certain public domain lands", approved September 14, 1961 (75 Stat. 500), is amended by striking out—

"Township 8 north, range 2 east:

"Section 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, and 16, south half north half;

"Section 6, lots 1, 2, 12, 13, 14, and 15, northeast quarter east half northwest quarter."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Township 8 north, range 1 east:

"Section 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, and 16, south half north half;

"Section 6, lots 1, 2, 12, 13, 14, and 15, northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter."

LAND HELD IN TRUST BY UNITED STATES FOR PRAIRIE BAND OF POTAWATOMI INDIANS IN KANSAS

The bill (S. 2893) to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described land, and improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas: Southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter section 21, township 8 south, range 15 east, sixth principal meridian, Kansas, containing 10 acres, more or less.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS TO LITTLE FLOWER MISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2895) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians to the Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud Diocese, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "is", to strike out "here" and insert "hereby", and on page 2, line 4, after "rights-of-way", to insert "The conveyance shall provide that title to the land shall revert to the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe when it is no longer used for religious purposes."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, is hereby authorized to convey to the Little Flower Mission of the Saint Cloud Diocese, without the payment of any consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America and the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe in and to the following described land located on the Mille Lacs Indian Reservation: Lot 7, section 28, township 43 north, range 27 west, fourth principal meridian, Minnesota, containing 4.78 acres, more or less, subject to the road right-of-way for Minnesota Trunk Highway Numbered 169, and all other valid existing rights-of-way. The conveyance shall provide that title to the

land shall revert to the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe when it is no longer used for religious purposes.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1605) to authorize the Federal Power Commission to delegate its functions was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL PROVISION FOR IRRIGATION BLOCKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2179) to amend section 9(d)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, to make additional provision for irrigation blocks, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 15, after the word "limits", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That, when the Secretary shall have deferred the payment of all or any part of any installments of construction charges under any repayment contract pursuant to the authority of the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 584), he may, at any time prior to the due date prescribed for the first installment not reduced by such deferment, and by agreement with the contracting organization, terminate the supplemental contract by which such deferment was effected, credit the construction payments made, and exercise the authority granted in this section.", and in line 25, after "Sec. 3.", to strike out "Where the Secretary shall have deferred the payment of all or any part of any installments of construction charges under any repayment contract pursuant to the authority of the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 584), he may, at any time prior to the due date prescribed for the initial installment under the contract prior to such deferment and by agreement with the contracting organization, cancel and make void the supplemental contract by which such deferment was effected and exercise the authority granted in this Act." and, in lieu thereof, to insert "In any repayment contract which provides for payment of construction charges by single annual installments, the Secretary may by agreement with the contracting organization amend such contract to provide for the payment of such annual installments in two parts on such dates in the calendar year as may best enable the contracting organization to meet its payments."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That after the execution of a contract pursuant to the authority of section 9(d)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485), and prior to the commencement of the development period provided thereunder, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to amend such contract to provide for irrigation blocks, or if such are already provided, to add to or modify such irrigation blocks, as he shall deem desirable to carry out the purposes of that Act.

SEC. 2. Section 9(d)(1) is amended by deleting the period at the end of the first sentence of said section and by adding the following: *"Provided further,* That when the Secretary, by contract or by notice given thereunder, shall have fixed a development period of less than ten years, and at any time thereafter but before commencement of the repayment period conditions arise which in the judgment of the Secretary would have justified the fixing of a longer period, he may amend such contract or notice to extend such development period to a date not to exceed ten years from its commencement, and in a case where no development period was provided, he may amend such contract within the same limits: *Provided further,* That when the Secretary shall have deferred the payments of all or any part of any installments of construction charges under any repayment contract pursuant to the authority of the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 584), he may, at any time prior to the due date prescribed for the first installment not reduced by such deferment, and by agreement with the contracting organization, terminate the supplemental contract by which such deferment was effected, credit the construction payments made, and exercise the authority granted in this section."

SEC. 3. In any repayment contract which provides for payment of construction charges by single annual installments, the Secretary may by agreement with the contracting organization amend such contract to provide for the payment of such annual installments in two parts on such dates in the calendar year as may best enable the contracting organization to meet its payments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF BURLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT CONTRACT

The bill (S. 2665) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1416, H.R. 9647, an identical House bill, but with a technical amendment to correct a clerical error, which I shall offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 9647 will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9647) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 15, after the word "are", it is proposed to strike out "designed" and insert in lieu thereof "defined".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2665 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO ACT ADMITTING STATE OF WASHINGTON INTO THE UNION

The bill (H.R. 8030) to amend the act admitting the State of Washington into the Union in order to authorize the use of funds from the disposition of certain lands for the construction of State charitable, educational, penal, or reformatory institutions, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF NAME TO WHITMAN MISSION NATIONAL HISTORICAL SITE

The bill (H.R. 9805) to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historical Site, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN IDAHO

The bill (S. 1485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in Idaho, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 9097, an identical bill now pending in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the Senate to do so, it would be necessary that the committee be discharged from further consideration of that bill. Does the Senator so move?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the identical bill, H.R. 9097.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from further consideration of H.R. 9097.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9097) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 9097) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1485 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN COUNTIES WITHIN WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

The bill (S. 2270) to amend section 105 of title 28, United States Code, so as to transfer certain counties from the western division of the western district of Missouri to the St. Joseph division of such district, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (1) of section 105(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The western division comprises the counties of Bates, Carroll, Cass, Clay, Henry, Jackson, Johnson, Lafayette, Ray, Saint Clair, and Saline.

"Court for the western division shall be held at Kansas City."

(b) Paragraph (3) of section 105(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The Saint Joseph division comprises the counties of Andrew, Atchison, Buchanan, Caldwell, Clinton, Daviess, De Kalb, Gentry, Grundy, Harrison, Holt, Livingston, Mercer, Nodaway, Platte, Putnam, Sullivan, and Worth.

"Court for the Saint Joseph division shall be held at Saint Joseph."

MERRITT-CHAPMAN & SCOTT CORP.

The bill (S. 2572) for the relief of the Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Merritt-Chapman and Scott Corporation, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $192,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Merritt-Chapman and Scott Corporation against the United States for compensation for damages sustained by such corporation when, on August 5, 1959, a federally owned aircraft assigned to the 128th Fighter Group of Wisconsin Air National Guard, General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, crashed into a barge owned by the said Merritt-Chapman and Scott Corporation while such barge was anchored in Milwaukee Harbor, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LOST COLONY AND BIRTH OF VIRGINIA DARE

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 438) to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at ceremonies celebrating the 375th anniversary of the landing of the Lost Colony and the birth of Virginia Dare, was considered, and agreed to.

CANCER PROGRESS YEAR

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 576) to designate calendar year 1962 as Cancer Progress Year, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL CASTINGS WEEK

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 149) authorizing the President of the United States to designate the week of May 6, 1962, as International Castings Week, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be requested to designate the week of May 6, 1962, as "International Castings Week" in recognition of the Twenty-ninth International Foundry Congress and its theme of "Castings Technology for World Progress".

The preamble was agreed to.

INCORPORATION OF SEA CADETS OF AMERICA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1308) to incorporate the Sea Cadet Corps of America, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

TITLE I INCORPORATION

Incorporators

SEC. 101. The following persons: John J. Bergen, William J. Catlett, Junior, Morgan Fitch, George Hallis, and W. Royce Powell;

And, in lieu thereof, to insert "That the following named persons: John J. Bergen, William J. Catlett, Junior, Morgan Fitch, George Halas, John S. Leahy, Junior, and J. Paull Marshall;"; in line 11, after the word "hereby", to strike out "incorporated" and insert "created"; on page 2, line 3, after "corporation")", to insert "and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained"; at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "102" to "2"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "103" to "3"; in the same line, after the word "in", to strike out "section 101," and insert "the first section,"; at the beginning of line 24, to change the section number from "104" to "4"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "105" to "5"; at the beginning of line 21, to change the section number from "106" to "6"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "107" to "7"; in line 8, after the word "section", to strike out "117" and insert "17"; in the same line, after the word "this", to strike out "title" and insert "Act"; in line 11, after the name "Fitch", to strike out "George Hallis, and W. Royce Powell" and insert "George Halas, John S. Leahy, Junior, and J. Paull Marshall"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "108" to "8"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "109" to "9"; on page 7, at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "110" to "10"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "111" to "11"; at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "112" to "12"; at the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "113" to "13"; on page 8, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 114. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 14. (a) Annual audits shall be made by an independent licensed or certified public accountant or a firm of independent licensed or certified public accountants, in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

On page 9, at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "115" to "15"; on page 10, at the beginning of line 2, to change the section number from "116" to "16"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "117" to "17"; at the beginning of line 18, to change the section number from "118" to "18"; at the beginning of line 24, to change the section number

from "119" to "19"; and at the top of page 11, to strike out:

TITLE II—RELATIONSHIP TO UNITED STATES NAVY

Functions of Secretary of Navy

SEC. 201. (a) The Naval Sea Cadet Corps shall be established as a volunteer civilian auxiliary of the United States Navy. To assist the Naval Sea Cadet Corps in the accomplishment of objectives as set out in section 102 of title I of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, to the extent and under such conditions and regulations as he may prescribe—

(1) provide active practical training for the sea cadet divisions of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps at naval stations and on board ships;

(2) to transport sea cadets to and from such stations or ships and furnish them subsistence while en route or, instead of transportation and subsistence, pay them a travel allowance of 5 cents a mile by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed and return, and pay the allowance for the return trip in advance;

(3) furnish subsistence to sea cadets while on board naval stations or ships for training;

(4) furnish medical attendance and supplies to sea cadets, and admit them to military hospitals;

(5) use members of the Navy or Marine Corps, and such property of the United States as he considers necessary, for the training of the sea cadets; and

(6) issue appropriate regulations governing the administration and curriculums of the active training program of the sea cadet divisions.

(b) Active training provided for any sea cadet may not exceed a period of nine weeks in any calendar year.

(c) Under such conditions as he may prescribe, the Secretary of the Navy may—

(1) issue uniforms to the sea cadet divisions except that he may pay commutation at a rate fixed by him annually instead of uniforms;

(2) provide means of transportation, training equipment, arms, ammunition, supplies, and incentive awards and training grants;

(3) assign active duty personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, as a collateral duty, to assist in the instruction and training of sea cadet divisions;

(4) appoint as officers of the sea cadet divisions volunteer retired members of the naval service, members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and members of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve and others who are qualified and volunteer; and

(5) in conjunction with the Naval Sea Cadet Corps, prescribe uniforms and insignia for the sea cadet divisions and issue regulations governing their organization, administration, instruction and training in coordination with the administration officer of the corporation.

RELATIONSHIP TO CORPORATION

SEC. 202. (a) In carrying out the functions enumerated in section 201, the Secretary of the Navy will take into account the known policies and objectives of the corporation established by title I of this Act, treating the latter to the fullest extent consistent with existing laws and regulations as a partner in the common enterprise. The principle of mutual support and public recognition shall be adhered to in connection with all external relationships pertaining to the naval sea cadet movement.

(b) The Navy League of the United States shall be granted the exclusive right of sponsorship of sea cadet divisions of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps. In instances where the Naval League is unable to sponsor a particular division, such sponsorship may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be passed to others. Warrants authorizing the establishment of sea cadet divisions shall be issued by commandants of naval districts to and in the name of the sponsoring organization.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following named persons: John J. Bergen, William J. Catlett, Junior, Morgan Fitch, George Halas, John S. Leahy, Junior, and J. Paull Marshall; members of the Navy League National Sea Cadet Committee and their associates and successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the Naval Sea Cadet Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 2. The objects and the purposes of the corporation shall be, through organization and cooperation with the Department of the Navy, to encourage and aid American boys to develop an interest and skill in basic seamanship and in its naval adaptations, to train them in seagoing skills and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 3. The persons named in the first section, their associates and successors are hereby authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, the promulgation of rules or regulations that may be necessary for the accomplishment of the purposes of this corporation, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purposes.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

(2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any private corporation, association, partnership, firm or individual and to hold any property, real, personal or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property; and

(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE, SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Tacoma, Washington, or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designation of classes of members shall, except as provided in this title, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: COMPOSITION, RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon the enactment of this title the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the present members of the board of directors of the Sea Cadet Corps of America, the corporation described in section 17 of this Act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified members of said board of directors, to wit: John J. Bergen, William J. Catlett, Junior, Morgan Fitch, George Halas, John S. Leahy, Junior, and J. Paull Marshall.

(b) Thereafter, the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number (not less than three and not more than fifteen), shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of directors shall be the governing board of the corporation, and shall be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation and for the control of all funds of the corporation.

OFFICERS; ELECTION AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SEC. 8.(a) The officers of the corporation shall be a president, one or more vice presidents (as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation), a secretary, and a treasurer, and such other officers as may be provided in the constitution and bylaws.

(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

USE OF INCOME: LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the

amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS: INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. (a) Annual audits shall be made by an independent licensed or certified public accountant or a firm of independent licensed or certified public accountants, in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEM, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to the name "Naval Sea Cadet Corps" and to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes, distinctive insignia, emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases, as may be required in the furtherance of its functions. No powers or privileges hereby granted shall, however, interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

TRANSFER OF ASSETS

SEC. 17. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Sea Cadet Corps of America, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of Washington applicable thereto.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 18. The corporation shall report annually to the Secretary of the Navy concerning its proceedings and activities for the preceding calendar years. The Secretary of the Navy shall communicate to Congress the whole of such reports, or such portion thereof as he shall see fit.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHAPTER

SEC. 19. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

JOEY KIM PURDY

The bill (S. 1526) for the relief of Joey Kim Purdy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Joey Kim Purdy shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Ralph B. Purdy, Junior, and Julia Purdy, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Joey Kim Purdy shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

MRS. GEOHAR OGASSIAN

The bill (S. 1889) for the relief of Mrs. Geohar Ogassian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Geohar Ogassian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ELVIRA CICCOTELLI

The bill (S. 2247) for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elvira Ciccotelli may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

TIO SIEN TJIONG

The bill (S. 2309) for the relief of Tio Sien Tjiong was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tio Sien Tjiong (A-10396702) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 3, 1953.

RONALD WHITING

The bill (S. 2482) for the relief of Ronald Whiting was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ronald Whiting may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

MICHAEL NAJEEB METRY

The bill (S. 2565) for the relief of Michael Najeeb Metry was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Michael Najeeb Metry, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Dr. and Mrs. John M. Metry, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Michael Najeeb Metry shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

CONSTANTINA CARAISCOU

The bill (S. 2574) for the relief of Constantina Caraiscou was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and

205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Constantina Caraiscou, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George Caras, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Constantina Caraiscou shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

ALEXANDRA CALLAS

The bill (S. 2586) for the relief of Alexandra Callas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Alexandra Callas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Callas, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Alexandra Callas shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

HAMBURG TANG

The bill (S. 2649) for the relief of Hamburg Tang was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of sections 201(a), 202(a)(5), and 202(b)(4) shall not be applicable in the case of Hamburg Tang, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 245(b) of the said Act, a record of lawful admission may be created as of February 11, 1950, the date on which Hamburg Tang was first admitted to the United States.

CHAO YAO KOH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1074) for the relief of Chao Yao Koh, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chao Yao Koh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 5, 1952, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CHIARA PALUMBO VACIRCA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1568) for the relief of Chiara Palumbo Vacirca, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chiara Palumbo Vacirca may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. ANTONIA A. ZACCARIA EPIFANI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1739) for the relief of Mrs. Antonia A. Zaccaria Epifani, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 10, after "1953", to insert a comma and "and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (Stat. 657), shall not be applicable in this case"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens", approved September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 644), Mrs. Antonia A. Zaccaria Epifani shall be held and considered to be an alien registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act under a priority date earlier than December 31, 1953, and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (Stat. 657), shall not be applicable in this case.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ASSUNTA BIANCHI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1882) for the relief of Assunta Bianchi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Assunta Bianchi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard A. Lange, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural mother of Assunta Bianchi shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANNA MARIE ERDELYI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1999) for the relief of Anna Marie Erdelyi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Marie Erdelyi, the fiancée of Sergeant Clinton G. Dubey, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Anna Marie Erdelyi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sergeant Clinton G. Dubey and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that the provisions of sections 212(a)(9) and 212(a)(12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable to the said Anna Marie Erdelyi: *Provided further,* That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Anna Marie Erdelyi, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Anna Marie Erdelyi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anna Marie Erdelyi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

WOJCIECH ANTONI DROGOSZEWSKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2446) for the relief of Wojciech Antoni Drogoszewski, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "States", to strike out the colon and "*Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Wojciech Antoni Drogoszewski shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Wojciech Antoni Drogoszewski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Antoni Drogoszewski, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FONG YEE HIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2555) for the relief of Fong Yee Hin, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to insert "and head tax"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fong Yee Hin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 25, 1940, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LEE HWA SUN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2607) for the relief of Lee Hwa Sun, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Mr. and Mrs. John Mathews," and insert "Mr. and Mrs. John Matthews, Junior,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lee Hwa Sun, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Matthews, Junior, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Lee Hwa Sun shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MICHELINA LANNI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2622) for the relief of Michelina Lanni, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michelina Lanni may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

JOHN AXEL ARVIDSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2679) for the relief of John Axel Arvidson which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act," to insert "or the Act of July 9, 1918, or the decree of the Hennepin County District Court, Minneapolis, Minnestoa, dated March 15, 1919,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or the Act of July 9, 1918, or the decree of the Hennepin County District Court, Minneapolis, Minnesota, dated March 15, 1919, John Axel Arvidson shall be held and considered eligible to be naturalized as a citizen of the United States provided he is otherwise qualified in accordance with the general requirements as to residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution, and disposition to the good order and happiness of the United States as set forth in section 316 of the said Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ERNST FRAENKEL AND HIS WIFE, HANNA FRAENKEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2709) for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, the provisions of section 352(a)(1) of that Act shall be held to be and to have been inapplicable in the cases of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel, naturalized citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That they return to the United States for permanent residence prior to June 1, 1965.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

KIM BOOSHIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2606) for the relief of Kim Booshin, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Kim Booshin" and insert "Patricia Kim Bell (Kim Booshin)", and in line 8, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "said Kim Booshin" and insert "beneficiary", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Patricia Kim Bell (Kim Booshin), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Doctor and Mrs. Archie Bell, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Patricia Kim Bell (Kim Booshin)."

CHOI SUN HEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2633) for the relief of Choi Sun Hee, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Choi Sun Hee" and insert "Susan Holt Lerke (Choi Sun Hee)", and in line 8, after the word "said", to strike out "Choi Sun Hee" and insert "Susan Holt Lerke (Choi Sun Hee)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Susan Holt Lerke (Choi Sun Hee), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Kurt Lerke and Julia Lerke, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Susan Holt Lerke (Choi Sun Hee) shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Susan Holt Lerke (Choi Sun Hee)."

FONG CHUN HONG

The bill (H.R. 1349) for the relief of Fong Chun Hong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACINTO MACHADO ORMONDE

The bill (H.R. 1435) for the relief of Jacinto Machado Ormonde was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FONG KAI DONG

The bill (H.R. 1588) for the relief of Fong Kai Dong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPENCER E. HEWITT

The bill (H.R. 1604) for the relief of Spencer E. Hewitt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIOLA BORWICK WARBIS

The bill (H.R. 1697) for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KIKUE YAMAMOTO LEGHORN AND MINOR SON, YUICHIRO YAMAMOTO LEGHORN

The bill (H.R. 1701) for the relief of Mrs. Kikue Yamamoto Leghorn and her minor son, Yuichiro Yamamoto Leghorn, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAXIMO B. AVILA

The bill (H.R. 1703) for the relief of Maximo B. Avila was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN D. MORTON

The bill (H.R. 1918) for the relief of John D. Morton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS HELEN FAPPIANO

The bill (H.R. 2687) for the relief of Miss Helen Fappiano was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MADDALENA HAAS

The bill (H.R. 3148) for the relief of Maddalena Haas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 3247) to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, over, as *not calendar business.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, notwithstanding the request that the bill go over, I wish to state that I heartily support the bill, as does the entire Republican conference. That position was taken on May 8. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the conference be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER, CHAIRMAN, SENATE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

The Senate Republican conference committee today endorsed H.R. 3247, to amend the Smith Act, which is now on the Senate Calendar.

This bill would clarify the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act of 1940, which outlaws certain activities whose objective is the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

Among other things, the Smith Act made it a crime to organize any society or group to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of the Government.

The case of *Yates* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 298 (1957), involved the question whether 14 known Communists had violated the Smith Act. The Supreme Court, in reversing their convictions for conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and for organizing groups for the same purpose, held that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party and not to a continuing process of organization. In the Court's opinion the organizing took place in 1945 when the Communist Political Association was disbanded and reconstituted as the Communist Party of the United States. The indictment in the *Yates* case was returned in 1951, and was therefore barred by the statute of limitations.

There have since been reversals of convictions in seven cases by U.S. courts of appeal, at least in part on the basis of that case.

The Republican conference committee is in complete agreement with the statement in the unanimous Judiciary Committee report that:

"From a study of the legislative history of the Smith Act, and as a matter of commonsense * * * the term "organize" was intended to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States."

GERTRUDE M. KAPLAN

The bill (H.R. 3696) for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SP5C. DANIEL J. HAWTHORNE, JR.

The bill (H.R. 4365) for the relief of Sp5c. Daniel J. Hawthorne, Jr., was considered, orderd to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABRAHAM GELB

The bill (H.R. 4563) for the relief of Abraham Gelb was considered, ordered to a third reading read the third time, and passed.

PIERINO RENZO PICCHIONE

The bill (H.R. 5610) for the relief of Pierino Renzo Picchione was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. WILLIE MAE BROWN

The bill (H.R. 5686) for the relief of Mrs. Willie Mae Brown was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CECIL D. ROSE

The bill (H.R. 6464) for the relief of Cecil D. Rose was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENDRIKUS ZOETMULDER (HARRY COMBRES)

The bill (H.R. 6772) for the relief of Hendrikus Zoetmulder (Harry Combres) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPEAL ACT OF AUGUST 14, 1957 (PRIVATE LAW 85-160)

The bill (H.R. 6773) to repeal the act of August 14, 1957 (Private Law 85-160), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUANNA L. LEIS

The bill (H.R. 7671) for the relief of Louanna L. Leis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RONALD L. MUTTER

The bill (H.R. 8195) for the relief of Ronald L. Mutter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL J. PERICLE

The bill (H.R. 8482) for the relief of Paul J. Pericle was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES R. BANKS

The bill (H.R. 8515) for the relief of James R. Banks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH A. TEDESCO

The bill (H.R. 8628) for the relief of Joseph A. Tedesco was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZE ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT TO UNITED STATES BY WILL OF ESTHER CATTELL SCHMITT

The bill (H.R. 8941) to authorize acceptance of the gift made to the United States by the will of Esther Cattell Schmitt was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RHEA G. BURGESS

The bill (H.R. 9060) for the relief of Rhea G. Burgess was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THEODORE A. ANDERSON

The bill (H.R. 9188) to relieve Theodore A. Anderson from loss of agricultural conservation program benefits was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. IRIS ANN LANDRUM

The bill (H.R. 9409) for the relief of Mrs. Iris Ann Landrum was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL E. MOORE

The bill (H.R. 9596) for the relief of Daniel E. Moore was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES N. TULL

The bill (H.R. 9597) for the relief of James N. Tull was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS IN CERTAIN DEFENSE FACILITIES

The bill (H.R. 9753) to amend sections 3(7) and 5(b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, relating to employment of members of Communist organizations in certain defense facilities was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN B. HOGAN

The bill (H.R. 9830) for the relief of John B. Hogan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GAIL HOHLWEG ATABAY AND DAUGHTER

The bill (H.R. 10643) for the relief of Gail Hohlweg Atabay and her daughter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM BURNICE JOYNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1348) for the relief of William Burnice Joyner which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to pay to William Burnice Joyner, of Palatka, Florida, the amount of $1,531.08. This sum represents the amount due as retroactive compensation for services rendered the United States Post Office, Palatka, Florida, during the period September 1, 1946, to and including September 1, 1948: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

KEVORK TOROIAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5652) for the relief of Kevork Toroian which had been reported from the Committe on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "October 22, 1959" and insert "November 23, 1959".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read a third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1458) for the relief of Lee Dock On was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 123) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, over, as not calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2164) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the first World Conference on National Parks, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CARLSON, Mr. President, over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION FOR CELEBRATION OF BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) to establish the sesquicentennial commission for the celebration of the Battle of New Orleans which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 3, line 21, after the word "resolution", to insert a colon and *"Provided, however,* That all expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donated funds only.", and on page 6, line 19, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act" and insert "$165,000 to carry out the purposes of section 5 of this Act"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of twenty-three members as follows:

(1) Eight members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate (two each from Louisiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee);

(2) Eight members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (two each from Louisiana, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee);

(3) One representative of the Department of the Interior who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his designee, and who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and

(4) Six members to be appointed by the President after consideration of such recommendations as the Governor of Louisiana may make, upon the request of the President.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

SEC. 2. The function of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute plans for the observance in December 1964 and January 1965 of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Chalmette, or New Orleans, a resounding victory at arms which resulted in prompt ratification of the Treaty of Ghent and the welding of the new Nation—East and West—into a truly independent Republic; and the celebration of one hundred and fifty years of unbroken friendship between this Nation and Great Britain. In carrying out these functions, the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist such groups as the State of Louisiana and the city of New Orleans may establish to celebrate the sesquicentennial of the Battle of New Orleans.

SEC. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this resolution: *Provided, however,* That all expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donated funds only.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account also for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within one year following the celebration as prescribed by this resolution. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. Within the boundaries of Chalmette National Historical Park as designated by the Secretary of the Interior on March 20, 1958, pursuant to the Act of August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1342), and depicted on drawing numbered NHP-CHAL-7008, said Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire, with appropriated funds, lands and interests in lands as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the west line of Fazendeville Road with a

line 50 feet south of southerly boundary of right-of-way of the Louisiana Southern Railway at coordinate point X–2,425,730.76 and Y–467,506.11; (the bearings and coordinates herein stated are in accord with the Louisiana geodetic survey plane grid system); and running thence south 66 degrees 32 minutes 46 seconds east, parallel to said southerly boundary of right-of-way of Louisiana Southern Railway, a distance of 30 feet to coordinate point X–2,425,758.28 and Y–467,-494.17; thence south 23 degrees 45 minutes 21 seconds west for a distance of 917.90 feet along the east right-of-way of Fazendeville Road to a point;

Thence south 66 degrees 14 minutes 39 seconds east for a distance of 161.83 feet to a point; thence south 23 degrees 45 minutes 21 seconds west on a line parallel to Fazendeville Road for a distance of 1,406.51 feet to a point; thence north 64 degrees 19 minutes 9 seconds west for a distance of 161.92 feet to a point on the east right-of-way of Fazendeville Road; thence south 23 degrees 45 minutes 21 seconds west along the east right-of-way of Fazendeville Road for a distance of 19.41 feet to a point;

Thence south 64 degrees 19 minutes 9 seconds east for a distance of 95.70 feet to a point; thence south 23 degrees 45 minutes 21 seconds west on a line parallel to Fazendeville Road for a distance of 54.90 feet to a point; thence north 64 degrees 19 minutes 9 seconds west for a distance of 95.70 feet to a point on the east right-of-way of Fazendeville Road; thence south 23 degrees 45 minutes 21 seconds along the east right-of-way of Fazendeville Road for a distance of 279.44 feet to a point;

Thence crossing Fazendeville Road on a line running north 49 degrees 02 minutes 49 seconds west for a distance of 31.40 feet to a point on the west right-of-way of Fazendeville Road; thence north 23 degrees 45 minutes 21 seconds east along the west right-of-way of Fazendeville Road for a distance of 2,663.28 feet to a point which is the point of beginning; containing 7.02 acres more or less, including 1.83 acres more or less within the right-of-way of the Fazendeville Road; and excluding lot 15, as shown on a map of survey by F. C. Gandolfo, Junior, dated January 9, 1953, and being in section 10 of township 13 south, range 12 east, parish of Saint Bernard, State of Louisiana, and known locally as Fazendeville.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated $165,000 to carry out the purposes of section 5 of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE CERTAIN LANDS AT ANTIETAM NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD SITE

The bill (H.R. 10098) to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield Site was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE LAND CLAIM IN THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

The bill (H.R. 4380) to quiet title and possession to an unconfirmed and located private land claim in the State of Louisiana was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

H. F. HSÜ

The bill (S. 2310) for the relief of H. F. Hsü was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, H. F. Hsü shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of February 12, 1954.

YIANNOULA VASILIOU TSAMBIRAS

The bill (S. 2675) for the relief of Yiannoula Vasiliou Tsambiras was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yiannoula Vasiliou Tsambiras, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Jerry Simos and Helen Chamber Simos, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Yiannoula Vasiliou Tsambiras shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

YOON SO SHIM

The bill (S. 2732) for the relief of Yoon So Shim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yoon So Shim, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Thatcher, Junior, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Yoon So Shim shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

DR. KWAN HO LEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1174) for the relief of Dr. Kwan Ho Lee which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Kwan Ho Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of December 13, 1952.

SEC. 2. The time Doctor Kwan Ho Lee has resided and has been physically present in the United States since December 13, 1952, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SALVATORE SPATAFORA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1524) for the relief of Salvatore Spatafora which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959, Salvatore Spatafora shall be deemed to have been registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act under a priority date earlier than December 31, 1953, and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall not be applicable in this case.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

FILOMENA T. SCHENKENBERGER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2355) for the relief of Filomena T. Schenkenberger which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Filomena F. Schenkenberger may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LISE MARIE BERTHE MARGUERITE DE SIMONE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2198) for the relief of Lise Marie Berthe Marguerite De Simone which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of sections 201(a), 202(a)(5), and 202(b) shall be inapplicable in the case of Lise Marie Berthe Marguerite De Simone.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CATERINA SCALZO (NEE LOSCHIAVO)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2990) for the relief of Caterina Scalzo (nee LoSchiavo), which had been reported from the Committee on the

Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Caterina Scalzo (nee LoSchiavo), the fiancée of Bernard Scalzo, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Caterina Scalzo (nee LoSchiavo) is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Bernard Scalzo and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Caterina Scalzo (nee LoSchiavo), she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Caterina Scalzo (nee LoSchiavo), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Caterina Scalzo (nee LoSchiavo) as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ERICH HOFFINGER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1398) for the relief of Erich Hoffinger, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "provision of section" and insert "provisions of sections", and in line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That if the said Erich Hoffinger is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 212(a) (1) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erich Hoffinger may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That if the said Erich Hoffinger is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

ALEX VEDELER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2144) for the relief of Alex Vedeler, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "Alex" and insert "Alexander", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alexander Vedeler shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 25, 1953, and the time he has resided and has been physically present in the United States since July 25, 1953, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Alexander Vedeler."

ISABEL LORETTA ALLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2621) for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Isabel" and insert "Izabel", and in line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and *"And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Izabel Loretta Allen may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen."

RENATO GRANDUC O'NEAL AND GRAZIA GRANDUC O'NEAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2769) for the relief of Renato Granduc O'Neal and Grazia Granduc O'Neal, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "O'Neal"; in the same line, after the name "Grazia", to strike out "Granduc O'Neal," and insert "Granduc"; in line 9, after the name "Granduc", to strike out "O'Neal"; and in line 10, after the name "Granduc", to strike out "O'Neal", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Renato Granduc and Grazia Granduc shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor children of Captain William L. O'Neal and Mary Granduc O'Neal, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Renato Granduc and Grazia Granduc shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Renato Granduc and Grazia Granduc."

CERTAIN ALIENS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 638) for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the name "Moreno", to strike out "Orlando V. Jamandre,"; in line 7, after the name "Mayo", to strike out "Federico M. Periquet,"; and on page 2, line 4, after the word "deduct", to strike out "thirteen" and insert "eleven".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

ROCCO CAMBREA

The bill (H.R. 1372) for the relief of Rocco Cambrea was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEE KYONG JA

The bill (H.R. 1533) for the relief of Lee Kyong Ja was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRENE KEMENY

The bill (H.R. 1650) for the relief of Irene Kemeny was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 1700) for the relief of Jaime Abejuro was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. ENGLE. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

SISTER MARY AURELIA (CHIARA DI GESU)

The bill (H.R. 3005) for the relief of Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FELICJA SAULEVICZ

The bill (H.R. 5689) for the relief of Felicja Saulevicz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MON (FRED) YOUNG

The bill (H.R. 6344) for the relief of Mon (Fred) Young was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADOLF M. BAILER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1347) for the relief of Adolf M. Bailer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Adolf M. Bailer. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Adolf M. Bailer shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 10162) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. I ask that the bill go over, as not calendar business.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I was going to object to consideration of H.R. 10162 because it provides for United States participation in loans to the International Monetary Fund and to strengthen the international monetary system.

There is no country in the world today which faces greater problems involving financial stability than does the United States. There has been much discussion recently in the Senate about the serious outflow of gold which, from January 1 to May 8 of this year, in a period of a little more than 4 months, amounted to $424 million.

In the Washington Daily News of today there appears an article entitled "J.F.K. Is Wrong on Gold," written by Henry J. Taylor. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

J.F.K. IS WRONG ON GOLD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In the world's cold, slow-motion appraisal of what is happening here, away goes more of the Nation's gold—nearly $1 billion more since the President first announced his programs.

The President can stop this, and the world catastrophe it implies. But he can never, never stop it so long as he keeps his present White House advisers and believes as he does. Their crystal ball is kaput.

On May 9, after dropping week by week, our gold reserve fell to another 22-year low. Instead of improving the grave gold problem he inherited, the President has turned it into a gold crisis. And gold withdrawals, following Mr. Kennedy's tragic smash at business confidence by his methods in the steel affair, now drop our reserves to less than $16.5 billion.

Even so, and hardly known to the public because it is obscured by economic jargon, not one penny at Fort Knox any longer belongs to the United States. We owe foreigners every ounce of it—and $1.5 billion besides—in $18 billion net short-term claims, payable in gold. Our entire currency reserve required by law ($11.5 billion), our "free gold," and more, is mortgaged to world creditors now calling on us steadily to pay them in gold as they see our dollars become dollarettes.

There will be rallies, but by common consent our monetary stopgaps are merely tactical and the required U.S. correctives also go far beyond increasing America's exports.

The worldwide doubt about the dollar can be overcome only by a balanced budget, a favorable balance of international payments, and a systematic reduction in the national debt. The U.S. Treasury is merely a cash register. Its officials have no control over international confidence if the Nation's boss takes more money out of the till than the people put in.

Nevertheless, the White House advisers are all cut out of the same cloth and here enters Prof. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, busting onto the Nation's TV screens.

Is Dr. Heller concerned about how wisely he and the President are tackling things? Not at all. Gleeful as a Boy Scout at a jamboree, Dr. Heller explained that, in fact, "the Government isn't spending enough." "The budget does not need balancing," he stated. This danger, along with the national debt, is a "myth." As for the interest burden, oh, well, "We're rich." Who is rich?

If I were this man's butcher he'd be on a cash-on-delivery basis with me tomorrow morning.

Dr. Heller has been dead wrong on every major financial calculation he has made since he entered the White House, as has likewise the President himself. Thus, Mr. Kennedy will earn the profound thanks of our great Nation and the free world by abandoning such White House advisers and making the hard turn to thrift and prudence that the world demands if he is to save our dollar.

For the chips are down. Our jobs, our savings, sustenance, and the Nation's security are at stake. On the record, the President has no right to bet America on quiz kids who repeatedly flunk the quiz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENDING APPLICATION OF CERTAIN LAWS TO AMERICAN SAMOA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10062) to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the head of any department, corporation, or other agency of the executive branch of the Government may, upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, extend to American Samoa without reimbursement, scientific, technical, and other assistance under any program administered by such agency that will promote the welfare of American Samoa, notwithstanding any provision of law under which American Samoa may otherwise be excluded from such program. The provisions of this section shall not apply to financial assistance under a grant-in-aid program. The Secretary of the Interior shall not request assistance pursuant to this subsection which will involve nonreimbursable costs as estimated for him in advance by the heads of the departments, agencies, and corporations concerned in excess of an aggregate of $150,000 in any one fiscal year.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

SEC. 2. (a) American Samoa shall be entitled to share in the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 151 et seq.), and any Act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto, upon the same terms and conditions as any of the several States. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and annually thereafter, the sum of $80,000, to be available for allotment to American Samoa under such Act and the modifications hereinafter provided.

(b) Sums appropriated under the authority of subsection (a) of this section shall be allocated for vocational education in (1) agriculture, (2) home economics, (3) trades and industries, and (4) distributive occupations, in the proportion which the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively, of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, bears to the sum of such amounts except insofar as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, deems it necessary to modify said proportions to meet special conditions existing in American Samoa.

(c) The provisions of section 3, section 7, and section 8(b) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, shall apply to sums appropriated under this section with such modifications as the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall deem necessary to meet special conditions existing in American Samoa.

(d) In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under section 9 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, such sums to be expended for the same purposes and in the same manner as provided in section 7 of the Act of February 23, 1917 (20 U.S.C. 15).

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

SEC. 3. (a) The National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam,"

wherever appearing in such Act, except that after "the apportionment for Guam," in section 4, such Act is amended by inserting the following: "the apportionment for American Samoa,".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to funds appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 4. (a) The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) in seciton 314 strike out subsection (l) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(l) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection the provisions of this section shall be applicable to Guam and American Samoa in the same manner in which they apply to the States. Amounts paid to Guam or American Samoa from its allotment under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (e) of this section, together with matching funds of Guam or American Samoa, respectively, may, with the approval of the Surgeon General, be expended in carrying out the purposes specified in any such subsection or subsections other than the one under which the allotment was made.";

(2) in subsections (a) and (d) of section 631 insert "American Samoa," after "Guam,"; and

(3) in sections 624 and 652 insert a comma and "American Samoa," after "Virgin Islands".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1962.

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

SEC. 5. (a) The Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) in subsection (a) of section 4 strike out "and to the Virgin Islands" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and "American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands";

(2) in subsection (a) of section 6 strike out "and of Guam" and insert in lieu thereof a comma and "American Samoa, or Guam"; and

(3) in the remainder of such Act insert "American Samoa," after "Guam," wherever appearing therein.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1962.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INVESTIGATING CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY METHODS

The resolution (S. Res. 332) to investigate certain aspects of national security methods was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from the date of approval of this resolution to January 31, 1963, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from date of approval of this resolution to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $70,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the resolution.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON

I wish to speak briefly of Senate Resolution 332 which requests funds for studies of the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to meet the requirements imposed by the increasing complexity of national security problems.

The Senate has before it the text of the resolution, together with an estimated budget of $70,000 for the period from the adoption of the resolution through January 31, 1963. This resolution has been favorably reported by the Committee on Government Operations and by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The proposed studies are a followon to the work of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. As my colleagues know, that 2½-year inquiry was the first overall review of the national security policymaking process since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. More than 50 hearings were held, opening with the penetrating testimony of Hon. Robert A. Lovett in 1960, and closing with the appearance of Secretary of State Dean Rusk in 1961. The subcommittee issued a series of background studies, six staff reports, and the chairman's final statement giving detailed findings and recommendations for improvement.

Some of the recommendations contained in these reports are under review in the executive branch. Many others have been adopted. Most recently, for example, the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, providing for certain reorganizations in the field of science and technology implements the basic recommendations of our staff study issued in 1961 under the title "Science Organization and the President's Office."

The studies projected in Senate Resolution 332 will follow up on the previous subcommittee findings which are still under discussion and consideration in the executive branch. The proposed studies will also permit the Senate to maintain an initiative in timely and constructive contributions to urgent problems of staffing and operations in the national security area.

In accordance with the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee, the subcommittee will be concerned with interagency problems and operations which involve several departments and agencies in the national security field.

The studies will be conducted by the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations.

We shall, of course, approach the task proposed in this resolution in an objective, scholarly, and nonpartisan spirit.

SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

The resolution (S. Res. 324) expressing the willingness of the Senate to cooperate in a Senate youth program was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its willingness to cooperate in a nationwide competitive high school Senate youth program which would give several representative high school students from each State a short indoctrination into the operation of the United States Senate and the Federal Government generally, if such a program can be satisfactorily arranged and completely supported by private funds with no expense to the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall investigate the possibility of establishing such a program and, if the committee determines such a program is possible and advisable, it shall make the necessary arrangements to establish the program.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES ON "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) to print additional copies of hearings on "Constitutional Rights of the Mentally Ill," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary one thousand additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings on "Constitutional Rights of the Mentally Ill," and one thousand copies of its hearings on "Wiretapping and Eavesdropping Legislation", held by its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on 'Constitutional Rights of the Mentally Ill' and 'Wiretapping and Eavesdropping Legislation'."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "STUDY MISSION TO SOUTH AMERICA"

The resolution (S. Res. 330) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a report entitled "Study Mission to South America" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "Study Mission to South America", submitted by Senators Gale W. McGee, Frank E. Moss, Clair Engle, and Stephen M. Young to the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Interior and Insular Affairs, Agriculture, and Forestry, and Armed Services on February 13, 1962; and that five thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF H.R. 6775 OF 87TH CONGRESS

The resolution (S. Res. 334) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a legislative history of H.R. 6775 of the 87th Congress (a bill to the Shipping Act, 1916) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a compilation of materials constituting a legislative history of H.R. 6775 of the Eighty-seventh Congress (a bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences) be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT SYMPOSIUM ENTITLED "EDUCATION FOR SURVIVAL IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST WORLD COMMUNISM"

The resolution (S. Res. 335) to print as a Senate document a symposium entitled "Education for Survival in the Struggle Against World Communism" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a symposium prepared for the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, entitled "Education for Survival in the Struggle Against World Communism". There shall be printed six thousand additional copies of such Senate document which shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 336) to print additional copies of a report on Government contracting for research and development, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, in line 1, after the word "printed", to strike out "for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of" and insert "with illustrations as a Senate document"; and in line 7, after "1962", to insert a semicolon and "and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Government Operations", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document a report compiled by the Bureau of the Budget entitled "Report to the President on Government Contracting for Research and Development", submitted by the President of the United States to the Congress on April 30, 1962; and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a report compiled by the Bureau of the Budget entitled 'Report to the President on Government Contracting for Research and Development'."

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF REVISED EDITION SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 98

The resolution (S. Res. 338) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a revised edition of (an original resolution) Senate Document No. 98 entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 98 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities" be printed as a Senate document.

PAYING GRATUITY TO ESTELLE A. ENGLAND

The resolution (S. Res. 339) to pay a gratuity to Estelle A. England was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Estelle A. England, mother of Shirley A. Preston, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to five months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYING GRATUITY TO ROBERT I. PLOWMAN AND LUCY P. MUNRO

The resolution (S. Res. 340) to pay a gratuity to Robert I. Plowman and Lucy P. Munro was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Robert T. Plowman, son, and Lucy P. Munro, daughter of S. Rex Plowman, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Building at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to 3 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

The bill (H.R. 11261) to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That concludes the call of the calendar.

ORSOLINA CIANFLONE IALLONARDO

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1915) for the relief of Orsolina Cianflone Iallonardo, which were, after line 10, insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363), Mrs. Chow Chui Ha shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of that Act, and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall be inapplicable in this case.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Act of April 13, 1962 (Private Law 87-346), Giuseppe Aniello shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363), and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall be inapplicable in this case.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Orsolina Cianflone Iallonardo, Mrs. Chow Chui Ha, and Giuseppe Aniello."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on March 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 1915 to enable the adopted daughter of a U.S. citizen to qualify for a nonquota immigrant visa under the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 86-363.

On May 15, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 1915, with amendments, to include two additional beneficiaries. The amendments will enable the adopted daughter of U.S. citizens and the son of a U.S. citizen to qualify for nonquota immigrant visas under the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 86-363.

Mr. President, these amendments are acceptable and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1915. This matter has been cleared with the leadership on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

ELISABETTA PICCIONI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7777) for the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from

New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is on his feet, I should like at this time to have the pending business laid down.

I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1333, S. 3225.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no consideration of the bill this afternoon, unless a Senator desires to do so.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF THE CALENDAR COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to the members of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle and their staffs for the work they have done this afternoon in helping to clear the calendar to the extent that it has been cleared. They have done a good job.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECISION BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN BROWN VERSUS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks the eighth anniversary of the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in Brown against Board of Education, the so-called school desegregation case.

Mr. President, it is tremendously interesting, I think, and should be of interest to the country, to see what has occurred in the light of the big to-do which has been made in this Chamber concerning the literacy test bill, which has gone down the drain.

This is the really critical element of the desegregation process. The desegregation of education, desegregation with respect to jobs, and desegregation with respect to housing are the three principal areas in which action is urgently required; yet the whole concentration of attention by the administration, I think quite wrongly, and the whole concentration of attention by the Congress has been upon voting matters, about which there should be very little dispute.

School desegregation has been allowed shamefully to lag. The 1961 report of the Civil Rights Commission specifies that in no uncertain terms, showing that the process has not even begun in biracial districts in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina, and has not begun in all but one district in Florida and in all but one district in Louisiana.

In this regard I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the "Conclusions of the Civil Rights Commission."

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

The Nation's progress in removing the stultifying effects of segregation in the public elementary and secondary schools—North, South, East, and West—is slow indeed.

During the period 1959–61, only 44 school districts in the 17 Southern and border States initiated desegregation programs; 13 of these acted under court orders; 15 more were pressured into action by pending suits. Seven years after the Supreme Court decision in the School Segregation cases, 2,062 school districts in the South that enroll both white and Negro pupils had not even started to comply with the requirements of the Constitution. These include all districts in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina; all but one in Florida and one in Louisiana. Some of the 775 that have started to desegregate have barely begun a 12-year progression; others, by making all initial assignments by race and placing the burden of seeking transfer on Negro pupils—often under extensive pupil placement procedures—have kept at a minimum the number of Negroes in attendance at formerly white schools.

In the North and the West, where segregation by race, color, religion, or national origin is not officially countenanced, it exists in fact in many public schools. A Federal court decision in the New Rochelle, N.Y., case in January 1961 (affirmed by the court of appeals) which required the desegregation of a public school in a northern city, was probably the most significant single event affecting equal protection of the laws in public education since the Supreme Court's decision in the Little Rock case in 1958.

Legislative resistance to desegregation has continued in some Southern States, notably Louisiana. Others, such as Virginia and Georgia, have shifted from massive resistance to freedom of choice fortified by tuition grants. The former proved unconstitutional; the new strategy is now before the courts. The Prince Edward (Va.) case raised the question whether the closing of the public schools and financing the education of all children who seek it in private schools is an evasion of a court order to desegregate. In the St. Helena case the closing of a public school in accordance with Louisiana State law to avoid the necessity of desegregating has been successfully challenged as a denial of equal protection under the 14th amendment.

The Attorney General of the United States has been active in the New Orleans case to prevent nullification of constitutional principles by State action; to prevent evasion of the Federal court order to desegregate public schools; and to provide protection to Negro children assigned to formerly white schools. He has also filed a brief as amicus curiae in St. Helena. By invitation of the Federal court in the New Rochelle case, he filed a brief advising the court with regard to the order to be entered. Only in Prince Edward has the Federal court denied the Attorney General the right to intervene to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, even as late as this week, notwithstanding orders of the courts, New Orleans has decided to desegregate only its first grade, after 8 years.

It is also interesting to note—and I call this very strongly to the attention of the Government departments concerned—that so far as we know there have been no reports by any Government departments either on my bill, S. 2980, introduced for myself and a number of other Senators with relation to desegregation in the education field, or even upon what had been thought to be the administration bill, the Clark-Celler bill on the same subject.

Hence the even greater irony of a big conflict lasting 3 weeks on the literacy test bill, which died, while absolutely nothing is done in the Congress with respect to the desegregation of public education, the subject of one of the most historic decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court 8 years ago.

I think it behooves us to do something about the problem. I should be less than frank with the Senate if I did not say that I shall take counsel with the other Senators concerned about these civil rights matters—it is well known that we have always taken counsel without regard to party—in order to see whether the most critically important of all the measures, the measure which would give the Attorney General power to institute suits in representative civil rights cases, including school desegregation cases—yes, even in this election year—should be brought before the Senate for some consideration.

Mr. President, if we are to be frustrated in respect to civil rights legislation, in the face of a shameful lack of compliance with the highest law of the land, which is shown by the failure to act and the foot dragging in respect of desegregation of our school system, let us at least go down fighting on something which really rates and which really counts, like the authority of the Attorney General to start representative civil rights suits. Let the country know that the critical civil rights bill is the so-called part III bill. Nothing else should confuse the country as to what is really the basic issue at stake.

So, Mr. President, on this eighth anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown against Board of Education, I rise to protest the inaction on the part of the Congress. I rise to point out that in wide areas of the country this fundamental national decision is not being observed but is being completely frustrated. We have no right to wonder why extra legal means—passive resistance, lack of confidence in our intention to honor the pledge of the Constitution—become the order of the day.

As I said the other day, when some untoward development does break out, in the form of violence or otherwise—we hope and pray it will not—let us look back to the kind of frustrating inaction which has taken place in respect to these weighty matters which affect so deeply

the minds, consciences, and hearts of the people and which move them so deeply emotionally, in terms of the denial of their fundamental civil rights, to see whether we have done our duty.

Mr. President, I do not think we have. As I say, I shall consult with other Senators interested in this field in order to see, notwithstanding where we stand in the session and the fact that it is an election year, whether we should nonetheless bring the subject up for further consideration by the Congress.

CONSUMERS' PURCHASES OF BEEF

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 28, 1962, I inserted in the RECORD an article published in the March 1962 issue of McCall's magazine, entitled "Consumers' Purchases of Beef," written by Samuel Grafton, concerning consumers' purchases of beef, relating to the fat content as affected by the grading practices of the Department of Agriculture and the resultant consequences to be considered, the health of consumers. At that time I asked the Department of Agriculture for a report on the questions raised in Mr. Grafton's article. I have received the Department of Agriculture's response and another letter of comment from Mr. Grafton, and ask unanimous consent that the letters addressed to me by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and by Mr. Samuel Grafton be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1962.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The Department is glad to comply with your request in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28 for an evaluation of the article appearing in the March 1962 issue of McCall's magazine. "If You Are Buying the 'Better' Beef," by Samuel Grafton. This article does a distinct disservice to the consumer and to the entire beef industry. It contains serious errors and some false conclusions, and we are anxious to help correct misunderstandings that may result from this statement.

The central theme of the McCall's article is reflected in the statement that "the more fat distributed through the meat or curled lovingly around it the higher the grade it will be awarded." This idea is certainly untrue. The amount of fat on the outside of the beef carcass—and this is generally the location of the largest amount of fat—is not a grade-determining factor since it has no direct effect on the palatability of the lean. In fact, some carcasses in the U.S. Good grade have more outside fat than carcasses in the U.S. Prime grade.

With reference to factors used in determining grade, the article further states "the fat marbling is the decisive element." This is not the case. The maturity of the animal that produced the beef is the most important grade-determining factor. However, among carcasses from animals of the same age, the amount of marbling, or fat distribution within the lean meat, is an important grade factor because of its contribution to overall palatability—tenderness, juiciness, and flavor.

The article focuses undue attention on the fatness of beef. The opening sentence is: "Among the things the average American fears as he once feared witches is fat." If this is true, the average American has scarcely reflected his fears in his diet; consumption of fat per person remains close to record high levels.

The great proportion of fat on beef is on the outside surface of the carcass and is readily separated from the lean—in fact, much of it is trimmed from retail cuts at the store, in the kitchen, or on the plate, and is not consumed. All lean meat contains some fat. However, the differences in fat content of the lean muscle of beef from different Federal grades are relatively small. In a recent study conducted by one of the agricultural colleges, chemical analysis of the fat actually within the rib eye muscle—the large muscle in T-bone steaks and rib roasts—averaged about 7.75 percent for the Choice grade, and 6.25 percent for the Good grade. Most of the other major muscles contain less fat. For example, the muscles of the round normally contain about one-half as much fat as the rib eye. Thus, although marbling is closely related to quality, the actual quantity of fat associated with marbling is small indeed.

McCall's went on to say, "a housewife, semantically stirred by an attractive word, buys beef according to U.S. Government grade mark and chooses the highest grade, U.S. Prime, over the second grade, U.S. Choice, or the third highest grade, U.S. Good."

During 1961, only 3½ percent of the beef federally graded was in the U.S. Prime grade, and the semantic power of the word "Prime" apparently was not strong enough to entice the housewife into outbidding the hotels and restaurants for even that limited supply.

The Department of Agriculture does not recommend any one grade as being "better" than another for all purposes. Grading merely groups carcasses together which have similar characteristics. This permits consumers to choose the particular grade that best suits their needs. We contend that all beef is good and that each grade is best for some specific use.

In November 1960, the U.S. Department of Agriculture published Marketing Bulletin No. 15, "U.S. Grades for Beef." It says, "the purpose of this booklet is to give consumers a brief explanation of the U.S. grades for beef—and to show how they can be used as an aid in the purchasing and cooking of beef."

The USDA's bulletin offers these suggestions: "Learn the grade best suited to your needs. Remember, too, that the proper selection of cuts is important. A Good grade T-bone steak, for example, can be more tender than a Choice grade round steak." The bulletin points out that most retailers will sell only the grade or grades that will satisfy the majority of their customers.

The McCall's article further suggests that the Government use some other terms to designate present grades of beef such as a system of numbers or words denoting fatness starting with "1" or "fattest."

As pointed out above, words relating to fatness would not be appropriate for the present grades since the grades are not based on overall fatness. Moreover, we believe that if numbers were used to designate grade, consumers would be more reluctant to buy meat labeled "No. 3" than they are to buy meat labeled "Good." After years of use by the consumer, processor, and producer, changing USDA grade names would result only in creating confusion in the entire industry. In reality, a grade name has meaning only to the extent that the user associates it with a specific kind of beef.

In this connection, however, it is interesting to note that while the author criticizes the grade names used by USDA for beef he offers no criticism of the superlative terms used to identify packer brands. The article suggests that less emphasis is given fatness in determining packer brands than in Federal grading. There is no published information which indicates the basis on which packer brands are determined. However, observation of beef with packer brands provides no evidence that additional fat—either as marbling or outside fat—excludes beef from their higher brands. Whether beef is federally or privately graded the same physical factors which determine quality must necessarily be used to assure comparable tenderness, juiciness, and palatability.

The paragraph in the McCall's article discussing hamburger also is quite misleading. The statement in reference to hamburger that "the housewife will pay more to get less fat" implies that the leaner the hamburger the better it is. A certain amount of fat is required in hamburger to give the flavor, texture, and juiciness for palatability and acceptance by the consumer. Research has established this point. While the level of fat in hamburger need not be excessive to insure desirability, so-called lean hamburger may contain more than double the fat content of the lean portion of a Choice or Prime beef rib roast.

McCall's says, "The French use a beef breed called the Charollais, which is able to produce tender steaks without visible fat marbling even in animals as old as 5 years. Import restrictions, for fear of hoof-and-mouth disease, prevent the development of pure Charollais herds in the United States."

Actually, Charollais cattle are being imported into the United States, but they are from herds that have been established for many years in other countries that are free from hoof-and-mouth disease. However, the limited carcass data available to us on Charollais cattle in this country do not indicate that this breed has any superiority with respect to tenderness.

In January 1959, the U.S. Department of Agriculture published a research report entitled, "Economic Effects of U.S. Grades for Beef." This report was based in part on a sample survey of national packers, independent packers, wholesale distributors, and chain and independent retailers of meat which was made by an independent research organization under a USDA contract. The following section of that report is quite pertinent to the McCall's article:

"Among the most important of the economic effects of the distribution of beef by Federal grades are:

"(1) Federal grades for beef have contributed to many basic changes in the organization or structure of the beef wholesaling industry. Independent packers and independent meat wholesalers increased in number and volume of meat handled while packer branch houses declined greatly in number. The retail chains developed mass buying procedures and specifications tied to Federal grades. The bargaining strength of the national packer declined.

"(2) Federal grading of beef has resulted in numerous within plant or intrafirm changes and has tended to stimulate technological innovation. Use of the grade standards has tended to intensify competition and this, in turn, has focused attention on production and marketing costs and on means of reducing those costs.

"(3) In combination with other factors, the Federal grading of beef may have tended to increase consumer demand for beef and to stimulate beef production.

"(4) Federal grades have contributed to the demand for higher quality beef. This is reflected in higher percentages of beef production and sales in the higher grades, particularly Choice. Retailers' advertising and merchandising policies on beef are tied closely to the Federal grade standards. These policies, particularly opportune in a period of high consumer incomes, have influenced consumers' buying patterns. Most consumers, however, apparently have not been influenced in a direction contrary to their

basic desires and eating preferences. For many consumers Choice grade appears to represent the most satisfying compromise from among the Federal grades."

The McCall's article also comments that there are signs of slackening dependence on Government grading. This is obviously incorrect since more beef was graded in 1961 than in any previous year under voluntary grading. In fact, this increase amounted to 381 million pounds over 1960, up 5.4 percent compared with an increase of only 3.8 percent in beef production. From the current data available concerning the volume of beef graded in 1962, the upward trend in Federal grading has continued.

The statement that a particular retail store in the Washington, D.C., area alternately features "a less fat meat selected according to its own specifications" raises the question of such meat being less fat than what? Much of the highly publicized lean beef is actually no more lean—and in some instances it carries more trimmable fat—than the average Choice grade beef. Research has produced no magic formula which, under commercial conditions, permits the uniform selection of beef according to its palatability without using the same basic quality-indicating factors used in Federal grading.

The Department has long realized the desirability of reducing the quantity of fat deposited on the outside of most beef carcasses. As previously indicated, this fat makes no direct contribution to the palatability of beef and most of it is not eaten. Large deposits of this fat on carcasses are an economic waste and reduction of this fat on beef without lowering the quality of the lean is a continuing objective of both cattle breeders and feeders.

We have had a number of different types of research projects directed toward that goal, and our standards for grades of beef are under continual review for any improvements that can be made in them for use as a tool for reflecting consumer preferences back through the marketing channels to the producers. In this connection, on April 10, 1962, the Department announced that beginning July 1, 1962, the livestock and meat industry will be offered an opportunity to evaluate a new approach to beef grading. On that date we will make a dual grading system available on a trial and optional basis along with our present system of grading.

The proposed dual grading system would provide for two separate grade identifications on beef carcasses. One of these—the quality grade, utilizing current grade names—would indicate differences in palatability of the lean—factors associated with tenderness, juiciness, and flavor. The proposed additional grade identification relates to the cutability—the percentage of salable meat which the retailer can cut from the carcass. In today's complex livestock and meat marketing, both of these characteristics strongly influence the ultimate value of the beef carcass and thus the value of the live animal.

The current grade standards utilize the best indicators of the quality of beef that research has provided to date. These indicators of palatability will still be considered in determining the quality part of the dual grade. The same grade names—Prime, Choice, Good, Standard, Commercial, Utility, Cutter, and Canner—will be used to identify quality differences.

The present grading system gives no direct consideration to the most important factor affecting cutability—the amount of excess fat that retailers trim off retail cuts to make them more acceptable to the consumer.

Cutability differences will be identified in the proposed standards by six yield grades. These will be numbered from No. 1 to No. 6 with No. 1 representing the highest yield of retail cuts and No. 6 the lowest.

The Livestock Division of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service has been developing and testing the dual grading system for nearly 10 years. It has been demonstrated before cattle producers, market agencies, meatpackers, and university research groups. Cattle producers, particularly, have expressed keen interest in and support for a program of this type to aid them in meeting the needs and requirements of consumers.

If dual grading becomes widely used and if processors and distributors make appropriate price differentials among the various kinds of beef carcasses and cattle, there will be a decreased production of waste fat through better breeding and feeding practices, with a saving in cost that should be shared by the producer and the consumer.

The Department of Agriculture feels very strongly its responsibility to the consumer as well as to the producer. The Department feels that its past and recent efforts to improve beef grade standards have always been aimed at providing a more efficient yardstick through which consumer preferences can be reflected back through the marketing channel to the producer.

Members of industry and other interested persons have been invited to submit written data, views, or arguments concerning the proposed standards for dual grading to the Director, Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C., after they have had an opportunity to observe the new system in operation. The deadline for such comments is July 1, 1963. The 1 year of operation should allow ample opportunity for members of industry to evaluate the new standards before they present comments.

Meanwhile, the Department of Agriculture will continue to break new ground in research on livestock breeding and feeding, in human nutrition, in use of instruments to measure quality by objective standards, and in utilization of byproducts—research that will advance the frontiers of our knowledge to the common benefit of producers, market agencies, and consumers.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

RIDGEFIELD, CONN.,
May 5, 1962.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am happy to have had the opportunity to read Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman's letter to you of April 23, in which he takes strong exception to my article on Government beef grading practices, published in McCall's for March of this year. I have been appreciative of help given me by the Department of Agriculture in preparing this article, and of the Department's many useful publications in this field. For this reason alone I regret that Secretary Freeman, for whom I have the highest regard, has chosen to cut phrases out of context in my article, to stretch and distort the meaning of the phrases thus culled, and to omit passages which did not happen to suit the defensive case he was making.

Let me review briefly the theme of my article, since this is essential to an understanding: The ingestion of animal fat has of late years become a medical and personal issue in America. Many physicians and nutritionists have become convinced that a high intake of animal fats may represent a serious health danger, particularly from the point of view of increasing blood cholesterol levels and promoting the chances of heart disease. The key document in this field is the statement by the American Heart Association, issued on December 10, 1960, which recommended, in the words of the association's own summary, "reduced fat consumption—combined with reasonable substitution of vegetable oils and other unsaturated fats for animal fats in the diet." The American Heart Association made this recommendation "as a possible means of preventing atherosclerosis (hardening of the arteries) and lessening the risk of heart attacks and strokes."

It will be conceded, in view of the importance of heart disease as a great killer in America, that this represents a public health issue of top concern. When it came to my attention that Government beef grading practices operated so as to give higher (and therefore more appealing) grade designations to beef carcasses containing more fat, and lower (and therefore less appealing) grades of beef carcasses containing less fat, I felt that this was an area in which the public deserved to be fully informed.

I found, by inquiry, that most people were not completely or clearly aware that "Prime" beef was, generally, more fat than "Choice," which is the second grade, or that "Choice" was usually more fat than "Good", the third grade. In view of the health issue that exists in the food fat area, as regards not only heart disease but our prevalent national problem of obesity, I felt that consumers were entitled to this knowledge, and therefore wrote the article.

It is interesting that nowhere in his long letter (it is considerably longer than my article) does Secretary Freeman mention the health issue. He ignores it, and by doing so ignores the reason for which the article was written. It seems to me that a consumer-minded Department of Agriculture should be just as interested in this health problem as is the American Heart Association, or as I am, as an independent journalist. This, as much as any other factor, has startled me in the defense which Secretary Freeman has made of his Department's beef grading practices.

Defending those practices, Secretary Freeman tries to leave with the reader of his letter the impression that the fat content in beef carcasses is not a major factor in determining grade. He takes a phrase from my article: "the more fat distributed through the meat or curled lovingly around it the higher the grade it will be awarded," and he says: "This idea is certainly untrue." He quotes another phrase: "The fat marbling is the decisive element" and he says flatly: "This is not the case." He declares that "the maturity of the animal is the most important grade-determining factor," though he concedes that "among carcasses from animals of the same age, the amount of marbling, or fat distribution within the lean meat, is an important grade factor because of its contribution to overall palatability—tenderness, juiciness and flavor." This comes close to admitting the major point of my article, which is that if other factors are equal, fat marbling is the decisive element. Actually, the phrase first quoted above was torn from its context in my essay, and the sentence reads, in full: "Other factors being equal, the more fat distributed through the meat, or curled lovingly around it, the higher the grade it will be awarded." Why were those first four words left out of the quotation? They would not have taken up much more room in a seven page single-spaced letter and would have presented a fairer picture of the article's content.

The second quotation from my article, "the fat marbling is the decisive element" has been even more summarily decapitated. The full sentence is: "Though other factors are carefully considered—the age of the animal (younger is tenderer), the shape of the carcass, the condition of the bone, the color of the meat—the fat marbling is the most decisive element."

This is rough surgery indeed. The sentence as a whole gives a full and fair picture of grading criteria, more complete than Secretary Freeman's own description of the

process. Only the tag end of my sentence has been quoted in the Secretary's letter to you, and even here the word "most" has been cut out, entirely changing the meaning. I did not write "the fat marbling is the decisive element." I wrote "the fat marbling is the most decisive element," which has a completely different meaning because it indicates that other decisive elements exist. I am willing to leave to any jury of English grammarians and sentence-parsers the question of whether I have not been misquoted in such a way as to create the impression that I have made extreme statements, so that these could then be knocked down. This is a piece of business of which no responsible journalist, for example, would ever allow himself to be guilty.

Let us go further: Secretary Freeman, using the truncated quotation: "the more fat distributed through the meat or curled lovingly around it the higher the grade it will be awarded," goes on to deny vigorously that the amount of fat "curled lovingly around the meat," that is, the fat, as he says "on the outside of the beef carcass" is a grade determining factor. I do not know how he can square this statement with the fact that in pictures of the standard cuts of beef, presented in the Department's own publications, the higher grades uniformly show more fat "curled lovingly around the meat" than do grades just under the highest. Secretary Freeman, in discussing the grading system, refers to a Department of Agriculture publication, Marketing Bulletin No. 15, published in November 1960. I have that marketing bulletin before me. Its pages are not numbered, but on what would be pages 2 and 3 (not counting the covers) a photograph of a cut of "Prime" beef is contrasted with a photograph of a cut of "Choice" beef. The amount of blubber shown surrounding the "Prime" cut measures almost half an inch, even in this reduced picture, and is more than twice as thick, at some points, as the suet surrounding the "Choice" cut, in the official Department photograph on the facing page. Furthermore, the text matter on these pages says of the "Prime" grade: "Such cuts have liberal quantities of fat interspersed within the lean (marbling)." On the "Choice" page, the descriptive sentence runs: "This grade is preferred by most consumers because it is of high quality but usually has less fat than beef of the 'Prime' grade." The purpose of Secretary Freeman's letter is to minimize the differences in fat between the grades (or it has no purpose) and so I must ask him to explain away these pictures. On pages 6 and 7 of the same pamphlet we are offered official photographs of corresponding cuts of "Good" and "Standard" beef.

Here, too, the outer envelope of fat shrinks as the grades decline; by the time we get down to "Standard" (which is the fourth beef grade, in descending order) the outer fat is a mere strip. On page 8 a photograph of a cut of "Commercial" grade beef is shown, and I will admit that this has the thickest envelope of fat in any of the pictures, but since this is beef cut from elderly cattle, and is rarely if ever offered for broiling or roasting purposes, it is irrelevant to our discussion. Marketing Bulletin No. 15 should be obtainable from the Department of Agriculture, and an examination of its photographs should be most illuminating to anyone interested in the end results of the grading process.

Secretary Freeman complains that my article "focuses undue attention on the fatness of beef." Let us see how much attention the Department's own publications focus on it. In a Department pamphlet, "Official U.S. Standards for Grades of Carcass Beef," dated June 1956, which describes the grading system, the statement is made: "Within any specified grade the degree of finish and marbling required increases progressively with advancing maturity." "Finish" and "marbling" mean, in effect, fat, and the sentence means that an older animal has to be fatter to make the grade; i.e., fat is so important in grading that, to a degree, it makes up for age of a slaughtered steer.

In describing "Prime" beef, the same publication says: "The interior fat is abundant in the pelvic cavity and over the kidney. The profusion of fat between the chine bones is liberal and the overflow of fat over the inside of the ribs is abundant and fairly evenly distributed. The intermingling of fat with the lean in evidence between the ribs, called feathering, is extensive." But in describing "Choice" beef the wording changes, and the official description for this grade calls for "a moderate quantity of interior fat" and "a modest protrusion of fat between the chine bones and moderate overflow fat and feathering." In older "Choice" carcasses, "fairly heavy" deposits of interior fat are called for, and "a moderate protrusion of fat between the chine bones and moderately abundant overflow fat and feathering." In sum, "Prime" beef calls for "abundant" overflow of fat over the inside of the ribs, whereas "Choice" carcasses show only "moderate" or "moderately abundant" overflow.

When we get down to the third grade, "Good," the official description requires "only a slight protrusion of fat between the chine bones and only a small overflow of fat over the inside of the ribs." Older "Good" animals will have "slight protrusion of fat between the chine bones and slightly abundant overflow fat and feathering."

"Standard grades will have "practically no protrusion of fat between the chine bones and very scanty quantities of overflow fat and feathering," varying to older carcasses showing "very slight protrusion of fat between the chine bones and a small amount of overflow fat and feathering." If these standards do not focus attention on fat, one can only wonder what words mean.

Secretary Freeman attempts to show that "much" fat on the outside surface of the carcass "is trimmed from retail cuts at the store, in the kitchen or on the plate, and is not consumed." Here he touchs very lightly indeed on the unending war between the consumer and the butcher as to how much trimming is to be performed before the weighing. Few housewives and few butchers would agree that this comment disposes of the costly suet problem. As to the statement that the fat "is not consumed," I quote Dr. Ancel Keys, director of the Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene of the University of Minnesota, one of America's foremost heart researchers: "The most expensive grades of beef are the fattest; the top grade—and price—goes to beef so diffusely marbled with fat that it defies trimmming to produce really lean meat." (Page 135, "Eat Well and Stay Well," by Ancel and Margaret Keys, New York, 1959.)

The Secretary of Agriculture mentions an agricultural college survey purporting to show that "chemical analysis of the fat actually within the rib eye muscle—the largest muscle in T-bone steaks and rib roasts—averaged about 7.75 percent for the Choice grade and 6.25 percent for the Good grade." But no housewife I ever heard of cuts out this one muscle for cooking; the whole cut is cooked and the fat of the whole cut adds itself to the gravy and to the meal. As against Secretary Freeman's point, there is a table by Dr. Keys showing (op. cit., p. 333) that "Prime" rib of beef runs 2,040 calories to the pound and is 44 percent fat, while "Good" rib goes 1,540 calories to the pound and is only 31 percent fat. Secretary Freeman's quarrel is with such experts as Dr. Keys, not with me, and he must realize that he has placed himself in the position of contending against authorities of this type.

I could go on indefinitely, but will not. I have not touched on the atmosphere in the meat trade, the concentration on "finishing" and fattening steers to "make the grade." I recall a Government grader, working in a coldroom, saying: "The exact amount of marbling is easily discerned. This is a very important grade factor, one of the most important. It is the real true quality factor."

As to other points raised by Secretary Freeman, I hold no special brief for "packers' brands." I do, however, feel that they would lead to a lesser competition in the production of fat to "make the grade." I did not imply that "the leaner the hamburger the better it is."

I wrote that in hamburger, housewives pay more to get less fat, because in this area they are aware of fat content, while they are not quite so clear that this question is involved in the grading system. I believe that the Charolais steer produces cuts that are likely to be tender while lean; however, the point is not central to this dispute; and I am well aware that a few Charolais steers are being imported from such countries as Mexico, though not in numbers and not from their home country, France. I spoke of a slackening dependence on Government grading, which Secretary Freeman tries to answer by showing an increased consumption of graded meat: the context of my reference clearly shows that I was not referring to consumer habits, but to the fact that some stores are learning to use other appeals, such as leanness, instead of Government grade names, in advertising their beef. As regards Secretary Freeman's description of the new dual grading system, it is devoutly to be hoped that this will produce and popularize leaner meat, but, again, that is not central to the blunt and direct attacks raised against my article.

In obtaining my material, I conferred with a spokesman for Mr. Freeman's Department. I traveled to Chicago. I spoke with representatives of two packers' associations, and with individual retail meat sellers. I went down into the cold rooms and saw grading in process. I obtained cuts of the various official grades of beef, and tested them in my home. I conferred with meat buyers and chefs of three famous restaurants. I spoke with cattle breeders and experimenters. I canvassed the literature, and checked my findings with an outstanding heart student, who hailed my article "for breaking the ice on this issue." Secretary Freeman has used such phrases as "untrue," "serious error," etc. I do not propose to trade unpleasant phrases with him. But accuracy is my integrity. In respect for my profession, I feel I must say that I consider it out of order for a high public official to assume that an experienced journalist, with no ax to grind, working for a most reputable section of the American press, would use material that had not been most carefully checked.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL GRAFTON.

LET US JUST ONCE DO AT LEAST HALF AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE IN FOREIGN LANDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2965—the emergency public works bill—which it is my intention to call up at the appropriate time.

The amendment is simple.

It raises the amounts authorized to be appropriated for emergency public works from $600 million to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202—for the fiscal year 1963—212, 401, and 451 of the

Foreign Assistance Act of 1961." Those are the exact words of my proposed amendment. However, in order that my colleagues may have the amendment before them in customary form, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have previously served notice of my intention to offer this amendment in my individual views in the committee's report on S. 2965. I ask unanimous consent that those views be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment seeks only to place our domestic program for alleviating unemployment in a position of equality with what we are doing abroad. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, even if my amendment is adopted—and I sincerely trust that it will be—there still will not be equality.

The amendment which I propose would raise the maximum authorized to be appropriated for the program of emergency public works from $600 million to $2,645 million computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund (for fiscal year 1963 only)	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

Actually, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizes the appropriation of much more than $2,645 million for foreign economic aid. Actually, for the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1963, section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the appropriation of $1,500 million for each of these fiscal years or a total of $7,500 million for the five.

Thus, even with the adoption of my amendment, there would be authorized to be appropriated for this "one shot" program of emergency public works to help our own unemployed only about one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

I wish to make it crystal clear that my amendment does not affect or apply to the standby provisions of S. 2965. Actually, it can be said that my amendment moves up the $2 billion authorized for a program of standby public works to the emergency program and says in effect that emergency intended to be met by the standby program is upon us now.

And, considering the all too many pockets of depression of the United States, that is by no means an exaggeration.

We cannot accurately judge the human misery stalking our land by looking at the overall rate of unemployment.

During the week ending April 28, 1962, insured unemployment in Nome, Alaska, was 33.5 percent. It was no comfort to the unemployed worker in Nome to know that the national rate of insured unemployment during the same week was 4.3 percent.

The unemployed worker in Fairbanks—insured unemployment rate 17.9 percent—could derive little comfort from the fact that the Congress was talking about standby public works when things get worse.

How much worse must it get, Mr. President, before the Congress acts to relieve to the extent possible unemployment in the numerous pockets throughout the Nation?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table, prepared by my office, of unemployment in Alaska for the week ending April 28, 1962. These figures have been derived from the Labor Market Bulletin issued by the Alaska Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is no time to stand by. This is a time for bold, decisive action. In my opinion, nothing can be more heart-rending than a man—a husband and a father—who cannot find work to support himself and family even though, week after week after week, he trudges wearily from door to door seeking such work. It is distressing for single men with no family responsibilities.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith has written an excellent book entitled "Our Affluent Society" showing that more people in the United States are now living at a higher standard than ever before. I agree with the picture he has drawn in his book and I am happy that it is so.

But in rejoicing at the greater affluence of more and more of our people, let us not overlook the almost one-fourth of our Nation who are living in abject poverty without hope for the future or for their children's future unless prompt and intelligent measures are taken at once. The plight of these 40 million Americans is graphically pictured in a recent book by Mr. Michael Harrington entitled "The Other America" published by McMillan Co. this year. I commend it highly to my colleagues for it brings to our attention forcefully the need for immediate action—and action on a scale commensurate with the size of the problem.

As long as this problem exists for some 40 million Americans it is our inescapable duty to face it and to eliminate it as far as is humanly possible. Our obligation to these Americans, in my judgment, supersedes aid for impoverished people in other lands. Moreover, we shall be able to help these people in foreign countries all the better if we raise our own living standards and put an end to the costly wastes of chronic unemployment.

In this—the richest of all lands—such a situation cannot and should not be tolerated.

Nor should we meet an emergency situation with halfway measures. We should not delude the people of the Nation. We must bring to bear on a solution of this problem all the resources that are needed. To do less is little better than doing nothing at all. To do less would be to disappoint millions of unemployed men and women throughout the country who are looking to Congress for action now.

According to the report from the Area Redevelopment Agency of the Department of Commerce as of May 1, 1962, 933 areas in the United States are designated as eligible to take part in the area redevelopment program. These are divided as follows: 148 urban-industrial areas; 735 rural and small labor markets; and 50 Indian reservations.

These areas have a population of 34.7 million people and a labor force of 13.2 million. Of the latter, 1.4 million are unemployed. Thus these areas have 19 percent of the Nation's population and 19 percent of the Nation's labor force, but they have 31 percent of the unemployed of the country.

Now what is proposed to meet the persistent high rate of unemployment of these 933 areas throughout the Nation?

It is proposed in S. 2965 to authorize the appropriation of $2 billion for a program of public works on a standby basis, usable only if the total unemployment in the Nation rises to a predetermined figure. In addition, it is proposed to authorize the appropriation of an additional $600 million for an emergency, immediate public-works program. This sum averages about $600 for each man and woman unemployed in these designated areas, assuming the entire amount is spent on wages, which, of course, will not be the case.

My amendment would quadruple that sum.

That quadrupled sum would be much more realistic considering the magnitude and the urgency of the problem.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that my proposal would not take a single penny from the foreign aid program. It merely uses the particular wording to point up the fact that we would be spending on this one-shot, emergency program here at home far less than we are spending abroad for economic aid.

The foreign aid program would continue as now authorized and the money appropriated for that program would remain intact, if Congress approves.

I know that the question will be raised: Can the sum you propose to spend on public works within 27 months actually be spent by the States economically and efficiently within that period of time?

It should be raised, and answered, because I do not want to propose anything here that would lead to wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. I know that none of my colleagues want to do so either.

But I do know that along with me many of my colleagues are concerned

that we do enough to meet the problems of persistent unemployment in the 933 designated areas throughout the country.

In order to obtain the answer, I wired the Governors of the 50 States of the Nation and asked them the question and asked them to be specific in their replies. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my telegram to the Governors of the States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have to date received replies from the Governors of only 12 States who have indicated that they are ready to go with public works projects totaling $1.6 billion.

I also ask unanimous consent that the detailed replies received from the Governors of these States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, let no one here delude himself.

We shall either spend this $2,645 million on constructive investments in the future economic strength of the United States—in schools, hospitals, roads, sewer and waterworks, dams, airports, and the like—or we shall spend that and much more in the next 27 months and in the years to come in unemployment compensation and in welfare payments, and suffer the loss of tax revenue which fuller employment will generate.

We cannot long neglect our own resources—human and natural—while building the resources of foreign nations. At stake is not our willingness to continue to aid the less developed countries, at stake is our ability to continue without at the same time renewing our own strength.

We can renew that strength by a program of public investments of the magnitude which I propose by my amendment.

In the years 1955–61, we have granted to foreign nations for foreign economic aid projects of exactly the same type as would be constructed under my amendment millions upon millions of American dollars.

Can we afford to do less for our own people at a time when many of the areas of our Nation are so hard pressed?

Can we afford to do less for the unemployed of the United States when we are doing so much for the unemployed and others abroad?

As one reads about the flight of capital from Latin America one cannot but compare the lack of faith of the rich of those nations with the abiding faith of our unemployed who are willing to pitch in and work but lack only the opportunity to work.

I ask, Mr. President, for an additional $2 billion to give our own citizens the same chance that we have given and are giving to the citizens of other lands.

The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greeneville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis. the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars.

For myself, Mr. President, the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

Mr. President, to date I have received replies from Governors of the following States giving the amounts which they could use for public works which could be completed in 27 months:

State:	*Amount*
Alabama	$50,500,000
Alaska	64,184,400
California	183,000,000
Colorado	20,926,000
Connecticut	28,545,000
Hawaii	24,111,912
Maryland	92,590,000
Michigan	639,000,000
Nevada	4,968,000
Ohio	329,259,645
Washington	40,000,000
West Virginia	89,155,950

It is obvious from even this response that in all the States at least four times the amount of funds which I propose could be spent on useful public works projects to relieve unemployment in areas of chronic unemployment.

My proposal is really a very modest one considering the need.

EXHIBIT 1

On page 10, line 23, and on page 11, line 1, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".

EXHIBIT 2

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all, but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same

purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

ERNEST GRUENING.

EXHIBIT 3

Private industry insured unemployment rates by administrative area and industry

By administrative area	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)		By industry	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]		Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
State	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	6,500	19.9	Total	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	6,500	19.9
Anchorage	3,005	16.7	3,198	17.8	3,315	18.4	Mining	201	17.4	257	22.3	310	27.6
Fairbanks	1,220	17.9	1,322	19.3	1,664	27.6	Construction	2,044	45.0	2,238	49.3	2,706	46.6
Juneau	282	10.5	294	10.9	328	11.5	Manufacturing	1,035	19.7	985	18.8	1,232	21.5
Ketchikan	276	10.3	302	11.3	500	15.9	Transportation and utilities	462	6.6	542	7.7	502	8.3
Nome	177	33.5	201	38.0	207	33.3	Trade	503	6.2	571	7.0	627	8.3
Petersburg	274	34.7	297	37.6	312	40.9	Finance	56	3.7	51	3.4	80	5.7
Sitka	88	7.2	85	7.0	165	13.8	Service and other	1,021	19.8	1,055	20.5	1,043	21.0

[1] Insured unemployment rate.

EXHIBIT 4

APRIL 18, 1962.

Senate Public Works Committee today reported emergency public works bill authorizing appropriation of $600 million for one-shot effort for public works projects in economically distressed areas. As member of committee, I expressed concern that sum authorized was totally inadequate to meet Nation's needs. Would appreciate your writing me as soon as possible giving me as much information as possible concerning public works projects in economically distressed areas of your State which could be completed in 27 months, giving estimated costs and man-hours of work which would be provided.

EXHIBIT 5

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, May 2, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We have gathered the following information from the Alaska Department of Public Works.

Of the approximately $388,812,748 listed as capital improvement needs for the next 6 years, approximately $99 million would be paid for by the State of Alaska, exclusive of any Federal moneys made available under Federal grant-in-aid programs. A summary of this $388,812,748 program is set forth on page 8 of the attached document, "A Capital Improvement Program for the State of Alaska, 1962–68." Projects which are to be financed in whole or part from State or local funds are summarized on pages 11 through 17.

As you can see, we have a considerable inventory of buildings, structures and improvements that should be built. We do not have a great many projects ready to be advertised at this time, but we should be able to add to the list fairly quickly providing that we can obtain Housing and Home and Finance Agency advances for advance planning and providing that the various bonding proposals pass. With the incentive provided by a public works act, such as S. 2965, the State could prepare a number of the more uncomplicated projects, such as classroom additions to State-operated schools, small State-operated schools for contract, and make application for Housing and Home and Finance Agency planning advances and grants for the more extensive projects. Actually, we are now working on a number of applications for HHFA advances and grants for the planning and design of a number of State-operated schools and various facilities at the University of Alaska.

Accordingly, the following list of projects which are designed, are being designed, or will be designed in next year, very substantially understates our ability to utilize S. 2965 in carrying out the purpose of that act. In this connection, I should note that the capital improvement program is a conservative document. In preparing the capital improvement program many needed projects were deleted to hold the program within the State's ability to finance.

The projects which probably most nearly qualify for immediate consideration under a standby public works act are:

1. The International Airport terminal buildings projects at Anchorage and Fairbanks, representing a value of $3.8 million and $1.8 million, respectively, are fully complete and ready for bidding.

2. Projects which are now in the planning stage with design completion anticipated before August of this year are Salcha Elementary School ($160,000), Eagle River School addition ($288,000), Soldotna School addition ($183,000), and Glen Allen Refrigeration and foundation ($55,000). Funds for these projects have been provided under the 1962–63 State education budget. The total for these schools is $686,000.

3. At present, three applications are being prepared for submittal to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for an "Advance for Public Works Planning." If approved, funds would be available to complete architectural-engineering design for the Ninilchik School addition ($400,000), the Metlakatla Elementary School ($600,000), and the Fort Yukon School addition ($260,000). Approximately 5 months will be required before these projects would be "set to go." The total for these schools is $1,260,000.

4. The following schools might be ready for contract this year if the $5 million bond issue for State operated schools passes:

Ambler School	$55,000
Eagle River (further classroom addition)	52,000
Delta Junction	516,000
Homer	554,000
Tanana	252,000
North Kenai	554,000
Sterling	150,000
Chugiak High School	1,200,000
McGrath	78,000
Brown's Court	160,000
Fortuna Ledge	78,000
Total	3,649,000

NOTE.—The legislature appropriated $75,000 for planning and design for Chugiak High School. Some preliminary work has already been done on this project.

5. The vocational school at Nome, although funded under a $1,500,000 general obligation bond authorization, is another project which could qualify. Final plans could be completed within 5 months.

6. If the $7,200,000 bonding program for the University of Alaska passes, money will be available for the construction of an addition to the engineering and physical sciences building, a biological sciences and renewable resources building, completion of the university's new heating plant, and other related facilities.

7. Invitations to bid on the construction of fire and crash stations at the Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports, approximately $180,000 each, will be advertised this June.

8. A $160,000 addition to the Miner and Minerals Building in Anchorage may be erected in the 1963 construction season.

9. Proposed water and harbors projects scheduled for the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons which are not yet under contract are:

Angoon, docks	$50,000
Cordova, floats	50,000
Craig, dock	40,000
Douglas, floats	45,000
Homer, floats	65,000
Hydaburg, dock	25,000
Hyder, float	7,500
Klawock, dock approach	40,000
Kodiak, floats	30,000
Ninilchik, floats	23,000
Seldovia, floats	65,000
Seward, floats	46,000
Valdez, floats	38,000
Wrangell, floats	31,000
Total	555,500

NOTE.—Considerable work has been done on some of the foregoing projects or is now underway. Since this work is already contracted out, it is not reflected in the above estimated cost figures. Other projects which are now under contract are also not reflected.

10. The following bush airfields are programed for construction in the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons:

New Stuyahok	$15,000
Alitak	50,000
Anvik	15,000
Buckland	10,000
Chevak	15,000

Circle City	$7,500
Egegik	20,000
False Pass	10,000
Goodnews	10,000
Holikachuk	15,000
Kasaan	5,000
Koliganek	10,000
Koyukuk	15,000
McCarthy	49,000
Metlakatla	5,000
Nulato	25,000
Ouzinkie	30,000
Pilot Point	15,000
Quinhagak	5,000
Russian Mission	15,000
Shageluk	7,400
Shungnak	10,000
Stebbins-St. Michael	10,000
Tanunak	15,000
Togiak	10,000
Total	393,900

I have omitted mention of projects planned for our annual $37 million to $40 million Federal aid highway program and the Federal aid airport program. I gather that these programs will not be affected by the proposed standby public works act.

If I can supplement any of this information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

GARY THURLOW,
Executive Assistant.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 7, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegram of April 18, it is estimated that the State of California could initiate and accelerate $183 million in public works projects and complete them within a period of 27 months. These projects would utilize an estimated 18 million man-hours of labor at the job site.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *May 2, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Review of public works of our State indicates that nearly $400 million would be needed for the completion of the total public works projects contemplated in the next 3 to 4 years in economically distressed areas when limited to projects believed to have a completion date within a 27-month period. The total would amount to approximately $40 million. This latter figure would represent specific items such as buildings, utilities, etc. The larger figure given would include such items as dam completion, the canal possibility, atomic generation of electric power, and steam generation coal plants.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Public Works Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am happy to supply the information you requested in your recent telegram regarding the emergency public works bill.

The accompanying data, compiled by our department of highways, relates to roadway construction contemplated or underway in the counties of Lincoln and Mineral, the two Nevada counties officially recognized by the Federal Government as depressed under the area redevelopment program.

I trust the enclosed data provides you with the information you desire. If I can be of any further service, please let me know.

Cordially,

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

Road contracts to be completed within approximately the next 27 months, Lincoln and Mineral Counties, Nev.

	Estimated construction cost	Estimated man-hours
Lincoln County:		
Project S-544(10) U.S. 93 from 14 miles southeast to 1 mile north of Alamo (15 miles)	$1,600,000	150,000
Project S-554(9) U.S. 93 from 14 miles to 22 miles southeast of Alamo (8 miles)	700,000	63,000
Project F-008-1(3) SR 25, from 2d St. to 6th St. in Panaca (0.5 mile)	70,000	7,000
Subtotal	2,370,000	220,000
Mineral County:		
Project F-004-1(3) U.S. 6 from 8.6 miles east of California-Nevada State line to 3.5 miles east of Basalt (6.7 miles) (construction underway)	948,000	86,000
Project F-004-1(4) U.S. 6 from California-Nevada State line to 8.6 miles east (8.6 miles) (construction underway)	1,100,000	99,000
Project S-525(1) FAS 525 from Nevada-Scheelite mine north to U.S. 50 (19.1 miles) (25% of this project in Mineral County)	550,000	52,000
Subtotal	2,598,000	237,000
Grand total	4,968,000	457,000

STATE OF COLORADO,
Denver, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In response to your telegram of April 18, we are enclosing a list of public works projects in Colorado redevelopment areas that reportedly could be initiated and completed in 27 months subject to availability of funds.

This information was accumulated through contact with various city and county officials and State agencies.

We are not entirely familiar with the criteria for eligibility to participate under the terms of the proposed legislation or with the legislative definition of public works. We have not, therefore, attempted to evaluate whether or not all of the listed projects could qualify for assistance under the proposed legislation.

We were not able to obtain an assessment of the man hours of work which would be provided by the projects as engineering studies are not available in connection with most of the proposals.

Very truly yours,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Alamosa		Water service to East Alamosa	$250,000
		Community Youth Center	200,000
		Addition to county courthouse	150,000
		Storm sewer and curb and gutter for East Alamosa	50,000
		Dike and river work on Rio Grande through city of Alamosa	50,000
		Total	700,000
	Alamosa	Paving city streets	386,000
		Extending airport runway	40,000
		New water well, mains, and extensions	100,000
		Enlarge sewer lagoons	50,000
		Storm sewer, South Alamosa	60,000
		Sanitary sewer system; new major trunkline	330,000
		Total	966,000
		Total, Alamosa County	1,666,000
Clear Creek		Georgetown Reservoir	360,000
	Idaho Springs	Shortwave communication system for city and county	8,000
		City street paving	75,000
		Sewage disposal plant	20,000
		Total	103,000

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department—Continued

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Clear Creek	Georgetown	Sewage disposal plant and collection system	$100,000
		Develop Georgetown Lake as recreational area	225,000
		Rebuild water distribution system	100,000
		Total	425,000
		Total, Clear Creek County	888,000
Conejos		No county projects reported	
	Antonito	75 low-cost dwellings for transient workers	400,000
		Waterline	60,000
		Sewer system	180,000
		Total	640,000
	La Jara	No projects reported	
		Total, Conejos County	640,000
Costilla		County courthouse and jail	225,000
		County shops	100,000
		Fort Garland community building	35,000
		Hospital addition	50,000
		San Luis Water and Sanitation District sewage system	(1)
		Total	410,000
	Blanca	Water and sanitation system	(1)
		Total, Costilla County	410,000
Gilpin		Improvement, Corona Pass Rd	225,000
	Blackhawk	Water system and sewage disposal plant	75,000
	Central City	Water system and sewage disposal plant	100,000
		Recreational development, park, etc	25,000
		Total	125,000
		Total. Gilpin County	425,000
Huerfano		County courthouse and jail	1,000,000
		Surfacing county roads to ski and other scenic areas	239,000
		Acquisition and development of irrigation system for development of recreational facilities for Huerfano-Cucharas area.	3,000,000
		Waterfowl development	110,000
		Total	4,349,000
	La Veta	Expansion of sewer collection system and disposal plant	40,000
		Water filter plant	65,000
		Total	105,000
	Walsenburg	Sewage disposal plant	158,000
		Street paving, curbs, gutters, and storm sewer system	500,000
		Rebuilding and extending waterlines	100,000
		Purchase and install water meters	108,000
		Extension of sewerlines	42,000
		Rebuilding electric distribution system and expanding electric production facilities	1,500,000
		City park recreational area	50,000
		Mine museum	18,000
		Senior high school	750,000
		Total	3,226,000
		Total, Huerfano County	7,680,000
Las Animas		Grade and pave Cucharas Pass for 12 miles	1,000,000
		Construction of 2-mile connecting roads between 2 State highways	40,000
		Recreational development at fairgrounds	50,000
		Pave connecting road from Aguilar to Highway 111	200,000
		Develop mountain recreation area	100,000
		Enlargement of North Lake	100,000
		Enlargement of Monument Lake	200,000
		Alkali Creek Reservoir	100,000
		New road construction, North Fork, Purgatoire River	50,000
		Total	1,840,000
	Aguilar	Filter plant and water distribution system	200,000
	Cokedale	Pave streets	50,000
		Water distribution and storage	300,000
		Total	350,000
	Trinidad	New sewage lines and disposal plant	627,000
		Animas Street Bridge over Purgatoire River	230,000
		Rebuild water distribution system and water storage facilities	2,230,000
		Curb and gutter and paving	1,500,000
		Garbage, refuse, and disposal	40,000
		Police and fire building	200,000
		Development of Monument Lake recreational area	2,000,000
		Total	6,827,000
		Total, Las Animas County	9,217,000
		Grand total	20,926,000

[1] No estimate.

THE STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, April 27, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mr. E. S. Preston, director of highways, has estimated that in the 20 counties which have been declared as distressed areas his department could have the capacity to develop plans and complete $250 million worth of highway construction projects in the next 27 months. There is now under construction in the same area 102 miles of highways estimated to cost $79,797,000. He further estimates that the $250 million highway construction program would generate 28 million man-hours of work.

This area, I think, will be benefited immeasurably by the improvement of the highway situation which I think contributes very largely to the chronic depression that exists. If it is difficult to move man and materials into a community, then this community does not lend itself to industrial or economic development. Other programs can be of assistance, but there is no program that can be more helpful and is as basic as is the improvement of the manner of transportation.

I have asked our director of public works to also report on the necessities of this area with reference to public works generally and, as soon as those figures are available, we will make them available to you.

With all best personal wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Ohio Brush Creek Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Adams	$3,530,700	321,920	3	$3,000,000	Construction plans needed.
Brush Creek and Shawnee State Forests.	Timber stand improvement, roads and trails, structures.	do	442,060	268,350	1	(1)	
Trimble water system	Village distribution system	Athens	60,000	4,081	1	5,000	Plans complete.
Strouds Run State Park development.	Buildings, water and sewer, camping, swimming beach, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation.	do	600,000	50,000	3	50,000	Estimate 10,000 annual increase park attendance. Dow Lake in this park is an attraction which far exceeds facilities available.
Waterloo, Gifford, and Athens Park State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures.	do	74,011	45,260	1	(1)	
Belmont Lake	Road relocation	Belmont	205,000	17,083	1		Plans complete.
Barkcamp State Park	Buildings, water and sewer, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation, camping, picnic areas.	do	700,000	58,000	3	500,000	New park with lake ready for filling except for road relocation. Would serve transient trade using Interstate 70.
White Oak Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Brown	3,106,783	121,872	3	1,500,000	Construction plans needed.
Stonelick State Park development.	Camping area	Clermont	250,000	20,833	1	150,000	Conrtruction plans complete.
Salt Fork Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Guernsey	2,157,600	206,757	1	4,000,000	Construction plans complete. Includes road relocation and land needed.
Hocking State Park development.	Camping area	Hocking	257,000	21,417	1	100,000	Plans complete.
Hocking and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	244,215	138,650	1	(1)	
Richland Furnace State Forest.	do	Jackson	426,000	252,000	1	(1)	
Dean State Forest	TSI, roads and trails	Lawrence	48,500	30,000	1	(1)	
Forked Run State Park development.	Camping area	Meigs	70,000	5,833	1	50,000	Do.
	Buildings, roads and parking, reforestation.	do	75,000	6,000	3		
Shade River State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	94,825	41,370	1	(1)	
Burr Oak State Park Development.	Camping area	Morgan	110,000	9,167	1	75,000	Do.
Wolf Run Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Noble	577,830	48,153	2	500,000	Need construction plans.
Pike State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	Pike	416,800	243,900	1	(1)	
Ross County Lake	Recreation	Ross	400,000	25,000	1	50,000	Feasibility report being completed.
Scioto Trail and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	526,600	329,300	1	(1)	
Shawnee Recreational Area	Construct 3 impoundments and reconstruct another for recreation.	Scioto	506,933	42,245	2	150,000	Need construction plans.
Shawnee and Brush Creek State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	1,322,400	813,900	1	(1)	
Lake Hope State Park development.	Camping area	Vinton	86,000	7,167	1	150,000	Plans complete.
	Cabins, water and sewer, swimming pool, roads and parking.	do	1,300,000	108,000	3	320,000	Estimate of 64,000 annual increase in park attendance.
Wheelabout Reservoir	Recreational impoundment	do	130,000	6,667	2	150,000	Construction plans needed.
Zaleski and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	533,343	320,225	1	(1)	
Muskingum River locks and dams.	Repairs to locks and dams 1 to 8, inclusive for recreation and commerce.	Washington	677,870	56,489	1	233,000	Construction plans needed. Preliminary design on No. 6 completed.
	Fishermen's access and boat ramps at 8 lock and dam pools.	do	20,000	2,000	1	48,000	These facilities would accommodate 16,000 fishermen per year.
Total			18,855,645	3,582,369			

[1] The improvement of the timber stands on State forests will not result in immediate financial returns to the community except for the wages paid to local workers; however, ample benefits will be enjoyed in future years. Timber stand improvement includes tree planting, pruning crop trees, thinning dense stands, and removal of cull trees and vines. The increase in value to the remaining stand will result from more rapid growth and higher quality timber. Under Ohio conditions, this improvement will often double the volume of wood produced. The cutting and fabricating of the raw materials will support local industries and attract new users of wood to these dependable sources of supply. Recreational benefits will accrue also. Wild land under intensive forest management produces maximum populations of wildlife.

OHIO

Project cost summary by counties

Adams	136,050
Athens	19,280,700
Belmont	989,630
Brown	114,080
Clermont	61,050
Gallia	7,597,360
Guernsey	3,268,563
Highland	19,080
Hocking	1,460,860
Jackson	19,080
Lawrence	101,360
Meigs	536,360
Monroe	19,080
Morgan	903,360
Noble	229,080
Pike	81,080

OHIO—Continued

Project cost summary by counties—Con.

Portage	17,517,223
Ross	137,080
Scioto	2,580,360
Vinton	972,050
Washington	557,510
Southeast Ohio	3,823,709
Total	60,404,705

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, April 19, 1962.

The Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Senate Public Works Committee's approval of President Kennedy's $2.6 billion public works program to combat unemployment is encouraging. With 268,000 workers, 9.2 percent of our labor force, currently unemployed in our State, we feel the need for this legislation is eminent.

You ask for information concerning Michigan's ability to participate in the $600 million immediate effect provision of the program.

We currently have 53 areas in our State that qualify under this legislation as area redevelopment or eligible labor surplus areas. In an analysis I recently conducted, I found that we are ready to embark upon capital improvement programs totaling $639 million that would provide approximately 60,000 man-years of employment. These figures

were developed only from those projects in Michigan that can meet the limitations of the $600 million proposal. They constitute, if anything, an understatement of the volume of activity that could be started in Michigan without delay.

While we have not projected our figures to a period longer than 12 months, it is our belief that the backlog of public works projects that could be initiated at the present time in Michigan would certainly absorb any extension of the time and financial limits of the program.

Concerning the time duration of the project, I urged the House Public Works Committee to grant a flexible time limit for project duration. Due to weather conditions in Michigan, a limit of 12 months would prohibit the initiation of some public works projects that might otherwise qualify.

My statement to the House Committee on Public Works contains a detailed breakdown of the type of projects we could initiate in Michigan. I am enclosing a copy of this statement for your information.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, April 26, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The following is a list of public works projects as requested in your telegram of April 18:

Ansonia area:	
Ansonia-Derby flood control project	$6,000,000
Street and road reclassification project	250,000
Sewage disposal plant	1,000,000
Additional recreational facilities	100,000
Reconstruction of Route 34 in Derby from 3d St. to A St	200,000
Reconstruction of 0.2 mile of Route 115 and railroad underpass, Maple St. to Broad St., town of Seymour	1,000,000
Reconstruction of 1.5 miles of Route 115 in Derby and Ansonia from Route 34 to Colburn St	800,000
Bristol area:	
City hall (Bristol)	1,630,000
Civic center (Bristol)	450,000
Fire station (Bristol)	250,000
City streets (Bristol)	2,000,000
Sewage treatment plant (Bristol)	2,535,000
Airport (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Industrial park (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Construction of truck climbing lane on Route 69, Bristol	205,000
Widening approximately 1 mile of Route 6, Bristol, in Jerome Ave. vicinity	250,000
Extension of truck climbing lane on Route 6 in Plymouth from end of 1962 construction to vicinity of Todd Hollow Rd	100,000
Correcting sight line on Route 6, in Plymouth, in the vicinity of Orchard and Kellogg Sts	150,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area:	
Sewer treatment plant and pumping station (Killingly)	800,000
Town dump and incinerator (Killingly and Putnam jointly)	700,000
Downtown renewal project (Killingly)	3,000,000
Town roads drainage and repair (Killingly)	100,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area—Continued	
Sewage facilities and disposal (Plainfield)	$500,000
Recreational project	150,000
Correction of sight line on Route 169 1 mile south of Brooklyn Town line	75,000
Reconstruction of 1.2 miles of Route 171 from Thompson Town line to Quinebaug River	400,000
Reconstruction of 2.6 miles of Route 169 in Pomfret and Woodstock from Route 44 to Route 171	700,000
Reconstruction of Maple St., Killingly, from Route 6 to Route 101	375,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 south of Route 6 underpass	200,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 in Putnam and Thompson from 300 feet south of Route 12 to 0.5 mile north of Route 193	4,500,000
Resurfacing of Main St., Killingly	100,000

The estimated cost of the above-listed projects is $28,545,000 including $19,865,000 in local projects and $8,680,000 in State highway department projects.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Annapolis, Md., April 25, 1962.

The HONORABLE ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Governor Tawes has asked me to reply to your telegram of April 18 regarding possible public works projects in persistent labor surplus areas of Maryland.

To date we have been able to learn of 23 projects in such areas whose total cost is estimated at approximately $92,590,000. It is estimated that total man-hours would exceed 15,600,000.

The single most expensive project would be the relocation of U.S. Route 40 as a 4-lane highway for a distance of 112 miles from Hancock, Md., to Washington County, Pa. This would traverse five labor surplus counties. The estimated construction cost for the entire highway, exclusive of right-of-way acquisition, is $84,400,000 providing an estimated 15,275,000 man-hours of work.

The most critical Allegany County project is the construction of a new Pinto Bridge and improvement of the road from the bridge to U.S. 220. The existing bridge is wholly inadequate for the movement of employees to and from the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory and efficient delivery of some materials to the plant. The estimated cost for this project is $1 million involving 100,000 man-hours.

There are at least four projects in Washington County including the proposed North-East Highway at a cost of $400,000 and 75,000 man-hours. A new water transmission main from Williamsport to Hagerstown would cost $1,450,000. There is no estimate of the number of man-hours. A project involving sewer system extensions in Hagerstown and other Washington County towns would cost $3,500,000. Again there is no estimate of man-hours. Sewer and water main extensions and highway improvements to a proposed industrial park would cost $670,000. The number of man-hours is unknown at this time. The total cost of these Washington County projects is $6,020,000. Man-hours were computed for only one of the four projects; i.e., 75,000 man-hours.

Seventeen projects for the city of Cambridge in Dorchester County were proposed and a tabulation is enclosed. The total cost is $1,070,000 involving 196,800 man-hours.

We are also endeavoring to uncover other appropriate projects and will forward details next week.

I hope this information will be useful and please wire or phone if additional details are required.

Cordially,

ROBERT M. SPARKS,
Chief, Business and Industrial Development.

City of Cambridge, Md.—List of projects which could be completed in 27 months

No. and name of project	Approximate cost	Approximate labor hours
1. Improvements to Race St	$19,000	4,000
2. Streets and utilities, Plaza Park, part 1	18,500	4,000
3. Improvements to Maryland Ave	12,000	3,200
4. Extension of Goodwill Ave	13,500	3,500
5. Streets and utilities, Parkside subdivision	33,000	6,000
6. Sewage pumping station, Stone Boundary Development	20,000	3,800
7. Bozarth Farms area, drainage	33,000	6,000
8. Improvements to sewage system, Jimson Rd	33,000	6,000
9. Repair shop and garage, public works department	9,000	2,400
10. Sewer, storm water separation, Fairmount Ave	70,000	12,000
11. Improvements to Leonards Lane	80,000	14,000
12. Drainage improvements, Dorchester Ave	24,000	4,300
13. Drainage improvements, Phillips Ave., Robbins St	30,000	5,400
14. Sludge disposal units, sewage treatment plant	200,000	40,000
15. Improvements to water distribution system	340,000	58,000
16. Woods road to wire cloth intercepting sewer	100,000	18,000
17. New 1,000,000-gallons-per-day well	35,000	6,200
Total	1,070,000	196,800

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
Montgomery, April 23, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: At the request of Governor Patterson, I am pleased to furnish the information requested in your telegram of April 18, 1962, regarding emergency public works which might be completed in Alabama in 27 months.

Both the State highway department and the State conservation department, which would be largely responsible for emergency public works, made estimates and plans sometime ago. Engineering has been completed and it is believed all projects could be commenced within 6 months.

The following estimates, in broad categories, cover proposed projects in those areas declared economically depressed:

County roads and bridges	$3,500,000
State highways	8,000,000
Interstate highways	20,000,000
Reforestation, water, and wildlife conservation, State parks, fire control	19,000,000
Total	50,500,000

Man-hours are estimated as:

Highway and roads	3,000,000
Conservation projects	6,000,000
Total	9,000,000

The Governor is in agreement that the suggested authorization would be very inadequate, particularly if such funds are

allocated to the States on the usual pro rata basis.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. WILLIAMS,
Director of Industrial Relations.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, May 3, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 18, 1962, concerning proposed public works projects in West Virginia.

I would first like to inform you of the situation with regard to public works projects in West Virginia and to give you some information relative to specific projects which could be accomplished under the proposed program.

At the present time, the State of West Virginia has a public works program based on the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program. We have elected to participate in this program with a stipulation that each recipient who receives assistance will work for that assistance. As of March 30, 12,600 men were employed under this program. As you know, this program is financed by both the Federal and State governments on a matching basis, the State paying 30 percent of the cost and the Federal Government paying 70 percent.

One shortcoming of this program is that only individuals who are married with dependent children qualify. No employment is made available under this program for individuals who are not married or individuals who are married and have no children or whose children are grown.

Three million dollars in State funds have been appropriated for the coming fiscal year for emergency employment. I may, as chief executive, use these funds to match any Federal funds which may become available for the relief of unemployment. This, of course, means that should the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program be continued at the Federal level, these funds may be used for participation in that program.

It is my understanding that the public works plan proposed by President Kennedy will make Federal money available to various State and local governmental units on a 50–50 matching basis. I would like to strongly urge that consideration be given to a more favorable matching ratio in favor of State and local governments.

A program with a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State matching ratio would provide employment for approximately 7,000 to 12,000 persons. As only $3 million are available in State funds for matching purposes, a 50–50 matching ratio would only provide employment for 1,500 to 2,400 persons. These figures assume expenditures for material and equipment of 20 percent to 50 percent.

Enclosed you will find proposed projects from our State department of natural resources and from our State road commission. I would like to emphasize that these projects are only a sample of those projects which can be undertaken and completed within 27 months under this program and which would qualify under the rules and regulations of such program. It is anticipated that many projects at the community level, both county and municipal, would be submitted for accomplishment.

Again let me express my desire that Federal money be made available at less cost to the States.

I sincerely hope that this information meets your needs and that you will give every consideration possible to the suggestions which I have outlined. If I may assist you in any way or provide any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Yours truly,

W. W. BARRON,
Governor.

STATE OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, May 2, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is in reply to your recent cablegram wherein you requested information on public works projects which could be completed during the next 27 months in our economically distressed area (Hawaii County). The attached tabulation gives information on gross construction costs by major types of functions and the estimated number of man-hours needed to complete the projects. These represent projects which are currently authorized or those for which authorization begins on July 1, 1962, for the new fiscal year. It is estimated that all of these will be completed during the 27-month time period you cited.

I have not seen a copy of the proposed emergency public works bill. Hence, it is not possible to say if all projects included in this tabulation would be eligible for financial assistance. As you know, highways and airports now receive Federal grants. Perhaps these projects would not be eligible for further aid. It would also be of value to know if such financial assistance would be in the form of interest-free loans or grants. The mechanics of the proposed bill may affect an area's willingness to participate in the program.

Hawaii's public works program for the coming fiscal year is the largest in our history. Part of the reason for this scale of State public works is to stabilize our employment situation. However, all of us recognize that public works construction alone will not solve our Nation's unemployment problem. Increased public works construction is only one tool of many that must be utilized to spur the growth of our economy. The Area Redevelopment Act and the program of retraining unemployed persons are examples of other actions that will help. Some areas will continue to suffer chronic unemployment until new economic activities are introduced. The private sector of the Nation's economy must maintain a vigorous growth if public efforts to solve unemployment are to be successful. Thus, any public works program should be accompanied by vigorous efforts to encourage and promote increased employment through new permanent job opportunities.

I hope this provides you with the information you need. However, if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)

I. Public works division (miscellaneous public buildings and the State's share of a sewage treatment plant):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$1,351,412
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	122,184
II. Airports division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,500,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	320,000

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)—Continued

III. Harbors division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,855,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	617,000
IV. Highways division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$14,427,500
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	1,978,000
V. Land and natural resources department (land development, parks, water development, forestry, fish and game):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$978,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	136,500
Total estimated construction costs	$24,111,912
Total estimated man-hours of work	3,173,684

THE FARMER AND THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I hope and expect that in a very few weeks the House and the Senate will be considering the King-Anderson bill and related legislation calling for a Federal program of hospital insurance for America's older people.

For months, now, we have heard discussion of it. Press, radio, and television have devoted much attention to it. The public has argued its pros and cons.

Yet, throughout all this discussion, one most important facet of the problem seems to have gone wholly unnoticed.

It is simply this.

Rural America needs Federal hospital insurance even more than does urban America. Passage of the King-Anderson bill will mean even more to farmers—young as well as old—than it will to city people. Whereas legislators identified with great metropolitan centers have been foremost in advocating this legislation, it is those Representatives and Senators whose constituencies are primarily rural who should be asserting leadership in this great cause. It is their constituents who need it most, who would benefit most from it, and who will suffer most should it fail to pass.

Why do I say this, Mr. President?

Briefly stated, it is because of what the subcommittees of our Special Committee on Aging found in recent months as they conducted hearings, not in our great cities only, but throughout the length and breadth of our country and especially in its smaller communities. These things we found. Ten good reasons for rural America's demanding hospital insurance for its older people.

First, the percentage of older people is higher in much of rural America than it is in our cities. And this percentage is increasing. Already more than 5 million, nearly one-third, of our elderly live on farms or in small towns. In many rural towns they make up close to one-fifth of the population. And as the young leave and the elderly stay or return, the ability of the local community to support the elderly is more and more impaired.

Secondly, cash incomes are lower in rural areas. Average cash incomes are less than half those of urban areas. And modern hospitals cannot accept barter as payment for hospital bills.

Moreover, cash assets on which to draw in an emergency are relatively low for farm families who have their savings tied up in farms and equipment.

Another reason is found in the fact that elderly farm families suffer more disabling and longer lasting illnesses than do elderly townfolk yet, under today's system, they get less care.

A fifth reason is that, while private health insurance is altogether inadequate for most older city folk, farmers have even less; it is of poorer quality: it costs more; it pays less of the bill.

Sixth, our older farm families spend an even higher percentage of their low incomes for medical expenses than do city people.

Seventh, younger farm families are at a serious disadvantage in paying for health care of their older people, either directly or through taxes.

Eighth, rural hospitals are in even greater need of the assured income which a Federal plan would provide than are city hospitals and they need it badly.

The ninth reason is that the Kerr-Mills Act as a substitute for a Federal insurance program is even less successful and far more burdensome for farm people than for those in our cities. About half of our 5 million older farm people live in States than cannot afford or do not have a Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged, even though they are required to pay Federal taxes for it. Eighty-eight percent of all Kerr-Mills funds are now being spent in four great metropolitan States—New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and California—where fewer than 14 percent of our rural aged live.

Finally, the means test incident to a charity program—repugnant as it is to most city people—also is distateful to proud and independent farm folk. The reason is that in the city, the man forced to plead poverty and beg help for himself or his aged wife, can take refuge in anonymity, can merge his identity with that of hundreds of others in an office removed from his home and neighbors and before a social worker who is a stranger to him and his. In a rural community, such a confession of failure and need must be made before one's neighbors and friends. It is truly a most shameful and humiliating burden to ask a farmer and his wife to take on in their declining years.

Those, Mr. President, are the reasons—10 excellent reasons—why the farmers of our country, more than anyone else, need a program of hospital insurance for the elderly. They are many, they are cogent, they are persuasive. I have merely set them forth. I shall explain each of them further in a moment. Let it suffice, at this point, to say that when, a few years ago, we visited and studied the problems of our country's older people in such cities as Boston, San Francisco, Miami, and Detroit, we came away convinced that the greatest need of our older people was for a means of lifting from their minds the fear of the costs of illness. We were convinced, too, that this could be done only through a plan which would be uniform throughout the Nation; which would not impose new burdens on local tax resources; which would preserve the dignity, the justified and essential pride of Americans in their last years of life.

What we found in our cities then, was again found during the last year in our rural areas and our smaller communities. The problems were the same. They were different only in emphasis and in intensity. Our cities need a program of hospital insurance for their older people. Our rural areas need it even more. To the retired city worker, such a program will mean much. To the retired farmer it will mean still more.

Originally, social security was framed in terms of the urban worker. It is not strange, therefore, that its logical extension to meet a great new need should have been championed first by men of the cities. But social security was extended to the rural areas. It has proved a boon to the farmer. Its extension to help defray the costs of hospitalization for our older people will prove of great benefit to rural America. I urge those who, in these halls, have stood forth as the champions of the farmer to make common cause with those from our cities in behalf of a bill which is needed for all of our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have set forth as an appendix to these remarks, a table which makes clear the truly significant extent to which our social security program has already reached into our most rural States—clear proof of the importance to our rural aged population of the proposed extension of the social security program. I ask consent also, to include a more definitive explanation of the 10 points I made above—the 10 reasons why our hospital insurance program will be good for rural America.

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

THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY HOSPITAL INSURANCE TO RURAL AMERICA

OUR RURAL POPULATION IS OLD

Of the total population in rural areas, 9.3 percent were 65 and older at the time of the 1960 census—only a slightly higher proportion than the urban percentage of 9.2. But in rural places of 1,000 to 2,500, the aged made up as much as 12.2 percent of the total population; in many of these small towns, 1 out of 5 persons is past 65.

More than 1⅓ million of the rural aged live on farms. While the farm population of all ages is rapidly declining, there has been an increase in the number of aged classified as living on farms. Estimates for April of 1960 and 1961 show a drastic decline of nearly 1 million in the farm population (from 15.7 million to 14.8 million). Over the same year, the farm population aged 65 and older rose by more than 40,000 (from 1,326,000 to 1,369,000). In a single year, the aged as a percent of the total farm population increased from 8.5 percent to 9.2 percent.

INCOMES ARE LOWER IN RURAL AREAS

The average money income of farm families is less than half that of urban families.

Among the aged, the rural-urban difference is less great—due in part to increasing importance of social security retirement benefits. But even among those 65 and over, the median money income in 1960 for persons living in rural farm areas was only $740, more than $200 less than that for all persons 65 and over. Among income recipients, the medians were $895 for the rural farm group and $1,150 for all aged.

In the course of our Senate hearings, we were repeatedly reminded that national averages with regard to retirement income can be very misleading as far as the incomes of the rural aged are concerned.

The findings of an intensive study on the resources and income levels of farm and nonfarm households in 10 rural counties in the eastern Ozarks section of Missouri were reported to the committee. In those farm households where the principal breadwinner was 65 years or older, 45 percent had annual family incomes of less than $1,000, and 82 percent had incomes of less than $2,000. For the rural nonfarm households whose heads were 65 years of age or older, 29 percent had incomes of less than $1,800 and 93 percent had less than $2,000. In rural Florida, the situation is even more acute, the committee learned, with about 66 percent of retired families receiving less than $1,000 and 93 percent receiving less than $2,000 a year in income. These retirement income figures contrast sharply with the median income of $2,530 for all two-person families with an aged head.

Rural families can be expected to have more noncash income than urban families. Home-ownership is high in rural areas and there is more opportunity to grow food for home consumption. Increasingly, however, even the farmers are producing less of their own food and depending more on purchases than they used to. And it must be remembered that in today's economy these items of nonmoney income are not acceptable in payment of hospital bills.

ASSETS ARE LOW

Nearly half of all rural families—young and old combined—own less than $5,000 in total assets, including the value of home-ownership. Agricultural workers and others living in rural areas have difficulty in accumlating assets over a lifetime characterized by low incomes. On retirement, farm families are likely to have a good part of their assets tied up in the farm and in farm operations.

MEDICAL EXPENDITURES CLAIM MORE OF THEIR RETIREMENT DOLLARS

Farm families with an aged head spent 13 percent of net family income in 1955 for medical expenses—over and above any costs defrayed by health insurance—for physicians, dentists, surgeons, hospital care and medical insurance premiums. This level of spending makes serious inroads into the resources available for other essentials which families must buy, even when some of their food and housing is farm furnished. The average aged farm family with net cash for the year of less than $1,000 spent as much as 20 percent of its income for the medical items listed (items which on the average accounts for two-thirds of the total medical care dollar).

Expenditures for medical insurance averaged $76 for older farm families, in comparison to $62 (in 1955 dollars) for older urban families, reflecting the lesser availability to farm families of group or group-conversion insurance, so that they must pay the higher cost of policies issued on an individual enrollment basis.

THEY HAVE MORE DISABILITY BUT LESS MEDICAL CARE

Nearly half (48 percent) of all aged persons residing in rural areas have chronic conditions which limit their activity. Among the urban aged the proportion is 39 percent.

Bed disability days per person per year average 17.0 for the rural farm aged in contrast to 11.8 for the urban.

Yet the rural group receives less medical attention: an average of 6.4 physician's visits per person per year as compared to 6.9 for the urban. Use of hospitals by the rural farm group was also lower. The national health survey study of discharges from short-term hospitals yields an average of 192 days for every 100 aged in urban areas, some 40 percent above the average of 136 days per 100 for the rural farm aged.

THEY HAVE LESS PROTECTION THROUGH HEALTH INSURANCE

According to the national health survey, only 28 percent of the aged in rural farm areas had hospital insurance in 1959, in comparison to 41 percent in rural nonfarm areas and 51 percent in urban areas.

Among the urban aged, most of the insurance was with the nonprofit Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans. But among those in rural areas, where community and group enrollment is not usually available, the bulk of the insurance was on a commercial basis, indicating that much of it was through individual policies with high costs, poor benefits, or both.

The insurance carried by the rural aged meets a smaller part of the hospital bill than in the case of the urban aged. Based on a national health survey study of discharges from short-stay hospitals from July 1958 to June 1960, only 33 percent of the rural farm aged, but as many as 57 percent of the urban had some part of the hospital bill paid by insurance. Of those where insurance paid part of the bill, the fraction paid was less than three-fourths in 40 percent of the urban discharges and in 47 percent of the rural farm discharges.

A recent North Carolina survey of retired farmers found that almost three-fourths of them had no health insurance coverage; of those not covered, close to half said it was because of the high cost.

THE SIGNIFICANCE FOR YOUNGER FAMILIES AND FOR THE RURAL ECONOMY

That the aged in rural areas have much to gain from the President's proposal is obvious from these basic facts about their health and economic status.

What then would the proposal mean to our younger farm families and to the rural economy in general?

The relatively low income position of families in rural areas means that they are at a serious disadvantage in helping to finance the medical costs of the older population, either as children of aged parents or, as taxpayers, for older people living in the community. Rural workers are already heavily burdened with health costs which claim a relatively large proportion of their family expenditures.

These costs, and the costs of any savings put aside for their own old age must usually be borne out of their own pockets, without the help of the tax-free employer contributions which characterize industrial employment. Expenditures for the education of their children come high when assessed against the low cash incomes of rural families.

The load which rural families now carry for health costs of the aged, through their taxes and through their expenditures for older members of the family, would be lightened by the administration's proposal. At the same time, the proposal provides a means for farmers and other rural workers to participate—with all other workers in the Nation—in a group hospitalization plan that assures them protection in their own old age. Because their cash incomes are low, their contributions would be relatively small. Yet these contributions would purchase exactly the same benefits available to a worker paying the maximum contribution rate.

Rural localities—and indeed entire States—have been wrestling for many years with the problems of financing health costs for their aged and other needy persons. In some of our most rural counties, as many as 6 or 7 out of every 10 people over 65 are on old-age assistance. In these same areas, there may be virtually no provision for public assistance medical care. Despite the availability of Federal dollars, the State is unable to raise the revenue needed for its share.

Hospital beds go unused in rural areas, not because there is less need for hospitalization, but because of financial inability to pay the costs.

Many rural areas have built modern hospitals that serve as the center for a wide variety of outpatient diagnostic and other health services. An analysis of the Hill-Burton hospitals built in the last 10 years or so, indicates that two-thirds of the general hospital beds are in rural areas, towns or small cities. The President's health insurance proposal provides a means for continued financial support of these facilities.

KERR-MILLS

The Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged, important as it is potentially in protecting those who are medically needy, cannot solve the problem of medical care for rural America's aged. About half of our 5 million people over 65 who reside in rural areas are in States which do not have programs of medical assistance for the aged. But more significantly, even where these programs are in effect in our more rural States, they are extremely limited in their benefits and most strict in their eligibility requirements. Eighty-eight percent of the funds being spent on MAA are expended in Massachusetts, New York, California and in my own State of Michigan. But 86 percent of our Nation's rural aged population live outside these four States and gain nothing from their relatively comprehensive programs.

Even if it were not for the fiscal realities that argue against basic reliance on the Kerr-Mills approach in rural areas, the public assistance method has two drawbacks that are especially serious in relation to our rural population.

Public assistance medical care can never meet the needs of those migratory farm workers who are unable to meet a residence requirement, even though liberally defined in terms of intent rather than duration of residency. This often throws a financial burden on the rural community hospital which must, of course, be picked up by local residents.

The fact that public assistance requires a test of need (we can argue till doomsday over whether this is a means test, a pauper's oath, or merely a statement of income—by whatever name, I find it objectionable) has the effect of excluding some persons from medical care that they need. In rural areas, this will commonly be the farmer, the "backbone" of this community, who—because of the very characteristics of pride and self-reliance implied in this term—would be completely unwilling to admit to his neighbors that he cannot pay for needed medical care. It is often said that the local community is best able to determine need. This is true. But it is also true that there is real value in big-city anonymity when one is forced to drop the cloak of self-respect in order to prove indigency.

The rural population will therefore find extra meaning in the guarantees under the Administration's proposal that uniform benefits would be available throughout the Nation on predetermined conditions and as a matter of right, rather than through a means test after resources have been exhausted.

EXTENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE IN RURAL AREAS

It is sometimes thought that social security has not really reached into the rural areas as yet and that there are many in our more agricultural States who would not be eligible under the President's proposal. The following table shows for each State the proportion of the aged population that would be eligible. Of the six States with the highest proportion of rural aged—60 percent or more in contrast to the national average of 30 percent—only two would have significantly fewer eligibles than in the country as a whole (Alaska with 57 percent and Mississippi with 72 percent in contrast to 84 percent of all persons 65 and over in the Nation who would be eligible at the beginning of 1964). Of the aged population of the six States combined, 81 percent would be eligible.

Estimated number of persons aged 65 and over who would be eligible for benefits under H.R. 4222 and population aged 65 and over, by State, Jan. 1, 1964

[In thousands]

State	Number eligible under OASDI [1]	Number eligible under RRA [1]	Total number eligible [2]	Population aged 65 and over	Number eligible per 1,000 population
Total	14,448	794	15,009	17,877	840
Alabama	195	12	203	276	736
Alaska	4	(3)	4	7	571
Arizona	83	6	87	109	798
Arkansas	148	9	155	201	771
California	1,191	52	1,227	1,514	810
Colorado	122	10	129	169	763
Connecticut	233	5	237	262	905
Delaware	33	3	35	38	921
District of Columbia	47	2	49	72	681
Florida	535	27	554	686	808
Georgia	208	14	218	308	708
Hawaii	27	(3)	27	31	871
Idaho	53	3	55	62	887
Illinois	856	60	898	1,038	865
Indiana	410	27	429	464	925
Iowa	276	17	288	338	852
Kansas	198	17	210	250	840
Kentucky	239	19	252	303	832
Louisiana	156	10	163	260	627
Maine	96	5	99	108	917
Maryland	189	13	198	245	808
Massachusetts	505	13	514	594	865
Michigan	624	20	638	695	918
Minnesota	304	23	320	379	844
Mississippi	137	7	142	196	724
Missouri	404	28	424	526	806
Montana	57	6	61	69	884
Nebraska	137	10	144	171	842

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimated number of persons aged 65 and over who would be eligible for benefits under H.R. 4222 and population aged 65 and over, by State, Jan. 1, 1964—continued

[In thousands]

State	Number eligible under OASDI [1]	Number eligible under RRA [1]	Total number eligible [2]	Population aged 65 and over	Number eligible per 1,000 population
Nevada	15	2	16	20	800
New Hampshire	63	2	65	69	942
New Jersey	541	22	557	613	909
New Mexico	39	4	42	57	737
New York	1,555	56	1,595	1,811	881
North Carolina	271	10	278	334	832
North Dakota	50	3	52	60	867
Ohio	788	49	823	943	873
Oklahoma	176	7	181	260	696
Oregon	175	10	182	197	924
Pennsylvania	1,024	78	1,079	1,190	907
Puerto Rico	83	0	83	135	615
Rhode Island	86	1	87	93	935
South Carolina	117	5	121	158	766
South Dakota	61	2	63	75	840
Tennessee	243	18	256	326	785
Texas	565	33	588	819	718
Utah	53	5	57	66	864
Vermont	38	2	39	44	886
Virgin Islands	1	0	1	2	500
Virginia	239	21	254	306	830
Washington	250	13	259	296	875
West Virginia	149	14	159	174	914
Wisconsin	377	16	388	429	904
Wyoming	22	3	24	29	828

[1] Numbers eligible under OASDI and under RRA exclude 98,000 persons and 6,000 persons, respectively, residing abroad. (Medical care furnished abroad not included in H.R. 4222.)

[2] Adjusted to count only once 233,000 persons who could qualify on the basis of OASDI coverage, but would also be eligible on the basis of railroad employment.

[3] Less than 500.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAXATION OF FOREIGN SUBSIDIARIES OF U.S. CORPORATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 10650, the tax bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is the proposal which I outlined to the Committee on Finance during my testimony on Tuesday, May 3. It is in the nature of a substitute for the present section 13 of H.R. 10650. I have submitted a draft of the amendment for the committee's consideration. However, I believe that the printing of the proposed amendment could be helpful to other Members of Congress who are interested in maintaining the competitiveness of U.S. oversea investments.

The principal reason for my introduction of this substitute is that the legislation proposed by the administration fails to distinguish between the correction of specific tax abuses and the need to avoid measures which will discourage continued and expanded participation by the U.S. private sector in the international economy. The proposal to tax currently the undistributed earnings of oversea subsidiaries of American corporations is in sharp contrast to the policies of many other nations whose investors compete with American private enterprise for preeminence in world markets. For example, the earnings of Dutch and French companies resulting from foreign operations are not taxed at all by their Governments. In the United Kingdom, companies which are appropriately organized and operate outside of the country do not have to pay a tax on their profits until distribution within the United Kingdom. In Belgium and Norway dividend income from foreign subsidiaries is taxed at a reduced rate.

The international responsibilities and the domestic welfare of the United States demand an expansion—not a contraction—of U.S. private investment overseas. I believe that the amendment I am proposing will strengthen the measures designed to prevent tax evasion while having a minimal adverse effect on the continued, natural, economically sound flow of investment.

This proposed amendment to section 13 of H.R. 10650 is designed to tax U.S. shareholders of certain foreign corporations without deferral, if the earnings and profits of such corporations are accumulated unreasonably abroad rather than being paid to the shareholders as dividends. In effect, section 13 so amended would treat the deferral of foreign corporation profits as tax avoidance only if there is no business-related reason for such deferral, rather than as per se tax avoidance as does section 13 in its pending form.

It should be noted that other than section 13, sections 6 and 16 of H.R. 10650 accomplish a great deal to eliminate true tax abuses in the foreign field. Modified by the amendment I have submitted to the committee, section 13 would constitute a relatively direct approach to the problem of taxation of profits of foreign corporations controlled by U.S. persons. Because it is a direct approach, it would be effective primarily as implemented by regulations of the Internal Revenue Service and decisions of the courts. Hence, it would be neatly tailored to do precisely what is sought to be done; namely, to take the romance out of runaway earnings and profits which are escaping taxation because they are being held abroad, but at the same time not prevent American companies which are engaged in productive activities and productive investment abroad from continuing in that way. They will be able effectively to compete with companies of other countries, such as Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy. One of the great objections to the foreign tax provision in the bill as it is now before the Committee on Finance is that it would disadvantage American companies in such competition.

The amendment to section 13 is modeled basically on sections 531 through 537 of the Internal Revenue Code which tax the accumulated earnings of domestic corporations. However, certain changes were made necessary because of the different contexts in which the two sets of provisions would operate. The principal change is that the provisions contained in section 534 of the code relating to the shifting of burden of proof to the Government would not be applied to foreign corporations because the Commissioner is at a greater disadvantage in obtaining factual information overseas.

Apart from these differences, I believe that the accumulated earnings approach patterned upon section 531 of the code offers a valid test for differentiating between tax-haven and legitimate operations abroad, in keeping with the policy objectives which I have urged, and which are those of the administration and of the devotees of a bipartisan policy on the part of the United States.

I have no doubt that the Committee on Finance will give the most serious consideration to my amendment; but I desired to call it to the attention of other Senators who are similarly being consulted by their constituents who conduct operations abroad, in the hope that it might enlist their interest as the subject is developed before the Committee on Finance.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF SUPREME COURT'S DESEGREGATION DECISION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today marks the anniversary of a historic occasion in our national life. Eight years ago the Supreme Court declared that the forced racial separation of school children did violence to our Constitution and had no place in our free society. This decision was a milestone in the

steady progress that this country has made toward realizing the ideals set forth by our Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. It was the culmination of nearly a century of effort to rid our law of the pernicious separate but equal doctrine. That such a situation could no longer be tolerated is evident from the unanimous voice in which the Court spoke.

The Court was aware of the difficulties that the implementation of its decision would cause. In response to this awareness, the Justices did not require that all schools be desegregated by a particular date, but rather demanded that the States proceed with "all deliberate speed" to carry out the decision. The Court anticipated that the States would follow the decision in good faith, for without such compliance a society based upon law will erode from within.

Yet, in many cases defiance, rather than adherence, has followed and the erosion of our free society has far exceeded the rate of compliance. After 8 years, only 7 percent of previously segregated school districts have been desegregated. Three States have not even made a token attempt at compliance.

For 8 years now we have been faced with the spectacle of a large section of our country openly violating the law—grasping at every conceivable means available to thwart the ruling of the highest Court in our land. At times we have seen mobs go into the streets to enforce the law of the jungle as a result of this constant advocacy of disobedience to the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

We have also witnessed the timidity of the Congress to come to the aid of the citizens our Court has now endeavored to protect against the wilful abuse of power. For 8 years now, with only two mild exceptions, we have refused to construct a firm foundation on which the law must stand if our civilization is to endure. We have just added another failure to act to our long list of failures on this issue. The Supreme Court cannot accomplish the task alone. If we are to insure that our Negro citizens are finally and truly free the Congress must act to aid in implementing the decision of the Supreme Court.

The defiance of the States and the refusal of the Congress to act has seriously endangered the judicial institution of our country—the third great branch of Government our Constitution created. The unrelenting guerrilla attacks which have been launched against the Court are designed to undermine the Court's authority and to force it to recant its desegregation decision. It appears that to some elements in America, destruction of the Court would be preferable to equal rights for the Negro.

This country was founded upon the principle that the rule of law, and not caprice, would be the basis on which our Government would operate. The Supreme Court was set up as the referee in our constitutional system—it is the arbitrator of disputes arising under the fundamental law. But it is more. It is the conscience—the moral force—that underlies our free society. The Court must provide the flexibility to meet the demands of a changing society that has been founded upon universal principles. The Constitution is not a static and sterile document. It is a living, viable instrument that has provided the foundation on which this country has grown and prospered.

The Supreme Court has erred in the past, and surely will again, for it is not an infallible oracle transmitting messages down from a Delphic temple. But so have we all erred. Yet, this fact does not negate our quest to achieve the ideals upon which this Government was founded.

During the debate on the literacy bill our colleagues quoted and defended Supreme Court decisions of the past which it was claimed supported their positions. The Court decisions at the turn of the century which upheld the separate but equal doctrine are the keystones to much of the arguments still made against civil rights legislation. The 1954 decision which overruled those determinations is regarded almost as sacrilege, as if the world stopped with the Plessy case in 1896.

Congress many times has overruled decisions it made in the past. Are we to deny this same capacity for growth and change in the interpretation of our law? We cannot contend that once a decision is made, regardless of whether right or wrong, it can never be changed.

We cannot pick and choose the laws we will obey, while discarding the remainder. If this Government is to continue to exist as a government based on law, we must accept all of the Court decisions as law, whether we support or disagree with the decision. Reversal by appropriate legislation or constitutional amendment can be sought, but once we embark on a systematic program of defiance we are on the road to destruction of the institution itself.

The elimination of the Plessy doctrine from our law came not as a result of defiance, but through the long, arduous process of legal tests and trials.

The battle to insure that all Americans are protected in the rights guaranteed them by the Constitution has been long and trying, and is still far from over. It is true that at times in its history the Supreme Court has been reticent about violations of the constitutional rights of our Negro citizens. But there have always been voices on the Court that have cried out against these inequities in our society and sought persistently to have these doctrines that sought to perpetuate legal servitude struck down.

It is fitting that as we pay tribute to the Supreme Court's historic desegregation decision we also express gratitude to a great Justice who keeps alive the spark of conscience during a dark season in this Nation's history. It was Justice John Marshall Harlan who provided the groundwork that eventually led to the judicial burial of the separate-but-equal doctrine. Harlan sought, unsuccessfully and often times alone during his long stay on the bench, to have the Court strike down State laws that perpetuated the vestiges of slavery. It is significant that he was the only southerner on the bench at the time of the Plessy decision and dissented vigorously from that decision. His words still have great meaning for us today. "The Constitution," Justice Harlan declared, "is colorblind and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." He saw clearly the situation developing that the Court in another day could no longer tolerate if our Constitution was to have meaning.

Another great justice, Charles Evans Hughes, once declared that a dissent in a court of last resort "is an appeal to the brooding spirit of the law, to the intelligence of a future day." It was such an appeal that Harlan made in the generation of his day—the generation that freed the Negro from slavery and then failed to guarantee that freedom from all encroachments. Harlan's voice is as clear and as pertinent today as when he protested against the Plessy decision:

> State enactments, regulating the enjoyment of civil rights upon the basis of race * * * can have no other result than to render permanent peace impossible, and to keep alive the conflict of races, the continuance of which must do harm to all concerned.

Need we remind ourselves of the accuracy of Harlan's insight?

In the early years of this century and as he neared the close of his long battle for equal rights, Harlan posed this poignant inquiry to the American people:

> Have we become so inoculated with prejudice of race that an American government, professedly based on the principles of freedom, and charged with the protection of all citizens alike, can make distinctions between such citizens * * * simply because of their respective races?

We have yet to give a fully adequate answer to that question.

It is because discrimination continued and flourished in the fertile soil of enforced segregation that the legal battle to have such laws eliminated was waged throughout the first half of this century. It is because of this fact that the Supreme Court stepped into this breach 8 years ago in an effort to heal the schism that threatens the wellsprings of our national life. Under any criteria—legal, moral, or political—the decision was just and necessary if we are ever to achieve the goal of a truly free democratic society based on equal rights and equal protection under the law.

The past 8 years have been difficult and trying for the Supreme Court. It has boldly and courageously pushed forward in its effort to secure the equal rights of all our citizens—this despite the attacks and defiance that has followed in the wake of its decision. It is the Congress which has held back, which has refused to enact legislation to implement the Court's decision. Until this occurs we will continue to witness defiance by some of our States and the harassment of the institution of our judiciary. Our courts and our laws cannot long stand if they are violated with impunity.

I have said on many occasions that the failure of Congress to enact legislation to aid in enforcing the Supreme

Court's desegregation decision cannot be attributed to any constitutional impediment. On the contrary, the failure to act has impeded the realization of the principles of the Constitution. Surely, the Congress can, without transcending the limits of our Constitution, do now for human liberty and the fundamental rights of American citizenship what it did in a misguided era for the protection of slavery prior to the Civil War.

This the Congress must do if freedom is to continue to prosper and to endure on our shores.

LITTLE PEOPLE TO LITTLE PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some months ago the 10-year-old son of New Jersey's Congressman, PETER RODINO, JR., undertook a very worthwhile project which deserves support of big people as well as little people. Peter Rodino wrote to Soviet Premier Khrushchev asking for names and addresses of some children to whom he could write in Russia. He has also asked Khrushchev to stop exploding nuclear weapons. Recently little Peter Rodino wrote to President Kennedy telling the President about his project.

Mr. President, there is a lot to be said for this project. It has been endorsed by the New Jersey chapter of the Disabled American Veterans and by the Amvets and the American Legion. President Eisenhower has also congratulated the boy for his enterprise in trying to break through the iron wall of Soviet totalitarianism with the simple faith and persistence of a child.

Mr. President, if more American youth undertook constructive efforts at international communication, there would be less time for juvenile delinquency. Now that the long summer vacation has nearly arrived for schoolchildren, it is important for the boys and girls of America and for youth guidance counselors and organizations to put their energies to work. Little Peter Rodino's letter writing project is one way to encourage the spirit of international peace and put the talents of our future leaders to work.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE RAILROADED TO MENTAL INSTITUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a few days ago I discussed what I considered to be the highly improper manner in which an employee of the Department of Agriculture was carted off, or railroaded to a mental institution. Yesterday I was equally disturbed to read in the Washington Evening Star a statement by Dr. Frederick Thuee, chairman of the District of Columbia Mental Health Commission, in which he stated that two psychiatrists had pronounced Miss Jones to be mentally ill.

In his statement Mr. Thuee takes exception to my remarks of May 14 at which time I had said that Miss Jones was declared sane on May 7, the day on which she had been released from the mental institution.

I quote now from the May 16 article which was published yesterday:

> Commission Chairman Thuee had not released Miss Jones as of sound mind but "we felt that if we could get her under the care of a private doctor, a good psychiatrist, there was no place like home for her."

Mr. President, I agree that Miss Jones should have been sent home and that that would be the best place for her; and I think it would have been better if she had been sent there on April 25.

But the fact is that yesterday Chairman Thuee in his release contradicts his own remarks of May 7, 1962.

My statement of May 14 to the effect that Miss Jones was sane on the date when she was released from the hospital was largely based on a statement given by what I thought at the time was a very reputable man who was supposed to know what he was saying, the Chairman of the Mental Health Commission, Mr. Thuee, himself.

I now quote what Mr. Thuee said on May 7, just 10 days before, about the same case—and what I shall quote now is his statement, not mine; it is his statement, as delivered and released. It appeared in many of the newspapers, but I shall quote now directly from the article published in the Washington Star on May 7, just 10 days ago:

> Miss Mary Kimbrough Jones, former secretary to N. Battle Hales, a figure in the Billie Sol Estes-Agricultural Department investigation, today was discharged from District General Hospital where she has been under mental observation since April 25.
>
> A District Mental Health Commission hearing, which lasted more than an hour, certified Miss Jones, 51, as sane. Mental Health Commission Chairman Fred A. Thuee presided over the three-man board, which also included two staff psychiatrists from the hospital.
>
> Miss Jones was taken to the hospital April 25 by fourth precinct police at the request of Dr. Lee K. Buchanan, Chief of the Health Division of Agriculture's Personnel Office.
>
> Her former superior, Mr. Hales, today told a reporter Miss Jones had been concerned about classified files in his office which were barred to him after his transfer to another section of the Department April 20. Last Friday, in a press conference, Mr. Hales charged the files contained pertinent information in the investigation of alleged preferential treatment for Estes, a Texas financier.
>
> Mr. Hales also charged he was transferred so he would be denied access to the records.

I am still quoting from the May 7 article on the statement made by Commission Chairman Fred A. Thuee:

> A court order for mental observation was obtained April 26, according to Miss Jones' attorney, William T. Pace. The Mental Health Commission must report within 25 days whether a patient is to be retained at District General Hospital for further examination, sent to St. Elizabeths for psychiatric care, or be discharged as being of sound mind. Today's action did the latter.

Mr. President, this article states very clearly that Miss Jones was discharged as being of sound mind. I should like to read again the second paragraph of the article:

> A District Mental Health Commission hearing, which lasted more than an hour, certified Miss Jones, 51, as sane. Mental Health Commission Chairman Fred A. Thuee presided over the three-man board, which also included two staff psychiatrists from the hospital.

Mr. President, I just do not understand why all the effort is being made to discredit this girl. She certainly must have had a horrible enough experience as it was. This May 7 statement that she was released as being of sound mind was not contradicted by anyone. It was a very emphatic statement that she was discharged and was "certified as sane." Yet yesterday by the same man, Mr. Thuee, an attempt was made for some reason or other to deny their earlier release. Why? Why is it so important to someone that this employee be discredited? Never have I seen a situation where the rights of an individual were so seriously violated.

She was placed in the mental institution on April 25. But there is no record anywhere where any doctor signed the proper commitment papers until 2 days later, April 27. That statement is based on their statements—not mine. She was placed in the psychiatric ward, and was held there 48 hours before being officially committed by two doctors. I venture to say that if some of the rest of us had been confined in such a cell, sleeping, as she did, on a mattress on the floor, we would not be quite normal.

I checked with Miss Jones' attorney, and asked him whether he could get a transcript of the hearing in order to clear up for the record exactly what happened. I was amazed to find that no transcripts of such hearings are kept. It seems that Mr. Pace, Miss Jones' attorney, on the date of the hearing tried to get a transcript. He asked that the proceedings be transcribed and even offered to pay for the transcript, but he was refused. They said that was not according to their procedure but that one of their secretaries would take notes and would transcribe them as she understood what was going on; but not even those notes would be available to the attorney for this client. What kind of a hearing was this?

Mr. President, in such a case the client certainly is entitled to some consideration. It is a horrible experience for anyone to be put in the position in which he or she must prove sanity. This lady was adjudged mentally ill from the moment the police officer signed her commitment papers. Now she has to prove her sanity.

I ask unanimous consent that the article of May 7, as released by Chairman Thuee, of the Mental Health Commission, and as published in the Washington Star of May 7, be printed at this point in the RECORD and that there also be printed at this point in the RECORD the two letters signed by Miss Jones' attorney. One is dated May 14, and the other is dated May 17; letters the attorney outlines, the procedure by which this case was handled.

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

[From the Washington Star, May 7, 1962]

HALES' EX-SECRETARY RULED MENTALLY SOUND

Miss Mary Kimbrough Jones, former secretary to N. Battle Hales, a figure in the Billie

Sol Estes-Agriculture Department investigation, today was discharged from District General Hospital where she had been under mental observation since April 25.

A District Mental Health Commission hearing, which lasted more than an hour, certified Miss Jones, 51, as sane. Mental Health Commission Chairman Fred A. Thuee presided over the three-man board, which also included two staff psychiatrists from the hospital.

Miss Jones was taken to the hospital April 25 by fourth precinct police at the request of Dr. Lee K. Buchanan, chief of the health division of Agriculture's personnel office.

Her former superior, Mr. Hales, today told a reporter Miss Jones had been concerned about classified files in his office which were barred to him after his transfer to another section of the Department April 20. Last Friday, in a press conference, Mr. Hales charged the files contained pertinent information in the investigation of alleged preferential treatment for Estes, a Texas financier.

Mr. Hales also charged he was transferred so he would be denied access to the records.

"I talked to her (Miss Jones) the Friday (April 20) I was barred from the records. I talked to her on the phone and she was concerned about the safety of the records. I reassured her and she seemed all right then. The next I heard, she was brought here (the hospital)," Mr. Hales said today.

A court order for mental observation was obtained April 26, according to Miss Jones' attorney, William T. Pace. The Mental Health Commission must report within 25 days whether a patient is to be retained at District General Hospital for further examination, sent to St. Elizabeths for psychiatric care, or be discharged as being of sound mind. Today's action did the latter.

Testifying at the hearing were two staff psychiatrists, Drs. J. L. Foy and Robert Pine, Pvt. Robert Selby, of the fourth precinct, who took her to the hospital, Mr. Hales, and Miss Jones' brother and sister. The hearing was closed to the press.

MOUNT RAINIER, MD., *May 14, 1962.*

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am in receipt of your letter dated May 8, 1962, wherein you inquired regarding my client, Miss Mary Kimbrough Jones, former secretary to Mr. N. Battle Hales of the Department of Agriculture.

On April 26, 1962, Metropolitan Police Officer Pvt. Robert L. Selby, Precinct No. 4, signed a printed petition stating that on April 25, 1962, he had gone to the Agriculture Building and had observed Miss Jones in a confused state of mind. Said petition was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on April 26 in Mental Health Proceedings No. 861-62. Attached to the petition was a medical certificate signed by two physicians on the staff of the District of Columbia General Hospital's psychiatric ward.

As I informed you during my telephone conversation with you on May 8, 1962, after the above-mentioned two papers were filed, the court, on April 26, 1962, issued an order whereby the patient would be detained in the District of Columbia General Hospital for a period of 30 days unless discharged at an earlier date.

On Monday, May 7, 1962, there was a hearing before the Commission on Mental Health, which lasted approximately 1 hour and 20 minutes. After the hearing Miss Jones was discharged.

Officer Selby stated that when he arrived at the Department of Agriculture he reported to Dr. Buchanan's office where he saw Miss Jones and Dr. Buchanan's nurse. He further stated that Miss Jones was carried from her office by Dr. Buchanan into the doctor's office and was retained there against her will. Officer Selby alleged that Miss Jones was claiming that FBI agents were swarming around her and that all of her friends now appeared to be her enemies. At this time Officer Selby knew of no investigation that Miss Jones or her former boss, Mr. Hales, had been involved in. Officer Selby further testified that there was no alcohol involved whatsoever; in fact, he was examined rather closely by the Commissioner as to whether he, Officer Selby, could have ascertained that and the officer stated that he not only could but had made a special point of determining that there was no alcohol whatsoever on Miss Jones' breath.

Officer Selby testified that he was in Dr. Buchanan's office with Miss Jones and the doctor's nurse for a period of from 30 to 45 minutes and that a great deal of this time was spent in talking with Miss Jones to quiet her down so that she would leave the Agriculture building and go to the patrol wagon in a ladylike manner. He testified that Miss Jones agreed and, in fact, walked out of Dr. Buchanan's office to the patrol wagon without being touched or handcuffed.

Neither Dr. Buchanan, his nurse, nor any security officers or personnel of the Agriculture Department who saw Miss Jones on April 25, 1962, appeared at the hearing.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM T. PACE.

MOUNT RAINIER, MD., *May 17, 1962.*

Re Miss Mary Kimbrough Jones.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Miss Jones' sister retained me just a few days before the hearing of May 7, 1962. The sister, Mrs. Allen, told me that she did not think she needed a lawyer because she had talked to Dr. Robert Pine of the staff of District of Columbia General Hospital psychiatric ward. Dr. Pine had indicated to Mrs. Allen that Miss Jones would be leaving for home in a very short time and was all right.

As soon as the hearing commenced, by the Commissioner on Mental Health, I made a formal motion that I and my client, Miss Jones, be provided with a copy of a verbatim transcript of this hearing. I further stated that I, personally, would pay for the copy of the transcript. This motion was denied by Mr. Thuee, Chairman. He stated that that was not the procedure. I again stated that I needed this information and made a formal motion for it, and I then made a second motion that I receive a copy of part of the transcript that was going to be taken down by the reporter. This was denied.

It appears to be very unjust to me that the Commissioner on Mental Health should conduct a hearing, with a shorthand reporter physically and actually there taking down only part of the notes. It also appears unjust to the patient to be denied the notes that are taken down, and it also appears unjust to the patient to be denied a full copy of the transcript if he or she is willing to pay for it. At the time Miss Jones had her hearing, a reporter was there but I, as Miss Jones' attorney, could not have the benefit of any notes whatsoever.

I would like to comment on the article written by Miriam Ottenberg that appeared in the Evening Star on May 16, 1962, wherein she quoted certain allegations from the court papers that were filed ex parte on or about April 26, 1962. These allegations signed by the doctor were strictly conclusions. Dr. Pine was one of the doctors who signed the affidavit. However, under cross-examination, Dr. Pine knew of no acts, deeds, or facts that indicated that Miss Jones was dangerous to herself or to others. Under cross-examination, Officer Selby and Dr. Foy also stated that they knew of no acts, deeds, or facts that indicated that Miss Jones was dangerous to herself or to others. This is the sworn statement of the three people that the Government produced. This was uncontradicted by anyone else. This information even included hearsay information.

Dr. Anna C. Todd, who was one of the psychiatrists on the Commission that was conducting the hearing, was not sworn as a witness and was not subject to any cross-examination by Miss Jones' attorney. Dr. Todd, as she has a right to do, asked Miss Jones if she was sick; the answer was "no." Dr. Todd asked her if the reason Miss Jones did not eat the food that was presented to her was because Miss Jones believed it to be poisoned, and Miss Jones stated that she did not eat a couple of meals when she first arrived. Miss Jones further stated that the only reason she did not eat the meals when she first arrived was because the confinement upset her; that she was taken out of her regular, usual environment, and placed in a ward with many people who were sick, was stripped of her clothes, and caused to sleep on a mattress on the floor, and these things caused her to lose her appetite the first day or two and she missed a couple of meals. I am sure that you and I would have the same reaction to such a change.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM T. PACE.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in addition to the fact that no transcript was kept of these hearings her attorney has pointed out the fact that neither Dr. Buchanan nor his nurse nor any security officers or personnel of the Department of Agriculture who saw Miss Jones on April 25, 1962, and who were responsible for her commitment appeared at the hearing.

I should like to discuss briefly, Mr. President, the procedure followed in handling this matter, because I still think this was a most highly irregular procedure, not the kind of procedure I would want to have followed for my wife or my daughter or my sister.

If the girl in this case were ill on that day, or were nervous or were mentally disturbed she needed help, sympathy, medical attention, and she should not have been carried off in a paddy wagon that is used for ordinary criminals without notifying any of her family or without the signed approval of a doctor.

The District of Columbia laws relating to the handling of such cases have grave weakness. I was amazed to find that if a man, while on the streets of Washington, D.C., murders someone, the officer who arrests him takes him to the police station where he must first be officially booked before he is imprisoned; and he is given an opportunity to call his lawyer. But this girl who had committed no crime was given no such opportunity. The police officer—and I have here his statement—confirms that not only did they not call any of the family of this girl, but they made no effort to call any of them. They merely loaded her in the patrol wagon and sent her off.

Furthermore, much claim has been made of the fact that this girl was put in the hospital by two doctors; it has been said that she was put there by Dr. Buchanan, of the Department of Agriculture, along with the consent of her personal doctor. Her doctor denied that

he had approved her being carried to a mental institution.

But the fact is—the records in the case show that neither her family doctor nor Dr. Buchanan ever signed any papers for the commitment of this lady to the mental institution. She was originally committed to the mental institution without the signature of any doctor. This is a matter of public record, a fact which no one can deny. This girl was put in the mental institution solely on the responsibility of a police officer of the District of Columbia, and it was not until April 27, two days after she had been admitted, that two of the staff doctors signed her commitment papers.

Now, who was this police officer to whom was delegated such power to commit this woman? What experience had he had? He said that was the first time he ever was called in on a mental case. We find that he has served 5 years on the police force, and before that 5 years as a railroad fireman and 4 years in the military service. What sort of qualification is that for a man who is allowed to determine whether someone should be put in a psychiatric ward on a 20-minute examination? Yet, based on his own testimony this was his own decision. I am amazed to find that he took that responsibility and kept insisting that his decision was not influenced by the doctors.

I talked with Dr. Buchanan and he seemed to think it was his decision.

Surely we need a drastic revision in our laws if this can happen in the District of Columbia.

Much is made in the article of yesterday of the fact that the lady is sick at this time. I would be the most surprised man in the world if she were not sick. I think anyone who experienced a situation where one were confined in a padded cell for a period of 10 or 12 days, having been railroaded there without having any opportunity to call one's relatives or family, would be nervous and sick. She has a brother in Baltimore. She has two or three brothers in North Carolina. Why were they not called? The only thing the police officer said was that somebody told him that somebody had called her sister the day before. How did that "somebody," a third party, know that she was going to be placed in the hospital the next day? It would be impossible. To accept that statement there would have to have been a plot to put her there. What kind of a police force do we have which relies so strongly on what someone said someone told someone?

I understand the lady was not working ing the two days before, and the person who called her sister had not even seen her. I do not know, but I do know there are a lot of strange circumstances surrounding this case.

Now, what was the condition of the patient on the day of her commitment? I would like to read what the officer in charge said about the condition of the employee on April 25, the day they took her in. I shall quote from Officer R. L. Selby's own statement, but first, I want to call attention to the difference in the law if this girl had been picked up at a private home as against being picked up on Government property. I checked the existing law. I was told that if this girl had been in a private home in the District of Columbia, before she could be taken by this officer and committed to an institution of this kind, it would take the signature of four people on affidavits. Two residents and two doctors must sign affidavits certifying the need for mental attention before anyone in the District of Columbia who is not violent can be committed to a mental institution. However, from a public building a person can be sent off to a mental institution charged for mental observation without the certification or examination of any doctor or anyone else except the police officer. Once that patient is committed to the institution she has this "mental observation" charge on her record and from that moment on it is up to her to prove her sanity.

Sure, if the patient is threatening suicide or violence to anyone else the laws are that the police officer can for their protection and for the protection of others be detained. But no one has charged this lady with violence.

It is true that the doctors may discharge the patient, but the fact is that the commitment is on the police record, the person is charged with it, and has a stigma on his or her record to that extent. I recognize the necessity even in a private home, if a man is running around with a shotgun, and there is a likelihood that he may do harm to others or himself, an officer, can take him into custody to protect the patient and others. That was not the case here and I quote Officer Selby's own words. I asked this question concerning the four affidavits—two from doctors and two from residents:

Had this same situation existed with Miss Jones, an identical case on private property, and you had been called to her home by anyone, and this was on private property now, the identical case, the same girl, would it have required these papers here?

Mr. SELBY. It would.

Senator WILLIAMS. I understood you to say that it would. Before you would have picked this girl up, you would have required that whoever called you get these affidavits from the two residents and the two doctors' certificates, and then notify you, and after that you would have taken her down; is that right?

Mr. SELBY. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Am I correct then that it is only after this had been followed that you would have done it?

Mr. SELBY. From the private residence; yes, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. And that answer is on an identical case as near as you can imagine it of Miss Jones; is that correct?

In other words, her condition was not such as the captain described where it was a real threat of danger, of shooting somebody, or where you would have had to carry her on your own initiative. But you think her condition was such, that you would not have thought of carrying her without these proper papers being filled out, is that correct?

Mr. SELBY. That is right.

That shows that the officer did not consider this a violent case. Now there have been suggestions made that the girl was threatening to jump out of a window and they only wanted to protect her. Now what the the facts? I will let Officer Selby tell you in his own words:

Did you see anything while you were there that indicated that she wanted to hit anybody or kill anybody?

Mr. SELBY. She never showed any indication that she wanted to hit anybody or kill anybody while I was there.

Senator WILLIAMS. That is what I mean. Did you see any indication she wanted to kill herself while you were there?

Mr. SELBY. She kept walking over to the window.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, I am sitting next to a window now, but I am not going anywhere.

Mr. SELBY. No, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did she make any effort—was the window open?

Mr. SELBY. No, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did she make any effort to open the window?

Mr. SELBY. No, sir. She leaned out, like leaned on the sill and looked down.

Senator WILLIAMS. But the window was closed?

Mr. SELBY. The window was closed.

I understand that Officer Selby was on the first floor. If she had jumped out of the window it would not have hurt her, but by his own words she wasn't even trying. Why were they getting excited? The officer said she occasionally would go to the door and walk over to the window. Mr. President, if you or I were being held in a room and knew they were planning to take us to a mental institution I venture to say we would pace the floor too; that is, if we were sane. If we were insane we would not care what they did to us. It would be natural that a normal person would be walking around.

Officer Selby seemed quite proud of the fact that it was his decision and his decision only to commit her. I would have considered Dr. Buchanan's opinion as quite necessary.

But let us hear to what extent Officer Selby considered Dr. Buchanan's opinion:

Senator WILLIAMS. Did Dr. Buchanan suggest to you that he felt she should be sent down to a psychiatric ward?

Mr. SELBY. No, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. What did he call you for, then? Why did he not call an ambulance?

Mr. SELBY. That I don't know.

Senator WILLIAMS. When he called you, did he call you for that purpose? I mean was he going to arrest her for disturbing the peace?

Mr. SELBY. No, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. If she was worse—I thought you said he told you she was in a worse condition a few minutes before you came than she was when you came.

Mr. SELBY. He stated that she had, 5 minutes prior to our arrival, that she had been hitting him over the head with a shoe, and that he didn't know what to do with her.

But we must remember that this doctor had carried her from her office. She had been told she was going to be sent to a psychiatric ward, so in the struggle she hit him with a shoe. I would not be surprised; I would have reacted to a far greater extent than that, and he would be fortunate if it were only a shoe he was hit with.

I read further:

Senator WILLIAMS. And so he must have had it in his mind when he called you to send her to a psychiatric ward.

Mr. SELBY. I don't know. He never said that.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did he not indicate that that is where he thought she should go?

Mr. SELBY. No, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did he indicate that he thought she should not go there?

Mr. SELBY. He never indicated either way.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did he mention that you should take her down or was it all your idea?

Mr. SELBY. This is based on my own opinion of her and observation.

Senator WILLIAMS. He didn't suggest that you should take her to the hospital?

Mr. SELBY. No, sir.

Senator WILLIAMS. What did he ask you to do when you got there, just maintain order?

Mr. SELBY. He didn't know what to do with her. That is why he called.

Senator WILLIAMS. Wouldn't she go home?

Mr. SELBY. He never said whether she would go home or not. When I arrived, of course, he told me what had happened, and that he was called up in her office.

Senator WILLIAMS. Did you see anything while you were there that indicated that she wanted to hit anybody or kill anybody?

Mr. SELBY. She never showed any indication that she wanted to hit anybody or kill anybody while I was there.

I talked with Dr. Buchanan. He said that one of the reasons he thought the girl needed psychiatric treatment was that she seemed to think everybody was against her. She asked him if he was an FBI agent and kept asking, "Are you with the FBI?" He thought that was strange. I can understand why he would with no background of the case. He had only been called in a few minutes before. But the fact is that the FBI was there. There is no question about it. They had been in the office, the office which her boss had been locked out of a few days before. The FBI was checking the files. So it was a logical conclusion when a stranger walked in to think that he may be with the FBI. She was not imagining things.

He said she thought everybody was against her. That is not so strange. Everybody was. I know of no one who was defending her or even suggesting that she be carried home to her relatives or if necessary taken for regular hospitalization. But there is a big difference between giving her hospitalization and committing her to a psychiatric ward. Under the regulations, the officer before sending to a mental institution has a responsibility to notify the family. That requirement is spelled out. But the officer admitted he did not make any effort to notify the family. I asked him specifically in that connection. He made no effort to notify the family.

I ask unanimous consent that further excerpts from Mr. Selby's statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Senator WILLIAMS. To your knowledge was there any effort—I will put it this way—did you at any time make any effort, either during your visit there or subsequent to your visit, to notify any member of her family as to her confinement?

Mr. SELBY. I did not notify anyone for the reason that her sister—having taken the information from Mr. Riggs that her sister had been called the day before and was on her way up.

Senator WILLIAMS. Who is this Mr. Riggs?

Mr. SELBY. He is in the employees' office of the Agriculture Department.

Senator WILLIAMS. Some employee of the Agriculture Department told you that they had talked to her sister the day before, and she was on her way up. Well, wouldn't it be logical to call her sister out at her home or wherever she was on her way up to? To your knowledge did anyone of the Department of Agriculture make any effort to contact any member of her family?

Mr. SELBY. That is what I just said. I mean not to my knowledge.

Senator WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. SELBY. I am only going by what I heard.

Senator WILLIAMS. What you heard, and even based on what you heard, the only call that you ever heard of was the one that was made the preceding day, is that correct?

Mr. SELBY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to review briefly the events as they occurred on that date, April 25.

Officer Selby was called at 11:32 a.m. He said it took him 7 or 8 minutes to get to the room, and that he arrived at 11:40. It was 12:10 when the patrol wagon arrived. They put her in the wagon and sent her to the hospital. In those 30 minutes he made a series of telephone calls, he made his diagnosis of the case, and he decided that she should be in a mental institution. What kind of a study and diagnosis is that? He had her taken without any doctor signing to put her in the institution. Neither of the doctors who allegedly authorized her to be taken ever signed any papers. They have not to this day signed any papers certifying as to her condition.

I am no lawyer, but if that is the law then before they get one of us we had better make sure we get this law straightened out. I question whether we could come out as well as she has.

The argument is made, "The proof is that she is sick today." I say to Senators, "If your wife, your sister or daughter were put in a cell for 12 days, I think you would find that she would be sick, too."

Any other person would be sick. That was a horrible experience, and to further try to discredit this girl now after what she has gone through is even more reprehensible.

I wish to review the whole list of peculiar circumstances which have surrounded this case from the beginning and circumstances which led up to the eventful date of April 25.

I go back to April 18. The girl was committed on April 25, but we should go back to the week preceding to see whether or not there was any basis for her disturbance.

Her boss had been working on an investigation which he thought developed information proving favoritism to Mr. Estes on the part of certain employees of the Department of Agriculture. That is the charge which Mr. Hales, her boss, had made. I am quoting again from the record.

The April 18 record shows that Mr. Hales went to the office of Mr. Hughes, the assistant to Secretary Freeman, and that he asked for an opportunity to see the Secretary. He wanted to call to the attention of the Secretary himself some of the things he thought the Secretary should know about this case. On April 19 he was asked to talk to the FBI representatives. That was a request with which he was glad to comply.

Apparently on that day Mr. Hales said he would prefer to discuss this case further with the FBI at his office. He made an appointment to meet the FBI representatives the following day in order to discuss the case with them at the office where he would have access to his files to prove to them what he was saying. That was a natural request.

The following day, April 20, Mr. Hales went to his office to meet with the FBI representatives to help them to prepare background information on some of this case. When he arrived at his office on April 20, he found that he had been locked out. Allegedly, he was told by the guard that he could go in and get his personal effects but that he had no further access to his files, that his files were being taken over, and that he was being transferred to another job in the stockpiling section in the Surplus Commodity Division of the Department of Agriculture, something which would have nothing whatever to do with any of the cotton acreage allotments or any of the activities which may have involved any of his previous work.

He was transferred. Therefore, he could not furnish the information to the FBI which he had been asked to furnish and which he would have liked to furnish. Why was this done?

That he was locked out of his office on April 20, apparently disturbed his secretary. Prior to this time, it should be emphasized, this girl, Mary Jones, had an excellent record of about 25 years of service with the U.S. Government. During that time there was not a single blemish on her record that I can find—not a blemish. During that time she had a very high efficiency rating as an excellent employee. That is the official record. There was no trouble prior to the rumbling of the Estes case. Certainly she got nervous. I venture to say that the loyal secretary of any employer would likewise have felt nervous and disturbed when her files were being ransacked. Remember that at this point she could well be the credible witness as to what was in those files.

Is it any wonder that we get suspicious when who could well be the only other witness as to what was in those files suddenly gets discredited in such a peculiar manner.

I do not know all the background of what led up to the case, but the record shows that on the day of April 25, this girl was forcibly taken from her office and carried over to another office, the office of the doctor. Yes, she was forcibly ejected from her office. Whether the girl refused to go when requested to do so I do not know. If she was ordered out of the office and if the person ordering her had a perfect right to order her out of the office and she declined to take that order, there are methods of handling such a case without sending the person to a mental institution. Had they wished to fire the girl

when she disagreed she could have appealed to the Civil Service Commission through regular channels. If someone wished to get her out of the building and she refused to go, she could have been charged in the normal fashion with a misdemeanor and taken down to the police court.

In order to get her out of an office it was not necessary to put her in a psychiatric institution. That is the point I make. I am not surprised that at that time she became disturbed.

It is important to have the background to show that this is far from an ordinary case. What had Mr. Hales said? He said that with his files he could prove that Mr. Marshall, deceased, had rendered an opinion that their plan to transfer cotton acreage in west Texas was illegal. Mr. Hales had also claimed that the manner in which the Department was letting Mr. Estes handle acreage allotments was wrong. He said there were also reports in the file concerning this recommendation of another important witness, Mr. Taylor Allen, which would support his charges.

Why should anyone be afraid to open up the files? Why not open up the files to find out whether Mr. Hales was correct? No, instead he was moved out of the office, and the files taken over by another man. On May 4, he had held a press conference, and at that time again had publicly offered to prove his charge if he could have access to his files. At this press conference Mr. Hales gave the name of the man who he said could support his charge that Mr. Estes had been getting favorable decisions from certain officials in the Department of Agriculture.

On May 7, Secretary Freeman in his press conference denied this, in effect. I wish to say, in reference to Secretary Freeman that I have made no charges of any impropriety on his part. I wish to emphasize that. I have not at any time joined even in saying that Secretary Freeman should resign. While I have been critical of Secretary Freeman, I have not said that. I have talked with the Secretary, and I have told him how I feel. I do say that it is time for Secretary Freeman to recognize the facts of life. If he is going to take it upon himself to assume full responsibility to protect all of those who are in the Department who have done wrong and if he is going to defend them, if he is not careful he will go down with the ship. I think that the Secretary, rather than resisting and fighting those of us who wish to help him, should recognize this.

Certainly there has been favoritism in the Agriculture Department. Who is so naive as to think that any private citizen ever approaches any Government official and starts giving away $500 bills or $1,000 bills or suits of clothes or mink coats or vicuna coats or rugs without expecting something in return? These lavish gifts are made for one purpose only—the expectation of something in return, and the record shows that the giver usually gets it. The fact that all of these gifts were floating around is certainly evidence of favoritism.

Secretary Freeman, at one of his press conferences, made an emphatic statement that the Government had not lost any money on the Estes deal. He said that the Government had not lost a dime. That was a broad statement and cannot be supported.

In fact, just 2 days after he made that statement the Department of Agriculture filed suit against Mr. Estes for $544,162.

Let us be realistic. If the man has done nothing what is he being sued for? The U.S. Government has filed this suit.

Then again at the press conference when asked about the manner in which the 1961 cotton acreage allotments had been handled Secretary Freeman said:

> Wait a minute. You say it strains of favoritism? Let me state that, before this case ever broke, what happened really, when you want to come right down to it, in these Texas counties, is something that nobody knows, and this perplexes me and it has been perplexing me from the first time that I went over the same thing that you are going over. And the reason nobody knows is because the key figure in this was the man who unfortunately is not alive. He was a key commodity man who was highly reputed and recognized, and there are different stories as to what he told the county committee to do, and nobody knows really what he did. This is the key, and that is the reason we cannot unlock this door. But nobody does know exactly because it was with the county committee.

But Mr. Hales had been claiming that somebody did know, and he named a Mr. Taylor Allen.

The man to whom the Secretary referred as being dead was Mr. Marshall. Mr. Marshall allegedly had committed suicide with a bolt-action rifle. Allegedly he shot himself five times with this bolt-action rifle. This is just about as weird a claim as what happened to Miss Jones. Both are too fantastic to be accepted.

I have nothing to prove that the Secretary made his statement other than on the basis of what he thought was the record. Therefore I make no condemnation of him if he will now proceed to correct the error. But I have been disappointed by his readiness to accept what happened to this girl as routine, and I am getting impatient at the lack of cooperation some of us are getting from his Department. Why was Mr. Hales denied access to his files? Should those files now fail to produce what Mr. Hales has alleged, who will ever know whether or not they have been stripped? Certainly these files were not confiscated for nothing. If Miss Jones is discredited as a witness, it could prove convenient to someone.

As evidence that Mr. Hales, the boss of Miss Jones, was correct in his allegation that there was another living witness to Mr. Marshall's decision, I refer to an article which appeared in Tuesday's Washington Daily News. This article quotes the same man, Taylor Allen, the former southwest area Director of the Commodity Stabilization Service, as offering to support the charge which Mr. Hales has made.

Mr. Allen said he was present at the January 17, 1961, meeting about which there has been so much controversy.

Let us get down to the facts of this case. I am asking the Secretary to cooperate with us. We want to know and certainly he should want to know who is responsible. I care not in which administration the responsibility lies. I have always said that neither political party has a monopoly on virtue. There have been scandals in both administrations. Human nature being what it is, unfortunately they continue. But the answer lies in how the problem is handled. What is needed is more aggressive action on the part of the leadership of this administration. What we need is their cooperation, and not their insistence that there is nothing wrong. Let us lay the whole record out and find out what has happened.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred as being published in the Daily News of Tuesday, May 15, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ESTES WAS WARNED AND USDA KNEW ABOUT IT

(By Jack Steele)

A former Agriculture Department official disclosed today that the Department has known for more than a year that Billie Sol Estes was warned in advance that his plan to transfer cotton allotments to west Texas was illegal.

The Department ruled officially only last week that the allotment transfers were illegal and slapped a $544,162 penalty on Mr. Estes, the west Texas farm tycoon who claimed influence in high places in Washington.

The former Department official who informed the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers of the warning to Mr. Estes is Taylor Allen, former southwest area Director of the Commodity Stabilization Service.

Mr. Allen said the warning was given by the late Henry Marshall, the Department's cotton expert in Texas, at a meeting in Mr. Marshall's office at College Station, Tex., on January 17, 1961.

Mr. Allen said he also was present.

He said Mr. Marshall gave the warning to John Dennison, attorney for Mr. Estes, and W. P. (Bill) Mattox, vice chairman of the Reeves County (Pecos) Stabilization Committee, which later approved many of the allotment transfers for Mr. Estes.

EMPHATIC

Mr. Allen recalled that Mr. Marshall had told Messrs. Dennison and Mattox emphatically that the proposal of Mr. Estes to transfer the allotments was illegal.

Mr. Marshall told them there was no chance to transfer these allotments to the Pecos area under the Agriculture Department's regulations, he said.

Mr. Allen added he had given this information to an investigator for the Department "more than a year ago."

Mr. Allen's version of the meeting was in sharp contrast to that given by Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman at a press conference last week.

Mr. Freeman said the meeting in Mr. Marshall's office held the "key" to the mysterious approval of the cotton allotment transfers for Mr. Estes.

DEAD

But he said the Department never had been able to find out what actually took place at the meeting because of Mr. Marshall's death. (Mr. Marshall was found dead in a field last June with five bullet wounds from a bolt-action rifle which were ruled to have been self-inflicted.)

"What happened really, when you come right down to it, in these Texas counties, is

something nobody knows * * * and the reason nobody knows is because the key figure in this was a man who unfortunately is not alive," said Mr. Freeman.

(In a Senate speech last night Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, alluded to the Freeman press conference, saying "we now have a new verb 'Freemanize,' which means to whitewash, to gloss over." Senator ALLOTT called for Mr. Freeman's resignation.)

Mr. Allen, however, said what happened at the meeting was "no mystery to me" and added that it should not be to Mr. Freeman or other Agriculture Department officials.

Reached by telephone at his farm home near Provo, Utah, Mr. Allen described in detail the January 17, 1961, meeting.

He said Messrs. Dennison and Mattox had requested the meeting with the Texas State Stabilization Committee, seeking approval for the allotment transfers for Mr. Estes. He recalled that the State committee arranged for them to meet, instead, with Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Allen said he was not familiar with all the details of the cotton allotment transfer proposals—but was certain Mr. Marshall had informed Messrs. Dennison and Mattox that they were illegal.

He recalled he had flown to Dallas with Mr. Dennison after the meeting and had discussed the matter further during the trip.

"Dennison tried to convince me all the way that Marshall's attitude was wrong and that it would be all right to transfer the allotments," Mr. Allen said.

Mr. Allen said an investigator for the Agriculture Department's "compliance and investigation division" later had telephoned him from San Francisco and then visited his home to obtain his story of the meeting and the warning to Mr. Estes and by Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Allen, who is a Republican, said he resigned from the Department on January 27, 1961—10 days after the meeting—because of the change of national administrations. He said his post was a patronage appointment.

Mr. Mattox told this reporter 10 days ago in Pecos that the Reeves County Stabilization Committee had approved the Estes allotment transfers after being advised by the Agriculture Department in Washington that they were legal.

Mr. Mattox later was suspended by the State stabilization committee because of his admission he had made a trip to Washington early this year as a guest of Mr. Estes to discuss the cotton allotments with Agriculture officials.

Mr. Freeman, at his press conference, said procedures followed in other States—under which similar transfers of cotton allotments were barred—"weren't followed in Texas."

"The only one who could tell what happened is Marshall—and Marshall isn't here," the Secretary said.

He did not mention Mr. Allen.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I certainly hope that the Department will give us greater cooperation in the future.

I conclude by repeating that I am more disturbed about what happened to this girl than I am about what favorable treatment Mr. Estes may have obtained. The loss of dollars can be replaced but we can never repay this girl for the suffering she has had to endure.

There can be no defense for the arbitrary manner in which her case has been handled.

I can see why this girl would become highly emotional. I can see a chance of her becoming hysterical under the conditions which existed. I still say that what she needed was some sympathy and help. Perhaps she also needed medical attention, but certainly she should not have been carted off like a criminal to a mental institution.

Why do these psychiatrists now, 10 days after having announced her dismissal as sane and of sound mind, reverse their position for no purpose other than discrediting her? At least they could certainly stick to their same story. They have not seen her in the past 10 days. Now, on second thought, they are trying to tell us a different story than what they released only 10 days ago. Let us never forget that the girl was committed to this institution without the signature of any doctor. Yes; she was certified 2 days later by a couple of doctors at the hospital, but she was carried to the institution without certification of any doctor. This is America. This is not a police state.

They did not even call her family. I have yet to hear anyone in the Government state that they called or tried to locate the family. In common decency that should have been done. This girl is an American citizen.

In the last couple of weeks we have heard a great deal on the floor of the Senate about civil rights. We have heard a great deal about what a great crime it is if someone is denied the right to vote. I agree that every man should have the right to vote. It is a sacred right that should be protected. But there are rights that are more precious even than the right to vote. I think it is about time that some of those who expressed such great interest in civil rights and the dignity of the individual should begin to express some concern about what is happening right here in the Nation's Capital.

Why is the Department not helping this girl rather than trying to prove that they did not make a mistake in the first place?

I want to cooperate with the administration in maintaining the integrity of this Government, but if they want my cooperation they had better start by correcting the injustice which has been done to this employee.

Then and only then will I have confidence in their sincerity.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment the senior Senator from Delaware for his very great contribution to a revelation of what happened in this case. The most ghastly incident that I think has come out of the Billie Sol Estes matter was not the attempt to circumvent the law, but the way Miss Jones was committed and held. I wish to express my own personal appreciation to the Senator for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate in such a well-documented and forceful manner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. As one who has been and still is interested in the Estes case I believe that from the standpoint of the money that has been lost by the Government we have a responsibility to follow through on that matter, but I am not half as much concerned about the loss of a half a million or a million dollars. The money which is gone can be replaced but this girl has lost something that cannot be replaced by the Senate or by her Government. This girl has been subjected to an indignity for which there can be no excuse.

I hope that in the future those who are responsible in the departments, instead of trying to defend their past mistakes will try to help this girl. This girl's family was miles away. She was alone. She was not allowed to call anyone. There was no friend around to help her.

PLANNED ORBITAL FLIGHT OF ASTRONAUT SCOTT M. CARPENTER

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to take just a moment to comment on an upcoming event of great interest to America and particularly to my native State of Colorado.

I refer to the flight, at this time scheduled for Saturday, May 20, in which a native of our State will carry the hopes of the world as he becomes America's fourth astronaut to venture forth into the still somewhat unfathomable mysteries of space.

Lt. Comdr. Scott M. Carpenter, of Boulder, Colo., is even now preparing to enter into final countdown for a three-orbit trip around the earth. Just as with those before him, this will be, we all pray, the successful culmination of years of intensive training and preparation. Having met and talked with Scott Carpenter, I know that he is eagerly anticipating this opportunity to be one of this country's pioneers into space, just as his forebears were pioneers into another new world about which comparatively little was known just a few generations ago, the Western frontier.

Colorado invites the world to join with us, on Saturday, as we prayerfully and pridefully watch this young pioneer make his contribution to this Nation's space effort.

And, as we listen, the words we shall listen for most are those words that have become such an accepted part of our language—"A-OK."

PROPOSED MANDATORY FEED GRAIN PROGRAM WOULD BE TRAGIC MISTAKE, SURE TO BACKFIRE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the farm bill will be the next order of business before the Senate when we convene on Monday. A few minutes ago the President of the United States, in his press conference, disclosed how vital will be the decision the Senate will make on the farm bill, and how vital that decision will be to our Nation, not only to the farmers, but also to all citizens from many standpoints, particularly in view of the tremendous cost of the farm program.

ADMINISTRATION BILL REJECTED BY SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

I wish to make it clear at the outset that the proposed Department of Agriculture mandatory feed grain program is not in the farm bill. It was eliminated in committee by my amendment, which was adopted by one vote. My amend-

ment replaced the mandatory proposal with a 1-year extension of the present successful feed grain law.

A few minutes ago I was asked whether I would support or oppose the farm bill on Monday. I am satisfied, at least, with the feed grain provisions in it, which I consider a substantial improvement. I have other amendments, and I hope certain specific details of the voluntary feed grain plan can be strengthened. I intend to offer my dairy income improvement plan.

I was asked my opinion on the farm bill in the course of a more or less unofficial nose count of Senators. I want to emphasize that the bill as presently written does not include the Department of Agriculture feed grain program. It contains an extension of the present feed grain law, and that is what I hope my colleagues will have the good sense to support.

Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to state in the plainest possible language exactly why I believe it would be a tragic mistake to enact a mandatory feed grains program as proposed by the Department of Agriculture, dependent on two-thirds of approval in a producer referendum. It would be especially tragic for feed grain, livestock, and dairy farmers.

MANDATORY PROGRAM SURE TO EMBARRASS SUPPORTERS AND REDUCE FARM INCOME SHARPLY

It would also be highly embarrassing to those who support mandatory feed grain legislation, if it should be passed, since it would certainly result in no price supports and all out feed grain production for at least 2 years, and perhaps much longer, with the grim consequences of cheap feed, distress hog and beef prices, and an even greater dairy surplus.

The reason for this is obvious. In the nationwide referendum of farmers required to put a mandatory program into effect, a majority would vote against it. Yet a minimum of two-thirds of those voting is needed to approve it.

If there is to be a mandatory feed grain program for 1963 a referendum must be called not later than mid-August, just 3 months from now. At that time the price of corn and hogs will be at or near their seasonal peaks.

Therefore farmers who market their feed grains through livestock, as well as the hundreds of thousands of feed grain producers in the so-called deficit feed grain areas of the West, the Northeast, the East, and the South, who obtain most of their income from other price supported crops or livestock, will vote heavily against the mandatory program. The proposed minimum acreage requirements will still permit hundreds of thousands of these farmers to vote.

Independent farm experts, reporters, and pollsters who have examined the situation agree that the mandatory program will be defeated in the necessary referendum.

NO DISAGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE WITH SECRETARY FREEMAN

This conclusion is not based on idle conjecture. Nor, as far as this Senator is concerned, is it in the least based on any opposition to the principle of supply management in agriculture. But because I strongly believe that the main requirement for any farm bill must be that it increases farm income while reducing costs to the taxpayer, I cannot bring myself to vote for a program which, on the basis of facts and logic, is so likely to backfire.

I fully recognize and support the overwhelming need to enhance the sadly deficient market strength of the farm sector of our economy. The inability of farmers as a whole to limit output to what can be sold at fair prices is perhaps the root cause of the farm problem. So a solution to the farm problem lies in finding ways to increase farmer's bargaining power relative to the other sectors of our generally prosperous economy. Without this no permanent improvement in farm income will be possible.

Believing this as I do, it should be abundantly clear that my opposition to the proposed mandatory feed grains program is in no sense based on any hostility to the Department of Agriculture or its able Secretary, my good friend Orville Freeman.

In spite of the attacks on Secretary Freeman, including the very recent attacks, I have the greatest admiration and respect for him and his staff. They have been doing an excellent job under difficult and trying circumstances.

But as I made plain in my statement in the Senate on April 17, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 6762, I cannot bring myself to vote for a program that demonstrably will result in income devastation for by far the largest group of farmers in our country—feed grains, dairy, and livestock producers.

DETAILED ANALYSIS, NOT BROAD GENERALIZATIONS, NEEDED

However, agreement on the need for supply management programs for agriculture is one thing. The specific circumstances and details and timing of a specific proposal are something quite different. And it is a regrettable lack of specificity in the arguments advanced in favor of the proposed mandatory feed grain program that has seriously beclouded the issue.

Broad, general utterances to the effect that "if farmers don't vote for marketing quotas, they should not have price supports" conceal the vitally important fact that, in the case of feed grains, several different types of farmers are involved, with sharply different, divergent interests.

It is one thing to say that price supports without supply management cannot be justified.

But it is quite another thing to say that farmers whose incomes depend entirely on feed grains or milk for manufacturing should be denied reasonable price supports because other producers of these commodities, whose incomes are protected in part by other price support and marketing order programs, vote against proposed mandatory marketing allotment programs.

If there were any indications that a two-thirds majority of feed grain producers as a whole would vote "yes" in the required referendum, the situation would be different. But the fact is there have been no such indications. Every poll and study taken in the past few months shows that feed grain producers overwhelmingly oppose marketing quotas. But if merely one-third plus one vote "no," the program is rejected and prices will plummet.

Mr. President, I questioned the Secretary of Agriculture on this point when he came before the committee. My staff and I have been in touch with him and his staff. We pleaded with him for days to give any information or any evidence to show that this referendum would pass. Absolutely none from any source has been provided.

Somehow this action of mine, which eliminated the administration's proposal on feed grains and extended the present program which the administration supported last year, has been interpreted as bitterness toward or a difference with the Secretary of Agriculture, or even with the President of the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. As I have said, I admire the Secretary of Agriculture, and I warmly support the President of the United States. But I just plain disagree with this proposal, on the basis of evidence and simple logic.

If a mandatory feed grain program dependent on two-thirds approval in a producer referendum should be enacted—in other words if the administration should win and knock out the feed grain provisions which the Agriculture Committee has placed in the bill, and should succeed in restoring the mandatory proposal—then I think the administration would live to regret it, and regret it in a short time.

Once again, however, I challenge the supporters of a mandatory program to come forward and say that in a referendum, a majority, let alone two-thirds, of the farmers would vote in favor of the proposal.

FACTS BEARING ON PROBABLE SUCCESS OF A FEED GRAIN MARKETING QUOTA REFERENDUM

An examination of economic factors, geographic dispersion, and size distribution of feed grain producers will readily show why a marketing quota referendum on feed grains, as proposed by the Department of Agriculture, would probably fail to pass.

Feed grains differ fundamentally from the crops that have been brought successfully under marketing allotment programs in that a large part of the output is not directly bought and sold in a marketplace, but is fed to livestock or dairy cows on the farm where it is grown. Farmers who are feeders of grain, far from selling their crop for cash, in fact buy large quantities of feed grain. In a great many cases they think it is in their interest to vote against a program which will have the effect of raising the costs of what they buy and of restricting the amount they are permitted to grow for themselves.

In addition, cotton and tobacco growers who receive a large part of their cash income from these price-supported crops tend to oppose a program which will restrict the amount of feed grains and milk they produce on their farms. Wheatgrowers in the deficit feed grain

areas of the Northern Plains and Northwest also tend to oppose a program which will limit the acreage of feed grains they may grow on their farms.

SIZE OF FARMS AND GEOGRAPHY IMPORTANT

Only slightly over half of the farmers eligible to vote in a feed grain referendum, as proposed, grow 50 acres of grain and are located in the main surplus producing areas. Just under half grow 25–50 acres and market all their grains through livestock, or are located in feed deficit areas. These small producers, as well as both large and small producers in feed deficit areas, have little direct interest in a proposed increase in support prices. But they have serious objections to a 15 to 25 percent acreage reduction.

The payments for acreage reductions that have been proposed hold little attraction for these producers. Indeed, in a sense they only underline what these farmers consider the chief drawback to the program, namely, that it will increase the cost of the feed they buy.

The adverse votes of these hundreds of thousands of farmers would prevent a marketing allotment program from coming into effect, even if it were favored in the main cash grain-producing areas by a two-thirds or greater majority. Even this is unlikely, as I shall discuss.

Estimates based on the 1959 census indicate there are 1,222,200 producers growing 25 acres or more of feed grains, who would be eligible to vote in a marketing quota referendum as proposed by the Department of Agriculture. Only 641,700, or slightly over half, however, grow 50 acres or more of feed grains and are located in the Central and Western Corn Belt and Plains States where the interest in selling feed grains for cash, and in a mandatory price support program is undoubtedly greatest.

The total picture can be seen in table 1, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—*Estimated numbers of farmers having specified acreages of feed grains (based on 1959 census)* [1]

	Less than 25 acres of feed grains	25 to 50 acres of feed grains	Over 50 acres of feed grains	All farms growing feed grains
Central and Western Corn Belt and Plains States including New Mexico and Arizona	202,000	147,000	641,700	990,700
Mountain and Pacific Coast States	22,500	12,200	35,400	70,100
East North Central (except Indiana and Illinois), Atlantic, and South Central States, including Arkansas and Louisiana	855,000	199,900	183,700	1,238,600
New England States	9,400	1,600	700	11,700
Total, United States [2]	1,088,900	360,700	861,500	2,311,100

[1] Acreage of feed grains per farm estimated by increasing the major feed grain in the State, corn, barley, or grain sorghum (oats in Maine) by the percentage which the total feed grain in the State is of the total major feed grain. In the Southwestern States where grain sorghum was the major feed grain, the total number of farms producing feed grains was estimated to be all those producing grain sorghum plus ⅔ those producing corn.

Under ASCS regulations a census farm where a tenant rents from more than 1 landlord may be listed as 2 or more farms.

[2] Estimated total census farms having 25 acres or more of feed grains and eligible to vote in a referendum, 1,222,200.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an additional 147,000 farms growing 25 to 50 acres of feed grains are located in these States. However, most producers growing such small acreages of feed grains are diversified livestock farmers and have little direct interest in feed grain price supports. They may not be fully aware of the basic feed grain-livestock price relationship. Time and again under the previous administration they were told that livestock prices were continuing at favorable levels because of the absence of Government programs for livestock.

I recall debating this point several times with the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. A widespread feeling exists on the part of farmers throughout the country that livestock is doing pretty well because it is out from under Government supports. The fact is that if we study or think about the question, we see that livestock has been doing well because there has been price support for feed grains. But a great many farmers are not fully informed about the extent to which livestock prices have been dependent on the feed grain price support programs.

Only a minority of these smaller, diversified farms are participating in the current voluntary feed grains program. An increase in the support price would have little interest to them, and it is probable that a majority of them would disapprove of marketing quotas on feed grains for 1963 if confronted with an allotment 15 to 25 percent lower than their usual acreage.

OVER ONE-THIRD OF FEED GRAIN PRODUCERS LOCATED IN DEFICIT AREAS

In the Mountain and Pacific Coast States on the west, and in the States east of the Corn Belt, including the Southeast, there are an estimated 212,100 farms growing 25 to 50 acres of feed grains and 219,100 growing over 50 acres of feed grains. Although a number of these larger farms sell a substantial part of their production on the market, most are located in deficit producing areas and, when acreage restrictions have to be complied with, tend to reject a feed grain price support program. Even fewer of the smaller producers in these areas are aware of the benefits to them of a national feed grain price support program. Few, if any, sell feed grains on the market. For these reasons, a substantial majority of all these producers will undoubtedly tend to oppose a mandatory supply management program which requires them to reduce their acreage.

It is not only a matter of theorizing, of analyzing the types of farmers who would vote, and of estimating on the basis of various logical methods how they might vote in their interest; but let us see what the professional pollsters, who have gone out into the field and asked the farmers, conclude.

SAMUEL LUBELL'S CONCLUSIONS

Samuel Lubell is a man who has devoted his life to this work. He is recognized as a competent professional pollster, known to be honest, and having integrity and ability.

Mr. Lubell, after interviewing farmers in 14 States in February and March, in a syndicated newspaper article April 3, 1962 concluded:

> Among the corngrowers I have talked with, and even more so the dairy farmers, opposition is strong enough to defeat any referendum for compulsory production quotas.
>
> If Congress goes ahead with the referendum votes, it will touch off a bitter political struggle through the Midwest that would dominate this year's congressional elections and threaten even safe congressional seats.
>
> Many smaller farmers say in protest, "A 20 percent acreage cut will force me to quit farming."
>
> * * * other farmers are fighting the program because they feel the formulas used for fixing acreage allotments are unfair to them.
>
> Every farmer interviewed was asked the showdown question raised in Kennedy's message: "Which would you take if you had to choose between a free market with no price supports, or price supports with compulsory controls?"
>
> The responses varied by commodity areas. Dairy farmers were strongest for "let supply and demand run the show" while only a small minority of wheatgrowers urged "turn the farmer loose."
>
> Among corn and feed grain producers [only] a small majority said "we'd have to take quotas. We can't live without price supports."

Possibly the answers to Sam Lubell's key question would be different if it were asked by a local farm leader who explained that the price of feed grains would average one-third lower in the absence of price supports. However, local farm leaders at the present time are being confused by many farm organization officers and staff who are unwilling to accept the analyses of leading economists at the land-grant colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture—that farm prices would drop sharply and remain at distress levels for an indefinitely long period if current price support programs are withdrawn.

TWO-THIRDS FAVORABLE VOTE UNLIKELY EVEN BY LARGER FARMERS IN CORN BELT AND PLAINS STATES

In view of this situation, it seems highly improbable that even as many as two-thirds of the larger producers in the central and western Corn Belt and Plains States, voting in the next few months would favor marketing quotas for feed grains in 1963. It appears doubtful that more than half of the smaller farms in these States would favor quotas.

Only a minority of Corn Belt farmers obtain price support loans. In 1957 and 1958, the last 2 years of the corn acreage allotment program, although the seasonal average market price was 29 cents and 24 cents per bushel below the loan

level for cooperators—noncooperators were eligible for loans made at lower levels—in Illinois the total number of corn loans equaled only 30 percent of the number of corngrowers with corn acreage allotments of more than 25 acres. In Iowa the number of CCC corn loans equaled about half the number of corngrowers with allotments of over 25 acres.

Another indication that a favorable vote as high as two-thirds by the larger Corn Belt farmers is unlikely, is to be found in a recent poll taken by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa. Of 1,051 officers and directors of local grain marketing cooperatives, usually cash grain farmers growing over 50 acres, only 430 indicated they would favor a mandatory program in 1963. The question "If Congress fails to appropriate sufficient funds to operate a voluntary program—similar to the 1961 program—would you be in favor of a referendum vote for a mandatory program with penalties for failure to comply?" was asked in December 1961 and although over 80 percent of the respondents had complied with the 1961 program only 42 percent favored a mandatory program at that time. The results of this poll suggest that an intensive educational program would be required to achieve even a two-thirds favorable majority in a national referendum on mandatory marketing quotas on the part of the larger farmers in the central Corn Belt.

PARTICIPATION IN THE 1961 PROGRAM BY GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

It is even more improbable that a two-thirds majority of producers in other sections of the United States will vote favorably on a referendum until an intensive educational program has been carried on over a considerable period. This is suggested by the record of participation in the current voluntary feed grain program.

The percentage of all corn and grain sorghum producing farms participating in the 1961 program by geographic areas is shown below:

	Percentage of all corn and grain sorghum farms participating in 1961	Estimated percentage of all farms having over 25 acres of food grains participating in 1961 [1]
North Atlantic	23	23
North Central	49	48
South Atlantic	25	49
South Central	33	51
West	37	54
United States	40	48

[1] Total number of farms and total number of participants less farms with less than 25 acres of feed grains based on 1959 census and farms that diverted their entire acreage—base acres up to 25.

REFERENDUMS TO BE HELD WHEN PRICES ARE AT SEASONAL PEAKS

In view of the level of participation in the voluntary 1961 and 1962 programs, the aggressive opposition of the major farm organization, and the opposition of much of the farm and local press, it would be difficult to obtain a favorable vote on mandatory feed grain controls even though the referendum were held when corn and hog prices were at their seasonal lows. In order to meet the needs of winter barley growers, however, the referendum for feed grain marketing quotas, as proposed, would be scheduled for not later than August 19—when corn and hog prices are usually at or near their seasonal high points.

At that time it is reasonable to expect that the market price of corn will be about $1.05 to $1.15 a bushel and hogs will average $16 to $18 per 100 pounds. Even though the referendum fails to carry, price suports for the 1962 feed grains will keep market prices at recent levels through August of 1963. Under these conditions, livestock economists do not expect hogs to be more than $1 per 100 pounds lower in August 1963 than in August 1962.

Farmers would be voting the second time on a referendum when the market price of corn was $1.05 to $1.15 per bushel and the price of hogs $15 to $17 per 100 pounds. It is most unlikely that the referendum would carry on the second vote under these conditions.

PRICES AT DISTRESS LEVELS BY 1964

However, with no price supports on the 1963 crop of corn moving to market beginning in November 1963, the market price probably would fall below 75 cents a bushel. Farmers would breed more sows for spring farrow in view of the low price of corn. Corn prices would continue at distress levels through 1964 and by late October 1964 hog prices might very well fall below $12 per 100 pounds.

Serious maladjustments would have occurred in the livestock industry before the third referendum would be called and even though a favorable vote were recorded it would be the fall of 1965 before feed grain prices would be affected appreciably. It is doubtful that a new Congress could or would allow distress feed grain and livestock prices to continue until then.

COMMENTS OF IOWA FARMER WORTH PONDERING

At the World Food Forum meetings commemorating the centennial of the Department of Agriculture, held here in Washington on May 15–17, Robert K. Buck, an outstanding Iowa farmer, made some significant observations relative to the decisions facing agricultural leaders in 1962.

Mr. Buck is the only man who has served on the Secretary of Agriculture's Advisory Commission under both Secretary Benson and Secretary Freeman. He has been a leader in nonpartisan factfinding meetings and organizations such as the Farm Policy Council. He followed the former Secretary of Agriculture and Vice President, Henry A. Wallace, on the program. During the course of his remarks, he made the following penetrating comments:

Mr. Wallace emphasized the important role of the 1 million commercial farmers who account for most of the amazing increase in American farm productivity. A large number of these farms are feed grain-livestock-dairy-poultry producers. They are found in every State. This is the more dynamic portion of American agriculture where the long-run growth potential is greatest.

During the program today celebrating the centennial birthday of the USDA and the land-grant system, I wondered what people might be saying on the 200th birthday of these two great institutions. Would they say—

"In the year 1962 (as the United States celebrated its first 100 years of agricultural development) the U.S. Government made an historic decision:

"Holding stocks of feed grains amounting to 3 or 4 months' annual requirements above reserve needs—after bumper crops accompanying 4 years of very favorable weather, after paying great homage to the productivity of the American farmer and praising him warmly, after determining to continue large public investments (in reclamation, research, education, and conservation) to further increase farm productivity—the U.S. Government decided that the cost of farm programs to deal with surpluses was intolerable and offered the Nation's feed grain-livestock producers a choice between (1) no program at all—no price support, no storage, no land retirement, or (2) a system of mandatory allotments for States, counties, and farms."

I must confess that I have mixed feelings on this matter myself, but I feel strongly that we should recognize that in the next few weeks our Congress will hammer out a very important national farm policy—more important than most farm leaders now realize.

COULD HOLD REFERENDUMS ON ALL MARKETING QUOTA PROGRAMS SIMULTANEOUSLY

In a letter which I sent to Secretary Freeman a week ago, I proposed that if a referendum on a mandatory feed grain program is to be held, it should be simultaneous with referenda on cotton and wheat. Each producer who grew one or more of these crops would be asked at one time to approve or disapprove programs for all the marketing quota crops grown on his farm. Quotas would go into effect for each crop where they were favored by a two-thirds majority of those voting who grow that crop.

Under such a voting procedure it would not be possible for a producer to approve marketing quotas for his major money crop and vote against a mandatory program for feed grains—and thus contribute to the defeat of a program supported in the major feed grain areas.

ADMINISTRATION BACKING NEEDED TO EXTEND PRESENT PROGRAM

Mr. President, I wish to conclude by noting that the support of the Department of Agriculture will undoubtedly be needed in order to win approval for extension of the present successful voluntary feed grains program. Without such support, all constructive farm programs could be defeated. I hope that support will be forthcoming.

With modifications, the current voluntary feed grains program can be continued for several years, and will reduce surplus stocks effectively at a much lower annual cost than that incurred for the 1961 or 1962 programs, which in turn represented substantial savings over a continuation of the program of the previous administration. It is popular. It is working. As I have said, it is reducing costs. It is practical. Why not continue this program, instead of moving into a program which could have such disastrous consequences.

FARM INCOME WILL FALL

Mr. President, what I have been arguing this afternoon as forcefully as I can is that the vote on a mandatory program is very likely to be negative. Then there

would be no controls and no price supports, and there would be chaos on the farms. There would be vast overproduction of very cheap feed, which would mean low farm commodity prices, low beef prices, a surplus of dairy products, and a tremendous potential future cost to the U.S. taxpayers, as well as the real possibility of a tragic farm depression.

The chronic low level of farm income is one of the most serious weaknesses in our economy. Farm prices and income are so low that, according to official Department of Agriculture statistics, farmers in my State average less than 60 cents an hour for their labor, although they invest an average $40,000 in their farms and have increased their efficiency enormously.

I feel very, very strongly that the Department of Agriculture is making a serious mistake. These men are extremely competent and able and very conscientious and good; but I think in this case they have erred, and this error will cost our farmers very greatly.

SENATE COMMITTEE FAVORS VOLUNTARY PROGRAM

Mr. President, by proposal—namely, the reenactment of the present, current feed-grains law—has, as I say, been favorably reported by a majority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and is part of the farm bill, S. 3225, which the State will take up on Monday.

I urge my colleagues to read this bill carefully, study it, and examine the facts I have presented today. If this is done, I am confident that the wisdom of continuing the present successful feed-grains program for a further period will be recognized.

Mr. President, in my statement of April 17, as well as in my letter of May 11 to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, I outlined in further detail why it makes sense now to extend this popular program. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAY 11, 1962.

HON. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate will be taking up the farm bill, S. 3225, soon. In the light of all available evidence, and I have reexamined it again in the past few days, I believe it would be a tragic mistake to enact mandatory feed grain legislation at this time dependent on two-thirds approval in a producer referendum. It would be especially tragic for feed grain, livestock, and dairy farmers.

It would also be highly embarrassing to those who support it since it would have the near-certain result of no price supports and all-out feed grain production for at least 2 years and perhaps much longer, with the grim consequences of cheap feed, distress hog and beef prices, and an even greater dairy surplus.

The reason for this is obvious. In the nationwide referendum of farmers required to put a mandatory program into effect, a majority would vote against it. Yet a minimum of two-thirds of those voting is needed to approve it.

If there is to be a mandatory feed grain program for 1963 a referendum must be called not later than mid-August, just 3 months from now. At that time the price of corn and hogs will be at or near their seasonal peaks.

Therefore farmers who market their feed grains through livestock, as well as the hundreds of thousands of feed grain producers in the so-called deficit feed grain areas of the West, the Northeast, the East, and the South, who obtain most of their income from other price-supported crops or livestock, will vote heavily against the mandatory program. The proposed minimum acreage requirements will still permit hundreds of thousands of these farmers to vote.

Independent farm experts, reporters, and pollsters who have examined the situation agree that the mandatory program will be defeated in the necessary referendum.

Time and again under the previous administration farmers were told livestock prices were continuing at favorable levels because of the absence of Government programs for them. They are not aware of the extent to which livestock prices have been dependent on the feed grain price supports. Yet about two-thirds of the feed grain producers who would be voting in the referendum in August market their feed grains through livestock rather than at local elevators.

As I stated on the Senate floor recently I have the greatest admiration and respect for you and your staff. You have been doing a tremendous job under very difficult circumstances. And I am in complete agreement with you and the President—we must develop farm programs which increase farm income and are less costly to operate.

I am sure your staff could and would conduct a vigorous educational program prior to the referendum. But farmers would be confused by woefully misguided farm organization officers and staff who disregard or deny the analyses of leading economists. These people, in spite of numerous studies showing the opposite, greatly minimize the current benefits to livestock producers of feed grain price supports. The local press and much of the farm press also would confuse and obstruct your educational programs by raising fears of excessive bureaucratic controls, the inequities of historical bases, and similar issues.

It is too much to expect even your highly capable staff to offset the effects of 8 years of misguided leadership by the previous administration and many farm leaders in 3 months.

The referendum on the mandatory feed grains program also would suffer from adverse votes of producers located in the deficit feed grain areas of the West, the Northeast, the East and the South who obtain most of their income from the sale of other price supported crops or livestock. Only about half of the feed grain producers in the United States grow more than 50 acres and are located in the Central Corn Belt or Plains States where interest in a mandatory program is highest. Even though a two-thirds majority of these producers desired a mandatory program—which independent experts doubt—it is likely to be denied them by the votes of the smaller producers and those in the deficit areas.

If a referendum for a mandatory program were called and failed in August 1962, existing price supports on the 1962 crop would hold the price of corn near the loan level of $1.20 per bushel through August 1963 when the second referendum would be scheduled under the proposed legislation. With corn prices supported at current levels hog prices also are expected by livestock economists to be at very satisfactory levels, $15 per 100 pounds or higher, in August 1963.

With corn and hog prices continuing at these levels for a full year after the first referendum was defeated, farmers might be even more susceptible to the arguments of those who deny the validity of the basic economic relationships between feed grain price supports, feed grain prices and livestock prices. Under these conditions the second referendum almost surely also would be defeated. Feed grain producers almost surely will be without price supports on both their 1963 and 1964 crops if the current mandatory proposals are adopted.

When the 1963 crop of corn moves to market beginning in November 1963, however, with no Government supports available, prices would quickly fall to distress levels—below 75 cents a bushel. Farmers would breed more sows for spring farrow in view of the low price of corn. Milk, poultry, and egg production would expand as a result of the cheap feed grains. By the fall of 1964 hog prices are likely to fall below $12 per 100 pounds, and other livestock prices would be under pressure from excessive market supplies.

Yet even though producers in a referendum in August 1964 approved marketing quotas—which is by no means certain—price supports could not become effective under the proposed legislation until the 1965 crops moved to market. This is a situation that no responsible Congress or administration should inflict upon feed grain-livestock-dairy producers if it can be avoided. And fortunately it can be.

The veteran poll taker and political analyst Samuel Lubell after interviewing farmers in 14 States in February and March, in a syndicated newspaper article, April 3, 1962, concluded:

"Among the corngrowers I have talked with, and even more so the dairy farmers, opposition is strong enough to defeat any referendum for compulsory production quotas.

"If Congress goes ahead with the referendum votes, it will touch off a bitter political struggle throughout the Midwest that would dominate this year's congressional elections and threaten even safe congressional seats."

There will be a better time and there must be more acceptable provisions for a mandatory feed grain program than those in the original bill, S. 2786. Given a few years of studies and planning, I believe an acceptable supply management program can be developed and put into effect.

With modifications the current voluntary program, if continued for several years, will reduce surplus stocks effectively at a much lower annual cost than was incurred for the 1961 or 1962 programs, which, in turn, represented substantial savings over a continuation of the program of the previous administration.

When your staff compared the cost of the proposed mandatory program with a continuation of a voluntary program, they did not take into account the improvements I offered as amendments to S. 3225, and which I will press for on the floor. With these amendments, the program can be even more successful in reducing the surplus, at even lower cost.

To be sure, if mandatory legislation is adopted, it is probable that all costs will be avoided. But the direct Government budget savings will be lost many times over by the heavy income losses of hundreds of thousands of feed grains, livestock, and dairy producers who account for two-thirds of all farm income. And the effect on small towns serving rural areas will be equally devastating.

Again I want to reemphasize my concern that we develop fair and reasonable price supports and supply management programs not just for the producers of commodities where the supply management problems are least difficult, but also for feed grains and dairy products.

Have you considered the possibility of holding simultaneous referendums on the same date on cotton, wheat, feed grains, and

also perhaps on the small-acreage crops: rice, peanuts, and tobacco? Each producer who grew more than one of these crops then could be asked at one time to approve or disapprove of marketing quotas on all the marketing quota crops grown on his farm. If he grew wheat and feed grains he would either approve marketing quotas for both crops or neither.

The votes of the producers of each crop would be counted and marketing quotas would go into effect for each crop where they were favored by a two-thirds majority.

Under such a voting procedure it would not be possible for a producer to approve marketing quotas for his major money crop and vote against a mandatory program for feed grains—and thus contribute to the defeat of a program supported in the major feed grain areas.

Like you, I want to press forward as rapidly as possible with farm program changes that will improve farm income, liquidate Government surpluses and reduce Government costs. I believe this involves adoption of the proposed wheat certificate plan this year with authorization for the Secretary to permit the planting of wheat on feed grain acreage allotments only where producers have complied with the minimum voluntary feed grain acreage adjustments. But in the case of feed grains I believe it would be better to continue with a modified, lower cost voluntary program for a few years while developing a more acceptable supply management program and educating producers as to the need for adopting it.

Although farmers are losing representation in our increasingly urban society I am confident the Congress will continue to approve farm legislation which promises to improve farm income and also reduce Government costs while dealing fairly with consumers.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some very interesting comments on the farm bill have appeared in newspapers published in the main feed grain area. I want to read from the column by Rex Conn, which was published in the Cedar Rapids Gazette on May 6:

The worst can be no program at all, with the vast accumulations of Government-owned surplus feed grains dumped on the market. This would be followed by an upsurge in cattle, hogs, and other livestock that would result in disastrous prices in another year.

In an editorial published on May 12, in the Des Moines Register, it is stated:

If Congress passes this legislation—

Which the administration has proposed to be applied to feed grains—

Freeman may wish later on that it had not. Opposition to the feed grain program of compulsory acreage allotments is fairly substantial. Many observers in the Middle West, supported by public opinion polls, believe that farmers would not approve feed grain controls by a two-thirds majority.

It is ridiculous to call this program repression or regimentation or the like, but the practical fact remains that many general grain and livestock farmers do not like the idea. If they turned it down, the administration would be in an embarrassing position. Freeman could say that farmers brought on the lower prices which would ensue by rejecting his program, but this would not win him friends.

Another reason why it might be a mistake to try a compulsory feed grain program now is that the voluntary acreage retirement program of 1961 and 1962 seems to be working well. An encouraging reduction in corn production was brought about last year, and the administration has been able to reduce its surplus stocks considerably.

Despite predictions of failure by opponents of the program, participation in the 1962 program will be larger than in 1961—that is, more feed grain land will be held out of production.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD these three articles that were recently published in the Cedar Rapids Gazette, the Des Moines Register, and Wallace's Farmer. One is by farm columnist Rex Conn, who writes for the Cedar Rapids Gazette. The second is an editorial which was carried in the May 5 edition of Wallace's Farmer. The third is an editorial from the May 12 Des Moines Register.

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

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, May 6, 1962]

IT'S TIME TO LOOK FOR COMPROMISE FARM PLAN

(By Rex Conn)

Several times in this column we have expressed concern that the battle over the proposed farm programs in Congress would end with neither side winning and farmers being left without any protection at all.

Many farmers and others say it is time "to get the Government out of agriculture." That's a good sound sentiment, but agriculture is hardly ready to be thrown off the end of the dock unprotected after having been buoyed up for more than a third of a century by Government programs of one kind or another.

It is going to take a little time to get the industry ready to go it alone. There is some doubt that it ever can be freed from all kinds of government aid and intervention. Practically every great agricultural nation in the world has some kind of government farm program in effect.

As we have pointed out before, it is doubtful that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman can muster enough votes to get his proposed mandatory feed grain program through Congress.

And if he did, it is still more doubtful that two-thirds of the farmers would vote for the kind of strict Government controls that it proposes.

The Farm Bureau's cropland retirement bill appears to have no better chance of passage. It has much to recommend it, but the opposition to the program seems to be insurmountable.

Although neither side appears to have much chance of getting its program adopted, there still has been no sign of willingness on the part of the leaders to search for a compromise program.

The best that can come out of the deal is an extension of the present feed grain program.

The worst can be no program at all, with the vast accumulations of Government-owned surplus feed grains dumped on the market. This would be followed by an upsurge in cattle, hogs and other livestock that would result in disastrous prices in another year.

A proposal has been batting around among some thoughtful people for some little time which Editor Dick Albright outlines in an editorial in the current Wallace's Farmer.

Rather than extend the feed grain program for 1 year, with another big fight assured when it comes up in Congress again next year, why not extend it for 3 years or so?

Dr. Louis Thompson, of Iowa State, says most of the increase in surplus feed grains the last 3 years can be attributed to unusually good weather. It is unlikely that such phenomenally favorable seasons can last forever, and the chances are better than even that an unfavorable season or two will have cut back the surpluses by the end of the 3-year period.

Secretary Freeman has been citing the cost of the present program as one of the main reasons for abandoning it in favor of his mandatory program.

As a matter of fact, the bulk of the payments to farmers have been made in terms of feed grains which the Government already owns. The program has called for comparatively little additional expenditure beyond the value of the grain.

Continuation of the plan for a couple more years should go a long way toward solving the problem of what the Government is going to do with its grain stocks.

Along with extension of the present program for 3 years should go some benefits for cooperators which are denied nonparticipating farmers.

Price supports on any commodity storage facility loans, ACP payments and other Government aids should be limited to farmers who are "in the program."

Along with the cutback in feed grain acreage, the program could well include provisions for long-range retirement of additional land into other uses. At the rate of 8 million acres or so a year, this long-range retirement would offset the return of land into production that has been tied up in the old soil bank program.

All this can be done on a voluntary basis, which would remove one of the most serious objections to the administration's proposed farm program.

And, of primary importance, it might be a common ground on which proponents of both the programs now before Congress can meet—at least after they have finally resigned themselves to the defeat of their pet measures.

[From the Wallace's Farmer, May 5, 1962]

THERE IS A GOOD WAY OUT

Corn Belt farmers are in danger of coming out on the short end of the farm policy battles underway in Washington. It appears to us that the wishes and the welfare of farmers have been pushed to the sidelines in a blind and vicious power struggle. Yet, a spirit of compromise and reasonableness could accomplish much in the way of helpful farm legislation this year.

Orville L. Freeman is probably the most aggressive and politically astute Secretary of Agriculture we've ever had. We think he is sincere in his attempts to get agriculture straightened out. But we also think he has tried to move too fast to use mandatory controls to cut farm program costs.

U.S. agriculture is exceedingly complex. We in the Corn Belt feel the weight of surplus feed grains, and are anxious to reduce them. But farmers (and their Congressmen) in feed deficit areas such as the Great Plains States and the States near our east and west coasts do not share our grief. Some want to be free to produce more grain if they can. Others want cheap midwest feed grains for their dairy cows and poultry.

The South wants to be free to put acres diverted from cotton into feed grains. And even in the heart of the Corn Belt, we doubt if anywhere near two-thirds of the grain producers would vote for a mandatory control program. Here, too, we fear the redtape and the freezing of historic production patterns.

So although Secretary Freeman hasn't given up the battle, it looks like Congress isn't going to give the administration what it wants in the way of lower cost, mandatory farm programs.

This situation provides an opportunity for the American Farm Bureau Federation to take the lead in working out a compromise

plan. But American Farm Bureau Federation leadership has not yet shown a willingness to do this. Farm Bureau stands fast on its cropland adjustment plan. Yet there is almost no chance at all that it will be passed by Congress this year. And even if passed, the President could be expected to veto it.

Farm Bureau's noncompromising stand can seriously damage our agriculture. Several of the administration's proposals—price supports at moderate levels, long-range land retirement, helping small farmers move to other jobs—should be music to Farm Bureau's ears. But there's no indication they've heard the tune.

It appears to us, then, that Corn Belt farmers are caught in a vise between two unrealistic forces. Moderate, middle-ground leadership is seriously needed. We think that much good can be accomplished by this session of Congress if farmers can present something resembling a unified front.

We've urged the continuance of the present feed-grain program in previous issues. We still think it is the only route that makes sense at this time. Farmers are proving this year for the second time that they are willing to participate in a voluntary program that will curb production and permit an orderly reduction in CCC holdings.

The Senate Agriculture Committee has voted to extend the feed-grain program for 1 year. We think it should now be extended for 2 or 3 more years. We'll need it at least this long, so why must we sweat out repassage every year?

Also, we strongly urge that Congress and USDA tighten up the rules to make the present feed grain program even more effective. Let's limit eligibility for soybean and other support loans to farmers who participate in the feed grain program. Also, let's make participation a requirement for ACP payments, storage facility loans, and any other USDA aids that apply. (See p. 44 for more on this.)

If USDA won't take this leadership, needed to improve the present program, where did it expect to get the "guts" to enforce the unpopular mandatory program proposed by the administration? Is it possible that the administration would like to see the present program fail?

While the feed grain program is continued, we should also continue to move some land into long range or permanent retirement each year. (The administration and Farm Bureau forces certainly should be able to get together on this one.) Let's improve and extend the conservation program to take some 5 to 8 million acres out of production per year.

The long range retirement plan would move toward getting things in balance permanently without disrupting communities unduly. Meanwhile, the temporary feed grain program can bring about much needed reductions in our feed grain inventory.

These suggestions seem reasonable to us. They can be accomplished if farmers and farm leaders will just pull together a bit for the good of agriculture. We think our farm leaders should give the future of our agricultural industry priority over efforts to save face and to stand on principle.

[From the Des Moines Register, May 12, 1962]

SUBSIDY VERSUS CONTROL

Agricultural Secretary Orville Freeman's proposed new farm legislation has squeaked through the House Agriculture Committee by a vote of 18 to 17. The bill was opposed by all 14 Republican members of the committee, including CHARLES HOEVEN, of Iowa, and three southern Democrats. In spite of this narrow vote, the Wall Street Journal considers that the odds favor the bill's adoption by the House.

The administration has fought hard to get this farm bill enacted. Secretary Freeman believes it is important to establish compulsory acreage controls for grains, which are the heart of the farm surplus problem. He consented to a considerable change in his dairy marketing control proposals, as a result of widespread opposition. The bill now provides for payments to producers who voluntarily reduce their milk marketings, instead of the original plan to establish compulsory quotas for first-class milk, with excess milk to sell at a sharply lower price. However, the wheat and feed grain provisions are essentially the same as originally proposed.

The grain programs would establish acreage allotments, and farmers could be penalized for exceeding their allotments. The programs would not go into effect unless approved by two-thirds of the farmers voting in national referendums.

If the feed grain program were not approved, there would be no control and no price support, and the Government could sell up to 7 percent of national feed grain needs from its stocks each year.

If Congress passes this legislation, Freeman may wish later on that it had not. Opposition to the feed grain program of compulsory acreage allotments is fairly substantial. Many observers in the Middle West, supported by public opinion polls, believe that farmers would not approve feed grain controls by a two-thirds majority.

It is ridiculous to call this program repression or regimentation or the like, but the practical fact remains that many general grain and livestock farmers do not like the idea. If they turned it down, the administration would be in an embarrassing position. Freeman could say that farmers brought on the lower prices which would ensue by rejecting his program, but this would not win him friends.

Another reason why it might be a mistake to try a compulsory feed grain program now is that the voluntary acreage retirement program of 1961 and 1962 seems to be working well. An encouraging reduction in corn production was brought about last year, and the administration has been able to reduce its surplus stocks considerably.

Despite predictions of failure by opponents of the program, participation in the 1962 program will be larger than in 1961—that is, more feed grain land will be held out of production.

In view of this record, it seems strange that the administration is so eager to try a more drastic program this soon. One of the main reasons appears to be to cut the cost of farm subsidies and raise farm income in the market. This is a worthy objective, but if farmers will not approve it, it will not work. If the voluntary program was disappointing for several years, then farmers might be willing to go along with a program requiring everyone to participate.

Wheatgrowers probably will support this kind of program now. Wheat has been a more serious surplus problem than corn, and the growers seem ready to discipline themselves to control it.

If Congress passes this bill, and if farmers approve the program contrary to our present estimate of farm opinion, we would not consider it to be a disaster. If farmers are willing to vote upon themselves this kind of regulation, in the interest of stabilizing production and raising their income, they ought to have the privilege of doing so.

However, they ought to have an alternative choice which would be more reasonable than the abandonment of regulations and price supports. Practically speaking, we are sure this would be the case. Congress is unlikely to throw out price supports completely, even though it means continued large Federal spending. But the way the bill is written now the choice before farmers would be compulsory control or nothing.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 21, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of May 16), 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Harold R. Tyler, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York. (A new position.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 10th Anniversary of Mad Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 10th anniversary of a publishing phenomenon that exemplifies one of the strengths of our free society. I refer to Mad magazine, which for the past 10 years has humorously pointed out the laughable foibles of business, labor, advertising, television, sports, and entertainment—to say nothing of politics.

Mad magazine has let people laugh at those in high places without damage to those high places themselves. It has poked fun at many aspects of the American scene, and the country is the better for its raillery. We are all apt to take ourselves too seriously at times, whether we are businessmen, newspapermen, lawyers, or even Congressmen. It is then that we are fair targets for the satirist, if we live in a truly free country with a truly free press.

This magazine has succeeded in tickling America's funnybone during this Mad decade because Americans are always ready to laugh, even when the joke is on them. Some of our greatest Presidents, for example, relished the political satirists of their day. Lincoln was an Artemus Warde and Petroleum V. Naseby fan, Theodore Roosevelt read Mr. Dooley to his Cabinet, and the ready quips and

hearty laugh of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman are familiar to all of us today. President Kennedy's quick wit is already historic.

I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why we in the Congress of the United States, who have so often been the target of Mad's jests, should not in a spirit of good humor nevertheless publicly congratulate the magazine that mocks us and those responsible for its success. As their victims, we may not always be glad, but as good sports, we hope they will always stay Mad.

National Science Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1962

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Eighth District of Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent, is exceedingly proud of the accomplishments of a very lovely and talented young lady, Miss Bette Jane Wyckoff, of Quakertown, Bucks County. For in the National Science Fair recently concluded in Seattle, Wash., Bette Jane received the top chemistry award for her remarkable research project, microelectrophoresia, the separation into different bands by an electric charge of proteins and liproproteins found in the bloodstream.

Considering the nature of the competition and the high standards of this nationwide assembly of young scientists, we of the Eighth Congressional District are all the more elated because the No. 1 chemistry award went to Bette Jane. If any further evidence was needed that we have arrived at equality of the sexes, this was it.

Bette Jane is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Elmer E. Wyckoff, 341 Edgemont Avenue, Quakertown. She is a senior at Quakertown High School. She was encouraged in this project by her science teacher, Mr. Warren S. Buck, who has very modestly disclaimed any credit and has rather chosen to point to the fact that Bette Jane put in 2 years and nearly 700 hours—often working until 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning—on this intricate scientific project.

Bette Jane's trip to Seattle was made possible by her winning the grand prize award at the Lehigh Valley Science Fair sponsored by the Call-Chronicle Newspapers of Allentown, also in our Eighth Congressional District. Mr. Gordon Fister, associate editor of the Allentown Morning Call, who was just reelected chairman of the National Science Fair Council, made the trip to Seattle and his excellent writings enabled all of us to follow with close attention Bette Jane's attainments. The Quakertown Free Press and other area newspapers also have been very generous in their acknowledgment of this talented young lady's achievements. Dr. Watson Davis, director of Science Services of Washington, D.C. originators and sponsors of this program, presented the award.

I am sure that Members of the Congress join with me in paying honor to Bette Jane Wyckoff, winner of the top chemistry award in the 1962 National Science Fair.

Tribute to UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in our anxious determination to secure a peaceful, harmonious world order, we often tend to overlook the many allied agencies who are now making quiet and significant contributions toward that goal. I believe that it is a good idea to stop and pay tribute every now and then to these well-meaning and meaningful peace efforts, and today I should like to commend the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and particularly its U.S. National Commission.

It was less than a month ago that our National Commission for UNESCO met here in Washington for their annual spring conference. It is an unfortunate fact that there is little public attention given to the Commission, and, indeed, UNESCO itself is rarely mentioned in the press except when it comes under attack by uninformed and irresponsible citizens. Consequently, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a report of the meeting as it appears in the Commission's May newsletter:

U.S. SUPPORT FOR UNESCO PLEDGED

It is U.S. policy to lend all possible support to UNESCO and make it a strong instrument for good in the world, the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO was told at its annual spring meeting in the Department of State, April 26–28.

In his final address to the Commission as Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Phillip H. Coombs said this country will go to the next general conference next November well prepared and ready to play a strong role in the debates.

The Commission was created by Congress in 1946 to advise the U.S. Government in matters relating to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Mr. Coombs spoke at the first plenary meeting held in the Benjamin Franklin Room where diplomatic dinners are held. He used the occasion to review recent accomplishments in the field of educational and cultural exchanges such as the enactment of the Fulbright-Hays Act, plans for African students in this country, the teaching of English abroad as a second language, mass techniques in education, low-cost books for underdeveloped countries, educational programs in the Alliance for Progress, and American-Japanese cultural relations.

In assessing the role of UNESCO, Mr. Coombs noted the organization had exerted leadership in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, and had brought the educational needs of these continents into sharper focus. On the basis of his own travels, Mr. Coombs said he was much impressed by the confidence of educational leaders of Latin America, Africa, and Asia in the work of UNESCO.

Mr. Coombs cautioned, however, against making UNESCO primarily an agency for international aid. UNESCO, Mr. Coombs stressed, cannot tackle alone the overall task of providing for the world's educational needs but must work with other international agencies and with bilateral aid programs.

George V. Allen, Chairman of the Commission, felt that while there will be increasing pressures on UNESCO for technical assistance, "we should have a certain amount of reservation against letting UNESCO become another aid organization."

Mr. Allen observed that UNESCO, as the successor to the International Committee for Intellectual Cooperation organized by the League of Nations, was designed to build international understanding across national boundaries and not to be strictly an assistance agency.

Speaking on present and future activities of UNESCO, Dr. Hilliard Roderick, deputy director of the UNESCO Department of Natural Sciences, noted that a higher percentage of the overall budget was devoted to technical assistance projects while the staff, on the other hand, was devoting most of its time to other parts of the program.

Another main speaker, Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, outlined the major reasons why the United Nations serves the national interest.

In the last plenary meeting held in the International Conference Hall, the Commission heard reports of the various technical committees which had met for the 2 previous days.

The Committee on Natural Sciences discussed the UNESCO program in scientific documentation, hydrology, marine sciences, and laboratory animals. It recommended, among other decisions, that UNESCO take steps to insure the continued effectiveness of scientific apparatus and laboratory equipment sent to underdeveloped countries. The Committee noted that it had become apparent to the casual observer that some equipment is no longer in use for lack of small and inexpensive spare parts.

The Committee on Social Sciences recommended that the long-range view of the UNESCO program in the social sciences be part of the next annual meeting of professional organizations and societies. The Committee also discussed the need for research programs in linguistics, population heredity, law and social development, and the need for research stations in New Guinea and Africa to study the remaining populations unknown to science.

The Committee on Mass Communications urged that UNESCO and the Commission use their influence to insure that radio and TV programs by communications satellites include adequate programs of educational scientific and cultural content. The Committee also recommended that UNESCO give major emphasis to demonstrating the use of low-cost mass media techniques in underdeveloped countries, particularly printing techniques, transmitters, and film equipment.

On the question of the free flow of information, the Committee urged a study of unfulfilled objectives and obstacles, which still impair this major objective of UNESCO.

The Committee on Education urged that UNESCO collect reliable educational statistics from all countries for use by independent nations and by the world community of educators, planners, and policymakers. The Committee commended UNESCO for its regional conferences in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and for its support of educational development in these continents as part of their social and economic development. The Committee also commended UNESCO for its work in comparative education and urged

more publications and conferences to capitalize on new developments in the field.

The Cultural Activities Committee recommended that UNESCO produce reading materials for new literates in Africa similar to a project in operation in Asia and urged a steady expansion of libraries and archives in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The Committee also urged that UNESCO organize an exhibition of paintings by young artists. In the field of humanistic studies, the committee urged interested organizations to see how they can give greater support to the UNESCO program.

The Committee of the East-West Major Project concerned with the mutual appreciation of cultural values between the Orient and Occident reviewed activities undertaken in this country and discussed the possibility of a clearing center for information on all such activities.

In a show of common interests, the Canadian National Commission sent a nine-member observer delegation consisting of Cyril Belshaw, Director of the U.N. Training Center, Vancouver; Eugene Bussière, Secretary of the Canadian Commission, Associate Director of the Canada Council; Mary Dench, Information Division, Department of External Affairs; Pierre Gendron, dean of the faculty of science, University of Ottawa; Nathan Keyfitz, professor of sociology, University of Toronto; Lewis Perinbam, Associate Secretary, Canadian Commission; Vincent Price, attorney; Guy Roberge, Canadian Government Film Commissioner; and J. Frank Leddy, Chairman of the Canadian Commission, vice president (academic) of the University of Saskatchewan.

A highlight of the meeting was a concert in Lisner auditorium by Joan Baez, the young folk singer whose father, Dr. Albert Baez, is a physicist on the staff of UNESCO in Paris. The concert was a benefit performance for the Commission.

This give and take between the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and the State Department is certainly beneficial and it undoubtedly helps to improve UNESCO's programs and policies. Before continuing with an outline of the Commission's and UNESCO's activities, I should like to call particular attention to the final event of the meeting, a benefit concert by Miss Joan Baez. I believe that this was an altogether appropriate and fortuitous means of supporting our participation in UNESCO. As much as any performer of American folk music, Miss Baez is responsible for a renewed, serious interest in our unique cultural heritage. I believe that we can be justifiably proud of the appreciation we find abroad for our various types of folk music, including jazz, and since Miss Baez has enhanced this musical tradition with extraordinary talent, her concert was not only a financial contribution to UNESCO, but an American cultural contribution as well.

The National Commission has another important role besides advising our State Department on UNESCO matters. Once every 2 years the Commission sponsors a major conference in order to promote a better understanding of other parts of the world. Last year, for instance the Commission held a 4-day conference in Boston on the theme of "Africa and the United States: Images and Realities." The conference not only brought together the vast majority of African scholars in this country, but it also enabled hundreds of other persons with an interest in Africa to become better acquainted with the people and problems of that continent.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to summarize the part which UNESCO itself is playing in helping us bring about a friendly community of free nations in this world.

The basic objective of UNESCO is to promote peace and understanding through international cooperation in education, science, and culture. UNESCO is constantly striving to help peoples help themselves. In the field of education UNESCO is assisting new nations, at their request, in building schools, in providing teachers and teaching equipment, and in establishing adult education centers. In science, UNESCO is promoting research in desert lands and increasing man's knowledge of the world's oceans. Out of the desert institutes and marine sciences laboratories that are being established and strengthened at the urging of UNESCO will come knowledge which will create a better life for future generations. One of UNESCO's major cultural projects is devoted to increasing mutual understanding between the peoples of the Orient and the peoples of the Western World. In a world where it now takes hours rather than months to travel from one hemisphere to another it is vital that an effort be made to have peoples of various parts of the world know each other better. UNESCO is making that effort.

I am confident that I speak for a large majority of my contituents, as well as millions of Americans all over the country, in commending UNESCO and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO for their constructive work during these troubled days.

The Allegheny Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 17, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on May 10, hearings were held on the proposed Allegheny Parkway before Senator ALAN BIBLE's Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement which I made at the hearings be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, CONCERNING S. 1798, AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF THE ALLEGHENY PARKWAY, BEFORE THE PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, MAY 10, 1962

Mr. Chairman, on May 3, 1961, I introduced S. 1798 for myself and my colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, and for Senator BUTLER and Senator BEALL, of Maryland, and Senator COOPER and Senator MORTON, of Kentucky. S. 1798 provides for the establishment and administration of an Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland. Before proceeding further with my statement, I wish to thank you for affording us this opportunity to be heard on the bill, and I am particulary grateful that you, and the members of your subcommittee, have very graciously consented to hear the Governor and three members of his official family this morning so as to permit them to fulfill another engagement this afternoon at Blackwater Falls, W. Va. I am grateful to the other cosponsors of this bill who have consented to the Governor and his party's appearing earlier so as to accommodate their going on to the Blackwater Falls meeting.

At the outset I should say, too, that I have received hundreds of letters from West Virginians expressing support of this bill. I will not present these letters to the committee, but I would like, with your permission, to present for the committee files, resolutions from chambers of commerce and various civic organizations and other groups in West Virginia in support of the proposal. I could have had many persons appear and testify but, inasmuch as you have expressed the hope, Mr. Chairman, that the hearing could be confined to a single day, I have tried to limit the number of West Virginia witnesses so as to comply with your wish, and so as to also avoid imposing upon the time of other Senators who will want to be heard and who may likewise have constituents appear from their States.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed Allegheny Parkway would be a unique asset for our country in several important respects:

1. It would virtually be a roadway to the regeneration of many areas of economic distress and chronic unemployment. Construction of the parkway would make possible vast new economic opportunities for the people in my State, and for the people in those areas of Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky which it would traverse. It should provide corollary benefits to the people of Tennessee living adjacent to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, the southern terminus of the parkway.

2. The Allegheny Parkway would complement existing and developing highway systems, and thus connect a considerable number of points of outstanding historic and scientific interest. At the same time, it would make available vast stretches of scenic grandeur, and areas of great recreational potential, in a section of the country readily accessible to one-third of the Nation's population by less than 1 day's drive.

3. The parkway would be a Federal facility of enduring and increasing value in that it would stimulate a growing tax base from all of the areas adjacent to it. Moreover, it would open up heretofore inaccessible areas of rich natural resources, especially in the high mountainous sections it would traverse. S. 1798 permits access to those resources for economic exploitation. I might add that this stipulation in the bill would be especially beneficial to the Federal Government because it would afford greater revenues from timber sales in the Monongahela National Forest. The parkway would run through approximately 130 miles of the Monongahela National Forest, cresting many of its highest ridges.

4. The Allegheny Parkway is envisioned as part of a scenic and recreational corridor extending from Maine to the estuary of the Mississippi River. Such a parkway could add tremendous impetus to the Government's program to encourage travel in the United States by people of other countries, and thus help to stabilize our balance of payments and reverse the outflow of our gold reserves.

Physically, the proposed Allegheny Parkway would have its northern terminus in

the vicinity of Hagerstown, Md. That city is a hub for roads running to the west and to the north, as well as to the south and to the east. From Hagerstown, the parkway would run through 15 or more West Virginia counties, for the most part cresting mountain ridges in those counties. It would then probably cross the southwestern corner of Virginia, and continue on to the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park near the Kentucky-Tennessee border.

The Secretary of the Interior would select the route of the parkway and would acquire the necessary land. Acquisition of land would include space for recreational areas in connection with the parkway. Where the parkway traverses national forests, S. 1798 directs the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service to cooperate in developing recreational sites and facilities accessible by and from the parkway.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the economic justifications for authorizing construction of the Allegheny Parkway are concerned, they are manifold. For many years our Government has been wrestling with the problem of economic decline in the Appalachian region. I will not burden this committee with a long account of the reasons for this decline. It is important to state, however, that this decline can be reversed by assisting the people in the Appalachian highlands to make their areas recreational centers for the millions of people who live in our large urban centers in the East.

We in West Virginia are cognizant of the following three facts:

1. We must depend to a growing degree upon tourism and recreation for economic growth.

2. Our scenic and natural wonders are numerous and unique, but, unfortunately, to a large extent, they are either inaccessible or difficult to reach.

3. We must find ways to provide improved and new recreational resources for the growing demands of the millions of people in the eastern United States.

I might say, parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, that as we meet here today, persons representing various segments of economic activity in West Virginia, are concluding a 2-day "travel clinic" for this very purpose at Blackwater Lodge, near Davis, W. Va. The "travel clinic" endorses S. 1798 because of the many promises it holds for West Virginia, and because it would make accessible a line of panoramic views unparalleled anywhere east of the Mississippi River. The highest mountain ranges to be found in the East are in West Virginia.

Recreation has become one of the major industries in the United States, and an indispensable part of the American way of life. Today, the great majority of Americans are able to spend as much as one-third of their life span in leisure activities, according to the U.S. Travel Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Attendance records at national park and national forest recreation areas during the last decade are illustrative of the phenomenal growth of interest in these forms of recreation in the United States. During the last 10 years, the number of visitors to National Park Service areas increased by 113 percent, while usage of national forest areas rose 238 percent.

This increased demand for outdoor recreational facilities has also been experienced by the recreational areas managed by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the State park systems. There is every indication that these growth trends will double by 1972, and more than double again by the end of this century. The Allegheny Parkway can make a valuable contribution toward meeting the Nation's recreational needs.

The habits of tourists have been studied by the U.S. Department of Commerce and by private organizations. It has been found that 80 percent of tourists go by auto. While traveling, 69 percent stay in motels, 29 percent stay in hotels and resorts, and 27 percent stay with friends and relatives. It has also been found out that the average annual expenditures per family for vacation travel is $400.

Based on the experiences of the comparable Blue Ridge Parkway, the Allegheny Parkway, which would be closer to the East North Central States, should attract a million annual visitors within a few years after its construction is far enough advanced to make a major segment of it available. It should be added that last year some 6 million travelers enjoyed the Blue Ridge Parkway, and spent an estimated $60 million in 1961 along the parkway and in adjacent communities for food, lodging, gas and oil, and other miscellaneous items. This figure is expected to reach $70 million by 1966 when the Blue Ridge Parkway is fully completed. Thus, it can readily be seen how the Allegheny Parkway, supplementing existing highways and the interstate highway network, would bring equally important economic benefits to all of the areas in all of the States which it would traverse.

Some idea of the potential income that might accrue to the States and their communities through which the Allegheny Parkway would pass, may be gained by considering a few of the findings of the Outdoor Resources Review Commission contained in its report of January 1962:

1. Tourist expenditures are estimated at $25 billion annually.

2. Fishermen spend about $3 billion annually on their sport; hunters spend approximately the same amount annually. Thus, annual expenditures for hunting and fishing are approximately $6 billion.

3. It is estimated that visitors to Federal and State parks, forests, and reservoirs, spend over $11 billion annually.

4. An estimated $21 billion was spent at the retail level during 1958 for boats, engines, fuel, storage, repair and servicing, insurance, and other items connected with boating. Later figures are not available as yet, but it is believed that 1961 figures would show a doubling of the 1958 figures.

5. The Commission believes that outdoor recreation activity, already a major part of American life, will triple by the year 2000.

The effects of outdoor recreational facilities on an underdeveloped area are amply illustrated by the experience of the completion of several large reservoirs in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Missouri. In the period 1950–60, 17 counties having major reservoir shorelines, lost population at a far lesser rate than other nearby counties, according to the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

From 1949 to 1959, annual per capita income in the reservoir areas of Arkansas increased 57 percent—from $669 to $1,053, compared with an increase of only 23 percent in the State's other counties. Bank deposits increased approximately 58 percent from 1949 to 1958 in the counties in Arkansas where recreational facilities were available; in the State's other counties, the increase in that period was only 40 percent.

Tax collections showed a similar increase. In 10 counties of Oklahoma, tax collections were up 64 percent where recreational facilities were located, and up only 3 percent where there were none.

There have also been vast increases in capital investments in the reservoir areas of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Missouri. Overnight accommodations increased from $1.4 million in 1945 to $20.8 million in 1959. Construction of private homes and cabins grew from $86,000 in 1945 to $20.8 million in 1959, and are now estimated at about $32 million annually in those reservoir areas.

It has been the experience of the National Park Service that when a new park or similar area is established, tremendous local economic activity follows. In the regions adjacent to the new recreational facility, commercial enterprises expand, new ones are developed to meet the needs of park visitors, local tax revenues swell, and there is a general increase in employment opportunities.

An example of this is to be found at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Examination of tax records for the county wherein this Federal facility is located shows that assessed valuation within the county more than doubled within the same 6-year period that the tourist trade to that recreational area doubled.

Mr. Chairman, the Allegheny Parkway is needed by the people in the Appalachian highlands. It is also needed by the millions of Americans who are seeking new recreational opportunities. Its cost to the Federal Government would be repaid many times over by increased tax revenues from areas that currently yield low tax returns to the Federal Treasury. In short, construction of the Allegheny Parkway would be a good and sound business proposition no matter how one looks at it. I urge this committee to recommend that its construction be authorized.

A Healthy Economy Can Thrive Only in a Climate of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1962

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, those Members of this august body who have taken the time to listen to businessmen express their views on matters of vital concern to all of us must realize that this important segment of our economy is deeply apprehensive of this administration. From my own district in Illinois small and big business proprietors alike express deep discontent over the "anti-business attitude" of the Kennedy administration. This lack of confidence in the business world should be of vital concern to every American in every walk of life.

America was built by private capital, ingenuity and the persistent drive, all of which created an economic and industrial nation of great strength and stability. It provided the highest standard of living for the greatest number of people of any nation in the world, including those which had thousands of years of civilization behind them when our forefathers arrived on this continent.

Business and industry, like the labor movement, has not been without its malpractices of one nature or another over the years. Because government at both a State and Federal level recognized the need for reforms, it has acted to meet the collective problems which developed with the growth of a great nation. This has been accomplished through legislation reflecting the wisdom and judgment of the elected representatives of the people. The preservation of the free enterprise system dictates this pursuit in meeting our national needs. And as

long as the American people have a voice in these matters through our representative form of government, we have a system able to maintain the balance within our great economic structure which is essential to growth and progress.

It is high time that we recognize that if business progresses and profits, so do its counterparts. But it becomes a matter of national concern, it seems to me, when businessmen in a great nation of free enterprise are widely plagued with a host of fears and find themselves in a climate of constant pessimism.

We have heard a great deal of talk about expanding our national product. But unless a reasonable feeling of confidence prevails in the business and industrial world, we cannot expect to achieve this goal. Certainly there is no better proof of this fact than is reflected in the activity of the stock market in recent months.

We must have more jobs to meet the exploding population of this country. But permanent jobs which contribute to the well-being of the Nation and its economy are provided by private enterprise, not by government. Lack of confidence on the part of the business community stunts adequate expansion of business and industry, thus curtailing employment opportunities.

It has been politically expedient and almost saddening to find that many Americans, goaded into looking upon our great industrial society as a series of components, each combating the other for personal economic gain. This is particularly strange when one stops to consider that industrial expansion and investment during the past half century has consistently resulted in improved wages and job opportunities for all Americans. When business begins to slip and profits go down, our national income follows suit.

We have seen tax dollars, a substantial portion of which were contributed by American business, used to provide other industrial countries with the latest equipment and modern technological facilities, creating competition which has cost us markets abroad and, of course, American jobs at home.

As for the effect Government policies have had upon the other nations of the world, it is interesting to note the reactions of fiscal experts abroad. Typifying this reaction is the direct criticism which recently appeared in the Statist, authoritative British journal of industry and finance:

The fact that for 6 years the share of profits in the distribution of the growing national income of the United States has been falling, suggests that this is a well-defined and established trend.

It may at first sight seem highly paradoxical that this retreat on the part of profits going to enterprise should occur in what, by general consent, must be regarded as the headquarters of private capitalism.

The paradox lies in the widely accepted, but false, view that the United States provides the setting for the world's most uninhibited free-for-all capitalism.

In many respects the American is one of the most regulated economies of the free world. In few other capitalist countries are the banking and insurance companies and the capital market so hemmed in and often restricted by regulations as in the United States, where the State and Federal authorities vie with one another for disciplinary power.

President Kennedy is acting in accordance with this tradition of administrative and executive interference.

In his endeavor to control prices, he is applying his own version of a pause policy; but in contrast with that operated in Britain, the President is applying the pause to prices and, since it has not been applied to wages and other elements of cost, it may cause profits not merely to pause but to retreat smartly.

This kind of socialist capitalism will work well enough if basic economic policies are sound. If, on the other hand, the attempted control of prices is divorced from a corresponding control of demand and of the currency supply through which demand becomes effective purchasing power, President Kennedy will merely have indulged in the time-honored but futile pastime of plugging the thermometer in order to cure the fever.

Punitive Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the time the Committee on Ways and Means reported to the House on the Revenue Act of 1962, H.R. 10650, I joined with my Republican colleagues in filing separate views which in part protested the bad judgment and poor policy inherent in some of the provisions of the bill adversely affecting the operations overseas by American free enterprise. Because I felt so strongly about the inherent risks and dangers of "punitive taxation" against American industry engaged in world commerce, I filed additional views devoted almost exclusively to the foreign income features of H.R. 10650.

I pointed out in my individual views:

These Treasury-espoused tax changes affecting foreign income threaten the ability of American private enterprise to compete and share in world trade. These changes would tax American industry and commerce on veritably phantom income—income that has never been received—under arbitrary and unprecedented tax concepts forcing a retrenchment in the role of American business in domestic and foreign trade. The resulting impairment of our contribution to free world strength and progress would be a major benefit to the Communist bloc. To the extent that there is a tax-induced decrease in the role of the private sector of our Nation's economy in the development of the emerging countries, there will be increased dependence on less effective government-to-government aid at a vastly greater cost to the U.S. taxpayers.

In these views I also pointed out how American enterprise operating abroad was already subject to more confiscatory taxation than is applicable to the nationals of other countries in the world who compete against the efforts of American industry.

I asserted that administration officials were more responsive to the urgings of Common Market country finance ministers that higher taxation be placed on American industry than to the protests of American producers against these Treasury-espoused steps to place American free enterprise at a further competitive disadvantage. In my conclusion I stated as follows:

The Treasury proposals to change the tax rules for doing business abroad will unreasonably penalize those business entities on which America relies to perform vital and enduring foreign policy objectives. Such an approach would make U.S. business activity abroad less welcome and would encourage foreign nations to impose discriminatory taxes on foreign subsidiaries of American corporations. These consequences are contrary to our international commitments and to our national interest. The Treasury approach overlooks the fact that investment by U.S. business abroad has stimulated the purchase of goods and services from the United States and has enabled our free enterprise system to make a major contribution to America's preeminence in international affairs.

Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star for April 11, 1962, there was included an excellent editorial captioned "Punitive Taxation?" which perceptively comments in criticism of the administration's foreign tax proposals. This editorial points out that the present policy is a complete reversal of previous Government policy which for the past several decades had urged American private enterprise to expand and invest in world commerce.

The editorial properly points out that this kind of investment had heretofore been regarded as an effective free world weapon in the cold war competition between capitalism and communism. The editorial refers to a point made by a distinguished Senator from Kentucky in regard to these Treasury foreign income proposals, to the effect that the administration's recommendations permit no distinction between improper tax evasion—which can be effectively coped with under existing law—and the totally justified legitimate business undertakings in oversea ventures.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include the Washington Star editorial to which I have referred. I would commend the editorial staff of this distinguished newspaper for taking the lead in bringing to the attention of the American people the dangers that are inescapable under the unwise and imprudent tax policy presently being urged on the Congress by the Treasury Department.

The editorial follows:

PUNITIVE TAXATION?

The technique of making American business a whipping boy during consideration of omnibus tax legislation is not a new one. It is being practiced again today in connection with the administration's so-called tax reform bill, already passed by the House and now the subject of hearings before the Senate Finance Committee.

In its most flagrant form, this technique is being employed by supporters of the provision to tax the earnings of American capital investment abroad before such earnings are returned to the United States. By the loose use of the term "tax havens" it is being implied that the only important motive for this

investment is to escape taxation. It is represented as a massive and unbalanced outflow of dollars that is responsible in serious measure for our deficit in international payments, for a flood of imported goods and for the export of jobs. It is, in other words, pictured as a sort of unpatriotic employment of American capital.

There is an irony about this punitive attitude toward oversea investment which lies in the fact that for many years, and until now, American business has been urged and encouraged to place constructive capital abroad. Indeed, this type of investment heretofore has been considered one of the effective weapons in the cold war competition between capitalism and communism—and in fact has played a large part in the economic revival of Western Europe, still our strongest and most reliable partner in this continuing strife.

There is hope, fortunately, that the Senate will take another and more discerning look at this matter. Senator MORTON, Kentucky Republican and a member of the Finance Committee, has opened the way to a sounder judgment in a good speech on the subject. One of the first and best points made by Mr. MORTON is that the administration proposal permits no distinction between improper tax evasions and justified business investment abroad. Certainly such a distinction is all-important. And to the charge that this is a one-way flow of funds, the Senator points out that repatriated earnings from 1950 through 1960 amounted to $20.5 billion as compared with direct oversea investment in the same period of $12 billion. Present law provides, of course, that such earnings are taxable when returned to this country. On the goods and employment complaints, Mr. MORTON also reminded the Senate that foreign subsidiaries provided the channel for $2.7 billion in exports of American-made goods in 1960 alone—six times the value of products sent back to this country by these subsidiaries.

Other informed and forceful voices are being raised on behalf of a second look at this matter, and the Senate doubtless will listen carefully to what they are saying.

The People Are Learning About One Worldism Through the Hometown Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 17, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, how many times do we in this House hear it said that the people are uninformed on the vital issues of the day and do not really care to inform themselves? To listen to some of our mass circulation media, Americans at the grassroots care little about what is going on and are more concerned with what is on TV than with what's happening in Berlin or Laos.

For some months I have been convinced this is simply not true. It is a smokescreen printed by the eastern press which considers itself the final authority on what the people think.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to say that there is a revolution on the other side of the Appalachian Mountains. The people are learning about the perils of one worldism and the medium of communication is the hometown newspaper. Editors of newspapers in and around my district are becoming increasingly alarmed about the direction our Government is taking.

This is a fairly encompassing statement and the Members of this House have reason to expect documentation to support it. Some will remember that last year I was able to glean from one day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an imposing list of arguments proving that American liberties are being lost one by one.

I intend to do the same sort of thing today to reflect the concern and the opposition to our present policies. The documentation this time is the hometown newspapers in my district. Some are Republican in editorial policy, some are Democratic and others are independent. I shall not mention which is which and I do not think you will be able to tell, but, for the record, let me state that three of the newspapers are Republican, two are Democratic, and three are independent in editorial policy.

Let us first take our foreign policy. The No. 1 topic of the day is Laos, and the Madison Courier of May 10, 1962, asked this question editorially: "Is the military situation in Laos as hopeless as we've been led to believe?"

It goes on to ask if it is true that royal Lao people are so unconcerned about the dangers of communism that they have frustrated our attempts to counter a Red takeover.

The writer of this editorial reports facts as printed in another publication which show that most royal Lao people are willing to fight communism and have been trying to do so, but are frustrated by our no-win policy there.

The writer of the editorial reaches an entirely different conclusion than our State Department and concludes his editorial with the question, as asked by a Lao: "But why, why do you not wish to win?"

Is this unconcern? Is this apathy? Hardly. It is an intelligent understanding of the no-win policy whose existence is denied by the State Department even as it is pursued daily.

On that same day, May 10, 1962, the Seymour Tribune asked intelligent questions about our foreign aid to Yugoslavia and to Marshall Tito. It mentioned appearance in a recent May Day parade of Russian military equipment along with U.S. equipment and drew the conclusion that the development indicates "a new success in playing the major power blocs against each other and getting what he (Tito) wants from both."

The Tribune concluded its editorial by stating:

> There still may be reasons for continuing aid to Tito, but they are not apparent. If the only reason is to keep Tito from cozying up to Khrushchev, the 20 Russian tanks rolling through Belgrade streets are evidence the United States has failed.

The same newspaper, the Seymour Tribune, questioned our Berlin policy on the same day commenting that Gen. Lucius D. Clay had resigned as the President's personal representative in Berlin and asking the question:

> Was General Clay determined not to continue having his views on the Berlin situation compromised?
>
> General Clay—

The Tribune said—

> reportedly wanted to stand up to every demand made by the Soviets and to deny to them those he felt were not in the best interests of the United States and its allies. He was constantly overruled by the State Department and frequently was forced to water down his proposals for a more forceful American position.

The Tribune continued:

> The notorious nibbling technique of the Soviets was balked during the Eisenhower administration. It could be thwarted now, too.

Stating the fact that General Clay got the President's support when he appealed directly to that office, the Tribune continued:

> The intimation is that the State Department isn't carrying out the President's policy or wishes. Mr. Kennedy has given no indication that he is dissatisfied with the State Department. It might be well for him to ascertain how the American people feel about the situation.

Apathy? Unconcern? Hardly. What is shown here is intelligent concern in three phases of foreign policy. The questions and attacks are pertinent and timely. They indicate a deep-rooted interest and a deep-rooted desire for a truly nationalistic foreign policy—which, unfortunately for us, we simply do not have.

The economic policies of this administration are another important part of our national posture, and ninth district newspapers are current on those topics, too.

For example, let us take the tariff issue. Goodness knows, we are hearing enough propaganda from both sides on the issue. But what do the people back home think? What questions are they asking?

You will pardon me for being a bit prideful about my next quotation. It is from my hometown daily newspaper, the Bedford Times-Mail, which is a leader in its field. Writing on the tariff question, the Times-Mail said:

> Often public opinion is so concerned with the main object of a piece of legislation that important details of the bill get little attention. This is so with the administration's Trade Expansion Act now under consideration in Congress.
>
> There is no question that America will benefit from increased foreign trade, provided that the increase isn't predominantly in imports. Even so, there are sure to be some severe hardships to employees and companies in specific industries.

The Times-Mail continues:

> The bill's advocates say that it will help the balance of payments. But they overlook the fact that there is nothing in the bill that assures we will increase our sales more than we increase our purchases. And unless we do this, the balance of payments will get worse, not better.
>
> If we are to increase exports we will have to bring our costs in line and modernize our plants. Nothing in the bill assures that this will happen, and nothing in the administration's legislative program leads in this direction.

Control of production costs, income tax rate reform to allow larger investment, reform of depreciation allowances, control of inflation, and improved business climate in the United States will increase our exports, whether this bill passes or not. Without these steps, we will be in relatively the same position, despite tariff change.

The bill also attempts to provide compensation of various kinds for individuals who lose their jobs and companies that get into financial trouble because of increased foreign competition. Many Congressmen are now beginning to realize that determining just which jobs are lost and which contracts are lost due to imports, and which are lost due to rising labor costs, bad management, or domestic competition would be an impossible task. The bill contains a built-in invitation to attempts to defraud the Government.

This is hardly the editorial of an uninformed writer, as a matter of fact the questions asked are penetrating and basic. They still have not been answered by any of the braintrust of economists on Pennsylvania Avenue and until they are they must stand.

Now, how about domestic economics and domestic administration policies?

The Salem Leader said on May 9, 1962:

There's no question that administration pressure and a sluggish market combined to prevent a price increase in steel.

But the Leader does not feel the danger of price rises is past. It pointed out:

In New York, plumbers and bricklayers have served notice on their employers that they will demand a 5- or 6-hour day and pay increases averaging about $1.30 an hour. In Chicago, July 1 will bring an increase of half a cent a quart for milk, because of a new labor contract giving milk-wagon drivers pay increases amounting to about 13½ cents an hour.

The Leader also mentions the snickering still going on about the rent increases at the Merchandise Mart in Chicago, where "higher labor and tax costs" forced the Kennedy family to raise prices just at the same time the President was using the big stick on steel.

All across the Nation—

The Leader says—

new contracts forecast that such wage increases, and resulting price increases, will be common.

Inflation is created by Government policies, such as printing paper money and increasing credit by borrowing from banks. Lately in the United States we have had wage inflation caused by wages increasing faster than our production increases. Government has sanctioned this (by giving) the unions the power to insist on such increases and it has increased the money supply so they could be paid.

The Leader concludes:

If the administration is truly interested in rising prices, and not merely in making political hay, it will give some attention to these causes.

Another newspaper in my district mentions the different faces worn by the President when he talks to different groups. The Columbus Evening Republican, on its editorial page on May 10, scolded the President for his different attitudes toward labor and business.

President Kennedy's plea for organized labor to share equal responsibility with management in avoiding inflationary wage-price increases is laudable. But not so laudable was another plea, made at the same United Auto Workers convention (asking for union help in electing Democrats to Congress this fall—

The Evening Republican said.

It would seem better had Mr. Kennedy appeared before the UAW strictly as President of the United States and not as a leader for the Democratic Party. Earlier, Mr. Kennedy made the same anti-inflation plea to American businessmen. In this address, there was no mention of the election of Democratic candidates. There appears to be a strange difference—an implied difference that isn't laudable—

The Evening Republican concludes.

The manner in which the administration has tried to cover up the Billie Sol Estes scandals in the Agriculture Department is discussed by the Cincinnati Post-Times Star, a metropolitan newspaper with circulation in my district.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman says the Government "hasn't lost a dime" on the operations of Billie Sol Estes, the Texas boy wonder storage bin operator and cotton planter—

The Post-Times Star wrote on May 10. It continued:

That remains to be seen, but the remark begs the question. Not only the personal ethics of some bureaucrats is involved. There is a need to bring this fat boondoggle with surplus crops into line.

It seems to us that Secretary Freeman, as a man saddled with chief responsibility for getting agriculture out of its lavishly costly mess, should be among the first to favor an investigation—

The Post-Times Star concludes.

We all know how much encouragement that one of the many unemployed Governors in New Frontier officers has given this investigation. In this connection I might digress for a moment and predict that when Secretary Ribicoff, of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department resigns, the post will not be filled until after the November elections when it is known which ex-Governors need a job.

The loss of our liberties was dealt with in the Salem Leader of May 10, 1962. After making the statement that "we like to think that our Constitution guarantees us freedom of speech," the Salem newspaper says "America has a vicious form of Government censorship planned through taxation," and points out that lobbying expenses are not tax deductible.

The Leader goes on to point out that "various Government agencies carry on the world's greatest lobbying activities ever witnessed," and says:

They flood the mail with voluminous documents. Government agencies carry on a constant barrage of propaganda intended solely to beat down the opposition of the people. There is a constant flow of leaflets, booklets, letters, etc., extolling the virtues of urban renewal, rehabilitation, agricultural controls, Health, Education, and Welfare Department activities. Some may be good but the fact remains this is lobbying, pure and simple.

The Leader says. It concludes:

If the Government has the right to carry on such widespread lobbying activities at our expense, then most certainly the individual and business should have the same right.

It remains, however, for one of the smallest newspapers in the ninth district to supply the fitting conclusion. This newspaper, the Hope Star-Journal, is also concerned about the loss of States rights as expressed in its editorial of May 10 in which it said, in part:

Thomas Jefferson had a lot of ideas that sound out of keeping with the trends of modern times. For instance Jefferson wrote: "It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers, but by their distribution, that good government is effected. The way to have good and safe government is not to trust it all to one, but to divide it among the many, distributing to everyone the functions he is competent to do."

Observing that present-day trends are not in harmony with Jefferson's principles, the Star-Journal asks—

How have we changed? Have we become a nation of incompetents, requiring the guardianship of professional bureaucracy? Have we, by our failure to take an interest in government, permitted career bureaucrats to take away our duties, surrendering our right to decide for ourselves in exchange for the false security that bigness can offer?

The editor of the Star-Journal then makes this conclusion:

If government has been lifted from the hands of the people, it has not been at gunpoint. Rather it has been a gentle process, performed while, we the people, slept. Surely we cannot live in the past. And Jefferson wouldn't advise that. He was speaking historically and the message is still pertinent: "What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has ever existed under the sun? The generalizing and concentrating all cares and powers in one body." Jefferson knew whereof he spoke. When we fail to vote, when we leave to our neighbor, our representative, our county, our State and Federal leaders to decide, uninstructed, what is best for us, we have lost our right to complain with honesty.

The editorial writer finished by asking what happened to Jefferson and stating he was beaten by people who wouldn't vote. I might add this postscript about Jefferson by repeating what was said about him by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of the President's key advisers. I do not agree with Mr. Schlesinger in this or many other things, but this is what he said about one of our greatest patriots and greatest Americans:

Jefferson is today remote and irrelevant—a figure not of present concern but of historical curiosity. He believed that government governed best that governed least. Had the United States responded to this ideology, we would today be a feeble and impotent nation.

I endorse many of the principles of Thomas Jefferson even as does the editor of the Hope-Star Journal. It is too bad that the Kennedy administration has thrown his ideas on the junk heap.

It is also too bad that the Kennedy administration cannot recognize that many of its policies, plans, and programs are not popular outside of the one-world eastern part of the United States. It is too bad the New Frontier cannot see over to the other side of the mountains and realize that the people of the United States seriously question its foreign policy as well as its domestic policy.

If the New Frontier leaders would read some newspapers other than the New York Post, Washington Post, New York Times and the like, if the brain trust would start reading the hometown papers

as do many of this body, it would abandon its rush toward one-worldism and the welfare state and return to the principles that made this Nation great. These principles are a private enterprise economy, a frugal approach to Government spending, and a truly nationalistic foreign policy in every respect.

Mr. Speaker, these are the lessons I have learned by doing my homework and reading my newspapers. Many others could profit in the same way.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 21, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Dr. Henry J. Sullivan, of the Church of St. Mary of the Nativity, Scituate, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is administered rightly, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude the President and Vice President of these United States, that their administration may be conducted in righteousness, and be eminently useful to Thy people, over whom they preside, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion, by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy, and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress, and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty, through the same Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 17, 1962, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1962, the Vice President, on May 18, 1962, signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 10643) for the relief of Gail Hohlweg Atabay and her daughter, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) to print additional copies of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10594. An act 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; and

H.R. 10708. An act 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.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H.R. 10594. An act 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; and

H.R. 10708. An act 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.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Government Operations Committee, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

WITHDRAWAL OF A TREATY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Senate of the United States:

Among the treaties now pending in the Senate is the Cultural Convention between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, signed at Washington on October 17, 1950 (S. Exec. X, 81st Cong., 2d sess.).

Considering the mutual desire of the Government of the United States and the Government of Brazil for ever increasing cultural exchange between the two countries, and in view of the intention of the two Governments to consider the formulation of a new agreement on this subject, it appears to be desirable that the above-mentioned convention be withdrawn from the United States Senate. The Government of Brazil has expressed its concurrence with the view that this course of action is desirable and also that, pending the conclusion of a new agreement, the cultural activities of each of the two countries in relation to the other should continue on their present basis.

I desire, therefore, to withdraw from the Senate the above-mentioned Cultural Convention of October 17, 1950.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 21, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and seventy postmaster nominations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Vice Adm. Edwin J. Roland, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral.