and as long as they are the spirit of our people there can be no doubt about what the outcome of this struggle will be.

On June 12, 1776, in times not unlike these, George Washington wrote to his cousin, Lund Washington: "Heaven knows how truly I love my country; and that I embarked in this arduous enterprise on the purest motives. But we have overshot our mark; we have grasped at things beyond our reach; it is impossible we should succeed; and I cannot with truth say that I am sorry for it; because I am far from being sure that we deserve to succeed.

"Our want of skill, our want of ammunition, in short, our want of everything which an army ought to have, are all, no doubt, exceedingly against us; but they are all nothing to our want of virtue. * * *

"There are not a hundred men in America that know our true situation; three-fourths of the Congress itself are ignorant of it. * * *

"If it be the will of God, that America should be independent * * * and that this be the season for it, even I and these unhopeful men around may not be thought unworthy instruments in his hands. And should we succeed, we are heroes, and immortalized beyond even those of former times; whereas, disgrace only, and intolerable infamy await our retreat. In this persuasion I resolve to go on, contented to save my country, or die in the last ditch."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Job 28: 28: *And unto man He said, behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.*

O Thou who art the inspiration of every noble thought and every worthy achievement, may we accept and lay hold of the tasks and responsibilities of each new day with a radiant and responsive spirit and cast aside all resentful and rebellious tempers of mind and heart.

We earnestly beseech Thee to sustain us in all our struggles to preserve and perpetuate those blessings of freedom and democracy which our forefathers found so hard to win and which we are now finding so difficult to hold.

Kindle within us a sincere desire and a resolute determination to follow the ways of Thy spirit and may we be cheered and comforted with the assurance that Thou wilt enable us to be strong and steadfast in this time of crisis and confusion.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. 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 agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962.

RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING—LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings at the laying of the cornerstone of the Rayburn House Office Building this morning be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that it may include a copy of the program.

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

There was no objection.

PROCEEDINGS AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1962

The program of ceremonies follows:

PROGRAM OF CEREMONIES AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1962

PROGRAM

Introductions	Hon. J. George Stewart, Architect of the Capitol.
Invocation	Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.
Introduction of the President of the United States.	Hon. John W. McCormack, Chairman.
Address	Hon. John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States.
Reading	Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, Rabbi of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.
Laying of the Cornerstone.	Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Benediction	The Very Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Herrmann, Assistant Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Washington.

The proceedings commenced at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, we have met today to lay the cornerstone of the Rayburn House Office Building. I welcome each of you to the ceremony, and express the hope that in the years to come those who labor in this building will pause occasionally and pay tribute to the Honorable Sam Rayburn, whose great leadership and foresight made this structure possible.

At this time I will ask the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, to offer the invocation.

INVOCATION

Dr. BRASKAMP. Let us pray.

O Thou who art the Supreme Ruler of the Universe and the guiding intelligence in the life of men and of nations, encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy holy word, we are approaching Thy throne of grace through the old and familiar way of prayer which is never closed to those who come unto Thee with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

We have assembled to lay the cornerstone of this building, erected here on Capitol Hill and designated in a resolution offered by Speaker McCORMACK, adopted unanimously by the Members of Congress, and signed by President Kennedy as the Rayburn House Office Building.

As we share in this significant and joyous ceremony we find ourselves going up and down the courts of memory and calling to mind with gratitude and affection the noble life and character and ministry of the beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, who will always be remembered among those who do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with the Lord.

Grant that the chosen Representatives of our Republic, engaged in the business of statecraft, although holding different political philosophies as made known in their deliberations and decisions, may daily go forth from this office building to the House Chamber in the Capitol girded with that spirit of fairmindedness and justice which considers and weighs the convictions of their colleagues alongside of their own without bias or prejudice.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

Mr. STEWART. I now have the great honor to introduce to this assembly the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and also Chairman of the House Office Building Commission. Speaker McCORMACK. [Applause.]

REMARKS BY SPEAKER M'CORMACK

The SPEAKER. Mr. President, Mr. Chief Justice, reverend clergy, my distinguished colleagues of both branches of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen:

As great Americans of the past have contributed to the making and stabilizing of our Constitution, now the oldest Constitution on earth, a living, dynamic organism representing the hopes and the national objectives of our people, so did our late friend, Speaker Sam Rayburn, make his contributions during his long and honored public career.

Sam Rayburn was not only a great man, but he was also a good man; gentle, kind, understanding, possessed of wisdom gained from experience. Sam Rayburn gave unsparingly of his extraordinary talents in the service of our country. He possessed all of the gentle qualities and virtues of a good man, and all of the strong qualities evidenced by a great man.

This building will always be a living monument to his memory, a constant reminder to present and future legislators that Speaker Sam Rayburn was a legislator's legislator.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

We are signally honored in having with us today the Chief Executive of our country, a former colleague of ours, and a personal friend and strong admirer of Sam Rayburn. Under our Constitution the President represents and symbolizes the hopes and aspirations of our people and the national objectives of our country. With the wisdom he gained by his service in both branches of the Congress, the people have complete confidence in him and his courageous qualities of leadership. How happy is Sam Rayburn in the Great Beyond in the knowledge that President John F. Kennedy is with us on this occasion.

I have the great honor and personal privilege of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the audience rising.]

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, Members of the House and Senate, I appreciate very much the opportunity to join you in dedicating this building today to Speaker Sam Rayburn. We say in this country that ours is a Government of laws, and not of men; and it is in that sense that we strive for equality and integrity in the administration of Government and of justice. But this is also a Government of man, and it needs men of particular talents to make this system of ours work.

Our Founding Fathers, concerned about the centralization of authority, which they were revolting against, wrote very careful safeguards, checks, and balances into the American constitutional system. This provides great protection for individual liberty and right, but it also places a heavy burden upon the men and women who must make this system operate. The division of powers between the Executive, the Congress, the courts, the division between the National Government and the State governments requires the greatest comity between the various bodies if our system is to function effectively.

Sam Rayburn understood this perhaps as well as any man in the history of our country. Presidents of both parties paid equal tribute to him. While his devotion to his own party was never questioned, nevertheless he saw in a larger sense the need for harmonious relations between various branches of Government; and, therefore, I would be joined by all of my predecessors with whom he served, I know, in paying tribute to him and to the traditions which have followed with such distinction by others in his wake in attempting to make this system of ours work to protect the individual, but also to make the Government function. This was his great skill and his lasting contribution, and I think sets the most powerful example before us all.

This ceremony, this edifice, this assembly of public servants from all branches of Government, all States, and all parties pay homage to the memory of Speaker Sam Rayburn.

No monument, no memorial, no statue would please him half so much, I believe, as to have his name preserved here in this fashion on Capitol Hill. The Congress was his life, the House was his home. He served far longer than any who preceded him, but with distinction and wisdom as well. He preferred to preside over this body to any place of prestige or power.

As a former Member of the House of Representatives, I join with all of you in saying that while he may be long missed, he will not be forgotten. Our task is to carry on the work to which he was so deeply dedicated.

Thank you. [Applause, the audience rising.]

A READING

Mr. STEWART. At this time Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, rabbi of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, will give a reading. Dr. Gerstenfeld.

Dr. GERSTENFELD. Mindful of our experience at the last inaugural, I have attempted extreme brevity. This is a reading, this is not a prayer; this is a reading from the morning service of the Union Prayer Book, even though it is in the form of a prayer in our ritual:

Fervently we invoke Thy blessing upon our country and our Nation. Guard them, O God, from calamity and injury; suffer not their adversaries to triumph over them, but let the glories of a just, righteous, and God-fearing people increase from age to age. Enlighten them with wisdom and sustain with Thy power those whom the people have set in authority—the President, his counselors and advisers, the judges, lawgivers and executives, and all who are entrusted with our safety and with the guardianship of our rights and of our liberties. May peace and good will obtain among all the inhabitants of our land, may religion spread its blessings among us and exalt our Nation in righteousness. Amen.

THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE

Mr. STEWART. We will now proceed with the laying of the cornerstone.

Thereupon, at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m., the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, laid the cornerstone.

BENEDICTION

Mr. STEWART. The Very Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Herrmann, assistant chancellor of the Archdiocese of Washington, will pronounce the benediction.

Monsignor HERRMANN. As we conclude these rites, O Lord, and seal this stone, we ask that the spirit of the prayers which have been uttered to Thy holy name may be a lasting inspiration to all who will gather under this roof in years to come. May Your divine protection be with all the representatives of government who will labor here as the guides and sentinels of the destiny of this Nation.

To that end, we beseech Thee, our Lord and God to give them prudence in all their actions; justice in all their relations with their fellow men; fortitude in every undertaking; temperance and moderation in all things. Armed with these cardinal virtues may they, and we as well, so live in this life that our judgment may be in no wise at variance with Thee and in the life to come may we and they attain to everlasting rewards for deeds well done. We commend them and all our fellow citizens to Thy divine providence, dear Lord. Amen.

Mr. STEWART. This concludes the ceremony. I thank you all for coming.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.) the ceremony was concluded.

CORNERSTONE OF THE RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the copper box that will be sealed into the cornerstone of the Rayburn House Office Building will be placed in the Speaker's Lobby on May 28, 29, and 30, 1962, and during that period Members of the House of Representatives may deposit in the box any message, signature, or other writing which they wish to have preserved for posterity, in an envelope not to exceed the size of a postal card.

It is requested that each Member deposit only one message.

ASTRONAUT LT. COMDR. SCOTT CARPENTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House unanimously passed a bill authorizing appropriations of more than $3.7 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1963.

Early this morning Lt. Comdr. Scott Carpenter was rocketed into space as millions of Americans watched this dramatic event on television.

As we meet here now, Astronaut Carpenter's *Aurora 7* capsule circles over earth, a triumph of man in harmony with the forces of nature. We pray to God that our knowledge of nature will not fail us now but will return this brave American safely to earth.

Mr. Chairman, Astronaut Carpenter's flight is not a defeat of nature but an unleashing of the forces which comprise nature. In our democratic society, one of the forces of nature that is speeding Astronaut Carpenter over our heads is the consent of—nay, the emphatic willingness—of the American people to invest their earnings, through taxes, in this venture.

Our unanimous vote yesterday of a record authorization for appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration represented the unleashing of further forces of nature, forces which will soon speed teams of Americans around our earth and eventually land an American on the moon.

We are in competition, Mr. Chairman, with others who would beat us in this race into the spaces. But we shall win. Our effort is mightier. We are unlocking forces of our entire people, and our competitor has overlooked this force. Our entire Nation is in competition with a handful of scientists and bureaucrats,

and their power could never match that of our own.

May God protect Astronaut Carpenter and the spirit of the American people.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

Mr. BOGGS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on one night last week the President of the United States delivered a major address on the foreign economic and foreign trade policy of the United States. In that address he praised the work of the chairman of my Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. I should like to reiterate the praise the President gave Chairman MILLS, particularly for the outstanding job he has done on this piece of legislation, which will be reported by the Committee on Ways and Means this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's address be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of the legislative business today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when rollcall 95 was taken on the passage of the bill (H.R. 11737) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities, and for other purposes, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. 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. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, I wrote to President Kennedy urging him to support a national lottery as the only means of raising new revenue for a tax cut.

The White House through its Treasury Department replied as follows:

DEAR MR. FINO: There are numerous problems of administration, fairness, and ethics involved in the establishment of such a lottery. Perhaps the simplest explanation why a lottery is not used in this country as a revenue source is that it is not an acceptable proposal to the majority of people.

We appreciate the spirit in which you have made your suggestion and we are glad to have an opportunity to consider it. However, we do not believe that a national lottery is an acceptable substitute for taxation as a means of providing revenues for the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, while the contents of this reply reflect the opinion of this administration, it certainly does not express the feelings of the American people.

From time to time, reliable groups, magazines and newspapers have conducted polls on the lottery question and the results have always shown a substantial majority of the people favoring a national lottery as a means to cut taxes.

The most recent survey was conducted by the Police Gazette, a national magazine which conducted a presidential poll in 1960 and predicted Kennedy's victory by a razor-thin margin.

Mr. Speaker, the results of this magazine's national lottery poll show 97½ percent of the participants in favor of a lottery and only 2½ percent opposed. The tide of prolottery votes surged through every State of the Union.

This survey produced, Mr. Speaker, the heaviest response in the 116-year history of this magazine. According to the Police Gazette, three times as many ballots were mailed in as in their 1960 presidential poll. And, more importantly, according to this magazine, "the most frequently mentioned reason for backing a lottery can be summed up in two words: 'high taxes.'"

Mr. Speaker, in view of the present feelings of this administration which certainly does not reflect public sentiment, I urge the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to give favorable consideration to H.R. 5574, a bill to conduct a national referendum on the question of a Federal lottery.

A national referendum will give the American voters an opportunity to express their wishes on this issue. An expression of approval by a majority of the voters will be a clear-cut mandate to the Congress to enact a national lottery in the United States.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95 I am recorded as being absent. I was unavoidably absent on an important mission. If I had been present, I would have voted "aye."

DELIVERING WATER TO LANDS, THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 151) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object since I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from Colorado and also with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], I would appreciate it if the gentleman would kindly explain exactly what is involved here and whether or not it has been completely cleared by the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I might say that this has been cleared by the committee and it came out of the committee unanimously. This provides that certain users in the Third Division of the Riverton project in Wyoming who desire water for the year 1962 would be given the water with the payment of certain charges and that those users who do not wish to have water do not have to take it for the year 1962 and shall not be penalized for not using water during 1962. The report goes on record as asking for a report from the Bureau of Reclamation on this particular project before January 1, 1963.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I wish to direct an inquiry to the chairman of the full committee. There is a difference between the House version of this resolution and the Senate version; namely, that the House limits its action to 1 year. Is it my understanding from the chairman of the full committee that if the other body will not agree to this that the House will insist upon it, if we have to go to conference?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will yield to me again, I would answer that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. And if I may ask the chairman a further question, we expect the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to comply with the request we have made in our report that there be prepared for us by January 1, 1963, a report of what he intends to do on this project?

Mr. ASPINALL. My colleague from Pennsylvania is correct once again.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pending completion of a repayment contract the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to continue to deliver water to the lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, during the calendar years 1962 and 1963, as under the provisions of section 9, subsection (d)(1), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1195; 43 U.S.C. 485h(d) but without regard to the time limitation therein specified. Water shall be furnished upon individual applications accompanied by payments of an amount per acre to be irrigated equal to the estimated average per irrigable acre cost of operation and maintenance of the Third Division, whether or not all of the irrigable area is irrigated. Rates of charge for water delivery shall be $4 per acre for the first three acre-feet per acre

with water in excess of that amount at $2 per acre-foot. The portion of the operation and maintenance costs applicable to lands for which water service is not requested is hereby declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "years 1962 and 1963," and insert in lieu thereof "year 1962,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 656, 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. 10937) to amend the Act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. 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 Armed Services, 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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 656 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10937, a bill to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 10937 is to increase from $6 million to $25 million the amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure in accordance with programs approved by the President for certain activities within the Ryukyu Islands. The basic law which would be amended by this bill was originally approved by President Eisenhower, July 12, 1960.

The basic law which would be amended by this bill was designed to establish a basis in law for U.S. programs for the promotion of economic and social development in the islands. In essence that law did not change the situation that then existed in the Ryukyu, but rather gave legal sanction to a de facto situation.

The United States has but one reason for continuing to exercise in the Ryukyu those plenary rights of administration granted by article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan. This reason is the Ryukyu Islands' singular strategic value to the security of the United States and the free world. These islands, centrally located with respect to vital areas of the Far East, provide a major link in our forward defense barrier in the Pacific. Our base on Okinawa is essential. The presence of our military base there provides us the capability to bring our military power to bear rapidly in the event of aggression.

The armed strength deployed at bases such as the Ryukyu Islands is of the greatest importance in maintaining our deterrent power in the face of threats to the peace in the Far East. It is for this reason that we must continue to maintain the integrity of our administrative authority over the islands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 656.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 656 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 10937. This is an open rule and provides for 1 hour of general debate. I do not believe there is much objection to the bill; in fact, I am reasonably certain that it will pass as do most bills that come from the Committee on Armed Services. I would, however, like to bring out one consideration which to me is important, although I realize it is not of general importance to the House.

It seems to me that the raising of the figure in this bill from $6 million to $25 million is rather excessive. It is four times the original amount. In the report it is stated, and quite properly so, that the purpose of H.R. 10937 is to increase from $6 million to $25 million the amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure in accordance with programs by the President for certain activities within the Ryukyu Islands which are detailed later in this program.

Then on page 2 we see this paragraph:

As the result of the deep concern of the High Commissioner, an interdepartmental task force was established last August to investigate the extent to which economic and social conditions contribute to the dissatisfaction of the Ryukyuans, and to determine what steps were necessary to improve the position of the United States in the Ryukyus.

Mr. Speaker, we come back to our usual solution. We raise the ante by four. I do believe that we should give a little consideration to cutting down on some of these matters.

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

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. 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. 96]

Addonizio	Fulton	Norrell
Alford	Grant	Nygaard
Andrews	Gubser	Passman
Ashmore	Hall	Peterson
Bailey	Halleck	Powell
Baring	Halpern	Rains
Bass, N.H.	Harrison, Va.	Randall
Bennett, Mich.	Harsha	Reifel
Blatnik	Hébert	Riley
Blitch	Henderson	Roberts, Ala.
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Rostenkowski
Brademas	Horan	Rousselot
Brown	Huddleston	Scherer
Buckley	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Wis.	Seely-Brown
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Selden
Chelf	Kilburn	Shelley
Chiperfield	Kitchin	Sheppard
Corman	Kornegay	Smith, Miss.
Curtis, Mass.	Landrum	Stubblefield
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Taber
Dent	McSween	Tollefson
Derounian	Magnuson	Van Pelt
Devine	Mason	Watts
Dowdy	Merrow	Wharton
Dwyer	Miller, Clem	Whitten
Elliott	Miller, George P.	Wickersham
Farbstein	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Fisher	Milliken	Wilson, Ind.
Flood	Moeller	Yates
Fogarty	Murray	
Frazier		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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 certain rules.

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

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object because the gentleman has discussed this with me and with other members of the committee, but I would appreciate it if

the gentleman would give a brief explanation of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That 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.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WRIGHT: On page 1, after line 9, add the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 481; 40 U.S.C. 607) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) With respect to any lands located south of Independence Avenue, between Third Street Southwest and Eleventh Street Southeast, in the District of Columbia, no such land shall be acquired by the Administrator for use as sites, or additions to sites, without prior consultation with the House Office Building Commission created by the Act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1365).

"'With respect to any lands located in the area extending from the United States Capitol Grounds to Eleventh Street Northeast and Southeast and bounded by Independence Avenue on the south and G Street Northeast on the north, in the District of Columbia, no such lands shall be acquired by the Administrator for use as sites, or additions to sites, without prior consultation with the Architect of the Capitol.'"

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11145, as reported by the House Committee on Public Works, and S. 3157, as passed by the Senate and sent over to the House, in repealing subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, grants the Administrator of General Services authority to acquire sites for public buildings—other than buildings for the House, Senate, or the Architect of the Capitol—anywhere in the District of Columbia.

The only restriction is that the site must be for a public building approved by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works.

This means that any property bordering, adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds, the Library of Congress, the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Supreme Court Building, or any other building or grounds under the Architect of the Capitol can be acquired by the Administrator of General Services so long as such property is to be used as a site for a building project approved by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works, and necessary appropriations are provided therefor.

Under existing law, the Administrator of General Services is required to consult with the National Capital Planning Commission in the preparation of construction plans, in the interest of orderly city planning.

Under my amendment, in the interest of orderly planning, the Administrator of General Services would be required to consult with the House Office Building Commission before acquiring any lands located south of Independence Avenue, between 3d Street SW., and 11th Street SE., in the District of Columbia.

This would conform to the provisions of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955—69 Stat. 41—which authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to acquire properties in the District of Columbia located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the U.S. Capitol Grounds approved by the House Office Building Commission for the purpose of additions to the U.S. Capitol Grounds or of construction of additional facilities for the House of Representatives. I feel strongly that the House Office Building Commission should be consulted with respect to the selection of sites in the area specified in my amendment.

Under my amendment, in the interest of orderly planning, the Administrator of General Services would likewise be required to consult with the Architect of the Capitol before acquiring any lands located in the area extending from the U.S. Capitol Grounds to 11th Street NE. and SE., and bounded by Independence Avenue on the south and G Street NE. on the north, in the District of Columbia.

The Architect of the Capitol is the officer or agent of Congress who for many years has acquired properties and constructed buildings and other accommodations for the Congress and in the interest of sound and coordinated planning, he should be consulted with respect to the selection of sites in the area specified in my amendment.

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

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

Mr. BALDWIN. I would just like to say this was reported out of the committee by unanimous vote and has the approval of all interested groups including the Architect of the Capitol and the House Office Building Commission. I think this amendment will be a very helpful amendment.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten me and tell me whether or not this is in accordance with the requirements of the National Capital Planning Commission.

Mr. WRIGHT. The National Capital Planning Commission is not involved in either the Senate bill or the amendment that I have offered.

Mr. COHELAN. In other words, this does not permit anyone to go down and build in that area without the usual checks and limitations?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, indeed. The usual and ordinary checks and limitations still would apply, after consultation with the House Office Building Commission and the Architect of the Capitol. The General Services Administration then still would be required to follow the procedures now required to be followed, including the submission of prospectuses to the House and Senate Committees on Public Works. The only limitation lifted in the Senate bill is the geographic limitation.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Could I ask the gentleman the reason for acting on this so expeditiously since it just came out of our committee a few minutes ago? Is there any justification for acting on this legislation in this very quick fashion?

Mr. WRIGHT. The General Services Administration is desirous of the enactment of this legislation. Its enactment is necessary in order to permit the construction by the General Services Administration of certain buildings which are presently planned and which are not within the area presently prescribed by law.

Mr. CRAMER. I will not object, but I think the gentleman knows the reason why I have made this inquiry. I do intend to object to some other improper actions under the rules of the House taken by the Public Works Committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately prior to the enactment of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE RYUKYU ISLANDS

Mr. PHILBIN. 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. 10937) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

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. 10937, with Mr. KLUCZYNSKI 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 Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 10937, which relates to the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands was reported unanimously out of subcommittee and unanimously out of the full Armed Services Committee.

First, and in order to place the bill in an understandable context, I would like to review briefly the history of this legislation.

Since 1945, the United States has exercised full power over most of the Ryukyu Islands of which Okinawa is by far the largest and most important.

While I realize that all of you are familiar with the importance of our bases in Okinawa and of the importance to Okinawa in our overall military capability, you might wish to refer to page 25 of the committee report on which is set out a map showing the relative location of Okinawa to Red China, Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and the Laos and South Vietnam areas.

It is immediately evident from this map that Okinawa is a military base which is unique in its strategic importance.

Prior to the war, the Ryukyu Islands were an integral part of Japan but after Japan surrendered, they were treated as a separate and distinct territory for the purposes of occupation.

Japan was occupied under allied authority, the occupation of Okinawa was solely under American control.

During this period, 1945–52, the occupation was purely a military one.

In 1952, the treaty of peace with Japan was ratified. The treaty provided that—

> The United States shall have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands.

At this point a civil administration was introduced to take the place of the military occupation which had preceded it. Even though it was called a civil administration, it was, and is, in fact headed by a U.S. military officer.

Necessarily during the whole period from 1945, through 1952 and up to 1960, the date of Public Law 86–629—which is the act this bill would amend—it was necessary to carry on governmental functions in Okinawa.

These functions, however, were carried out in many instances under the rather broad authority of the treaty of peace with Japan.

Appropriations were made by the Congress from time to time but on occasion they were subjected to points of order. It became evident, therefore, that some basis in law should be provided not only to support the appropriations but to permit the retention and expenditures of revenues which arose in Okinawa itself. And these revenues accrued to both the local government, known as the GRI, or Government of the Ryukyu Islands, and also to the civil administration of our own country.

Actually, Public Law 86–629 did not change anything, but gave legislative sanction to a de facto situation.

I have mentioned that Public Law 86–629 sanctioned the retention and expenditure of funds arising in Okinawa. It also placed a limitation of $6 million on the amount of money which could be appropriated annually for the Ryukyus.

I think I should note particularly at this point two matters of importance which I brought up and stressed during our hearings.

First, I think it is important to quote the preamble to the basic law relating to Okinawa. It reads as follows:

> That, in the exercise by the President of the authority over the Ryukyu Islands granted the United States by article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, every effort shall be made to improve the welfare and well-being of the inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and to promote their economic and cultural advancement, during such time as the United States continues to retain authority over the Ryukyu Islands.

I have read that to place in context this further statement: Although the $6 million authorized for annual appropriations has, in fact, become a limitation as our responsibilities have increased, it was by no means intended to be a limitation at the time of its enactment.

On the contrary, it was intended to spur and encourage a greater level of expenditure in Okinawa and although it is phrased in the law as a limitation, and has actually become a limitation, it was intended to represent what was then thought to be a reasonable level of expenditure.

The first question which would arise in anyone's mind is : If $6 million were considered a reasonable level of expenditure only 2 years ago, why does that need to be increased to $25 million. The reason is this:

The United States has only one reason for continuing to occupy Okinawa and to exercise the rights which it has under the treaty of peace with Japan. That reason is that Okinawa has a most important strategic value to the security of the United States and the free world. We all know its location with respect to vital areas in the Far East and the fact that it provides a major link in our forward defense barrier in the Pacific. Our base in Okinawa is essential and there can be no doubt about this.

Recently the President himself stressed this fact when he said:

> The armed strength deployed at these bases is of the greatest importance in maintaining our deterrent power in the face of threats to the peace in the Far East. Our bases in the Ryukyu Islands help us assure our allies in the great arc from Japan through southeast Asia not only of our willingness but also of our ability to come to their assistance in case of need.

I think that all of us concede the importance of Okinawa and the necessity for our continued occupancy of it. So, how has the situation changed to require this higher level of expenditure?

The committee was told that there is an increasing concern on the part of our responsible officials for the stability of our military security in the U.S. position in Okinawa. One witness said that there are "discernible portents of developing conditions which could seriously impair the freedom of military mobility which we enjoy in that area under our sole jurisdiction."

He went on to say:

> There are evidences of growing dissatisfactions among the Ryukyuan people, indications that we might be taking for granted that we will continue to enjoy unimpaired that degree of voluntary cooperativeness and international acceptance of our administration which we have experienced since the end of military occupation.

Indeed, this concern mounted to the point where the President appointed a special task force headed by a member of his staff to study this problem.

The task force did several months of work here in Washington and then spent several weeks in Okinawa making an on-the-spot investigation.

Actually, this bill is a result of that task force study. So, we can see that this matter is by no means a routine piece of legislation but is one which has had the attention of the President himself.

I think I should explain that it is not expected that the $25 million upper limit will be reached in the near future. For example, for fiscal year 1963, the Department has requested $6 million in accordance with basic law and will request only an additional $6 million should this bill become law. This is a total of $12 million for fiscal year 1963.

Generally and briefly, these funds would be expended in the following fashion:

First. About $1 million to reimburse the Ryukyus for services provided our troops and other people—this is in the area of public health, public safety, and so forth;

Second. About $9.5 million as contribution to Government projects. This relates to promotion of the economic and social development of Okinawa through contributions to provide additional and improved educational facilities, teachers pay, public health and medical programs, social welfare activities, and general economic development. Also, $4 million of this amount would be for capital augmentation of two public credit institutions;

Third. About $1 million for disaster relief;

Fourth. Three hundred thousand dollars for technical education and training and a number of other smaller amounts.

Our relationship with Okinawa is unique in our history and our responsibilities are similarly unique. We have absolute control over these islands and, therefore, we have a special obligation to see to it that our administration of the islands is not less than should be expected from the United States. Okinawa has been a propaganda weapon before and will continue to be. We must counter this propaganda.

Twenty-five million dollars is, of course, a great deal of money but when we stop to think that we have a capital investment in Okinawa of over $1 billion and equipment and supplies totaling even more billions of dollars, $25 million be-

comes a pretty small amount as insurance to cover our investment. It approximates, I suppose, the price of two B-52 airplanes or a few more of our new fighter airplanes.

I would like to point out that the committee report goes into a great deal more detail than I have in this statement. I believe that a perusal of the report will be rewarding in that virtually every aspect of our unusual relationship with Okinawa is brought out and discussed in detail.

I submit that the same unanimous response which this bill met in the Armed Services Committee should be matched by a similar unanimous response by the House.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his fine statement, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, for the opportunity that he gave me, as a member of the general committee, to participate in the hearings. As the gentleman knows, I was out in Okinawa this past fall and I observed conditions there very carefully, and it is my feeling, as a result of the hearings, that this bill is very badly needed and it has my hearty support.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the able and distinguished gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. I would like to commend the gentleman on his fine statement and say, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that I approve of his position.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, all of the essential elements of the bill have been well covered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this matter. There is also available a very complete and detailed report on this legislation. Therefore, I shall not repeat any of the details which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] had covered. I would like to say, however, that I have maintained a strong interest in Okinawa for some 7 years now.

In 1955 I headed a subcommittee which studied the serious land problem in Okinawa. We traveled to Okinawa and spent some time there talking with the people, holding public hearings, and discussing every aspect of Okinawa with both the U.S. officials and the officials of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands.

I have mentioned the personal interest which I have in Okinawa. This is based at least in part upon my realization of the very great importance of Okinawa to us and the very great responsibilities that we have to the Ryukyuan people. It was for this reason that I introduced the original bill in 1959, the bill which became Public Law 86-629. This is the law which would be amended by the bill we are considering today.

It was a continuation of the same interest which again prompted me to introduce H.R. 10937.

Our occupancy of Okinawa since World War II has posed a series of problems over the years. Until recently, at least, the greatest of these problems was the land problem. Okinawa covers an area of only 290,555 acres. In this small area live 750,000 people, not counting our own military forces and others who are not Okinawans. Obviously any place as densely populated as Okinawa necessarily would have a land problem—a problem that was greatly intensified by our occupancy and by the relatively large areas which it was necessary for us to use for military purposes.

I am happy to say that through the efforts of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, this problem was finally solved and eliminated as an element of dissension between us and the Ryukyuan people.

But as time has gone on, other problems have—I suppose quite naturally—arisen and we are faced with one of these problems right now.

I would not for a moment want to create the impression that there has ever been any great dissension between the United States and the people of Okinawa. There has been agitation now and again for the return of the islands to Japan. Our occupancy has been used as a propaganda weapon by the Communists. And there have been minor conflicts now and again which I imagine are inevitable under the circumstances.

By and large, however, our relationship has been a warm and friendly one based largely, in my opinion, on two factors; one of these is the natural friendliness and cooperative attitude of the Okinawan people and the other has been the enlightening and efficient administration which the United States has afforded Okinawa.

Even though this relationship has been a very fine one for the reasons I have cited, there has been a growing feeling on the part of the Okinawan people that they have lost their identification—or as one witness put it, they feel that they are neither fish nor fowl. The people are Japanese but are not under the control of the Japanese Government. They are under the complete control of the United States but they are not citizens of the United States. In a very real sense, the Okinawans are not the beneficiaries of those things which normally flow from being a part of a sovereign government.

This has naturally caused some feeling of unrest, some disquiet. Although it is somewhat of a conjecture on my part, I think it entirely possible that the Okinawans believe that in view of the burgeoning economy of Japan, they would be better off if they were under Japanese control. Whether it is true that they would, in fact, be better off economically is actually entirely beside the point. The feeling does appear to exist, and conceivably might have some validity, and this bill is designed to alleviate the pressures which have grown by reason of this feeling.

I cannot stress too much the fact that we owe a very special responsibility to the Okinawans. One might say that we beat Japan in the war and the occupancy of Okinawa is a mere consequence of that defeat. This is factually true but it fails to recognize that Okinawa is geographically far separated from Japan. It has, in many ways, its own ancient culture. The Okinawans were never true enemies of the United States. They were the unhappy victims of a war in which they had little or no part or interest.

The eyes of the world, and particularly the eyes of the Communist world, are constantly turned on Okinawa. Every small mistake—and who does not make them—that we have made on Okinawa has been the subject of widespread comment in the Communist press. Indeed, the Communist press has manufactured mistakes which actually were never made. Charges of imperialism have been thrown at the United States and every other device used to cause dissention in Okinawa and to use Okinawa as a focal point for anti-U.S. feeling throughout the world.

From my own background knowledge of Okinawa and from the very fine hearings which were held by the Armed Services Committee, I am convinced that many or all of the difficulties which have been encountered and others which appear imminent can be rectified by enactment of this bill.

We have a responsibility; this bill is an instrument whereby we can meet that responsibility, and I most earnestly urge that the bill be not only passed, but passed by a vote which will indicate to the world just how we feel about our responsibility to the Ryukyuan people.

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the author of this bill, for his fine statement; also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]. I join them in the sentiments they have expressed. I think all of us on the Committee on Armed Services and particularly those of us who have been in the Okinawan area, realize that this bill is absolutely essential to our defense posture in the Pacific and Asiatic areas.

It has been pointed out, but I should like to mention it again, that this bill was passed out of the subcommittee unanimously. There was no adverse testimony offered. It was passed out of the full committee unanimously, and the same is true of the Committee on Rules.

Nowhere in the whole world is there a single military base which is more important to the United States. It has been mentioned that we have invested some $1 billion in capital investments on the island, and have other billions of dollars in military equipment and weapons on the island.

We must stay there, and we must stay there under the most favorable conditions that we can achieve. It has not

been mentioned but it might be well to bear in mind that the Okinawans, although subjects of Japan during the war, were never actually at war with the United States. They are essentially a peace-loving people who were caught in the middle, so to speak, between Japan and the United States.

Their island even then constituted a tremendously important area for attack. It was necessary that we take the island in order to further our military advances in that area. The Okinawans, to the best of my knowledge, offered no resistance to the invasion by our troops. It was only the Japanese troops who did that.

But here we find ourselves today with what is essentially a liability and an asset at the same time. Paradoxical as this sounds, it is true. Okinawa is a liability in that we have obligations which we have incurred and which we must satisfy; obligations to a foreign people who bear a strange relationship to the United States. A relationship that has been stated as being unique in our history. We have absolute control over the Okinawans, and with this control comes the responsibility to which I refer.

Okinawa is obviously an asset in that it is strategically located with respect to so many important areas in the Far East. It is within easy flying distance for virtually any airplane from Japan, the Philippines, Red China, and even Laos and South Vietnam. This fact has been mentioned but I think it bears repetition.

I would hate to think of what would be involved in money and effort if Okinawa were suddenly removed from our control. I have asked myself where would we position our troops and our weapons in the Far East. This question if pursued far enough tends to involve classified material which, of course, I cannot go into here. But I suggest that each Member of the House when deliberating on this bill give very real and serious thought to this question.

The best that we could expect if we did not have Okinawa would be a movement of our military striking ability for many hundreds and possibly thousands of miles from this area. The effect of this is obvious.

As to our tenure in Okinawa: I will not go into this in any detail, I will only refer the Members of the House to pages 6, 7, and 8 of the committee report. On these pages are contained the many statements that have been made by our responsible officials from 1953 up to 1962 as to our intentions with respect to remaining in Okinawa.

All of these statements can be summarized very simply that we will remain there until we have no more requirement to remain there. When that requirement will cease, no one knows.

Concededly, the bill which is being considered is an unusual one. It is not military aid, or foreign aid, or actually anything of this kind. In essence, it represents an expenditure which has two major elements. A military one in that we must spend the money in order to remain in the islands under the proper circumstance. And second, in the eyes of the world we have a very definite obligation toward the people of Okinawa. It is an obligation which we assumed under the Treaty of Japan and one which we must fulfill.

The bill is a sound one and a necessary one, and I urge your wholehearted support of it.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be sure that I understand this bill. As I understand, we are now spending $6 million a year; is that correct?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes, that is correct; that is the legal limit. We are spending less than that.

Mr. GROSS. That is, on the support of the Ryukyuan people. This bill would increase that amount to a ceiling of $25 million.

Mr. PHILBIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What support are we now giving these people in addition? Are there any enterprises operated by the Ryukyuan people on Okinawa?

Mr. PHILBIN. We are supporting the Ryukyuan local economy. The funds are being spent there for various purposes which are outlined in the report, which I take it the gentleman has read. For example, in the fields of reimbursement for government services, contributions to government projects, and disaster relief.

Mr. GROSS. Is there no economic benefit to the people of the Ryukyus from the money expended by our very substantial Armed Forces and civilians that are in the Ryukyus?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. GROSS. How much is it estimated to be?

Mr. PHILBIN. We are limited at the present time to $6 million. We propose to step that up to $25 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the contribution made to the economy of the Ryukyus by the substantial forces we have stationed there. Are they not deriving income from the pay of our military and civilian personnel in the Ryukyus?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes; that would be true. There is some benefit.

Mr. GROSS. How much would that amount to?

Mr. PHILBIN. In the neighborhood of $150 million a year.

Mr. GROSS. How much of this finds its way into the Ryukyuan economy?

Mr. PHILBIN. Undoubtedly some of it finds its way into the Ryukyuan economy.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Wherever you have a military base it naturally follows that the local community derives some benefit from the expenditure of that money. That is what the gentleman is driving at, I assume?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. I would say anywhere from $150 to $200 millions is involved in maintaining the Military Establishment in Okinawa. Much of the pay of the military, of course, stays right here in the United States. Naturally, the local community gets the benefit of the trade carried on in connection with expenditures made there. But let me call the gentleman's attention to this: This cannot be labeled in any sense as foreign aid. Here is a military base. Some 750,000 people live on the island. We must maintain this base. We must aid those people and assist them so that we will have friends in the area in which we have this large military base. This is absolutely essential and it is our obligation. It is the most important base in the whole Pacific. The basic law put a limitation on the direct contribution of $6 million. Only $6 million has been requested for fiscal year 1963. If this bill becomes law, another $6 million, for a total of $12 million, will be requested.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but this is a pretty substantial increase. Did the gentleman give any consideration to sending the Peace Corps over there to help these people?

Mr. VINSON. I do not know about that. We have fighting men over there and we want to keep those fighting men over there to preserve the peace.

Mr. GROSS. There is no help from the United Nations with their social and economic affairs?

Mr. VINSON. I would say no.

Mr. GROSS. I would think that if they were really interested and capable of doing anything worthwhile the United Nations and the Peace Corps could make a contribution. We are supporting so many of these organizations that it is becoming harder and harder each day to find any money to carry out the alleged purposes of this bill.

Mr. VINSON. We have complete control over Okinawa. We have military control. This bill has no relation to mutual security or foreign aid. That is not at all in the picture. It is very different from that.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman very well knows that when we occupied Japan we were pouring money in there.

Mr. VINSON. We are expending it here on a different basis. Okinawa is under the jurisdiction of the United States, absolutely. There is nothing comparable to this anywhere else in the world.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that. What I am trying to bring out is that we are spending money until it is becoming difficult to find additional money for purposes of this kind. The U.S. Treasury is busted. This Government will again be some $7 billion in the red at the end of next month when the current fiscal year ends. It seems that the United States alone is called upon to man the ramparts against communism. It is inevitable that the day will come when the taxpayers of this Nation cannot carry the burdens that have been heaped upon them, and their sons and daughters will not be able to meet the mortgages in the form of debts that have been passed on to them.

Mr. VINSON. The organic law said this:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $6 million in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure in connection with the program approved

by the President for (a) promoting the economic development of the island and improving the welfare of the inhabitants thereof.

And then it enumerates what it is for. Of course, the money that we spend in the armed services does help the community, but it is not sufficient to meet the whole situation.

Mr. GROSS. All I have heard here this afternoon is that we have got to increase this spending in order to assuage the feelings of the Ryukyuan people; that they do not have the proper feeling toward us. Whenever some people somewhere say that we are imperialists, are we going to continue to rush out with a bag full of money and say: "Look, we will give you a few more million of dollars but you must stop calling us imperialists?"

Mr. VINSON. May I call to the attention of the gentleman that the Secretary of Defense disburses the money and it is not disbursed by the Department of State.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it is going to be disbursed, that we know.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. The gentleman must remember and realize that the U.S. Army and Navy and Air Force have taken over large acreages in Okinawa and we had to do something like this by way of giving assistance and employment to the people.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with that. We have been giving them $6 million a year plus the other contributions to their economy. I have no quarrel with that, but this business of saying that we can hand out an additional $19 million a year and buy the friendly feelings of these people is something I cannot quite absorb.

Mr. NORBLAD. It is not a question of feelings. It is a case of doing a lot of things that are necessary such as, for instance, putting in a sewer system.

In the biggest city they have some open sewers and this is just one of the things needed.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Did the gentleman say whether or not any of this money is going into the powerplant that was built over there at our expense and which is now owned by a private company which is distributing the power and being paid for it?

Mr. PHILBIN. None of this money goes into the powerplant.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman knows that we did build this big powerplant over there for the armed services and then turned it over to a private company and they charge any rate that they want to. That is part of the economy over there and they get a good bit out of that powerplant.

Mr. PHILBIN. None of this money is going into the powerplant, and I might say that only the distribution of power is in private local hands.

Mr. VINSON. May I say in reply to the gentleman that the powerplant is under military control. The whole island is under military control.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but that, apparently, does not change the facts as set forth by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] that we built the powerplant over there and that it is now in the hands of private ownership and they are charging any rate, apparently, that they want to charge.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I think the chairman of our committee put his finger exactly on the spot. This island is under military control. I talked with the military administrator, the High Commissioner, about this for a long time and as long as it is kept under military control, it is fine but, if and when somebody softens up and this business gets outside of the military, then I wonder what might happen. That is my concern.

Mr. GROSS. But did not the situation that the gentleman from Ohio brings to our attention develop under the system of military control?

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

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

Mr. PRICE. The reason for the construction of the powerplant there was that the power was needed for our military installations as well as for civilian use. Secondly, the rates for power are now under the strict control of our civil administration. As a matter of fact, just recently the rates were reduced.

Mr. GROSS. There is one other question I would like to ask. Is there any ammunition on Okinawa?

Mr. PRICE. Quite a bit, I would say.

Mr. GROSS. Do you suppose the Defense Department could get some of it over to the battle group that is without ammunition in Thailand?

Mr. PRICE. I will say to the gentleman that we are not discussing that particular problem on the floor of the House at this time; if indeed it is a real problem.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad we have this base on Okinawa, and I hope that if there is any ammunition there it is shipped immediately to Thailand, because I cannot think of anything more futile than a soldier with an empty rifle or machinegun when confronted by an enemy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe a good case has been made for the $19-million-a-year increase as proposed in this bill, and I hope the Appropriations Committee will scrutinize it very carefully before making available the full amount of the requested increase.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Chairman, shortly after Hawaii was granted its long-cherished dream of statehood in 1959, and after I was duly sworn into membership to this honorable body, I was privileged with an invitation extended by the Department of Defense to visit the people and country of the Ryukyu Islands. As the representative of Hawaii, I had the honor of representing thousands whose ancestral homes originated in the Ryukyu Islands—principally from the island of Okinawa. I have known them from childhood, and anyone in Hawaii can and will vouch, as I do, for their extreme loyalty to the United States, which is equaled by their outstanding characteristic of industriousness. I was quick, therefore, to grasp the opportunity of visiting the lands of their forefathers, and may I say, at this time, that I am thankful for having done so.

Hardly had the amenities been dispensed with upon my arrival at Naha Airport when I was immediately cornered by an officer of the Ryukyuan Government and was very politely asked: "Will you support the Price bill?" I was honestly caught by surprise because I was not, at that time, familiar with nor had I even heard of the existence of such a bill. Although my visit to the Ryukyus was relatively a short one, I was confronted with this question over and over again—so much so that I was convinced that the Price bill represented to the people of the Ryukyus a symbol for their economic salvation.

Upon my return to Washington, I took it upon myself to study the provisions of the Price bill—H.R. 1157—and based upon my observations and experiences was satisfied that the greatest thing that the U.S. Congress could do for the people of the Ryukyus was to put its stamp of approval on the measure. Accordingly, I appeared before the committee and testified in support of its enactment. I was deeply gratified when both the House and the Senate approved it and was subsequently signed into law, Public Law 86-629, by the President.

The 890,000 people living in the Ryukyus are confronted with an economic plight which is perhaps not too uncommon in the Orient. However, by virtue of our relationship with the Ryukyu Islands over which we exercise full power of government, and because of its strategic value to the security of the United States and the free world, it is incumbent upon the United States to view their economic plight with more than just passing concern. Since the cessation of World War II, the people of the Ryukyus have had great difficulty in improving their standard of living. They lack the necessary industries to support 890,000 people. Much of the land, because of its topography and soil condition, is not suited for agricultural purposes, but every square foot of arable and usuable land is being employed for the sustenance of these people. Let me assure you that the passage of Public Law 86-629 has, in great measure, provided an alleviation of the problems confronting the Ryukyu Islands. But more than that, it has, in a very concrete manner, demonstrated to the inhabitants of these islands the good intentions and good faith of the Government of the United States.

It has been said that our presence in the Ryukyus will be for an indefinite period of time. Let it not be said by the Ryukyuans, or those who would be quick to take advantage of political propaganda to our detriment, that the

United States took but gave nothing in return.

In my testimony before the House committee on H.R. 1157, I stated that the authorized appropriation of $6 million, as contained in section 4 of the bill—for obligation and expenditure in accordance with programs approved by the President, first, for promoting the economic development and improving the welfare; second, for reimbursement to the Government of the Ryukyus for services performed for the benefit of the Armed Forces of the United States; and, third, for emergency purposes—would not solve all the economic problems of the Ryukyu Islands, but that it would serve to demonstrate our good intentions and our good faith.

I note that the task force, which was established in August of last year, and headed by Dr. Carl Kaysen, has concurred somewhat in that observation, for its report recommended the urgent need to increase our economic assistance to the Ryukyu Islands above the $6 million limitation of Public Law 86-629. As a result, the second Price bill was introduced in this 2d session of the 87th Congress, calling for an amendment to the first Price bill to increase the $6 million limitation to $25 million.

H.R. 10937 gives meaningful and realistic effectiveness to our earlier overture of brotherly assistance to the people of the Ryukyu Islands. It is of major importance not only to these people but to the image of the United States in its aspirations for world peace, understanding, and freedom. I heartily endorse its passage and respectfully urge my colleagues to give it their favorable consideration.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

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 4 of the Act of July 12, 1960 (Public Law 86-629; 74 Stat. 462), is amended by striking out the figure "$6,000,000" and inserting the figure "$25,000,000" in place thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having resumed the chair, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, 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. 10937) to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands, pursuant to House Resolution 656, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if he can inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the business for today and also for the balance of the week. It will be our purpose to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday.

Next Monday is District Day. There is no business.

There are various primaries on Tuesday. We have no business scheduled for that date.

Wednesday is Memorial Day. There will be no session on that day.

In view of that fact, it will be the intention of the leadership on Monday next to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over from Monday until Thursday.

For Thursday next and the balance of the week, the House will consider H.R. 11665—revise formula—School Lunch Act.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF BILLIE SOL ESTES

Mr. LATTA. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the Members of the House UPI report No. 109 that just came over the wire:

FRANKLIN, TEX.—Texas Attorney General Will Wilson announced today that Agriculture Secretary Freeman refused to provide a grand jury with a full report on an investigation of Billie Sol Estes that Henry A. Marshall made before he mysteriously died last June.

The death of Marshall, 52, the first agricultural official to investigate Estes, is officially recorded as suicide. But the grand jury is investigating to determine whether the cause of death actually was murder.

A pathologist who performed an autopsy on the exhumed body of Marshall Tuesday said he thinks Marshall was a murder victim.

Marshall suspected there was something illegal about the way Estes got supplementary cotton acreage allotments for his farms and investigated.

Wilson and District Attorney Bryan Russ subpenaed William Elliott, chief of the investigative division of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and ordered him to bring before the jury the report Marshall wrote of his investigations.

Wilson said today that Agriculture Secretary Freeman classified the document as "one that would be improper to produce." He said Freeman told U.S. Attorney Barefoot Sanders in Dallas that he is willing to produce selected parts of the report but not the whole thing.

Sanders and Elliott will appear before the grand jury Monday. At that time, the jury can decide whether it wants to accept limited portions of the report.

Wilson said Sanders told him that if the grand jury presses for the whole report, then the Government will take steps to quash the subpena. And if Elliott is cited for contempt, Wilson said, Sanders will go to Federal Court for a writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people want Mr. Freeman to produce that report in full, and I call upon the President of the United States to direct Mr. Freeman to produce that report to this grand jury in full.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Further, in connection with this matter, Mr. Speaker, it has been of considerable interest and, I might say, of concern to me in that Mr. Marshall was a Government employee. It should have been of considerable concern to the Justice Department in the past, when this matter occurred, instead of not showing any interest in it. It is my understanding, as a matter of policy, that any time there is a matter of death of an official Government employee or there is a case of assault and battery, that the Justice Department investigates to make certain there is no foul play involving the Federal Government. And I think the Attorney General should explain to the people of this country and to this Congress as to why his Department did not, at the time death occurred of this important Federal official, investigate and why the FBI did not conduct a thorough investigation and why the

Department of Justice did not carry out its responsibility under the Federal statutes in protecting Federal employees. It appears to me that an answer is justified.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, since small business comprises more than 95 percent of the U.S. business population, its problems perforce merit special attention. That was the reason for the creation by both the Senate and the House of Representatives of select committees in each house on small business.

The committees have found that the problems facing the small business segment of this Nation's economy have become more acute and that small business is now fighting a battle for survival. The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, and I, as Chairman of its Subcommittee on Distribution Practices, have in such capacities, learned first hand of the serious plight of small business, just as Senator SPARKMAN, the distinguished chairman of our committee's counterpart in the Senate, has.

Both Representative PATMAN and I have become fully cognizant of the great difficulties and discriminations encountered by small businessmen in obtaining locations in the growing number of shopping centers. It is a matter of common knowledge that the modern shopping centers with their attractive stores, free and ample parking spaces for the customers, generally having branches of banks, public utilities, and so forth, act as a magnet for shoppers near their homes. Small wonder then that spaces for stores are preempted by big businesses and that the small man is not able to obtain any store. The owners of such shopping centers, because of the large financial investment entailed in the construction, generally require that prospective tenants have AAA-1 credit ratings or a net worth of $1 million or more. Because of this, the small concerns are placed at a substantial competitive disadvantage impairing their growth and development, thus weakening the competitive free enterprise system and preventing the orderly development of the national economy.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN and I have, therefore, each introduced bills in the House, authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals in leases of commercial and industrial property. These bills are identical with the one which the Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, introduced today. I strongly urge that favorable action be taken on these sorely needed measures, lest the small business segment of an economy be irreparably damaged, to the detriment of our Nation.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and at the request of my very good friend, Mr. Edward F. Toohey, executive director of the Committee on Political Education, Philadelphia Branch, AFL-CIO, I would like to insert the following resolution adopted by Machinist Local No. 528, IUE Local No. 142, Iron Workers Local No. 13, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Locals Nos. 165, 170, and 791, calling upon the 87th Congress to enact S. 909 and H.R. 4222 to provide medical care for the aged.

The points set forth in the resolution prove without doubt the need for an adequate medical care program is urgent and immediate.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE 87TH CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 909 AND H.R. 4222

Whereas one of the most serious domestic issues of our time is the health of more than 17,500,000 Americans over 65 years of age, a great majority of whom are financially unable to personally meet the rising costs of medical care in their advancing years; and

Whereas we all share the responsibility to our parents, recognizing the fact that the cost of medical care has spiraled tremendously from a cost of $9.39 per day in 1946 to $32.33 in 1960; and

Whereas 90 percent of our people over the age of 65, according to the most authoritative surveys, are constantly faced with the prospect of entering hospitals with little or no money; and

Whereas most people over 65 have hardly enough money to support themselves—their average income is $1,300 a year; and

Whereas few of us can afford the increasing cost of raising and educating our children properly and, at the same time, carry the full burden of costly medical care for our parents; and

Whereas under social security, the King-Anderson bill would have us contribute 2 or 3 cents a day to build health insurance protection upon our retirement at 65; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill introduced by Senator CLINTON B. ANDERSON and Representative CECIL KING and cosponsored by many of their colleagues in both Houses, H.R. 4222 and S. 909. This bill would help to alleviate the hardship and suffering of many of our senior citizens by providing hospitalization for approximately 14½ million now receiving social security: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to this bill without delay, so this serious threat to the economic and moral strength of our Nation will be swiftly met and that the conditions above described can be corrected.

ILGWU COOPERATIVE HOUSES

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by President Kennedy and an address by the president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 19, 1962, President John F. Kennedy dedicated ILGWU Cooperative Houses, the Penn Station South project in Chelsea, located in Manhattan's 20th District which I have the honor to represent. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, presided at the ceremonies which marked the opening of this $40 million development which consists of ten 22-storied buildings containing 2,820 units.

Built under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, this project demonstrates my long held conviction that title I subsidies can and should be used for middle income housing, not luxury housing. In this cooperative housing the equity or downpayment is $650 per room. Monthly carrying charges vary from $19.60 to $27.45 per room with an average of $24 per room.

Long-term mortgage financing was provided by the ILGWU in the amount of $17 million, the New York State teachers' retirement system for $10 million and the Dry Dock Savings Bank for $3 million. Through the National Housing Act the reserves of funds won through collective bargaining to protect garment workers in ill health, old age, and job severance have been used for the benefit of the entire community. This is the second such development sponsored by the ILGWU. It shows what progressive and enlightened union leadership can accomplish in furtherance of the general welfare of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the speech of President Kennedy at the dedication:

Dave [David Dubinsky], Mrs. Roosevelt, Governor Rockefeller, Mayor Wagner, Mr. [Luigi] Antonini, distinguished city officials, distinguished Mayor, George Meany, Alex Rose, ladies and gentlemen, I want to register an official protest with the International Ladies' Garment Workers of the sweatshop conditions under which we're working today.

I'm not sure that this represents 50 years of progress. It is true that your distinguished president invited me to come to speak on November 3 as we were heading to a meeting which he was sponsoring 3 days before election. I would have agreed to anything.

But in any case, I'm delighted I agreed to come here because this is most impressive. And I think what Dave Dubinsky said and what George Meany said both carry very important messages for this union, for the labor movement as a whole and for the United States.

Because what they were saying was, "What can a union now do to contribute to the welfare of its own members and to the welfare of the country?"

We read frequently that one of the great problems that you face in organized labor is how to maintain the same fervor, the same spirit, the same zeal which motivated this and other unions in their early days of the great struggle to provide decent working conditions and pay for their members.

We still have great areas of effort which are left to this union in protecting the welfare of its members. But it is also important to emphasize—and there is also a great opportunity open to all unions across the

country to participate in—the strengthening of their country.

And that's what this union has done on this occasion as well as so many others. The work available for organized labor in the United States today is just as important—in many ways more important—than it was 25 years ago.

PRAISES LEADERSHIP

The unfinished business of our society still lies stretching before us, and this housing project demonstrates what labor with good, effective progressive leadership, and the cities and the States and private groups and the Federal Government together in cooperation can do for this city and this country.

And that's why I think it most appropriate to come here today with your distinguished leaders and tell you that this union has done a good job, and to ask that other unions across the country imitate your example.

The unfinished business of this country is your business. And I can assure you after being in the Presidency only 16 or 17 months that the progress of this country will depend in a great measure on the sense of public responsibility of members of organized labor.

If you want to have equal opportunity for all Americans, if we want to rebuild our cities, if we want to provide transit in and out of our cities, if we want to educate our children, if we want to have colleges and universities to which they can go, if we want to have medical schools to train our doctors, if we want to make this country as wonderful a place as it can be for the 300 million who will live in this country within 40 years, then we have to do our task today. It is the task of every generation to build a road for the next generation.

This housing project, the efforts we're making in this city and State and in the National Government, I believe can provide a better life for the people who come after us, if we meet our responsibilities.

There are those who say that the job is done, that the function of the Federal Government is not to govern, that all the things that had to be done were done in the 30's and 40's and that now our task is merely to administer. I do not accept that view at all. Nor can any American who sees what we still have left to do.

So this is a great effort by you. This union deserves the heartiest commendations. I hope others will follow your example. And I come here today and ask you to continue to work as you have in the past, and as free labor organizations must do all over the world for the kind of progress upon which our ultimate security depends. We believe that there is much left to do. And I come here today and ask you to join us in doing it.

About 30 years ago a distinguished French marshal asked his gardener to plant a tree and the gardener said that tree won't come to flower for 100 years. He said, in that case, plant it this afternoon. Well, that's the way I feel about all the tasks left undone in this country which will not be finished in our time. But we ought to do something about it this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, which express the spirit behind the development of ILGWU Cooperative Houses:

For the second time in 7 years it is my privilege to preside at a ceremony dedicating new homes in this city, sponsored by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

We in the ILGWU are not in the real estate business. We are in the business of improving the lives of workers, of lifting up not only their material standards but also the spiritual values of thir lives. And better schools, better health care, better housing are basic elements of a better life.

The dreams and the hopes that brought thousands of immigrants to these shores, early in the century, never died. They survived the challenge of the slums and the sweatshops. They were the ammunition of ILGWU pioneers who marched on picket lines—hungry but determined. Back in their minds they held on to the daring thought that the time would come when there would be a civilized length to the workday, a humane standard of pay, decent conditions of work, and when they would live in homes surrounded by space and sunshine and green things.

In that bitter time, many of our members were compelled to turn to the community for help. Now we are gathered here to balance the accounts, to return to the city and the community the fruit of that freedom that made it possible for us as a union to grow and flourish and achieve our present position.

Labor today has passed beyond an exclusive concern with wages and hours. We have passed beyond the only question of what can we get. In this spirit, we have created health centers which are an aid to communities. We have undertaken widespread community service for our workers and only last month, in recognition of how we are dependent one upon another, the ILGWU made funds available to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to extend loans to farmers of this Nation under a farm mortgage program. In this way, a trade union extends a helping hand not only to American agriculture but also to our entire national economy.

Today, American labor is concerned as much with what it can give as it is with what it can get.

These towering modern air-conditioned buildings stand as solid and dramatic symbols of what free and responsible labor can accomplish in a free and democratic society.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE FOREIGN ECONOMIC AND FOREIGN TRADE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, May 17, President Kennedy spoke to the Conference on Trade Policy on the subject of his proposed "Trade Expansion Act of 1962." This group consists of leading business, farm and labor groups throughout the country. It was an appropriate forum in which the President could pay tribute to the unequalled leadership of the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I would dare say that President Kennedy has not only leaned on WILBUR MILLS for advice and guidance, but for leadership in spearheading specific major legislation in the Congress, more than he has any other Member of the House and Senate in this Congress. In WILBUR MILLS the President and the country, and his State and District, have a champion the likes of which few of us have had or will have the privilege of knowing in all of our political life.

There are of course, as is always the case, reasons why WILBUR MILLS has reached a position of such importance in the affairs of this country. In a few words, "he has worked at it." I have heard his staff say that WILBUR MILLS is one chairman who is a better technician than the staff. It is a pleasure for us who are members of the Committee on Ways and Means to work for a man who is so knowledgeable in the various fields of legislation within our jurisdiction.

This alone would make it a happy experience to be on the Committee on Ways and Means, but in addition to this talent, WILBUR MILLS has many, many others. He is personable, he is considerate, he is respected by people from all walks of life he is dedicated to serving his country when we all know that it is at a tremendous financial sacrifice compared to what he would be paid in private industry he has an uncanny ability to sense the temper of the Congress in framing legislation that is acceptable to the House. He is possessed of a modesty which is always the mark of a great man, and he is interested in the welfare of all classes of people in our society.

President Kennedy, fully recognizing that without the respect in which WILBUR MILLS is held and without his ability to keep in mind the interest of individuals as well as the country, gave due credit to WILBUR MILLS last Thursday night in a nationwide television broadcast for his developing the President's proposed "Trade Expansion Act of 1962" in such a way as to not only satisfy the President but to also satisfy many segments of American business and labor, small and large, who have such divergent interests in the subject of foreign trade.

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have served under the guidance of WILBUR MILLS for these many years. He has been my friend, my confidante, and my teacher. There are few men I have ever known for whom I have as great a respect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the speech of the President last Thursday night. It was a notable one. It concerned American policy toward the Atlantic community and the role of the President's Trade Expansion Act in that policy.

It was a statement of major importance at a time when the Atlantic alliance has shown some growing pains and when the future of that alliance has been called into question in some quarters. It was most timely for the leader of the Atlantic community and the free world, the President of the United States, to speak out so clearly and constructively. He said:

I am confident that Atlantic unity represents the true course of history—that Europe and the United States have not joined forces for more than a decade to be divided now by limited visions and suspicions. The direction of our destiny is toward community and confidence—and the United States is determined to fulfill that destiny.

The President's foreign trade program is one of the essential elements in the construction of the road to an effective Atlantic community, marked by an open and constructive partnership between the United States and the European Economic Community. The action of the Committee on Ways and Means on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, marks

a critical step in the development of this policy.

The full text of the President's speech follows:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO THE CONFERENCE ON TRADE POLICY, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, MAY 17, 1962

Congressman Mills, Mr. Taft, Ambassador Lodge, Senator Humphrey, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my great appreciation to WILBUR MILLS who has seen and taken advantage of a unique opportunity to serve his State and country and the whole free world by the untiring efforts that he is now applying, with the greatest possible skill, and courage, and diligence, to securing the passage of an effective trade bill. If he can't do it, no one else could.

And I am grateful to all of you—to Mr. Taft who has labored in this field for so long—to Ambassador Lodge who has rendered invaluable service in this great effort in countless ways—to Mr. Clayton and Christian Herter who I do not believe are here, but who helped lay the groundwork for a great national effort, wholly separate from the parties and to all of you. I hope that in this effort in which you are engaged, at this meeting and on other occasions, you appreciate how vital and significant your efforts are. If we are making progress in this area this year, as I believe we are, it has been due to the enormous work done by countless citizens, many of them anonymous, who recognize that the idea and the hour and the opportunity have all struck.

When I submitted to the Congress the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I called it "the expression of a nation, not of any single faction or section." And that is true, and it is indicated by the fine messages of President Hoover and President Eisenhower and President Truman of the support that has been given this, by Vice President Nixon and Alf Landon and others, who recognize this as a national challenge and opportunity, and not that that belongs to any party.

The trade of a nation expresses in a very concrete way its aims and its aspirations. When the people of Boston in 1773 threw cargoes of tea into the harbor, the American Revolution was in effect underway, symbolized by this revolution against a tariff—a tariff which meant taxation without representation. When our Nation turned, in the 19th century, to its own protective tariffs as an aid to industrial development, they symbolized a policy on noninvolvement and of isolation, of detachment, from the affairs of the world. When protectionism, in spite of the efforts of President Hoover, reached its zenith in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff, it reflected a national lack of confidence and growth. And then, in 1934, under the leadership of Cordell Hull, the United States started on the long road back both from protectionism and isolationism.

As the reciprocal trade program was renewed and refined through 11 acts of Congress, under the successive leaderships of President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, it became more and more an expression of America's free world leadership—a symbol of America's aim to encourage free nations to grow together, through trade and travel, through a common defense, through aiding the development of poorer nations, and through an increasing exchange of capital and culture.

And now the time has come for a new chapter in American trade policy—a chapter that symbolizes our new great aspirations: for greater growth at home, greater progress around the world, and above all, the emergence of a greater Atlantic partnership.

In recent days some doubts have been heard about the reality of this concept of Atlantic partnership. Fears have been expressed on this side of the Atlantic that the United States may be excluded from the councils and the markets of Europe. And fears have been expressed on the other side of the Atlantic that the United States may some day abandon its commitment to European security.

But I want to emphasize tonight, to all the peoples of the Western Alliance, that I strongly believe that such fears are folly. The United States cannot withdraw from Europe, unless and until Europe should wish us gone. We cannot distinguish its defenses from our own. We cannot diminish our contributions to Western security or abdicate the responsibilities of power. And it is a fact of history that responsibility and influence—in all areas, political, military, and economic—ultimately rise and fall together. No nation can long bear the heaviest burdens of responsibility without sharing in the progress and decisions—just as no nation can assert for long its influence without accepting its share of these burdens. And our policies in Europe today are founded on one deep conviction: that the threat to Western Europe and freedom is basically indivisible, as is the Western deterrent to that threat.

The United States, therefore, is committed to the defense of Europe, by history as well as by choice. We have no wish to join, much less to dominate, the European Community. We have no intention of interfering in its internal affairs. But neither do we hope or plan to please all of our European allies, who do not always agree with each other, on every topic of discussion—or to base those decisions which affect the long-run state of the common security on the short-term state of our popularity in the various capitals of Europe.

Let us remember that we are working with allies, with equals—and both our allies and ourselves have a responsibility to speak frankly as well as constructively on all issues affecting the West. If the Alliance were to stand still, if we were to pursue a policy of merely patching over the status quo with the lowest common denominator of generalities, no doubt all disagreements could be avoided or postponed. But dissent does not mean disunity—and disagreement can surely be healthy, so long as we avoid, on both sides of the Atlantic, any ill-tempered or ill-conceived remarks which may encourage those who hope to divide and conquer.

We cannot and do not take any European ally for granted—and I hope no one in Europe would take us for granted either. Our willingness to bear our full share of Western defenses is deeply felt—but it is not automatic. American public opinion has turned away from isolation—but its faith must not be shattered. Our commitment, let it be remembered, is to a common united defense, in which every member of the Western Community plays a full and responsible role, to the limit of his capability and in reliance on the strength of others—and it is that commitment which will be fulfilled. As long as the United States is staking its own national security on the defense of Europe, contributing today 425,000 men at an annual cost—in the balance of payments, and therefore in dollars, and therefore potentially in gold—of $1,600 million to Europe, and calling up 160,000 men—at a budgetary cost of $3,500 million since last July—in a far greater effort than that of any other country in response to last summer's crisis, we will continue to participate in the great decisions affecting war and peace in that area. A coherent policy cannot call for both our military presence and our diplomatic absence.

I am confident that Atlantic unity represents the true course of history—that Europe and the United States have not joined forces for more than a decade to be divided now by limited visions and suspicions. The direction of our destiny is toward community and confidence—and the United States is determined to fulfill that destiny.

Far from resenting the rise of a united Europe, this country welcomes it—a new Europe of equals instead of rivals—a new Europe, born of common ideals, instead of the old Europe, torn by national and personal animosities. We look forward to its increased role, as a full and equal partner, in both the burdens and the opportunities of aid, trade, finance, diplomacy, and defense. We look forward to the strengthening of world peace that would result from a European Community in which no member could either dominate or endanger the others. And surely, may I add, each member would find in the fabric of European unity and Atlantic partnership an opportunity for achievement, or grandeur, and for a voice in its own destiny, far greater than it would find in the more traditional and vulnerable fabrics of disunity and mutual distrust.

The debate now raging in Europe echoes on a grand scale the debates which took place in this country between 1783 and 1789. Small states are sometimes fearful of big ones. Big states are suspicious for historical reasons of one another. Some statesmen cling to traditional forms—others clamor for new ones. And every eye is on the hostile powers who are never far away. All this reminds us of our own organic deliberations.

But whatever the final resolution of today's debates, Western unity is not an end in itself. Collective security and deterrence are not enough. The time and the opportunity that they afford us are not worth the risk and the effort they require if we do not use them for constructive ends. If there is to be a new Atlantic partnership, it must be a partnership of strong, not weak, economies—of growing, not declining, societies. And the great attraction of trade expansion for the United States is not only its contribution to a grand design of Atlantic partnership, but its practical benefits to our own economy as well.

For today we wish to step up our growth—and trade expansion, by increasing exports as well as imports, and providing new outlets and new jobs, will help exand that growth.

We wish to avoid inflation—and trade expansion, by inspiring American business to modernize for competition abroad, and by introducing new import competition here, will help to prevent that inflation.

We wish to improve our balance of payments—and trade expansion, by increasing our export surplus, will enable us to correct this deficit without imposing new restrictions or reneging on our security pledges.

We wish to increase investment at home—and trade expansion, by putting American businessmen on an equal footing with their European counterparts in terms of access to the Common Market, will help make it unnecessary for our industries to build new plants behind the Common Market wall instead of here at home.

We wish to increase the American standard of living—and trade expansion, by enlarging the supply of goods from abroad and stretching the consumer's dollar further, will help every American family.

There are many more gains that could be mentioned. Trade expansion will help spur plant modernization, it will turn the attention of the government and industry to how to make our plants more competitive, and how to put them on a basis of equality with those goods that are being imported, it will help provide outlets for our farm surpluses, and even help reduce existing budget costs—by lessening the costs of imported raw materials, for example, for our national defense, and ultimately the cost of foreign aid to those nations now denied the opportunity to earn foreign exchange for their own development.

We have prospered mightily during this period of the reciprocal trade program. Our

exports, a meager $2 billion a year during the 3 years before the enactment of the first Trade Agreements Act in 1934, have increased tenfold to some $20 billion. Every American is richer because of this great effort.

And yet, until recently, and this remains one of our most serious problems today in the Congress, most Americans were largely unaware of the benefits of foreign trade. Many can see an import—but very few could see an export. While both labor and management in other nations—such as Britain and Japan—recognize that they must trade or die, we have for a long time remained, in both labor and management, largely unconcerned.

Today I believe all this is changing, but it's not, obviously, changing fast enough. American businessmen are determined to share in the phenomenal growth of the Common Market, but we want every American businessman to be looking all around the world for a place in which he can participate successfully in private investment. The Japanese economy as well is growing at the spectacular rate of 8 percent a year or more. Over the past 5 years Americans have sold in Japan $1½ billion more than we have bought from Japan.

In short, this trade expansion program can benefit us all. I don't say that there won't be some changes in our economy which will require adjustment. But we will be producing more of what we produce best, and others will be producing more of what they produce best. There will be new employment in our growth industries—and this will come mostly in our high wage industries which are our most competitive abroad—and less new employment in some others. But these shifts go on every week in our lives, in this country, as the result of domestic competition. At the very most, the number of workers who will have to change jobs as a result of this new trade policy will not in a whole year equal the number of workers who have to change jobs every 3 weeks because of competitive changes here at home. And yet for these workers we are planning special assistance.

There may be a few cases—a very few cases—where individual companies or groups of workers will face genuine hardships in trying to adjust to this changing world and market, and lack the resources to do so. Our bill seeks to take out an insurance policy for these cases called trade adjustment assistance, which has worked so well in the Common Market. It is a constructive, businesslike program of loans and allowances tailored to help firms and workers get back into the competitive stream through increasing or changing productivity. Instead of the dole of tariff protection, we are substituting an investment in better production.

In addition, we have made special arrangements for such industries as textiles and oil. And finally, we are retaining an escape clause for those emergencies where an entire industry requires the temporary relief of tariff protection as the result of abrupt changes in trading patterns.

But let us not miss the real point: let us not focus ourselves so much on these insurance policies that we forget the great new positive opportunities opened to us in trade. To falter now or become afraid of economic challenges in this country which has been second to none in all of our history in our ability to compete, or become impatient in the face of difficult and delicate diplomatic problems, or make it impossible for those Americans who represent us in these negotiations to effectively speak for this country because of provisions written into bills which make it impossible for them, even though they bear the responsibility, they do not bear the authority if these powers are too circumscribed, so that we will end with an illusion of a tool to serve us, but not a reality. Unless we can concentrate our attention on what is an historic opportunity, we could well undo all the great achievements of this Nation in building this great Atlantic Community.

There is an old Chinese saying that each generation builds a road for the next. The road has been well built for us, and I believe it incumbent upon us, in our generation, this year of 1962, to build our road for the next generation. And I believe that this bill is it.

Thank you.

PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN LUMBER INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise, in righteous indignation of the handling of a situation that has developed, and demand action now instead of providing flowers for the burial of a great industry.

My indignation is directed not at individuals, nor at any personal affront I have suffered, but at a system of government which lavishes attention upon the transgressor of our laws and traditions and ignores the legitimate interests of law-abiding, contributive citizens.

The newspapers and news magazines have lately been filled with stories concerning alleged misconduct by some individuals within the Department of Agriculture concerning privileges improperly granted to a Texas entrepreneur. Both bodies of Congress have launched full-scale investigations of the situation to ferret out those who have contributed to this scandal. Presumably the Department of Agriculture has turned loose innumerable personnel to search the files and develop the evidence necessary to bring these malefactors to justice and retribution.

And yet I received last week a copy of a wire from another Texan addressed to the President of the United States respectfully soliciting his intervention to win positive Government action to deal with legitimate requests to resolve the problems facing our American lumber industry. Arthur Temple, Jr., of Diboll, Tex., is a patient man, far more patient than I would have been under the circumstances.

Let me cite those circumstances so that this body can join me in wonderment at the cavalier treatment accorded this fundamental American industry, employing 3 million citizens, by an apparently disinterested corps of Federal officials.

On February 21 of this year, Mr. Temple headed a delegation of 55 lumbermen, representing all regions of the country, to a meeting with the Secretary of Agriculture. The discussion was considered of such interest that more than 45 members of both Houses of Congress either attended the conference personally or were represented by their senior staff assistants. At that meeting the lumber industry sought four moderate revisions to present timber management and sales policies of the U.S. Forest Service to alleviate conditions in the forest industries, where there are now 200,000 workers unemployed. As of today, the lumber industry has received no reply from the Department of Agriculture although the proposed changes lie well within the province of the Secretary of Agriculture. The U.S. Forest Service employs 30,000 workers. Are they all so fully occupied with distributing Smokey the Bear commercials that they cannot reply to a legitimate inquiry from the industry which provides them with $130 million a year in timber sale revenues? Must 3 months elapse before a letter can be transmitted?

On March 22 of this year the lumber industry asked the businessman's friend, the Secretary of Commerce, to arrange an early conference between representatives of the United States, of Canada, and of the softwood lumber industries of each nation, to work out a mutually acceptable solution to the real threat of present high level Canadian lumber imports to this country. Two months later there has been no formal reply to this request. There has been a 10-minute conversation between Secretary Hodges and lumber leaders after one of our members alerted the White House to the evident disinterest of Commerce on this matter, but polite conversation has never put one man to work, to say nothing of 200,000.

The State Department has advised the lumber industry that more study of the problem is needed before any international conference can be arranged. We arrange cultural, educational, agricultural, scientific—and I might add, social exchanges with nations throughout the world—friendly and unfriendly, but when our industrial people seek a sanction for friendly talks with their counterparts in the neighboring county to the north, they are told that the problem needs further study.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is an industry which seeks no subsidy, which seeks no retraining program for its unemployed, which seeks no tax relief, which seeks no special privilege, being denied the attention it deserves through its fundamental right of petition.

The industry has conducted itself with grace and dignity throughout this official run-around. It has demonstrated its maturity and its good judgment by behaving with responsibility. But, I for one, am not content to demonstrate such forbearance. I want action for my constitutents who are affected by the very issues which the lumber industry is seeking to have resolved. I want government to be as responsive to legitimate business requests as it is to the needs of touring foreign delegations. I want action to strengthen the economy of all timber-growing regions in the United States. There is no State in the Union which does not produce lumber. There is no industry which has deeper roots in the heritage of this country. It has demonstrated its responsible stewardship for our Nation's only renewable resource. It deserves consideration, and so do those citizens, and communities, dependent upon it for their continued existence in economic comfort.

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

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman in expressing concern over the plight of the lumber industry. We, in the part of the country I represent in the State of Washington, have suffered grievously. Many of our lumber mills are closed down. We have our workers in those industries unemployed. We, too, are hopeful that the Government will do something to try and bring about better economic conditions in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any one cure for the problem. Many different solutions have been offered, but I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman for raising this issue here today and to say that there are a great many of us who have lumber industries in our congressional districts who agree with him, and who are hopeful that perhaps some action can be taken to try to bring about some voluntary agreement on the part of the Canadians so that they will cut down their exports into the United States. Underselling American mills in America and thereby putting American workers out of work is causing ill will and serious economic hardship.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman in expressing the hope that our Government will do something and commend him for speaking up today in this way.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I asked my distinguished colleague to yield so that I may associate myself with him in his remarks.

Many of the conditions that have brought about the present unemployment of 200,000 persons formerly employed in the forest products industry, the increasing rate of mill shutdowns, and the resulting problems to our Nation's forest-based communities are the direct or indirect result of Government policies and actions. These conditions cannot be remedied by the private action of the forest products industry, its employees, or the citizens in the communities dependent upon the lumber industry. Remedies can only come through a change in the policies and actions of our Government.

The lumber industry is firmly committed to a course of action that will bring about changes in Government policies and programs to permit the industry's continued existence as a vital force in our national economy. The industry is rightfully determined to take all necessary action to achieve this essential goal.

Specifically the industry regards quota action as urgently needed to stave off disaster threatening the American lumber industry by Canadian imports flooding into this country on cheap dollars, rail and water transportation advantages, and Canadian Government-subsidized timber.

Although I represent a State in which approximately one-third of the economy is directly tied to the forest products industry, the problem of lumber exports affects not only the Pacific Northwest but many other parts of our Nation. The Southern States, for instance, are also suffering loss of markets for our lumber producers.

As a direct result of Canadian lumber shipments by water, through the Panama Canal, and into our normal trading areas I am told by lumbermen in my district that last year 7 out of every 10 feet of lumber shipped into eastern ports originated in Canada. I am further advised that 1 of every 7 board feet of lumber shipped anywhere within the United States originated in Canada.

The United States has always been considered a timber country, proud in its ability to fulfill the needs of its people with its vast forest resources while at the same time perpetuating those forests for the use and enjoyment of future generations. If forest operations become economically unfeasible for private industry throughout the country, as a direct result of markets lost to imports, not only will additional thousands be thrown out of work, but more importantly, perhaps, the careful management of commercial forests will necessarily deteriorate since industry will simply not have the funds nor the incentive to grant them the tender care and attention they now enjoy as the Nation's main renewable resource.

American lumbermen want no handouts or subsidies. They, along with many concerned Members of Congress, have pleaded with Federal agencies for 16 months to respond to problems which are creating widespread unemployment in forest-dependent communities. No helpful response has been forthcoming from these agencies. Recent cheapening of the Canadian dollar has created an intolerable competitive situation in our domestic markets. The industry proposes that Canadian softwood lumber imports be reduced to that nation's 10-year average of rail and water shipments to the United States. This is requested as a temporary quota to be imposed until long-range agreements on sharing the American market can be negotiated with Canada.

Immediate action is mandatory, and the responsible Government officials must assume their responsibilities and act in the best interests of the United States.

I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for calling this serious situation to the attention of our colleagues in this body.

Mr. BERRY. Certainly I want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her contribution and for the work she has been doing for the industry in her years here in Congress; also for bringing to light the facts and figures on this import problem, as well as the problem that is created because of the differential in value of the Canadian dollar.

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

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

Mr. DOWDY. The flagrant disregard of legitimate inquiry cited by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota has also been called to my attention, not only through the copy of Arthur Temple's moderate appeal for White House action but through letters and personal visits from constituents. I might add that Diboll is in the district I have the honor to represent, and Mr. Temple is my constituent.

Generally speaking, lumbermen are not wealthy holders of vast areas of forest land which they convert to their own use. They are, mostly, practical businessmen, many of whom, the little sawmill operators particularly, are obliged to turn to the U.S. Forest Service to purchase the timber needed to keep their mills operating. This is particularly true in my district, because vast areas of the Seventh District of Texas are in the national forest. If they cannot obtain timber at a competitive price to meet the inroads of foreign imports in the American market they are obliged to suspend operations. When a lumber mill shuts down often the whole community shuts down. I have seen it happen on more than one occasion. The location of the vast areas of forested lands controlled by the Forest Service isolates these communities dependent upon the forest resources and makes them wholly dependent upon continued lumber production for their very existence. There are no alternative jobs available to loggers and sawmill workers; lumber producers must have access to timber under reasonable conditions if they are to keep the commodity competitive at all. A profit is not the question here under consideration, but rather, access to raw material from which marketable products can be manufactured. The executive departments should be and ought to be responsive to these requests for fair treatment; if they fail to respond the Congress must make it unnecessary for the lumber industry to deal with them by passing corrective legislation. When a Government agency fails to fulfill its responsibilities to the citizens it is designed to serve, it has outlived its usefulness. It cannot be too often repeated that the Government is the servant, not the master, of the people. Every effort must be exerted to keep Government in its proper role, not only in this instance but in all others.

Mr. BERRY. I thank my colleague from Texas for his contribution. Certainly the lumber industry is a great industry in his district, but I know from his record in the Congress that he would be interested in this problem even if he did not have any lumber in his district; the gentleman from Texas is one of the valuable Members of this body.

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

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Dakota for calling the attention of the House to a situation which I never thought could exist here in these United States of America. In my opinion, it is unthinkable that responsible agencies

of the Government, agencies for which we are asked to appropriate approximately $15 billion in this coming fiscal year should practically ignore the appeals of an industry responsible for the employment of some 3 million people. I think we should ask these agencies to account for the callous manner in which they have handled the requests of our forest products industries. These are not selfish, frivolous, or senseless requests. These are not Republicans or Democrats making these requests. This is the most bipartisan approach to a problem that I have seen in my 10 years in the Congress. These are the requests of an industry that is beset by the unemployment of some 200,000 people.

Now what are the requests this industry has made of the Government—their Government? They are simply these. First, they ask that the Department of Agriculture consider a revision of the policies that govern the sale of national forest timber so as to remove inequities and discriminations that make it almost impossible for lumbermen to buy such timber and convert it into lumber at a profit.

Second, they have asked the Departments of State and Commerce to take some kind of action to permit American lumbermen to remain in business in the face of the mounting imports of softwood lumber from Canada, imports which the Canadians are able to sell in this country at an advantage of more than $10 a thousand. The recent action of the Canadian Government further reducing the value of the Canadian dollar to 92½ cents—but if anyone would take a look at the exchange rates in the Wall Street Journal, they will find that the Canadian dollar is selling for less than that—just makes it practically impossible for the lumber industry to compete.

The question is—are these unreasonable requests? I think not, Mr. Speaker. But there is something very unreasonable and something very much amiss when the agencies of government to which this industry appeals gives such little notice and shows such little sympathy to the needs of our people. We hear a great deal these days about the Government assuming more and more functions affecting the life of the individual citizen. We all know it is true. We also know if this trend continues, it will destroy private initiative and individual responsibility to the same extent that such foundations of the private enterprise system have been destroyed in other planned-economy nations. With all the efforts that this administration is making to combat unemployment, you would think they could see that by expeditious handling of these requests, the administration could almost immediately relieve a great pocket of unemployment.

I, again, ask here on the floor of the House of Representatives, as I have asked in letters to these agencies, that immediate action be taken.

Mr. BERRY. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Washington not only for his comments but also for the work he has been doing in an honest effort to get sympathetic consideration from the Department of Agriculture and from the Department of Commerce on these problems. Certainly they cannot be solved unless serious, sympathetic consideration is given to them. This is what we are again today demanding and I thank the gentleman from Washington again for his contribution.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. McSWEEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that this issue is not a partisan political matter. I had the privilege of presiding not long ago at a meeting in the New House Office Building where 61 Congressmen of both parties gathered to discuss one problem we all had in common, the plight of the forest-based economies. Each of us had firsthand knowledge of the needs of our forest industries from letters and discussions we had had with workers, management, and community leaders in areas where the principal source of community revenue is trees. This was not a caucus for the purpose of determining policy; it was a meeting to examine ways and means to combat the dilatory attitudes of the executive departments with respect to the problems of industries dependent upon forests for their existence.

We note how actively the National Park Service and the Forest Service are vying to fulfill the recreational needs of 187 million Americans. I earnestly solicit the help of this body in winning similar zealous interest among Federal agencies for another need of our citizens—jobs.

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

Mr. BERRY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the feeling that what has happened to the lumber and woodworking industries is incongruous with the manner in which our Government should serve the people.

What is especially difficult for me to understand is the apparent inconsistency of the Kennedy administration with regard to Government forest policies.

Just a short time ago we were witness to the spectacle of the Government exerting every force at its disposal to force a major industry—steel—to rescind a price hike.

At that time, the Vice President told us:

> It is not enough to sit back and let the law of economics slowly solve things.

Whether or not we agree that it was proper for the President to pressure the steel industry into backing down on a price increase—whether or not we feel that a price boost was justified—we can all agree, I believe, that the pressures of inflation were relieved somewhat when steel prices were returned to their former level.

But what manner of logic is it that tells the Government, on the one hand, it should hold down the price of steel and, on the other hand, use its monopoly position to exact the highest possible dollar for timber—Federal timber—and put wage earners out of jobs? This is not the way the Canadian Government handles the problems of its forest products industry, and it is one of the reasons they are getting an ever-increasing share of U.S. lumber markets.

To me, that does not make good dollars-and-sense.

To me, that suggests we have a Government that is inclined to tell our people: "You can charge only x number of dollars for your product, but we—the Government—intend to charge whatever the traffic will bear."

In other words, the old story: "Don't do as I do; do as I say."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is coming dangerously close to the way they do business—state-controlled business—in countries whose philosophy is alien to ours.

Just a moment ago, my colleague from South Dakota explained how, under present policies of the U.S. Forest Service, national forest timber offered to private purchasers could be bid up to artificially high levels by the pressures of government monopoly, scarcity, speculation and related factors.

While I was listening to this explanation, it occurred to me that here we have a situation just as serious, just as potentially inflationary, as the steel price hike.

Obviously, the conditions for harvesting Federal timber will have an important bearing on the cost of lumber, millwork, flooring, and the other wood products manufactured from that timber, our only renewable natural resource.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Agriculture is in a most strategic position. He controls more than one-third of our Nation's wood supply. He can by the stroke of a pen—or by his failure to take up that pen—make us pay a higher raw material price for scores of the products basic and essential to our daily life.

The matter of timber supply must be a two-way street.

If the Government decides it must use pressure to keep one American industry competitive with foreign producers—as it said was necessary in the steel case—then, clearly, it has a responsibility to allow other industries to remain competitive with oversea producers.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the issue before us has many ramifications, many angles, that it behooves us all to study.

In furtherance of this idea, I intend to offer a resolution asking the appropriate committee of this body to conduct a special hearing at which officials of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, representatives of the lumber industry, and other interested parties may be heard. Let us investigate the policies and dilatory methods of these agencies and find out whether or not they are serving the American people or themselves.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his comments. Certainly he has a great interest in this industry and in seeing

that the industry is maintained. He has been most diligent in his efforts and most forceful in presenting the problems of the industry to the various executive branches of Government.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on this subject at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I had not known that the gentleman from South Dakota and his colleagues were going to take the floor on this very important subject, but I am happy that he is. I would simply like to comment that this matter became of concern to the Ways and Means Committee in our public hearings on the President's proposal on H.R. 9900 to extend the reciprocal trade act; and this specific problem of lumber, recently Canadian and our domestic lumber industry, became a point of illustration that I used myself to try to demonstrate that when we talk about increasing foreign trade we have to talk about fair trade, which means reciprocity, which means that if another nation uses licenses, or quotas or monetary exchange, or governmental subsidies, that that becomes an issue in itself. It is not fair trade to expect American industry to compete with that kind of operation from a foreign competitor. One of the things I think we must bear in mind if we are going to have a reciprocal trade bill on the floor in the ensuing weeks is whether or not enough attention has been paid to this very important factor of fair trade. It seems quite clear in the instance of lumber that Canada in effect has a governmental subsidy on the lumber products that are then turned over to the private concerns. In our own country we run into the same proposition, but any time that occurs it is a fact that must be weighed.

I will follow this particular problem of the lumber industry with a great deal more interest than I have previously shown because of the fine work the gentleman from South Dakota has done in bringing this out more clearly. I was using it as an example without having gone into the matter in full detail. Having listened quite closely to the gentleman's remarks, I am convinced this is an even more of an example of what I was trying to demonstrate. There is no sense in putting straitjackets around our people if they are going to permit foreign competition to be conducted in a manner which really is not fair.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his observations and for his comments. There is probably no one in the House who has made a greater study of economics, imports, and the result of imports on our economy than has the gentleman from Missouri. I know the gentleman is right that trade must be fair trade, a situation we do not have in connection with Canadian lumber because the Canadian Government has different standards for stumpage rates than we do in this country. There is no question but what their stumpage is sold at a much lower rate. Their access road requirements are much less, the requirements on their mills are a great deal less rigid than ours.

Certainly it is not fair. These are some of the things we have been asking the Department of Agriculture to consider but the only answers we have been getting is such replies as the memorandum of Chief Forester Cliff to Secretary Freeman and Secretary Freeman's letter to the northwest Senators in which he said in part:

> Part of the cause of recurrence of the same issues is refusal of industry representatives to accept decisions which the Forest Service considers to be the resolution of an issue.

Is this a disclosure of the true feelings of the Department? Is Congress to be placed in the same category? Are their decisions and rulings to be considered binding upon Congress too?

I think it is abundantly clear that there is no question of the need for relief in this industry, and there is no question about the urgency of this need.

Only a few of the Members have taken part in this special order today, but I know they speak for all 437 Members of the House and Members of the other body as well who are vitally interested in the future of this fourth largest segment of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we demand attention for this great industry, we demand action from the various branches of the executive department. This is not a political issue, as has been pointed out here by a number of Members. The problems of the lumber industry have been gradually worsened regardless of the political affiliation of the executive branch. It is an economic problem that needs immediate and nonpolitical attention. This, Mr. Speaker, is our demand.

Mr. Speaker, I include, as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD, a telegram from Mr. Arthur Temple, Jr., president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President, dated May 9, 1962, and a copy of a telegram from Eugene P. Foley, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Commerce, under date of May 21, 1962, both of which have been referred to in comments here today:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 9, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Representatives of the lumber industry throughout the United States have been meeting here in Los Angeles the past week in an effort to find answers to the many problems with which it is confronted. Intensive consideration has been given to plans and programs designed to improve our products, expand our markets, both at home and abroad, increase the value of our services to our customers, and to provide full employment and economic stability for the thousands of communities in our country dependent upon a healthy and prosperous forest products industry.

Our industry ranks fourth among American manufacturing industries in the number of people employed. The forest products industries employ over three million employees in the United States.

Many of the conditions that have brought about the present unemployment of 200,000 persons formerly employed in our industry, the increasing rate of mill shut-downs, and the resulting problems to our Nation's forest-based communities are, we believe, the direct or indirect result of Government policies and actions. These conditions cannot be remedied by the private action of our industry, its employees, or the citizens in the communities dependent upon the lumber industry. Remedies can only come through a change in the policies and actions of our Government.

On February 21 of this year, we met with the Secretary of Agriculture and presented a four-point program to modify the timber management and sale policies and procedures of the U.S. Forest Service so as to improve the utilization of our Nation's major renewable natural resources—trees. Implementation of this program is well within the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. As yet, we have no response from the Secretary on our proposals.

On March 22 of this year, we requested the Secretary of Commerce to arrange an early conference between representatives of the United States and Canadian softwood lumber industries to work out a mutually acceptable solution to the very serious problem arising from sharp increases, during the last several years, of exports of Canadian softwood lumber to the United States. Increasing imports from Canada are undermining the economic security of our forest-based communities. As yet, we have no formal reply to our proposal.

Representatives of the Department of State have advised us that more study of the problem is needed. They have stated that a high level interdepartmental task force will be formed to study the problem over the next few months. We are very grateful for this action, but we believe prompt action is imperative. The action last week of the Canadian Government in further reducing the value of the Canadian dollar to 92.3 cents, as compared to the U.S. dollar, gives Canadian softwood lumber an advantage of approximately $5 per thousand board feet over U.S. lumber in our country. We hope this further manipulation of exchange is not an indication of the attitude of the Canadian Government toward the reasonable offer of our industry to work toward an amicable solution. However, we believe it makes it imperative that immediate action be taken by the U.S. Government to impose a temporary quota on the flood of softwood lumber from Canada on a quarterly basis to remain in effect while a long-term solution is being explored by the several agencies of Government involved.

Mr. President, the lumber industry is firmly committed to a course of action that will bring about changes in Government policies and programs that will permit our continued existence as a vital force in our national economy. We are determined to take all necessary action to achieve this essential goal.

It is within your powers to direct policy changes within the various affected Government agencies which will immediately afford an opportunity for the millions of American people directly involved in our industry to achieve both community stability and full employment.

We earnestly request that you exercise those powers to serve the needs of our industry, our employees and our neighbors in forest-based communities.

ARTHUR TEMPLE, Jr.,
President, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 21, 1962.*

ARTHUR TEMPLE, Jr.,
President, National Lumber Manufacturers Association:

The President has asked me to reply. The Department of Commerce and other agencies of Government have been requested to conduct a complete study of the industry problems with a view to making recommendations for Government consideration and action.

EUGENE P. FOLEY,
Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Commerce.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

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

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill to establish a President's Advisory Council on Education. The purpose of the bill is to improve the quality of education in the United States by giving to the subject of education a national prestige which is sadly lacking, plus a sense of urgency.

There is at the present time a need for unity of effort and a pulling together of some of the unraveled threads that make up the education cloth of the country. We have seen, sadly, the demise, at least for the time being, of all proposals for Federal assistance to primary and secondary schools. There has been a rash of political crossfires and, I am sorry to say, religious controversy that has divided the Congress and divided the Nation. No one that I have talked to sees any hope for a modus vivendi within the reasonably near future.

Meanwhile, it seems to me criminal neglect that we should allow the subject of number one importance in the United States to drift without proper correlation with national goals.

Whether we know it or not we are competitors in the field of education. The Nation would not take lightly a sudden discovery that the Soviets had outstripped us in respect of quality of education, particularly in the sciences, humanities, and languages.

This being so, it seems to me essential that something be done rather than *nothing* be done. I am sure we have all noted with approval the success over the years of the President's Science Advisory Committee. This Committee has made remarkable contributions toward the advancement of science in the United States. One reason it has been able to do so is that it is at the Presidential level. It has status and prestige. It has acquired members who have been willing and anxious to serve.

The same is needed in the field of education. I note with disapproval the proposal of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that there be such a council on education connected directly with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is the wrong emphasis. It would have insufficient status and it would be just another temporary committee.

The kind of high-level Presidential council that I have in mind would perform very special functions. Among them would be the making of an annual assessment of goals and progress of education in the United States—in our public and private schools, colleges and universities. It would recommend to the President legislative proposals that have behind them the best thinking of leaders in the field in the whole United States. At the same time, it would propose action that can and should be taken by the States. It would act as a high-level board to correlate Federal departments and agencies presently concerned with education. Lastly and most important of all, it would provide national leadership to stimulate proper awareness of educational shortcomings. It would be able to do this because it would be a council directly under the President of the United States.

The bill provides for nine members to serve without compensation, except for expenses. The number nine is not sacred, but on the other hand I would emphasize the importance of not having too large a body. I am sure everyone has had experience indicating that smaller committees work better than large committees.

The members of the Council would be appointed by the President and would have to be confirmed by the Senate. The bill stipulates that they should be leaders in the field of education. The appointment is for 4 years. The President will designate the Chairman from among the members.

The most important aspect of this whole proposal goes to the caliber of the individual members of such a council. No Presidential council can serve a useful purpose unless the membership consists of the best. This is not easy, but it can be done.

This same proposal was made by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER in a bill introduced by him in June of last year, which was modeled on an earlier proposal by him in September 1959. His efforts in this regard are deserving of support and praise. He was farsighted. It seems to me now that the proposal takes on special significance in view of the circumstances surrounding all other proposals for Federal assistance to education in the U.S. Congress.

In introducing the bill in the Senate, Senator COOPER pointed out that there have been dozens of surveys and studies by various committees and conferences and foundations, but that no decisive action has been taken to raise the quality of education. What is needed now is to put these studies and surveys to use in decisive action on the part of States and communities and the Federal Government to improve the quality of education throughout the United States. This can be done only through the prestige of the President and through the prestige that will surround such a council at the Presidential level.

I am delighted to note that Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., the distinguished commissioner of education in the State of New York, has long favored such a proposal.

I am pleased to report also, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO], has has joined me today in introducing this bill. Mr. GIAIMO is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor and has long been concerned about the future of education in the United States. This bill, then, is bipartisan in its support and I hope will be considered on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to give careful and thoughtful study to this proposal that we may have action on it before the expiration of the 87th Congress.

PUBLIC POWER—GALLOPING SOCIALISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has a very serious question of basic national policy to decide and we might just as well face it.

Do we—as representatives of the people—want our electric power industry socialized?

If the present trend continues it is inevitable. As a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I have been very close to this issue and have discussed it with you several times on this floor and am going to discuss it again with the hope that my colleagues will recognize the seriousness of the situation and reverse the trend before it is too late. Public power can no longer be referred to as "creeping socialism"—is it now "galloping socialism."

In order to bring the facts on this subject up to date, I would like to discuss some of the recent activities of TVA and then the Bureau of Reclamation, the Interior Department, the Army Engineers, REA, SEPA, SWPA, and FPC.

Recently I received two very revealing newspaper clippings—one from Norton, Va., and another from Cumberland, Ky., which substantiates the fact that when TVA bond legislation was passed with its area limitation clause, TVA's ambitions for expansion was not stopped—it was just encouraged.

Congress relinquished a major part of its control over that agency and permitted it access to money through revenue bond financing. Now it is not required to convince the Congress of the necessity for expenditures. We can expect TVA to continue building generating plants until it is busting at the seams with capacity and looking for places to expand.

According to the information in these two newspaper articles, and I believe it is correct, the TVA Board has been meeting with officials from cities outside the TVA area and encouraging them to put pressure on the Congress to lift present area limitations; offering the help of the Board and the assistance of their General Counsel in these efforts. They even go so far as to advise municipalities against renewal of franchises with existing suppliers of electricity.

Mr. Speaker, has the Congress, which, according to the Constitution is a coequal arm of the Government, become so impotent that it will stand idly by and let Federal employees flout its will? Did we mean what we said when we de-

cided TVA should be kept within certain bounds or were we legislating with tongue in cheek, using the limitation provision temporarily to reduce opposition? Unless the Congress takes direct action to curb the excesses of TVA, it is going to continue to be a source of irritation to the Congress and the investor-financed electric companies operating around it. I will have more to say on this subject later.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a strong supporter of the orderly economically sound development and preservation of our natural resources. I have in the past and will continue supporting reclamation of our lands by soil conservation, flood prevention, and irrigation programs. I have and will continue to support protection of our great forests from fires, insects, and wasteful exploitation. I have fought hard for legislation that will set aside and preserve a reasonable amount of our wilderness areas for the enjoyment of future generations.

No one can rightfully accuse me of being anything but a true friend of honest reclamation. I have made a study of reclamation, and I know what it is. I have served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, the committee charged with the responsibility of approving our reclamation programs for a good many years. With my background of experience I feel I am as well qualified as any Member of this Congress to recognize true reclamation, but I am just as well qualified to recognize a phony when I see it. The Bureau of Reclamation as it is now functioning is a phony, and I will use the findings of one of its supporters to prove it. On page A3367 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1962, there appears an article written by a Mr. Bert Hanna which appeared in the Denver Post. The article was inserted in the RECORD by the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, another strong supporter of the Bureau. The article says in part:

> In its early decades, the reclamation program was utilized almost 100 percent for development of irrigation water required for the West's agricultural economy.
>
> But since the 1930's, the program has been altered to a larger and larger extent to meet other multiple-purpose water resources needs of the modern West—such as flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife propagation, water recreation.
>
> For the current year, for example, only 37 percent of the moneys appropriated for construction are for irrigation works and during the next fiscal year the percentage will drop to 28.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanna's article verifies what I have been saying for several years. The Bureau of Reclamation is no longer a Federal agency for reclaiming and irrigating arid lands of the West. It is now primarily a Government agency devoting most of its time, attention, and money to development of Government electric power. It is also becoming more involved in developing municipal water supplies and is developing some projects solely for that purpose.

Of course, the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs in both Houses are comprised largely of representatives of the reclamation States. We cannot expect those Members to object too strenuously to what the Bureau is doing—they are getting the projects.

Many of our colleagues from other sections of the country have generally been going along with these reclamation programs thinking they were helping the farmers in these arid regions. I am sure they have not realized that we are being asked to approve some fantastic "boondoggles" that actually have little relationship to reclamation. Where there happens to be some irrigation in these Bureau projects the taxpayers are spending up to thousands of dollars per acre to put water on land—several times what the land is worth even after it is irrigated.

If we are going to put up with that kind of shenanigans, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before and say again, there is no reason why the rest of the country should be discriminated against. If this Federal Bureau is going to develop hydroelectric power, domestic and industrial water supplies, and fish and wildlife propagation, let us not confine it to the States west of the 100th meridian, let us open it up so all the States can get their hand in this "grab bag." My constituents like to fish, too.

Mr. Speaker, I could spend the rest of the week discussing the machinations of the Bureau of Reclamation, that is if you believe as I do that its primary function should be the reclamation of land. It is long past time for Congress to take some corrective steps. The Bureau should either go back to its intended functions of reclaiming arid lands in the 17 reclamation States or extend its activities to the remaining 33 States as an electric power and municipal and industrial power supply agency.

However, I am only going to take a moment to discuss a few of the latest activities of the Bureau and show how it is working with other agencies of Government to promote public power.

One project the Bureau has been strongly promoting for several years is the Burns Creek development on the Snake River in Idaho. I have strenuously opposed this project in committee because it has no reclamation in it. It is a power project pure and simple and not a good one at that. It will not stand on its own feet but has to have help from a good reclamation project—the Palisades—to show any semblance of economic feasibility. That project was before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for 5 years. It was introduced under the subterfuge of reregulating and irrigation development. I have discussed that project on the floor before so will not go into it now.

Our committee gave it every consideration after extensive hearings over the years. This past February the committee rejected it by a substantial vote. It should have been rejected the first time we looked at it but the length of time we took substantiates the full consideration it received.

One would think that after the committee to which it was logically assigned rejected it that that would be the end of it. Apparently, however, this is not the case, Mr. Speaker, for we now find the project has been turned over to the Army Engineers and that after a very cursory examination they have accepted the Bureau's findings and are recommending it for inclusion in the big "pork barrel" rivers and harbors omnibus bill. In that way it will go before another committee of the Congress. The project would still be constructed by the Bureau, but they are trying to ignore the action taken by the Interior Committee by having it included in the corps' authorization request. Are we going to establish the policy of shifting projects for one committee to another until we find one that will approve them? Such a devious attempt should be abhorent to every Member of Congress. It could happen to your committee, too.

Now the Army Engineers admit they have not examined the project. They have not had the time. Furthermore, I do not think they want to find out what a sorry project it is. I, along with several others, wanted to appear before the Review Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to give testimony against it, but there will be no hearings. In other words, the Army Engineers have received orders from higher up to approve the project. This is a political and not an engineering or economic consideration. How can we respect any future Army Engineer findings if this is the way they go about approving projects? They are prostituting their profession.

One other interesting thing about the Army Engineers report—I understand they are recommending the project be built and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation in conjunction with the Palisades project—the very thing our committee said should not be done.

Another Bureau of Reclamation project that should never have been approved is the upper Colorado River storage and participating project. As an irrigation development it is a monstrosity. The taxpayers are spending up to several thousand dollars an acre for a supplemental water supply on land to raise hay—land that will not be worth more than $200 or $300 per acre after it is irrigated.

I said at the time we were considering the project that it was nothing but a Government power project and everything that has happened since has proven I was right. Five electric companies offered to wheel the power produced by the project to the Government's preference customers at a price that would not raise the cost to the purchasers over what it would be if the Government did the job. Under this arrangement, the Government would have only to build the bus tie lines between generating plants at a cost of about $51 million. This did not suit the Bureau or its public power customers. They wanted an all-Federal transmission system. The Congress appropriated the money for an all-Federal system but the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in its report, instructed the Bureau to negotiate with the companies.

The Bureau did negotiate and announced, with great fanfare, that it had reached an agreement with four of the five companies. This sounded like the

Bureau had been very reasonable—that they had worked out an agreement with four of five companies but could not get together with the unreasonable fifth company. But that does not begin to tell the story, Mr. Speaker.

After working out a deal with four of the five companies the Bureau still expects to spend $151 million for transmission line construction—$100 million more taxpayer dollars than would have been required if it had worked out an agreement along the lines of the original five-company offer. But that does not tell all of the story either, Mr. Speaker. Under the five-company offer the electric companies would have furnished steam generated power to supplement the Bureau's hydropower for the Government's preference customers. In order to make feasible the plan the Bureau has finally worked out, an REA-financed generation and transmission cooperative has to build a steam electric generating plant in Colorado. This plant will start out with 150,000 kilowatts of capacity at a cost of about $22 million of REA funds and is planned for an ultimate capacity of 600,000 kilowatts at a cost of $120 million which will also come out of the taxpayers' pockets. This means that the Bureau's refusal to work out the comprehensive plan with all five companies is going to require $220 million more from the Treasury.

The public power proponents were even dissatisfied with this solution. They wanted an all-Federal system and severely criticized Interior for working out an agreement with the four companies.

Now we have another Bureau of Reclamation "boondoggle" pending before the Congress—the Fryingpan Arkansas project. This project has been pending before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for several years, but this year—an election year, of course—the proponents have managed to squeeze it out so that it will be considered by this Congress. It includes hydroelectric power also which makes it highly desirable to the Bureau. The Bureau's fantastic appraisal of benefits and payout would not stand the light of an honest engineering and economic examination.

The Bureau of Reclamation is the marketing agency for power produced at Bureau and Army Engineer dams on the Missouri River. It has built an extensive transmission line network in the Missouri River basin—many lines for which there was absolutely no necessity. This system extends into the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota. When completed as now planned, the system will be comprised of some 6,000 miles of high voltage lines and appurtenant works. The ultimate investment in the Missouri basin, exclusive of Federal funds advanced for G. & T. cooperatives, will be in excess of $6 billion, of which electric power will be expected to repay $3.6 billion.

Twelve electric companies, a public power district, and the Dairyland Power Cooperative made an offer to the Department of Interior recently to supplement the Federal hydroelectric power in the basin with their steam power on an exchange basis. This would have permitted the Bureau to market about 650,000 additional kilowatts of firm power without any additional expense to the Government. It would have provided about $10 million of additional revenue per year.

Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, the Bureau turned down this offer and made a deal with the Basin Electric Power Cooperative Association to supplement the Federal power by building a 200,000-kilowatt steam plant. Of course, the basin co-op steamplant will be financed with tax funds from the Treasury. Simultaneously with the Bureau's announcement of the deal with the co-op, REA announced a loan of $36.6 million to the co-op to build the steam plant.

Mr. Speaker, this loan to the basin co-op is just a beginning. REA will be lending tax funds to this and possibly other G. & T.'s to build additional steamplants in this system from now on. This is all tax money that need not have been spent and still the administration talks about balancing the budget. I am surprised that the electric companies wasted their time preparing a proposal to the Bureau. With Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, Kenneth Holum, making the decision, the companies should have known their proposal would receive no consideration irrespective of how good it was.

This Missouri basin Federal power situation is an unholy mess as it is without the Government throwing millions upon millions of additional tax dollars into it. The price of power from the Federal dams was set years ago before anyone had a realistic idea of what the dams were going to cost. Costs have far exceeded the estimates on which power rates were based, so the Government is already facing a tremendous loss on the sale of this power without throwing away additional tax money. It would seem that those responsible for marketing the Federal power would be seeking ways to save additional Federal investment in this development instead of seeking ways to spend additional Federal funds.

The Bureau has announced that it will build a high-voltage transmission line to tie the Missouri basin system into the Southwestern Power Administration, another Interior power-marketing agency that has been losing millions of dollars each year since it has been in operation. This line is not necessary because it parallels electrically existing company lines that could do the job.

In addition to its other ventures into the electric utility business, the Bureau is making studies of interconnections between all of the Interior Department power marketing agencies. It has already received some funds and is requesting more for this purpose. The Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation has talked of transmission lines that would create ties from the Bonneville Power Administration all of the way to the east coast.

To indicate what little respect they have for spending Federal funds, they are asking us to appropriate funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to make studies for tying together all Federal power marketing agencies; while, at the same time, the Federal Power Commission is in the process of making a national power survey that would determine transmission line construction, interconnections and the location and size of generating stations needed for a national power grid. All of this is in addition to a study, which took 2 years, that the Edison Electric Institute, an association of electric companies, has just completed. It was an extensive and very conclusive study. Mr. Speaker, what does such a study by the Bureau of Reclamation have to do with the reclamation of lands?

Oh, yes, I understand the Bureau of Reclamation study also gets into the proposed line from Bonneville to the southern part of California, a study in which Bonneville Power Administration has also been participating. The Bonneville-southern California line is something else the Federal Government should stay out of. Electric companies are already working on a line that will make a substantial tie between these two areas, a tie that will be increased as fast as economically justified.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these Government power agencies are just looking for places to throw away taxpayer's money and are expecting the Congress to acquiesce with their schemes by appropriating the funds.

The President has also instructed the Interior Department to restudy the Passamaquoddy project in Maine. That thing has been kicking around since the New Deal days of the early 1930's. It was no good then, and it is still no good. A special commission recently completed a study of it and reported it as no good and yet Interior has made a new study which, I understand, supports it. It looks like Interior will support anything as long as it involves Government spending for more electric power.

Mr. Speaker, before we leave the subject of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, I want to call your attention to a UPI ticker item of May 17, 1962.

Interior Secretary Udall asked Congress to loosen the purse strings and allow him to spend $395 million on far-ranging plans to develop the Nation's power and water resources. You will notice the ticker item did not say hydropower, it just said power.

The Secretary wants this money to cover the widespread activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville, and the Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administrations. He was certainly right when he said widespread activities of these organizations. They have spread their activities far beyond what the Congress intended.

You will notice he wants to explore the possibilities of developing the Hanford steamplant; the development of pumpback storage hydroelectric plants; and transmission lines. The entire program emphasizes Government electric power.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Udall today asked Congress to loosen the purse strings to allow him to spend $395 million on far-ranging plans to develop the Nation's power and water resources.

The request, made before the Senate Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, was for $85 million more than appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The funds, for the year beginning July 1, would cover the widespread activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and the three Federal power marketing administrations—Bonneville, Southwestern, and Southeastern.

The key activities, Udall said, would be:

Exploration of possibilities for use of waste steam at the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor for the production of power by a public power organization.

Continued exploration of the use of off-peak power to pump water to higher elevations for use in producing power during periods of peak use of electricity.

Advancement of plans for the Pacific Northwest-California and Missouri River Basin-Southwestern Power Administration power interties, and the beginning of studies for interconnecting the Missouri basin system with the Pacific Northwest.

Completion of negotiations with private power companies for sharing in the five-State Colorado River storage project transmission system authorized by Congress as an all-Federal system.

Now let us have a look at REA. This is a Government agency that was set up for the purpose of extending central station electric service to rural areas, intended for the farmers that could not otherwise get it. I am satisfied that 90 percent of the Congress and 98 percent of the public still look upon REA as a farm program. However, nothing could be further from the facts. Even REA admits that better than 97 percent of the farms have been electrified. In fact, all of the rural areas that want electric service, with the possible exception of a few isolated ranches and maybe a few remote hunting lodges, have been electrified. To arrive at the less than 3 percent that are not getting electric service, you have to count abandoned farms and some tenant houses that could have service if they wanted it. For all intents and purposes, rural America is electrified. Five out of six new connections are nonfarm consumers. They are industrial, commercial, and new nonfarm rural residences, including suburban developments. Almost one-half of rural cooperative customers are now nonfarm users, and yet we are going along giving REA all of the money it asks for thinking we are doing something for the farmers. The rural cooperatives are making money—REA's statistics show this. They are borrowing money from the Federal Treasury at 2 percent and paying no income taxes, either Federal or State.

They usually pay much less than investor-financed companies would pay in local and State property taxes. Instead of repaying the Government the money borrowed at 2 percent interest as fast as they can, they invest their funds in higher interest rate securities, including Government bonds and make a profit on them while the taxpayers are subsidizing them with below cost money. Besides that they are lending money to industries that will locate in their service areas. They lend money at a lower rate than the industries could obtain otherwise and the co-ops still make a profit on the transaction. An example is the loan to a much publicized ski resort in Illinois for snowmaking equipment. There are many other examples that could be cited.

In authorizing the REA program it was the intent of the Congress that money should be loaned to the cooperatives only for the purpose of extending service to rural areas, really meaning farmers, that could not otherwise get central station service. The purpose of authorizing loans for generation and transmission of power was to assure the distribution cooperative of an adequate power supply at reasonable cost. The present REA Administration has completely disregarded that criteria. It will lend money for G. & T.'s if the co-op considers the electric company from which it is buying power antagonistic to the cooperative. In other words, there is really no criteria for making a loan for a G. & T. REA will lend the money if the G. & T. wants it. Real justification for the loan is beside the point. Loans are being made for G. & T.'s when there is adequate power available to the co-ops from companies at lower cost than the G. & T.'s can possibly sell it.

This REA program has gotten completely out of hand. It has been a "sacred cow" for many years because we considered it a farm program. It is time for us to recognize that we are no longer dealing with a farm program.

We are lending taxpayer's money at below cost to nontaxpaying electric systems distributing electric power to industrial, commercial and residential consumers who are quite able to pay the full market value of the power they are consuming including full cost of money and taxes. The Government put these electric systems in business at a time when they probably needed some financial assistance but that time has long passed. They are now going businesses and quite capable of standing on their own feet. If they are to get out and compete with electric companies for business, then they should be put on the same basis as electric companies and be subject to the same regulations, financing and taxes.

REA has stepped completely out of character in another way. It is now being used by other power producing and marketing agencies of Government to construct through G. & T.'s steam generating plants and transmission lines that the Congress would never approve for the agencies. While discussing the Bureau of Reclamation, I told you of two instances where the REA and the Bureau had joined hands to develop a hydroelectric and steam electric generating and transmission system—one in the Upper Colorado River System and one in the Missouri River Basin. Another instance of a joint operation is one now developing between Southeastern Power Administration and a G. & T. in Kentucky.

The plan is for SEPA to recapture power from TVA that is being generated at three Army Engineer dams on the Cumberland River and use a Kentucky G. & T. to transmit the power to municipalities now being served by the Kentucky Utilities Co., thus taking business away from this heavily taxed private industry.

There is no question in my mind but that this is a scheme which has been hatched out by TVA, SEPA and the REA or the Kentucky G. & T. it financed. TVA has been buying the power from SEPA at below cost.

I understand TVA has been paying under 3 mills for the power which is cheap in anybody's book. It is below fuel cost in many sections of the country. TVA is under contract to buy this power for a good many years to come. Now TVA has decided it is not interested in buying the power. Of course by mutual agreement TVA and SEPA can cancel the contract and make this power available for sale elsewhere by SEPA.

It does not take a soothsayer to see through this scheme. TVA has wanted to invade territory served by Kentucky Utilities as I told you before, but the Congress limited its service area. Now by working with SEPA and the REA-financed G. & T., it will accomplish the same purpose. It releases power it has been using to SEPA. SEPA, working with the G. & T., uses the power to raid the company's territory. When the company's customers have been taken over by SEPA there is no longer any need for the TVA area limitation. The restrictions can be raised so that TVA can expand north and take over the State of Kentucky.

I have not brought FPC into the picture as yet, but, headed by public power proponents, it has its plans in the making also. It has started a power survey to determine where transmission lines should be built and where and what size generating stations should be constructed. Of course, it has invited the electric companies to participate in the study but that is just window dressing. The electric companies have recently completed a similar study so there is no need for another one. I do not know what this new study is going to show but rest assured, after it has been completed, the pressure will be on for construction of Government transmission lines and generating stations. Consider also that within a few years licenses for hydroelectric developments now owned and operated by electric companies will start expiring. The Government can take these plants over. If it does, that will bring on agitation to build Government transmission lines to connect them up and Government steamplants to firm up the power. Then we would in fact be well on the way toward complete nationalization of the power industry.

The present Chairman of FPC was one of the leading masterminds behind the conversion of TVA into the giant Federal power monopoly it is today. I have no doubts but that his thinking far exceeds the regulating duties of FPA. He has always been a strong Government power advocate and I have seen no indications of any change.

The Army Engineers are active, too. They are dragging out their projects for the big pork barrel rivers and harbors omnibus bill. Among other things they are recommending the Devils Jumps project on the Cumberland River in Tennessee. It is a hydroelectric power project in a depressed coal area. They are also recommending the Raystown project

on the Juniata River up in my section of the country. It too is planned as a big hydroelectric project in a depressed coal area. As I told you before the Engineers have approved the Burns Creek project in Idaho, a no-good hydroelectric development that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House has already thoroughly studied and emphatically disapproved.

I have not tried to cover all of the Army Engineers activities but have cited the above three projects to show you some of their efforts in this Government power picture.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we are facing a plan, and a well-conceived one at that, by the present administration which could lead to the nationalization of the electric power industry. Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of the most influential members of the President's brain trust wrote in 1947 as follows:

> If socialism is to preserve democracy it must be brought about step by step.

Mr. Schlesinger has been faced with this statement recently and there has been no indication that his thinking has changed.

This "step by step" approach has been used for the past three decades in the electric utility field, but I am afraid that too many of us have not been aware of it. In the last year the "step by step" has been increased to a "jump by jump," as witnessed by the alliances being formed by the Federal agencies dealing in electric power.

As I have mentioned in some detail here today, we find TVA, SEPA, and REA planning the invasion of Kentucky with the Army Engineers joining with the proposal for more hydro for SEPA. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers have joined and worked a plan to promote Burns Creek, something the Bureau could not accomplish on its own. The Bureau of Reclamation and REA have joined hands to promote steamplants in two of the Bureau's marketing systems which for all intents and purposes are Federal steamplants, as they will be federally financed and operated for the benefit of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bonneville Power Administration and Atomic Energy Commission are working out a scheme with a public power agency in the State of Washington to use Government credit to build the Hanford atomic energy plant, something that the Congress, by a resounding majority, said "No" to last year. The Federal Power Commission and the Bureau of Reclamation are both working on studies aimed at the national grid, and I have no doubt but that it is a national Federal grid they are thinking of.

Mr. Speaker, a person would have to be both blind and deaf not to recognize what all of this is leading up to. If this move is not stopped and reversed immediately we are going to end up with a nationalized electric industry before we know it. The irony of the whole thing is that if there ever was an industry financed by private investors that needed no prodding, that needed no Federal financial help, it is the electric utility industry. Our existing electric companies are ready, willing, and able to take care of all of our future power requirements, furnishing ample amounts of low-cost electricity to all consumers.

With our country completely electrified, all that continued Government building and financing of electric facilities can accomplish is further inequities between consumers of electricity until such time as the industry is nationalized.

Mr. Speaker, with our unbalanced budget, our overwhelming national debt, our near confiscatory taxes on both individuals and businesses, I ask you, in the name of commonsense and justice, why does the Congress permit our Federal bureaucrats to go along spending hundreds of millions of tax dollars each year doing something that can be done better and with greater equity to all of our citizens by funds acquired from private investors? The answer will be found in ideology—not in economics.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am primarily taking this time because I am going to put in the RECORD a list of the attendance at the President's medicare rallies throughout the country last Sunday. It shows a list of the cities, the attendance, and the capacity of the crowds, and the rallies which were canceled.

I might also say that I placed in the RECORD yesterday an article from the New York Times where it was pointed out that those who were promoting these rallies had estimated that 150,000 people would attend, and according to their estimates, 100,000 people did attend, but this listing that I am placing in the RECORD indicates that it was less than 50,000.

Now, this matter has some significance, and the significance is this: For several years now the press, particularly the Washington media, has been reporting the fact that the old people were on the march in regard to this problem of health care for the aged. Two years ago, I think it was, I took the floor of the House to make a speech entitled "Lobbying Reporting: The Future Representative Government in the United States," in which I pointed out that the press was inaccurately reporting what actually was the situation; that really what was going on was a public relations program primarily by the AFL–CIO and others who were trying to bring this about but had been unsuccessful in doing so. And, there have been reports going around as to how much the people of this country want this particular program that the President is supporting, the King-Anderson bill.

The point that I want to drive home is this, that the Committee on Ways and Means held public hearings on this matter for 9 days. We sat there on some days until 7 o'clock in the evening listening to the witnesses. We heard all of the administration witnesses. We listened to the people from the AMA, we listened to people from the labor unions, we listened to people from hospital groups, we listened to people from the health insurance field. We listened to every citizen who thought he had something of importance or information that would bear on this very important issue of health care for the aged, so that out of knowledge, not ignorance, out of reason, not prejudice, we could come up with whatever was a correct solution of how we should move forward in this area.

The testimony of the administration witnesses, of course, was subjected to cross-examination, and so was the testimony of the people from the American Medical Association subjected to cross-examination; in fact, all witnesses were, and their data were examined. There are four volumes of hearings covering 2,000 pages of data and information on this subject available to the Congress of the United States, available to the President and the executive branch of the Government, and available to the people. There is no excuse for this exchange of ignorance that is going around the country on this issue, led, I regret to say, by the President. People who want to know, as best we can, what knowledge we have on this subject can refer—do not take my word and do not take President Kennedy's word and do not take anyone else's word—to these hearings.

They are well indexed. The data is there. Then let us see if the data is incomplete. That is important because, of course, we can get more information if the data has been contested or ought to be contested. Let us direct our attention to that.

Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee I am sure would be very glad to get any further information or arguments that the President or his representatives might want to present to that committee on this subject. But no one has said that the Ways and Means Committee has not done an adequate job of studying this problem and that we do not have the information. There is no excuse for the President of the United States going directly to the public, over the head of the Congress, unless the Congress or its committee has been derelict in its duty. But, there has been no indication that such is the case.

Mr. Speaker, I should be like to get back to this process of the President himself lending his Office to the technique of trying to rally support for what turns out to be nothing more than a promotional campaign. A campaign by certain people who think that this might be a good program for our society, but these people are not the older people, nor is there great fear apparently that this needs to be done. One of the things we said in the hearings, and I repeat here today, is this: Is there any person in our society, old or young, without adequate medical care, and whose situation has been called to the attention of the proper people, who would be without medical care? Of course, the answer is, "There is none." Why, heavens, if there were one, it would appear on the front page of the newspaper in that community. Occasionally we do have a report like that, and it will be headlined as "Young"

or "Old Person Found in Their Little Home in Such-and-Such Condition," not because of lack of means, not because of lack of humanitarianism on the part of people around, not because there were not the facilities, but because the problem of this person had not been called to the attention of those who could and would do something about it.

So we say, Mr. Speaker, the exposure, almost, of this situation by these rallies that were supposed to have been conducted around the country was not necessary. In my own town of St. Louis they did pay me the honor of sending the Vice President of the United States to speak; 1,100 people attended; the hall had a capacity there of 3,000. Of course, there are halls in St. Louis which will accommodate 10,000 people. But note this: No attempt to have anyone on these programs to express a contrary point of view was made.

This was a one-sided presentation in the same fashion that the so-called White House conferences held this fall around the country were conducted. Again, in my own city of St. Louis, among others, was there an honest presentation of both sides of the issue? Oh, no. This was for the administration witnesses to present their case. While this was going on, these four volumes of public hearings of the Ways and Means Committee lay unpublished and unavailable to the people of this country. I have asked this question: Who sent the orders to the Public Printer not to have these documents published? I ask that because usually within 2 or 3 weeks we have our hearings printed and available. But for 4 months, not until December 15, was this data available to the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee right now is in executive session on the Reciprocal Trade Act. We held public hearings that lasted a month, beginning around March 1, and we have the printed hearings in front of us as we have been going through executive sessions. Of course, the hearings on health care could have been printed and available. I daresay had they been available in the communities throughout the country where the White House Conferences for the Aged were being held, the spokesmen for this point of view would have been challenged and someone would have said, "Well, look; you said that before the Ways and Means Committee back in July and August, and on cross-examination did you not have to say this, or did you not say this which does not jibe with what you said." Or they would have said "how about the testimony of so and so before the Ways and Means Committee which was in contradiction to what you said, and how do you reconcile that?"

This is public debate that is bringing the people into these things; and not once in his Madison Square Garden speech did the President even intimate to the people that the Committee on Ways and Means had done this work. He did not say, "Don't take my word, people, read the documentation, read the committee hearings; here is what Secretary Ribicoff said, here is what the American Medical Association officials said, here is what other people said on this issue; make up your own mind as to what you think are the facts in the case." No, that was not done.

Yesterday I put in the RECORD—and I want to call attention to this—a very fine statement by the American Civil Liberties Union, calling attention to the fact that a very basic civil liberty was involved in the fact that the networks gave free time to the President of the United States, who was not appearing as the President of the United States, but who was appearing as the leader of the Democratic Party to try to present a point of view. Certainly I am glad that he did present it. But as the American Civil Liberties Union pointed out, if the people are going to be brought into this national debate, equal time should be granted to those who have a different point of view. So I want to commend the American Civil Liberties Union for pointing out this fact.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made. I wonder if today's newspapers give us any additional information as to the Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts who President Kennedy said was in such dire financial circumstances that he could not provide schooling for his children and take care of those allegedly afflicted in his family. I am awaiting with great interest for the President to identify that individual.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not know; apparently the President made up something out of whole cloth; maybe not out of whole cloth, but certainly no one fits the picture. The one Congressman who seemed to, his family indicated it could not be he to whom they were referring.

And I might say to the gentleman that this is not the only instance where the President has used a case that was supposed to demonstrate a point and when we got into the details we found that he was not accurate. During the campaign there was some person, I believe from Kentucky, who was supposed to have presented a pitiful situation and appeared on television with the then candidate for President. The record shows that that was an inaccurate presentation.

The gentleman in Congress from the city of Dallas [Mr. ALGER] and I, ran down this story of some person in Gonzales, Tex., concerning whom one of the Members of the other body had put in a statement in the RECORD as a pitiful situation, but when we got the details we found that it was not accurate.

The President in his address at Madison Square Garden tried to give as a typical example a case citing hospital bills and other medical costs, and it was not typical at all. The data that we have, even the data from the Department of HEW, demonstrates that hospital costs are less than physicians' and surgeons' costs. The latter are around 28 or 29 percent of the fees and the hospital's would be 25 or 26 percent. So I do not think that the public should take my word, or the President's word or anyone else's.

We try to be accurate, but it behooves me and it behooves the President or anyone to point to the record as best we can get it together. Here is volume 1 of the record, that I hold in my hand here, where this testimony was brought in. The data is there for anyone to contest it or add to it.

Mr. GROSS. There is also the matter of a Federal statute, which provides that moneys appropriated by Congress shall not be used to carry on a campaign for or against legislation pending before Congress.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to say to the gentleman there is no question in my mind there has been a violation of the actual word of the law, and there certainly has been a violation of the spirit of the law. This undermines our very form of representative government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this table in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Attendance at J.F.K. medicare rallies

City	Attendance	Capacity
Charleston, W. Va	46	3,500
Indianapolis	300	1,200
St. Louis	1,100	3,000
Sault St. Marie	6	50
Salt Lake City	250	1,000
Kansas City	700	1,200
Wilmington	100	1,400
Washington, D.C	800	850
Baltimore	275	400
Houston	500	1,200
Detroit	2,000	3,500
Columbus	700	1,400
Cincinnati	900	3,000
Seattle	320	1,200
San Diego	191	2,400
Los Angeles	700	3,000
Milwaukee	2,000	6,000
Chicago	1,450	3,000
Knoxville	400	4,000
Boston	375	3,500
Miami Beach	4,000	4,000
Cleveland	1,200	1,200
Youngstown	500	2,100
Peoria	37	2,000
Rock Island	300	3,500
New York City	17,550	18,300

Rallies canceled at—
Denver.
Philadelphia.
Dallas.
San Francisco.
Louisville.
Atlanta.
Birmingham.

Data for New York City and 25 others having rallies; 7 cancellations.

CRAMER BILL (H.R. 11794) FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED THROUGH FREE ENTERPRISE ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS, WITHOUT GOVERNMENT CONTROL

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, I introduced H.R. 11794, a bill to provide for medical care for the aged

through free enterprise on a voluntary basis, without Government control entitled "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." On that same date I discussed the bill, comparing it with the King-Anderson social security compulsory bill, as appears in the RECORD on page 8603.

Many House Members have expressed interest in my bill and many inquiries have been made. In order to clarify what the Cramer bill does and to compare it with the King-Anderson and Bow bills, I submit the following.

My bill, which is printed in full starting on page 8603 of the RECORD, provides, briefly, as follows:

First. A tax credit for citizens over 65 of $125 each—$250 for a married couple—for those who pay taxes or for their near relatives to be applied against medical bills paid or against health care insurance premiums paid.

Second. A tax credit for employers who provide protection against medical costs for their retired employees 65 or over equal to premiums actually paid, not to exceed $125 per person.

Third. For nontaxpaying citizens over 65, a certificate worth not to exceed $125—$250 for married couple—with which to pay premiums for health insurance coverage to be acquired, or to pay a premium on an existing policy by merely filing a simplified return showing no tax due or less than $125 tax due and by advising the Secretary of the Treasury on this form of his intention to purchase a qualifying policy for health care or to pay the premium on an existing policy.

Fourth. Establishes minimal policy coverages required for insurance carriers to provide, to qualify, to collect on certificates or to permit the taxpayer to qualify for credit against taxes. This coverage includes broader areas than King-Anderson, including doctors' bills, prescriptions, nurses' fees, and so forth, as set forth in greater detail in table No. 2 following.

My bill differs from the Bow bill—H.R. 10981—in the following respects:

First. It permits a tax credit for the person over age 65 or his near relative if he pays the bill for actual medical expenses paid not to exceed $125. Thus, this is not a compulsory health insurance bill, but is fully voluntary. The Bow bill gives a credit only for insurance premiums paid.

Second. It permits policies in existence to remain in full force so long as "the benefits under the program are substantially equivalent to the values of the benefits under qualified medical care insurance programs for the aged"—as defined in the bill as minimum coverage. Thus, senior citizens who have health insurance in effect, many times as the result of taking it out in earlier years with the resultant better rates and coverage, or who have group policies or special coverage that they wish to keep, can do so. This also prevents the elimination of noncertificated carriers from being included in the program.

Third. In plan 1 of the minimum coverages required for an insurance carrier to qualify for the program, my bill includes the doctor's bills. In the Bow plan No. 1, the doctor's bills are omitted. I included this in all plans as minimal coverage because more people over 65 have doctor calls or call on doctors for advice and treatment than go to the hospital. Any meaningful program, if it is to meet the real need of senior citizens, should include the most basic cost of the doctor. Of course, King-Anderson does not cover this cost at all. Bow covers it in plan No. 2.

Thus, I believe my bill is a freedom-of-choice and voluntary bill to the maximum extent possible, letting a person or his relative in his behalf pay the actual medical bills, and thus insure himself or have a near relative do it for him. Many people express themselves to me that they do not want the Government or insurance companies telling them how to take care of their medical expenses. This permits such individualists to pay their own bills without being penalized for doing so.

Also, my bill permits wider choice by the senior citizen or a relative on his behalf to keep a health insurance policy in force that is presently in existence so long as its coverage as a minimum substantially complies with obviously needed minimal coverage as set out in my bill.

My bill recognizes the basic need for the services of a doctor under our free enterprise system, avoiding Government control and socialized medicine under either the established doctor-client-insurance carrier method or just under the doctor-client relationship that has avoided the injection of the Government into medical treatment which must be avoided if freedom of choice and quality service are to be preserved.

To compare my bill generally with the King-Anderson bill, I submit the following table:

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 nurses' 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.

To compare my bill as to specific provisions with King-Anderson, I submit the following table:

Comparison of specific provisions 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.

[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.

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

	Cramer bill		King-Anderson bill
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; 2⅔ 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.
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 billions.

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE MEDICAL AND OTHER PROFESSIONS

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 11884, a bill to prohibit professional associations, such as the American Medical Association, from using any of the compulsory dues and fees received by the associations to attempt to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Although this bill applies to all professions, it is particularly aimed at the American Medical Association. It is a bill of rights for doctors. Its purpose is to cut through the surgical steel curtain erected by the American Medical Association, which is effectively coercing doctors to be silent and preventing thousands of physicians from expressing their approval of the King-Anderson bill, President Kennedy's plan for medical care for the aged under social security. My bill is simply a preventive measure, and will protect the rights of all professional men and women.

The American Medical Association has from the beginning opposed the concept of social security and any implementation thereof. Behind its vituperative and misleading barrage of propaganda, lies the heavy hand of the insurance company lobby, a known and strong contributor to those forces opposing social security. It would be most revealing if the American Medical Association were to disclose the list of its contributors. Hundreds of doctors who have expressed their approval of the King-Anderson bill are now faced with economic and clandestine pressures from organized medicine forcing them into silence.

Recently the American Medical Association Journal refused to accept an advertisement in favor of the King-Anderson bill presented by a number of AMA members for publication in their own Journal.

A group of doctors in the State of New Jersey have even threatened to refuse to treat their patients under the King-Anderson bill if it becomes law. This vicious and inhumane propaganda, distributed by these doctors, has caused distress and anguish in millions of American homes and constitutes a threat against the American people in general, for the public is fearful that it will not continue to receive its traditional medical attention and care from its family doctor. In my own constituency, folks have told me that they wanted reassurance from their physicians that they would be continued to be treated regardless of whether or not King-Anderson is passed.

Thousands of physicians in this country are being placed in an untenable position because of the power and control of the American Medical Association, as it carries the ball for the insurance lobby. A number of physicians in my district have told me that they fear to express their opinion in favor of this legislation for obvious reasons.

In too many jurisdictions membership in the American Medical Association is tantamount to retaining a license to practice. This is so, because if a physician refuses to join the association or refuses to pay AMA dues, because of personal opposition to the association's politics and legislative activities, he would, in these jurisdictions, be denied or forfeit his local medical society membership.

My bill will advance the true intent of physicians and surgeons who join medical associations for professional purposes and not for engagement in political propaganda and lobbying activities. In addition, the bill will in no way retard the avowed purpose of the American Medical Association recorded in its recent registration statement under the Lobbying Act:

> The advancement of science and art of medicine and improvement of the public health.

Since the AMA intends to engage in the field of propaganda, politics, and legislation, it should do so by voluntary contributions and not by coercing those physicians in honest and sincere opposition to its politics, to pay for the propaganda and lobbying activities of the American Medical Association through compulsory dues.

I trust this bill will receive the favorable consideration of my colleagues, thus assuring early passage of this necessary legislation.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, I have been acutely concerned with the operations of our Government agencies and departments for many years. One of the agencies that has elicited my special interest has been the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which has regulatory authority over more than 4,000 savings and loan associations. As a member of the Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board of the

House Committee on Government Operations I have participated in the intensive study and investigation being made by that subcommittee under the chairmanship of my able colleague from California, the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS.

We have sat through many, many days of public hearings since the subcommittee was constituted in 1960. As a result of testimony heard, we have become greatly concerned that there is a great void if not complete lack of adequate rules and regulations to serve as guidelines for this increasingly important segment of our national economy. This has resulted in practices and actions by the staff of that Agency which are open to serious questions of propriety. We have hopes that the present members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, under the chairmanship of Joseph P. McMurray, will chart a course which will provide appropriate guidance and prevent recurrence of the errors of the past.

On Tuesday, May 22, 1962, Chairman Moss was the principal speaker at the annual convention of the Texas Savings and Loan League held in Brownsville, Tex. I feel strongly that all Members of the House will find Congressman Moss' address both interesting and informative and I ask permission to include it at this point in the RECORD.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD, BEFORE THE TEXAS SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE, BROWNSVILLE, TEX., MAY 22, 1962

I am delighted to meet with the representatives of the savings and loan institutions in the State of Texas to discuss items of mutual concern. It is always a pleasure to visit the great State of Texas which has contributed so many outstanding leaders to our Government. All Texas can take great pride in its contributions to better government—to the economic, political, and cultural development of our Nation.

As chairman of a Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations—the Special Subcommittee on the Home Loan Bank Board—I have an interesting and challenging assignment which, in topsylike fashion, just grew and grew. The subcommittee was established in 1960 by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Chairman of the Government Operations Committee, to make an inquiry into the seizure of Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association. I was told the inquiry would occupy very little of my time and take only 2 or 3 days of hearings. What happened makes interesting history. The 2 or 3 days of hearings stretched into 16 days of the most difficult and frustrating hearings which I have encountered in my 14 years of legislating. The testimony of the then chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Albert J. Robertson, was an almost unbelievable performance. I became alarmed over his disclosure of the policies being pursued by the Board and gravely concerned about the identity of those who were, in fact, making policy.

The published hearings for this initial phase of the subcommittee's inquiry make interesting reading. On the basis of the hearings, the subcommittee filed a report containing 13 findings and 8 recommendations. The Committee on Government Operations approved the report, supporting completely the finding that the seizure of Long Beach Savings & Loan Association had been illegal and unnecessary. The report, accordingly, recommended that the Bank Board restore the association to its former management.

A very tedious and discouraging period followed the adoption of this report. The dispossessed management of the Long Beach Association and the then members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in 1960 undertook negotiations for the settlement of their problems. However, subsequent subcommittee hearings disclosed that the negotiations were not undertaken in good faith by Chairman Robertson.

In 1961 when a new administration assumed responsibility for Government in Washington, Joe McMurray was appointed as the new chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. I pay tribute to the good faith, the determination and the effectiveness of Chairman McMurray. With the full cooperation of Bank Board members Dixon and Williams he succeeded in bringing about the settlement of the Long Beach case and the return of that institution to its shareholders. Chairman McMurray recognized that continuation of the situation which resulted from the Long Beach Association seizure probably would mean the Federal operation of this institution until it wasted away to insignificance or was merged with some other association.

Neither course would contribute to the economic welfare of the community of Long Beach.

It is clearly my judgment—and in the official reports it is the judgment of the House Government Operations Committee—that the Long Beach Association should not have been seized in the first place. Its management was not charged with specific violations of rules, regulations, or statute. It had never been subject to specific supervisory instructions calling for correction of management practices. The committee was gravely concerned with the failure of the Board to follow the procedural due process provided by law, and we were concerned about what the Long Beach case disclosed about the overall operations of the Federal agency responsible for regulating the savings and loan industry.

The basic question to be considered is whether this important and sensitive segment of our economic system is to be regulated by the appointed Board members under properly promulgated rules and regulations or statute, or is it to be regulated capriciously and arbitrarily on the whims of a few long-time administrative employees who are supposed to be subordinate to the Board itself?

As a result of the Long Beach hearings the subcommittee has received information from many other institutions, both federally and State-chartered, complaining of the actions by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board's Division of Supervision. We have held hearings on three of these cases—one in Atlanta, another in Clovis, N. Mex., and another involving a member of your association, a State-chartered institution at Alice, Tex.

Let me assure you that I have very clear opinions on the type of regulations to which you should be subjected, notwithstanding the highly misleading and somewhat prejudiced report which was printed in a banking trade journal during the hearings on the Clovis, N. Mex., Association. Possibly the author of the report was not present at the hearings long enough to gain an objective understanding of the purposes of the hearings, for I was accused of presenting preconceived conclusions that the staff of the Bank Board had acted with impropriety. Neither I as chairman nor any of the subcommittee members have arrived at conclusions based on anything less than hour after hour of sworn testimony, day after day of investigation, all adding up to a record of clear facts.

My role as subcommittee chairman is to help find the answer to this question: Are the practices sanctioned by the Bank Board, as the regulatory authority, spelled out clearly enough so that a member association knows with reasonable exactness what its conduct must be or are the associations regulated by the personal views and convictions of the Board's supervisory staff? One system is part of our traditional pattern of government by law; the other is the antithesis of our whole concept of government, for it is a substitution of men and their ofttimes capricious views, their arbitrary and prejudiced convictions, for the orderly process of law. I favor strong, clear, and unequivocal regulation, but I cannot approve regulation under standards so ill-defined that they cannot even be identified.

During the Alice hearings, I had an exchange with Mr. John Wyman, the Director of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board's Division of Supervision, in an attempt to define self-dealing and conflict of interest. He informed me that they can be defined in terms of the principles, the responsibility, the duties, that rest upon persons in a fiduciary position. Then he said, "I doubt that they can be defined by regulation." So I asked Mr. Wyman how a new Board member could become familiar, rather quickly, with his duties and responsibilities and with the policies of the Board. To this he replied: "I would do my best to discuss with and to obtain from my staff the cha acter of actions and procedures, the reasons for them, the basis for them." This is exactly what I have been talking about. Previous Boards have failed to produce clearly defined policy, nor have they issued rules and regulations in support of policy.

A case in point is the experience of the Clovis, N. Mex., Savings & Loan Association. The Board's Director of Supervision, Mr. Wyman, was told to meet with officials of the Clovis institution. Let me quote his instructions from the Board's minutes: "The Board instructed the Director to fully advise the board of directors of the Clovis association as to the matters of supervisory concern arising from its management and operations and to request the board of directors to provide the association with sound management and sound practices, and to request that the board of directors select a committee of three from among their members who will be acceptable to the Director and who will be authorized and directed promptly to develop a program which will correct said matters of serious supervisory concern and provide for the sound management and operation of the association in a manner acceptable to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board."

Bear in mind what Mr. Wyman was instructed to do. Now let me read you part of the letter summarily served upon the directors of the Clovis association by Mr. Wyman on May 21, 1959:

"It is imperative that conclusive steps now be taken to put an end to the unsafe or unsound operation of the association and to the self-dealing relationships and practices which are the cause and the dominant policy of that operation. Therefore, we must insist that the directors, at this meeting, give us a letter over their individual signatures committing themselves to take the following actions promptly upon their return to Clovis and in any event not later than May 31, 1959:

1. Adopt a resolution immediately abolishing the agency at Hereford, Tex.

2. Adopt and confirm by appropriate resolutions the directors' action at this meeting establishing a committee of five directors and designating as members the eof persons who are unobjectionable to the undersigned, and directing such committee to prepare a program for the future management, policies, and operation of the association.

"This program shall include the employment of a new managing officer vested with authority fully consonant with that position; and an increase in the number of directors from 7 to a least 11 and the election

to the additional positions thus created of responsible citizens of the community, each of which persons, including the new managing officer, shall have been found acceptable by and to the supervisory agent prior to his appointment or election." Let me emphasize Mr. Wyman's instructions. He was told:

To advise the board of directors of the association as to the matters of supervisory concern;

To request the board of directors to provide the association with sound management and sound practices; and

To request the board of directors of the association to select a committee of three, from among their members, acceptable to him, to develop a program to correct the matters of supervisory concern and provide for sound management and operation of the association in a manner acceptable to the bank board.

Not only did Mr. Wyman make demands which exceeded his specific authority, but he did so in a most summary manner.

The board of directors of the Clovis association were called to Little Rock to meet with Mr. Wyman and the supervisoy agent. At this meeting they were read a nine-page letter setting forth accusations of unsafe or unsound policies and practices. Without giving them time to discuss this lengthy letter, they were told to sign a letter committing themselves to full compliance with the corrective action demanded. Mr. Wyman demanded. This is very clear. He did not request as he was instructed. Mr. Wyman demanded, and his actions exceeded the specific instructions imposed upon him by his superiors, the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

As a result of this highhanded action, one man was injured in his community and removed from his membership on the board of directors of an association to which he had admittedly made very constructive contributions over a period of many years. He violated no rule or regulation, he never failed to heed a supervisory instruction—nevertheless he was injured by this action. He had even requested a hearing called for by law. His request was never honored, even though the man who was then chairman of the bank board assured a Member of Congress that, when a conclusion is reached as to the proper action, and I quote—"the association's board of directors will be duly apprised and the action taken will be in accordance with applicable law and regulation"—he was without recourse. Is this the type of regulation we are to countenance?

In the past there has been a succession of weak, sometimes disinterested boards. Thus, strong staff men moved into the vacuum which was created. These strong-willed staff supervisors are dependent upon the field reports of examiners, and the record of the subcommittee hearings on some of the examiners' reports approaches the limits of fantasy.

Mr. Mullen, your colleague from the Alice Savings and Loan Association, can enrich your knowledge of how some of the examiners operate. It is my judgment that in some instances they have gone beyond the law, delegating unto themselves the power to go on hunting expeditions not sanctioned by any provision of law, rule or regulation. On the contrary, it would appear that their actions were specifically prohibited.

Let me make it very clear that I believe an examiner should have access to every record required by the Board to be kept by any association either federally chartered or federally insured. But I do not believe the examiner can without the specific approval of the Board, seek out by devious means other records in an effort to build a case. If there is evidence indicating a violation of law may have occurred, there are appropriate means for other agencies, specifically charged with the law enforcement, to undertake a further investigation. They are empowered to seek further evidence in an effort to protect the American investing public.

Let me outline what the subcommittee's study of the Alice case disclosed. An inexperienced examiner was placed in charge of the examination of this State-chartered institution. It was his first such assignment, and he was given special instructions which immediately removed it from the realm of a regular examination. He went through the records of hundreds of houses involved in six separate subdivisions to seek the possibility of secondary financing. To do this he had to go to records outside the association for which he criticized the institution while admitting that their records were complete and in accordance with requirements.

During the course of the examination he came across a completely proper action by the board of directors of the association, one which was completely set forth in the minutes of the board. Not satisfied with the statement in the minutes, he called in the FBI to get additional information to satisfy this curiosity. This led to a request by the examiner for over 100 Federal income tax returns of individuals and corporations who had some—no matter how remote—connection with the association. These tax returns actually were obtained by the U.S attorney and turned over to the bank Board examiners—in apparent violation of rules and regulations governing such matters and in total disregard of the intent of Congress that tax returns enjoy the highest type of confidentiality.

From the testimony in subcommittee hearings to date, I am firmly convinced that the recruiting, training and supervision of examiners must be improved substantially, and there must be a tightening up of the guidelines under which they operate.

The new Board recently announced the formation of some staff committees to help the Board. This might be a disturbing trend, if it permits staff officials to take over even more functions which the Board, itself should be carrying out. Chairman McMurray also announced the establishment of some Board committees to study general problems. These study committees, composed of three or four bank presidents along with some staff members, may well come up with the necessary guidelines to improve examination and supervision activities.

I have talked, so far, about those officials responsible for regulating the savings and loan industry, but they do not deserve all the blame. Isn't it time for this industry to throw its weight behind the efforts of the present Board to achieve definitive guidelines for those charged with supervising your activities? I know of the sincere desire of the present Board members to chart a course which will provide appropriate guidance and prevent recurrence of the errors encountered in the Clovis, Alice, and Long Beach cases.

Generally, the savings and loan associations of this country can be very proud of their achievements in fostering thrift and homeownership. Of course, we have cases like those developing in Maryland where all government must accept responsibility for the shocking developments. But in the main we are dealing with a group of people who are dedicated to the economic life of their community. They have a right to be treated fairly—a right to know what is expected of them and it is the responsibility of the Home Loan Bank Board to honor this right. They should not be hailed in, in a summary fashion with a threat of economic life-or-death hanging over them. When evidence of wrongdoing or of improper or unwise conduct arises, the Board should call them to task and put them on notice that improprieties must not continue. But the Board should not accumulate a myriad of charges which, at some future date, can be lumped together as an excuse for arbitrary action. If a practice is wrong you deal with it upon discovery. You give management the opportunity to take the immediate steps necessary for correction. If this fails, you then proceed to make sure that the questionable practices will not continue. But objectionable activities are not black or white in all cases. Sometimes it is in an area of gray where the Board needs more information—where it should ask management for an explanation.

It is my judgment that the original law regulating the savings and loan industry, as it has been amended over the years, gives the Federal Home Loan Bank power to regulate in a sound, reasonable and completely equitable fashion, protecting shareholders and clients and letting management know the course which must be followed to be above suspicion or criticism. If the Board believes that it is lacking in legislative authority to regulate properly, it is its duty to request of Congress proper amendments to the Act.

The Special Subcommittee on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is continuing the study of a few additional cases. We hope to finish this year and file a report with overall findings on the operation of the Board and with specific recommendations. The report will be objective and I believe it will prove helpful to the new Board which, I have every confidence, desires to build a record which will meet the needs of the investing public while meeting the approval of all segments of the industry.

MINIMUM WAGE LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage bill which I introduced today provides a living wage for the citizens of the District of Columbia. It provides for a wage that will enable the citizens of the District to earn enough per week to keep their families supplied with the essentials of life.

This bill establishes a minimum wage of $1.25 in the District without regard to sex. It also provides for a 40-hour workweek with time and one-half for overtime. This is not an extravagant bill, it is not an innovation, it does not foretell great economic upheaval for the District with places of business closing because the wage scale of the area is too high. This bill provides just and long overdue benefits for the working force of the city. This bill will provide what we have already provided for those engaged in interstate and foreign commerce; it does what State after State throughout the Nation has done.

The need for this legislation can be seen in the fact that a man earns less by working for a living than if he goes on the already crowded relief roles of the city. Working for 50 or 60 hours a work for $1 an hour or less not only provides a less than adequate income but it saps the strength, morale, and will to work of even the best of our citizens.

Many of the problems of the District can be traced to the lack of a wage scale that is equitable and adequate. This bill is designed to see that all of the people of the District have a minimum livable wage, and hours of work that are fair for the employer and fair for the individual.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the Congress to take action in this field. Let us not delay providing a decent income for the people of the District. Let us not delay in expressing our concern for the problems of the District. Let us not delay taking appropriate action and realizing that a family cannot live on an income of $1 or less per hour. This is 1962, Mr. Speaker, and we must see to it that employers pay their employees wages commensurate with the economic conditions that prevail in the Nation today.

AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the April 17, 1962, report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. The report is titled: "Examination of Procurement of 1,700 Gallons Unassembled Jettisonable Fuel Tanks by the Department of the Air Force Under Negotiated Fixed-Price Contracts With Beech Aircraft Corp., Wichita, Kans., and Fletcher Aviation Corp., Rosemead, Calif."

I am sorry to say that this report details sloppy business habits, costing $1,537,000, topped off with delaying tactics, buckpassing, and failure to meet responsibilities by the Air Force.

The Comptroller General shows in detail how $1,537,000 of taxpayers' money was wasted by the Air Force in procurement of jettisonable fuel tanks for B-47 bombers. The record shows that failure to make tests before beginning production meant a waste of time, money, and material on this project.

Although the Air Force had preproduction plans ready 4 months before contracts were awarded, their records show that no one was aware that plans showed that the tanks could not fit into the containers made for them. When the Comptroller General asked about this, the Air Force attempted to pass the buck to the Fletcher Aviation Corp. by saying that design changes after the contracts had led to the inability to match tanks with containers. This is simply false.

I would like to quote from page 17 of the Comptroller General's report:

> Air Force records indicate that the Air Force was not aware that it was impossible to package the unassembled tanks in the metal shipping containers until the first container was delivered to Fletcher in October 1956, about 20 months after the Air Force received and accepted the drawings from Beech, 16 months after the first production contract was awarded to Fletcher, and 8 months after the second production contract was awarded to Beech. Further, the Air Force did not determine until November 1956 that the unassembled tank, which, according to the development contract was to be capable of being assembled in 3 man-hours, could not be assembled by experienced mechanics in 3 days. Had the Air Force made a timely determination that procurement of unassembled tanks was not feasible, the contracts could have been awarded to provide for production of assembled tanks, as was provided by contract amendments after this determination eventually was made, and unnecessary costs to the Government of about $1,537,000 could have been avoided. There seems to have been adequate time, during the development contract and during the period between acceptance of the drawings and award of the first production contract, for the Air Force to make a determination as to whether unassembled tanks and metal containers, made in accordance with the drawings furnished by Beech, would meet Air Force specifications and requirements.

When proper procedures to prevent such foulups in future were recommended, the Air Force failed to inform the Comptroller General of any steps it planned to take.

In these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to do but recommend that the Secretary of Defense himself require the Air Force to institute adequate businesslike procedures to save useless wastes of millions of dollars.

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Mr. GIAIMO. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable JOHN LINDSAY, in sponsoring legislation to establish a Presidential Advisory Council on Education. I feel strongly that such a Council would give needed emphasis to the serious problems facing our educational system and our efforts to solve them.

The multiplicity of arguments surrounding the issue of education threatens to obscure and confuse the true magnitude of the problem. I am sure I need not remind my colleagues that the future of our civilization and our philosophy is dependent upon the excellence of our educational systems. Unfortunately, the need to assure such excellence has been overshadowed by the arguments for and against the forms of aid which should or should not be offered to education on any level. There is diversity of opinion on scholarship provisions, on the need for classrooms, on the proper treatment of increases in teachers' salaries. There is intense discussion on the providing of aid to public and/or private schools, on programs to assist institutions of higher learning, on proposals to meet the needs of technical and scientific education, on the nature of improving the quality of our educational systems.

Mr. Speaker, much of our country's foundation is based on reverence for education. The increasing complexity of our world requires high-level concentration on the problems of our educational system. We can benefit from the refreshing, distinguished approach which would be provided by a Presidential Advisory Council on Education. This Council would advise the President on matters concerning all levels of education. The members would be selected on the basis of their understanding of educational requirements and interest in and experience with our entire educational system. The Council would also make recommendations for the correlation and coordination of the many Federal activities now concerned with education. The Council's recommendations would be valuable guideposts in our work as well as in the work of the executive branch.

We must draw on the talents and experiences of every American who can assist us in our concerted efforts to bring our educational institutions to the high level of performance that is demanded by our times. This Council's work would be invaluable, and its contributions immeasurable.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague in sponsoring this proposal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. RILEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROOSEVELT, to transfer his special order for 30 minutes, today, to Monday, May 28, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SANTANGELO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona in two instances and to include extraneous material, including Mr. RHODES' questionnaire and its results.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER.

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

Mr. KING of California.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

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

Mr. BOW.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 28, 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:

2109. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving a net decrease in the amount of $2,111,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 422); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2110. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the development and procurement of similar-type helicopters within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2111. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to venue"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 667. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5532, a bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 668. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8845, a bill to amend chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to obstruction of investigations and inquiries; without amendment (Rept. No. 1737). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. 315. An act for the relif of Dr. Ting-Wa Wong; without amendment (Rept. No. 1729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1962. An act for the relief of Kenneth David Wooden; without amendment (Rept. No. 1730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2011. An act for the relief of Antonia Longfield-Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2099. An act for the relief of Tina Jane Beland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2143. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eva London Ritt; with amendment (Rept. No. 1733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2147. An act for the relief of Felipe O. Pagdilao; without amendment (Rept. No. 1734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Demitrios Dunis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1735). 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. BROOKS of Texas:

H.R. 11899. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 11900. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall assume the risks of its fidelity losses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11901. A bill to amend section 4142 (relating to the definition of radio and television components) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 11902. A bill to establish a President's Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 11903. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1939, chapter 409, as amended, to provide for the registration of professional nurses as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11904. A bill to establish a President's Advisory Council on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11905. A bill to establish the Capitol Hill National Historical Park and to provide for the protection and preservation of its historic character, dignity, and environment; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11906. A bill to strengthen the competitive system by assisting qualified small-business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where stringent credit requirements to exclude such concerns, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 11907. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11908. A bill authorizing the reconstruction of the Lake Kemp Dam on the Wichita River, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 11909. A bill to strengthen the competitive enterprise system by assisting qualified small-business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where stringent credit requirements tend to exclude such concerns, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 11910. A bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and maximum hours protection, and improved means of enforcement; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11911. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 721. Joint resolution to provide for the preservation and protection of certain lands in Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., and Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 478. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploratory of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 663. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COOK:

H. Res. 664. 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. KING of New York:

H. Res. 665. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Res. 666. 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11912. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ng Ying-Lung and Mrs. Ng Lau Kwen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 11913. A bill for the relief of Pierre Eli Dokhan, also known as Pierre Eli Dokan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11914. A bill for the relief of Charles Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

357. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of University of California Young Democrats urging enactment at this session of the Congress of the King-Anderson health care bill, and also urging that the deductible provision of this bill be deleted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

358. By Mr. NIX: Petition of Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union, Locals Nos. 362, 375, and 1034, AFL-CIO, favoring the Anderson-King bill to alleviate the hardship and suffering of many of our senior citizens by providing hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

359. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ruth A. Mendenhall, corresponding secretary, the California State Association of Emblem Clubs, Downey, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that they be placed on record as urging an unending fight against communism; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 1962

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., 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 God, who hast been the hope and strength of all generations, and who hast breathed into Thy earth-children, made in Thy image, the passion to seek Thee and, in seeking, to surely find Thee: To Thy servants here dedicated to the welfare of the state, grant, we beseech Thee, a clearer vision of the unlimited resources which await those who walk in the way of Thy will.

As we stand on these ramparts of freedom, with all mankind—the free and the enslaved—looking and listening to that which is said or done here, let all bitterness and wrath and intemperate speaking be put away, with all malice; and may we be kind to one another, tenderhearted and forgiving, even as Thou, our Father, forgivest our trespasses against Thy love and against the welfare of Thy other children.

We pray 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 24, 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. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 23, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

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. 107) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1348) for the relief of William Burnice Joyner.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11737) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11737) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

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 Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] be permitted to absent himself from the Senate today and tomorrow.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3552 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO PROCEEDS FROM DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN COINS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to provide that the proceeds from the distribution and sale of uncirculated coins shall be reimbursed to the appropriation from which the expenses of manufacture and distribution were paid (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July 1961–March 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT AND PROCUREMENT OF SIMILAR-TYPE HELICOPTERS WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the development and procurement of similar-type helicopters within the Department of Defense, dated May 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 8570. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit disbursing officers of an armed force to entrust funds to other officers of an armed force (Rept. No. 1527).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2107. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to extend the application of certain laws relating to the military services to the Coast Guard for purposes of uniformity (Rept. No. 1528); and

H.R. 4783. An act to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949 (Rept. No. 1529).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3016. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the act of August 27, 1935, relating to loadlines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1530).

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1184. A bill to conform the provisions of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with those of section 510 thereof as amended by Public Law 86-575, approved July 5, 1960, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1531).

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1526)

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report

favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H.R. 8031) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with minority views of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed as requested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 345); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 295, agreed to February 22, 1962, authorizing a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, is amended on page 2, line 14, by striking "$30,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$80,000."

REPORT ENTITLED "SMALL BUSINESS LEASE GUARANTEES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INTRODUCTION OF BILL (S. REPT. NO. 1532)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to file a report of the Senate Small Business Committee entitled "Small Business Lease Guarantees." Concurrently, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill intended to carry out the principal recommendation of this report. Joining me in the report and as cosponsor of the bill are Senators HUMPHREY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Louisiana, MORSE, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, and MOSS.

I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table for 10 days.

I am also pleased to announce that counterpart bills are being introduced in the other body today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] the distinguished chairman of the House Small Business Committee; and by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the able and vigorous chairman of that committee's Subcommittee No. 5, which works in the field of distribution problems affecting small business.

For some time, Mr. President, the Senate Small Business Committee has been concerned with the difficulties encountered by many seasoned small businesses in obtaining leases of choice commercial and industrial locations. In 1959, under the leadership of Senators HUMPHREY and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, our subcommittee on retailing and distribution practices conducted public hearings on the situation in suburban shopping centers.

Those hearings revealed that, not only in shopping centers but in other properties, downtown, and suburban, the small businessman was often being prevented from negotiating leases that not only he but his prospective landlord felt to be in their mutual best interest. This situation prevailed and still prevails because of the requirement of mortgage lenders that developers seeking loans must have leases with a sufficient number of tenants having triple A–1 credit rating to cover all mortgage payments.

Last December, at hearings of the full committee, we explored the question whether it would be feasible and desirable to remedy this situation through a program in which the Federal Government, through the Small Business Administration, would participate with the private surety industry in issuing guarantees of rental payments under the leases of qualified and experienced small businessmen. Such a guarantee would make the lease of a small businessman as safe an investment for a developer and his mortgage lender as the lease of a triple A–1 credit-rated big business.

The conclusion of the entire committee, Mr. President, is that the existence of a severe small business problem has been demonstrated. The conclusion and recommendation of the majority of the committee is that a Federal program for participating and, if necessary, direct lease guarantees by the Small Business Administration, is feasible and desirable. A minority of the committee—Senators SALTONSTALL, JAVITS, COOPER, SCOTT, PROUTY, and COTTON—feels that it is within the capability of the private surety industry to deal with this problem and that, accordingly, no new Federal program should be created until that industry has had more time to attempt a solution entirely within the framework of private enterprise.

The majority's recommendation, and the bill we are introducing today, would authorize the Small Business Administration to issue lease guarantees in participation with private surety companies only if no entirely private guarantee were available. Direct, entirely Federal guarantees would be authorized to be issued, only if no participation guarantees were available. The program, in this respect, would follow the pattern of the well-established SBA loan program.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of the bill and a summary, taken from the committee's report, of seven criteria met by the recommended legislation.

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

The bill (S. 3345) to strengthen the competitive enterprise system by assisting qualified small-business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where stringent credit requirements tend to exclude such concerns, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, and Senators HUMPHREY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Louisiana, MORSE, BIBLE, RANDOLPH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, and MOSS), was received and read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by adding after title III of a new title as follows:

"TITLE IV—LEASE GUARANTEES

"Policy and purpose

"SEC. 401. The Congress finds that small business concerns, even though well-established, sound, and successful, often cannot obtain leases of commercial and industrial property because of the requirements (particularly the minimum net worth requirement) imposed with respect to prospective lessees by the interested lending institutions. Such concerns are therefore placed at a competitive disadvantage, impairing their growth and development, thus weakening the competitive free enterprise system and preventing the orderly development of the national economy. It is the purpose of this title to assist qualified small business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where unduly stringent credit requirements for prospective lessees exist, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in participation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases.

"Authority of the Administration

"SEC. 402. (a) The Administration may, whenever it determines such action to be necessary or desirable in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, guarantee the payment of rentals under leases of commercial and industrial property entered into by qualified small business concerns, to enable such concerns to obtain such leases, and any such guarantee may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with any qualified surety company or other qualified company through a participation agreement with such company. The foregoing powers shall be subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) No guarantee shall be issued by the Administration (A) if a guarantee meeting the requirements of the applicant is otherwise available on reasonable terms, and (B) unless the Administration determines that there exists a reasonable expectation that the small business concern in behalf of which the guarantee is issued will perform the covenants and conditions of the lease.

"(2) The Administration shall, to the greatest extent practicable and consistent with the purposes of this title, exercise the powers conferred by this section in cooperation with qualified surety or other companies on a participation basis.

"(b) The Administration shall fix a uniform annual fee for its share of any guarantee under this section which shall be payable in advance at such time as may be prescribed by the Administrator. The amount of any such fee shall be determined in accordance with sound actuarial practices and procedures, but in no case shall such amount exceed two and one-half per centum per annum of the minimum annual guaranteed rental payable under any guaranteed lease: *Provided,* That the Administration shall fix the lowest fee that experience under the program established hereby has shown to be justified. The Administration may also fix such uniform fees for the processing of applications for guarantees under this section as the Administrator determines

are reasonable and necessary to pay the administrative expenses that are incurred in connection therewith.

"(c) In connection with the guarantee of rentals under any lease pursuant to authority conferred by this section, the Administrator may require, in order to minimize the financial risk assumed under such guarantee—

"(1) that the lessee pay an amount, not to exceed one-fourth of the minimum guaranteed annual rental required under the lease, which shall be held in escrow and shall be available (A) to meet rental charges accruing in any month for which the lessee is in default, or (B) if no default occurs during the term of the lease, for application (with accrued interest) toward final payments of rental charges under the lease;

"(2) that, upon the occurrence of a default under the lease, the lessor shall, as a condition precedent to enforcing any claim under the lease guarantee, utilize the entire period, for which there are funds available in escrow for payment of rentals, in reasonably diligent efforts to eliminate or minimize losses, by releasing the commercial or industrial property covered by the lease to another qualified tenant, and no claim shall be made or paid under the guarantee until such effort has been made and such escrow funds have been exhausted;

"(3) that the guarantor(s) of the lease will become successor(s) of the lessor for the purpose of collecting from a lessee in default rentals which are in arrears and with respect to which the lessor has received payments under a guarantee made pursuant to this section; and

"(4) such other provisions, not inconsistent with the purpose of this title, as the Administrator may in his discretion require.

"Powers

"SEC. 403. Without limiting the authority conferred upon the Administrator and the Administration by section 201 of this Act, the Administrator and the Administration shall have, in the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties conferred by this title, all the authority and be subject to the same conditions prescribed in section 5(b) of the Small Business Act with respect to loans, including the authority to execute subleases, assignments of lease, and new leases with any person, firm, organization, or other entity, in order to aid in the liquidation of obligations of the Administration hereunder.

"Fund

"SEC. 404. (a) There is hereby established a revolving fund for use by the Administration in carrying out the provisions of this title. Initial capital for such fund shall consist of not to exceed $50,000,000 allocated to that purpose by the Administrator from the fund established under section 4(c) of the Small Business Act. Into such fund there shall be deposited all receipts from the guarantee program authorized by this title. Moneys in such fund not needed for the payment of current operating expenses or for the payment of claims arising under such program may be invested in bonds or other obligations of, or bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States; except that moneys provided as initial capital for such fund shall be returned to the fund established by section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, in such amounts and at such times as the Administration determines to be appropriate, whenever the level of the fund herein established is sufficiently high to permit the return of such moneys without danger to the solvency of the program under this title.

"(b) Section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$1,200,000,000' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,250,000,000'; and

"(2) by striking out '$325,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$375,000,000'."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after the analysis of title III the following:

"TITLE IV—LEASE GUARANTEES

"Sec. 401. Policy and purpose.
"Sec. 402. Authority of the Administration.
"Sec. 403. Powers.
"Sec. 404. Fund."

The summary presented by Senator SPARKMAN follows:

1. The Small Business Administration (SBA) would be authorized to "guarantee the payment of rentals under leases entered into by qualified small business concerns of commercial and industrial properties to enable such concerns to obtain such leases." The SBA would be required, to the greatest extent practicable, to issue such guarantees in participation with qualified surety or other companies; but it would have power to issue full guarantees directly, if no private participation could be found.

2. A guarantee could be issued only upon a showing that no comparable guarantee was available from private sources, and that the applicant small business might reasonably be expected to perform the conditions and covenants of its lease.

3. The program would be set up on sound actuarial principles and should be fully self-supporting; however, the Administration would be limited to a maximum fee of 2½ percent per annum of the minimum guaranteed annual rentals, and would be required to charge the lowest fee that experience justified. Reasonable and necessary fees for processing applications would be authorized.

4. The SBA would be authorized to require small businesses receiving guarantees to make a deposit of 3 months' advance rental, to minimize risk of loss. The deposit would be utilized to pay rentals for any month in which a default occurred. At the end of the lease term, the deposit, if not needed to meet defaults, would be applied, with accrued interest, to meet final rental payments under the lease.

5. The lessor's first claim, in the event of default, would be upon the lessee's 3-month advance-rental escrow fund. During the period covered by the escrow, at least—and longer if the lease provided—the lessor would be obligated to endeavor to re-lease the premises. No claim against the guarantor(s) would be entertained until the escrow was exhausted and the effort to re-lease for the specified time, had been made. The guarantor(s) would be subrogated to the lessor's rights against the lessee, once any claims of the lessor against the lessee had been met by the guarantor(s).

6. The SBA would be authorized to establish additional rules, regulations, and limitations.

7. A $50 million separate revolving fund would be established to meet initial administrative costs and claims. All fees, both for guarantee premiums and for application processing, would be deposited into the fund.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay;

Seymour M. Peyser, of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for Development Financing, Agency for International Development;

Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, of Minnesota, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Bulgaria; and

Adm. Alan G. Kirk, U.S. Navy, retired, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to China.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis C. LaCour, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana;

Ben Hardeman, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Alabama;

Roland S. Mosher, of Arizona, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Arizona; and

Edward Hussey, Jr., of Delaware, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Delaware.

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Theodore William Parker, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, to serve in the rank of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list; and

Maj. Gen. August Schomburg, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, to serve in the rank of lieutenant general.

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. THURMOND:

S. 3339. A bill for the relief of Robert Murray McIntosh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 3340. A bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriations Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 3341. A bill to authorize the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 3342. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3343. A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 3344. 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.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 3345. A bill to strengthen the competitive enterprise system by assisting qualified small-business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property, where stringent credit requirements tend to exclude such concerns, by authorizing the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia and its conveyance to the International Monetary Fund, on a full reimbursement basis, for use in expansion of its headquarters; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 345) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. SYMINGTON, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

RELIEF OF CHINESE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. MUNDT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 346) to express the sense of the Senate on relieving the Chinese refugee problem, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

REPEAL OF PORTION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD, including the bill.

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

The bill (S. 3340) to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter, including the bill, presented by Mr. CHAVEZ, is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1962.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith, for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency "To repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the legislative program of General Services Administration for 1962.

The language to be repealed constitutes section 317 of title 40 of the United States Code, which relates generally to the purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment in Government-owned or leased buildings in the District of Columbia, and reads as follows:

"All electric fans, water-cooling units and air-conditioning equipment procured by a Federal activity, except Government-owned corporations, and which are now, or may hereafter be, installed in Government-owned or leased buildings in the District of Columbia and area adjacent thereto, operated by the Administrator of General Services, shall be and remain in the custody and under the control of said Administrator without exchange of funds and irrespective of the appropriations from which such items were procured or the source from which they were obtained, and existing appropriations or, unless specifically so provided, future appropriations, other than appropriations to the Administrator of General Services, shall not be available for the purchase or installation of the equipment enumerated herein in such buildings, such restrictions shall not apply, however, to ventilating and temperature and humidity control equipment for special laboratory, scientific, and research purposes, the cost of the purchase and installation of which may be borne from the appropriations of the particular Federal agency utilizing such equipment, but such installations shall be subject to approval by the General Services Administration and subsequent to its installation the equipment shall be maintained and operated by the General Services Administration and shall remain under the custody and control of such Administration without exchange of funds."

This act has been the subject of much misinterpretation and misunderstanding on the part of the tenant agencies and has been the source of friction between representatives of General Services Administration and other agencies for the reasons stated below. The need for this act has long since run its course, since regulations issued pursuant to title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 377), require General Services Administration's approval of air-conditioning equipment in buildings operated by it and provide for the installation to be made by General Services Administration on a reimbursable basis.

In this age of mechanization air conditioning has become almost a necessity, largely because of the requirement therefor in the installation and operation of electronic data processing and other heat-emitting or constant temperature machines. General Services Administration cannot possibly foresee and budget for air conditioning essential to the operation of such machines, which may be installed at any time. Under the present law we can accept reimbursement for air conditioning and similar equipment in the District of Columbia only if it is determined to be for special laboratory, scientific, and research purposes, language so vague as to make the determination extremely difficult in many instances, but at the same time too narrow to cover many purposes for which electronic data processing equipment is now being used.

In addition, the present trend toward block-type building design and the use of interior space in other types of buildings create a particular problem when heat-emitting equipment is used in nonventilated space. The normal design does not provide sufficient cooling to compensate for process equipment necessitating supplemental air-conditioning equipment, the need for which General Services Administration cannot anticipate. Unless we are permitted to accept reimbursement for this equipment, it may render the space unusable for the purposes intended.

The entire subject of reimbursement from the various departments and agencies which General Services Administration services has recently undergone a thorough analysis and a series of guidelines have been established which are more than adequate to cover the problem of accepting reimbursement for air conditioning in the District of Columbia.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

Enactment of this legislation will not increase the budgetary requirements of the General Services Administration.

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

Sincerely yours,
BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

S. 3340

A bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 999), as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That that portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942, in the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" (56 Stat. 999), beginning with the words *"Provided further"* in line 9 and ending with the words "in such buildings" in line 22 of such paragraph, as amended by the Act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930, c. 757), be and the same hereby is repealed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 14 OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, 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. 3343) to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received,

read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1962.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee of the Senate 20 copies of a draft bill to amend section 14(a) of the Natural Gas Act so as to give the Commission broad powers to conduct investigations and collect information with respect to the gas industry similar to those now conferred upon it with respect to the electric industry by section 311 or the Federal Power Act, but without impinging upon the existing authority of other Federal agencies in areas under their jurisdiction.

There are now more than 34 million natural gas consumers. Although a great deal of the Commission's work involves rates for natural gas in the field and at the city gate, we have very little information on what the *ultimate* consumer pays and so far as we know this information is not available anywhere. Of all the information we publish, the annual compilation of typical bills for household electric rates arouses the most interest and has probably been the most effective instrument in spotlighting out-of-line rates and stimulating better performance by the power industry with resulting benefits to consumers. We think that the information technique is equally applicable in the natural gas field. In his message of March 14, 1962, on protecting the consumer interest, the President recommended that the Congress enact legislation to enable the Commission to provide this information.

The Commission does not have complete authority to secure information relating to all segments of the natural gas industry. The result is that neither the Federal Government, the natural gas industry, nor the consuming public can turn to any single agency and obtain comprehensive information. In contrast, the Federal Power Commission is in a position to provide complete data concerning the electric power industry. Although the trade associations compile some statistical information on the industry as a whole, it is inadequate to meet the needs of the Commission and does not afford the detailed information desired by Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and the general public.

This amendment was recommended by the Commission in its 41st annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961. The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity.

This bill was submitted by the Department of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior accompanying the draft of 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. 3344) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1962.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity."

We suggest that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill would extend to this Department authority to employ aliens of any country in a scientific or technical capacity. The Secretary of the Interior is precluded by the General Government Matters Appropriation Act from using appropriations to compensate aliens whose post of duty is in continental United States unless certain statutory requirements are met. Section 502 of the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1962 (Public Law 87-125), provides in part:

"Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence * * *. That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies."

Among the agencies that have authorities to employ and compensate aliens of any country are the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission. S. 2236, 87th Congress, which would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, passed the Senate on September 1, 1961, and is presently pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The proposed legislation would enable this Department, in the absence of qualified U.S. citizens, to broaden its area of recruitment in searching for talented personnel with unique technical and scientific skills, regardless of the country of origin of an individual being considered. It would remove the anomalous situation whereby individual scientists of outstanding ability and experience, who are citizens of neutral countries may not be offered employment, unless they are employed on projects for which funds can be transferred from agencies that do have authority to hire such specialists.

The authority will be used to fill vacancies in current research and investigations programs that require qualified scientists and engineers with a depth of training and experience or a special combination of unusual abilities not commonly available in a single person. Lack of qualified applicants to fill present vacancies may result in postponement of needed research programs.

Examples of the kinds of specialists currently being sought include nuclear scientists skilled in mass spectrometer techniques and experienced in the absolute dating of rock specimens for geochronological studies (most of whom are Swiss nationals), scientists experienced in Arctic or Antarctic exploration with sufficiently broad training to extract maximum information from fieldwork performed at high cost under the most severe working conditions, including work performed on limited time schedules at points of observation where access is difficult, as in certain areas of Alaska (such specialists are few in number and are principally Scandinavian or Canadian nationals, of which Swedish and Finnish scientists cannot currently be employed). Other examples include scientists with technical training and linguistic ability in the central European, Asiatic, and other less well known languages, and with geographic familiarity with areas not currently accessible to travel, who would act not as translators as such, but provide scientific interpretations of materials produced in the geographic areas they know.

These specialists would be employed "* * * subject to such investigations as he (the Secretary of the Interior) may determine to be appropriate." This provision is in no way intended to permit lower investigative standards for aliens than for citizens. Rather, this provision would enable the Secretary to apply higher investigative standards for aliens if, in his discretion, he determined that such higher standards were necessary from the standpoint of the national interest.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

ACQUISITION AND CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce a joint resolution to authorize the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia, and its conveyance to the International Monetary Fund on a full reimbursement basis, for use in expansion of its headquarters.

This joint resolution is being introduced at the request of the Secretary of State. I ask that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of State under date of April 19, 1962, which sets forth a statement of justification for this proposal, be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

APRIL 19, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the acquisition of cer-

tain property in the District of Columbia and its conveyance to the International Monetary Fund, on full reimbursement basis, for use in expansion of its headquarters.

The International Monetary Fund was established in 1946 to promote international monetary cooperation through a permanent institution providing machinery for consultation and collaboration on international monetary problems. Pursuant to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act the United States became an original member of the Fund. At present 75 countries have adhered to the articles of agreement of the Fund. In addition, there are pending 11 applications for membership. The Fund's headquarters were established in the District of Columbia in acordance with the requirements in the Fund's articles of agreement that the site of its principal office be located in the territory of the member country having the largest quota in the Fund. The Fund rented quarters from 1946 to 1958. In 1958 it constructed, out of its own earnings, the building which it now occupies at 19th and H Streets Northwest. At that time its membership consisted of 64 countries.

On August 1 of last year, the Managing Director of the Fund, the Honorable Per Jacobsson, addressed a request to the Governor of the Fund for the United States and Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, requesting the assistance of the U.S. Government in acquiring certain adjoining properties necessary for an expansion of its headquarters. Mr. Jacobsson noted that the growth in the membership and activities of the Fund necessitated the construction of an addition to the present building in order to provide adequate office space to carry on the Fund's activities. He stated that some of the land necessary for the addition had been acquired, but that efforts to acquire two needed properties had met with utter failure.

The Secretary of the Treasury thereupon transmitted the request to me with a statement of his support. He noted that the Fund provides an important part of the international facilities which are essential to its members and recommended that the Department of State request the General Services Administration to assist the Fund.

On August 8, 1961, the Department, pursuant to section 405 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 298b), requested the General Services Administration to furnish the desired services to the Fund on the basis of full reimbursement. Representatives of the General Services Administration have sought to purchase from the interested parties the properties located at 701 19th Street, NW., and 1831 G Street, NW. The General Services Administration has reported failure in such attempts and has recommended that in the circumstances authority to permit the public taking of the properties is necessary.

It is my view that it is in the interest of the United States that legislation be enacted auhorizing the General Services Administration to acquire the said property by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, for conveyance to the International Monetary Fund on a full reimbursement basis. The Secretary of the Treasury concurs in this view. It is our hope that the Congress will be able to take early action on this matter.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the subject matter of this joint resolution, according to the Parliamentarian, would normally require its referral to the Committee on Government Operations. It is my understanding, however, that the chairman of that committee has no objection to having this joint resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations in view of the fact that it involves indirectly our relations with the International Monetary Fund.

Under these circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 190) authorizing the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia and its conveyance to the International Monetary Fund, on a full reimbursement basis, for use in expansion of its headquarters, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STANDBY AUTHORITY TO ACCELERATE PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BOGGS) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2965) to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to 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, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3225, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3225, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAMS OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10606) to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1363 AND S. 3096, GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION SET-ASIDES FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce that the hearings previously scheduled on bills S. 1363 and S. 3096, to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small business shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction, have been rescheduled for Thursday, June 7, 1962.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on these bills are requested to notify Mr. Reginald Barnes, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, at the earliest possible date.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 3203, TO EXTEND THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce that a hearing will be held on Tuesday, June 5, 1962, on the bill, S. 3203, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this bill are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

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

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, before the White House Conference on National Economic Issues, on May 22, 1962.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the morning hour, in order that I may make some remarks regarding one of our colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, next Sunday, May 27, will mark the 75th birthday anniversary of our colleague and friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

He was first elected to public office in 1915, when he was chosen to represent in the Virginia State Senate the counties of Rockbridge and Bedford.

After service in World War I, he resumed his place in the Virginia State Senate; and from 1922 to 1926 he served as Commonwealth's attorney of Rockbridge County, Va.

In 1926 he was appointed by the then Governor HARRY F. BYRD as chairman of the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries; and he served in that capacity for 6 years.

In 1932 he was elected Congressman at large for the State of Virginia; and from 1934 until 1946 he represented the Seventh District, which is known as the Valley District of Virginia, in the House of Representatives, where he served for 10 years as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

He is now a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. He is chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production; and is also chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in which position he has served since February 1959.

Typically, Senator ROBERTSON is, at this moment, hard at work presiding over a morning hearing of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, of which he is acting chairman. I regret that my remarks are being made at a time when he is unable to hear them in person.

Mr. President, one of the great good fortunes I have had is that when I became a Member of the Senate, I was assigned a seat next to that of Senator ROBERTSON. His long and distinguished public career, which I have just now enumerated, did not merely happen; it was caused by many things. But I think one of the basic reasons is his fine and intense dedication to the public interest and to the public service, based upon his high principles of honor and integrity. During all these years he has had the mounting confidence of his own people; and just 2 years ago he received the largest popular vote ever cast in his State for a public officer in a statewide race. That fact in itself reflects the utmost and absolute confidence of his people—which is the basis, after all, for his long tenure of service.

I know, too, Mr. President, from my associations with the people of Virginia, extending over a great number of years, even before I came to this body, that the people of Virginia love Senator ROBERTSON; and their love of him is based upon the intense trust and confidence they have in him.

All of us know, too, that his colleagues here respect him very greatly. They are influenced by him. Furthermore, all of us very much enjoy our associations with him. He has a fine sense of humor. He gives us wonderful flights of oratory. He has the gift of quick repartee in debate, and he has a comprehensive knowledge of history.

In addition to his other qualities, Senator ROBERTSON is a studious man of the most remarkable scholarly attainments.

Mr. President, I recount these characteristics of our colleague in order to point out just some of the virtues and merits which go to make up a great man and a great public servant.

All of us know that his political philosophy is based in large part upon his fine knowledge of and his study of the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, and Cordell Hull. Not only does he preach their principles, but he actually practices them.

Furthermore, Mr. President, Senator ROBERTSON is and has always been a tower of spiritual light, strength, and inspiration to his fellow men.

I am one of the 99 other Members of the Senate who hope that he will be active and will serve for many, many more years; and I extend to him our heartfelt greetings of appreciation and congratulations on his 75th birthday anniversary next Sunday.

I may say in closing that Senator ROBERTSON represents the Senate at its best.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have heard with pleasure the observations of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi about our great colleague from Virginia. I understand that Senator ROBERTSON will be 3 score and 15 years old on Sunday of this week. It is of more than passing interest to me, because I recall my first ventures with WILLIS ROBERTSON in the House of Representatives. He antedated me there slightly, but I became quickly acquainted with him and fond and appreciative of this lanky, homespun Virginian, first, because of his courage, second, because of his devotion to his country, and, third, because of his complete candor.

He is one of the great public servants of our time. In all those years my respect and affection did not diminish one bit.

As I joined him in service in this body, I took particular note of his performance, which was consistent with his record in the House in all the years we were together.

So I pay testimony to a great American and to a great public servant from a great State that has been known in the history of the Republic to have nurtured and nourished so many great men, so many great minds, and so many persons with a singular devotion to the perpetuity of this great Republic.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

In my short service in the Senate, the intimate associations and friendships with my colleagues have been a source of particular enjoyment to me.

During this period of time I have had the very great pleasure of close association with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. Along with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], I have experienced the leadership of Senator ROBERTSON in our breakfast meetings on Wednesday mornings. Undoubtedly the junior Senator from Virginia is the foremost Bible scholar in the U.S. Senate.

Senator ROBERTSON is outstanding in his knowledge of history. He is an authority on the Constitution of the United States. He ranks in the forefront of those who have defended the foundations of our Republic from assault.

In addition to that, I have had the privilege of hunting and fishing with him; and in those ways one really gets to know a man.

Never in my life have I met one for whom I have greater respect or in whom I have greater confidence. I salute the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia on his forthcoming birthday; and I commend my friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for calling it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in extending our hearty congratulations to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

These congratulations are well deserved. During the past 20 years I have had the opportunity to serve with him in both the House and the Senate, and to know that he exemplifies, in the best traditions of the Senate, the faithful performance of the duties of a Senator.

Senator ROBERTSON is cooperative and understanding. He is diligent and faithful in the carrying out of his duties.

I am delighted to join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and other Senators, who, I know, will join in paying this tribute, in extending congratulations to one who has proved himself to be an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives and a fine and great Member of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join in these expressions of congratulations to the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is one of the most able and most conscientious Members of this body. I join our other colleagues in saluting Senator ROBERTSON for his years of public service and his fine accomplishments in both public and private life.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to express my affection for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

After having followed him in the course of fishing trips, I cannot believe that he is approaching age 75.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to join my colleague the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in warmly congratulating our colleague the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] on his 75th birthday. It was my pleasure and privilege a few years ago to be in Staunton, Va., on a fine public occasion with WILLIS ROBERTSON and it was a source of pride and inspiration to me to see the great affection and appreciation in which he is held by the people of Virginia, the State that has given to our country so many of her noblest and greatest men. "The glory of man," said Solomon, "is strength," and WILLIS ROBERTSON is one of our country's strongest men—strong physically as attested by

his health and vigor on his 75th birthday—strong intellectually—behold his works and his leadership in this body—strong morally—see his devotion to truth and justice and righteousness and his inflexible adherence thereto. On this day we proudly salute WILLIS ROBERTSON, the friend, the patriot, the statesman, and the great and dedicated servant of our country.

Mr. ROBERTSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I am told that during the morning hour today several of my friends extended congratulations and good wishes to me on the approach of my 75th birthday, next Sunday.

Because I was presiding over an Appropriations Subcommittee hearing at the time, I was unable to respond to the kind words of my friends. I wish now to express my heartfelt gratitude to each of my colleagues for the thoughtfulness and friendship that prompted their comments.

I should like to add my own expression of hearty good wishes and warm congratulations to 13 other of my colleagues whose birthdays fall in the month of May. They include, in alphabetical order, Senators J. CALEB BOGGS, PRESCOTT BUSH, NORRIS COTTON, THOMAS J. DODD, VANCE HARTKE, HUBERT HUMPHREY—whose birthday and mine fall on the same date—HENRY JACKSON, JACOB JAVITS, KENNETH KEATING, JAMES B. PEARSON, ALEXANDER WILEY, JOHN WILLIAMS, and STEPHEN YOUNG.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues; and I extend to all of them my warmest congratulations upon their approaching anniversaries. They have not had as many birthday anniversaries as I, but I hope they will live far longer than I, and will enjoy long life, health, and happiness.

ORBITAL FLIGHT OF LT. COMDR. MALCOLM SCOTT CARPENTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at 7:45 a.m. today a man by the name of Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Scott Carpenter was projected into outer space in an orbital flight from Cape Canaveral, our great missile, rocket, and space operations base in Florida.

This was a wonderful sight to behold. Of course, we are all deeply indebted to television, radio, and the press, the news media, for recording this flight for us and giving us intimate contact with these fantastic, incredible technological developments that are related to the exploration of orbital flights and space itself.

As I understand, Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Scott Carpenter is now completing his first orbit. He is over the United States, and will soon be entering into the second orbit of this history-making flight.

The radio and television reports tell us that his space capsule will vary from approximately 85 to 150 miles from the earth in the orbital flight pattern.

The particular space capsule in which Lieutenant Commander Carpenter is now flying is known, I believe, as *Aurora 7*. It was thrust into orbit by an Atlas space booster. Everything was, as they say at Cape Canaveral, "A-OK."

What a remarkable experience it is to hear the voice of Lieutenant Commander Carpenter coming back out of the orbit on tape recording and played on radio and television, so that we here in the States and people around the whole world can hear his reports.

This is another step forward in America's experimentation in scientific exploration and manned flights in orbit and in space.

I commend all those who are responsible for this spectacular achievement. I am sure I speak for every Member of the Senate when I say the eyes of the world are on each and every effort we make, and when these efforts are successful, as this one is today—and pray God it may continue to be a complete success through the entire planned operation—and when triumph crowns our efforts, every American feels a little stronger, a little better, and a little more confident.

I believe every member of a free society feels that these achievements are not just ours; that they belong to the world; indeed, they belong to all those who seek to live a better day and to explore an uncertain future.

I commend and congratulate Lt. Comdr. Malcolm Scott Carpenter upon his courage, bravery, skill, and fitness for his task, and I join every American in wishing him well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I join in the observations of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] with respect to what we hope and pray will be a completely successful orbital flight.

Surely, all who have participated, all who by patience and devotion have made this a success, merit the commendation of the entire country and the gratitude of our people.

So our hopes and prayers will be with them, in the belief and in the deep conviction that this flight will be a great contribution to the advancement of mankind as we begin to reap the benefits of space exploration.

BENEFITS TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES SERVING IN FAR EAST

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on April 25 I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 180. It deals with wartime benefits for members of the Armed Forces who are subject to hostilities in any foreign country, and for other purposes.

I introduced the joint resolution after it came to my attention that there were several helicopter casualties in Vietnam and that, since it was not regarded as a combat area, those persons could not share in benefits for servicemen, and, in fact, did not merit the customary decorations.

I have noticed that since that time there have been other casualties, and I think four officers and an enlisted man have been injured just within a few days in a helicopter crash in Vietnam.

I was glad, therefore, that the Republican policy committee on May 22 took judicial notice of the fact that American troops in Thailand and Vietnam were eligible for the Purple Heart and adopted as a policy that these be entitled also to the other benefits, and that the resolution which I introduced be quickly considered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire statement of the Republican policy committee and, in connection therewith, a statement by Ray Henle in his "Three-Star Extra" program.

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

REPUBLICAN POLICY STATEMENT

Whereas American troops are now stationed in the areas of South Vietnam and Thailand, in which regions they have been, and may further be, subjected to hostilities; and

Whereas these troops stationed in these areas are not now eligible for benefits granted to troops serving in World War I, World War II, and in the Korean conflict except for eligibility to receive the Purple Heart; and

Whereas on April 25, 1962, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 180, a joint resolution to provide benefits for members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are subjected to hostilities in any foreign country and for other purposes; and

Whereas said resolution has been referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services:

The Senate policy committee therefore recommends that the Senate Armed Services Committee consider as rapidly as feasible legislation to provide appropriate benefits to members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are subjected to hostilities in any foreign country.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

STATEMENT BY "THREE-STAR EXTRA"

The Republican Senate policy committee resolved today that giving the Purple Heart to members of the American armed services who are subjected to hostility in the operations in the Far East is not enough and that our forces should also be given the benefits which accrue to men in war.

Senator HICKENLOOPER announced that the policy committee feels President Kennedy's recent action in making our men in the Far East eligible to receive the Purple Heart does not begin to meet the requirements.

The policy committee called on the Senate Armed Services Committee to forthwith recommend for favorable action by Congress the bill recently introduced by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republic Senate leader. This bill would make members of the armed services who are subjected to hostilities in the Far East eligible to receive education, survivor, and other benefits which present law extends in time of hot war and police actions such as Korea.

SOIL AND WATER STEWARDSHIP

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have the privilege of serving as chairman of a Special Watershed Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In this capacity, I should like to draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that next week will be observed throughout our Nation as Soil Stewardship Week. It is sponsored by the 2,900 local soil conservation districts, their national association, and cooperating church groups. The theme of this year's observance is "The Stream of Life—The Water That Sustains Us."

Throughout our land next week hundreds of thousands of church observances will be held to reflect the close relationship between the teachings of the Bible and the conservation, development, and proper use of soil, water, and related resources.

We are indebted to the 15,000 soil conservation district leaders who have for 8 years inspired this annual observance. I salute, also, the thousands of clergymen in all faiths who use this observance to gain understanding of the concept of soil and water stewardship by their members and the Nation.

This point was underscored by Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, in a statement he issued in connection with Soil Stewardship Week observances. He said:

Soil Stewardship Week is a time to renew our awareness of the blessings of soil and water in our daily lives. Water will be our friend or our enemy, depending largely on how we treat and manage the land on our farms and ranches and in our watersheds. For water stewardship and soil stewardship are one and the same. As we practice so shall we reap.

I salute Mr. Williams on this fine statement. I request unanimous consent to place his full statement in the RECORD.

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

A TIME FOR STEWARDSHIP

(By Donald A. Williams, Administrator, U.S. Soil Conservation Service)

Soil Stewardship Week, being observed across the Nation May 27 through June 3, is a time to renew our awareness of the blessings of soil and water in our daily lives. The observance is sponsored by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts cooperating with national church organizations.

This year's theme, "Water: The Stream of Life," is of special significance, for water is vital to all living things. How many times a day are we dependent on this priceless gift for necessities and for pleasures?

Water for commonplace things such as drinking, bathing, or sprinkling our lawns. Water for major purposes such as farm, city, power, or industry. Water for pleasures such as swimming, boating, or fishing.

We can enjoy the handiwork of water, our friend, in the green pastures after a soft, spring rain, the healthy crops in the field, or the flower garden in our backyard. We know that without water they could not be.

We can dread the power of water, our enemy, when we see the flooded streams and the destruction they leave behind them.

Water will be our friend or our enemy, depending largely on how we treat and manage the land on our farms and ranches and in our watersheds. For water stewardship and soil stewardship are one and the same. As we practice so shall we reap.

God gave us the gifts of soil and water to be used and enjoyed. He also gave us the responsibility for their care. One has only to see a muddy stream, a gullied hillside, or a dust storm, to know how great man's responsibility is. One has only to see a landscape of beauty, or taste pure, sparkling water or good food to know that our responsibility is worth fulfilling.

As our population expands and our cities overflow into once-rural areas, we become more conscious of the importance of water. New homes, highways, airports, shopping centers, recreational areas, and factories dramatize the increasing competitive demands we make of our remaining land and water resources.

Thousands of dedicated leaders of the Nation's more than 2,900 soil and water conservation districts have given unselfishly of their time and energy in accepting their responsibilities as stewards of soil and water in their communities. They are stewards for us all. New horizons in land use today give nonfarm people a greater opportunity than ever before to practice stewardship. Many townspeople are joining farmers and ranchers in multiple resource development of small watersheds for community development. They are accepting the challenge of stewardship. Their rewards will be great—a better and more prosperous life for all and the knowledge that they are building for the generations to come the heritage that is rightfully theirs.

Soil Stewardship Week is a time for all of us to pause and reflect on the blessings of soil and water. It is a time to remind ourselves that these blessings bring responsibilities. It is a time to remember that as man cares for the soil and water, so God intended that the soil and water should care for man.

STOCK MARKET VOTES NO CONFIDENCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the past few days the stock market appears to have climaxed a massive vote of "no confidence" in the ability of the present administration to produce a climate healthy and productive for American business. This trend has been abundantly clear ever since the Government resorted to punitive tactics in the recent steel price dispute. No matter how the New Frontier economists try to explain the stock market's behavior, there can be no doubt that the President and his advisers triggered the present slide which has sent the market to a 16-month low.

Yesterday what the newspapers described as a "near tidal wave of selling" hit the New York stock market. The Dow-Jones industrial average dropped to 626.52 points—or more than 108 points below its high in December of last year. Reliable estimates show that on the New York Stock Exchange alone losses have run over $50 billion since the first of the year. Almost half of these losses are believed to be directly attributable to the Government's high-handed tactics in the steel dispute.

The stock market today reflects—more accurately than any other indicator—the feelings of American business investors. It is sensitive to the slightest change in business climate. It reacts swiftly and drastically to governmental actions which serve either to encourage or discourage business activity and economic growth.

We know now that the American business community is not to be persuaded easily. The steady stream of reassurances stemming from administration sources are not producing the desired effect. The action of the stock market shows the fear, the indecision, and the confusion which now run rampant through the ranks of American business. It points up the need for the speedy adoption of sound fiscal policies, and actions by the Government to renew the business confidence so necessary to our national future. Words, it seems, are not enough in the present situation. The administration cannot speak loud enough to drown out the noise of governmental interference.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the threat to our character as a people which is inherent in various welfare proposals is too often obscure. The so-called benefits of a proposed social program are made to sparkle with such brilliance that people are blinded to the fact that the "benefits" actually are injurious. Occasionally, along comes a person whose eyesight is not so blinded. Such a person is C. W. McManamy, associate editor of the Council Buffs Nonpareil. In a column titled "One of These Days Why Work at All?" which appeared in the December 12, 1961, issue of the Nonpareil, Mr. McManamy has seen through the shining "benefits" of the medical-care-for-the-aged plan and viewed the injurious effect such a program would have on our character as individuals and as a nation. Furthermore, Mr. McManamy has reported on this ominous view in down-to-earth terms that make the picture clear to all who are willing to look upon the facts of life. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

ONE OF THESE DAYS WHY WORK AT ALL?

One of the pet projects of the present administration is a medical-care-for-the-aged plan. This program is the foot in the door it seeks in its long-range goal of a national medical and hospital aid plan.

In order that all of this welfare might seem to be something for nothing, proponents would tack it on to the present social security program.

From the bureaucrats standpoint this social security program is ideal. It takes its bite from the paycheck before the employee gets that check and so he seldom misses that bite. Moreover, the program is so complicated in all of its details that few people really understand much about it. The little they think they know about their social security usually turns out to be far to optimistic.

Before anyone agrees to having anything more hooked on to this deduction scheme he will do well to take a look at what social security presently is taking and what it contemplates within the next few years.

At the moment there is a 6-percent payment on every salary up to $4,800 per year. Of this the employee pays 3 percent. The employer pays the other 3 percent, adds it into the cost of business and the employee, in the role of consumer eventually pays this 3 percent, also.

On January 1, 1962, this deduction will be increased to 6¼ percent. This will be divided 50–50 between employee and employer. By January 1, 1966, the deduction will be up to 8½ percent and by January 1, 1968, it will have risen to 9¼ percent.

All of this is simply the present social security program without any additional load. Just what the proposed medical aids would cost is anybody's guess but current estimates are centered around 3 to 4 percent.

If the social security pattern is any indication these 3-to-4-percent estimates are conservative. Granting that they are about right we could expect our deduction for this expanded program to be up to almost 15 percent by 1968.

If we couple this 15 percent with the minimum income tax take of 20 percent we find that in these two fields alone some 35 percent of our wages will be lifted from us before we ever see them.

If we then add on the multitude of hidden, and not so hidden, additional taxes it is not unreasonable to expect that 40 to 50 percent of our earnings will someday soon be going for taxes.

At about that point, or perhaps even sooner, one of the facts of socialism, which its proponents do not care to talk about, begins to catch up with us.

If a person is only to have a fractional portion of his earnings left to him in any event, and if the various and sundry welfare programs are ready and eager to care for him, then why work at all?

As more and more people adopt this philosophy it will mean higher and higher taxes on those who are working until the whole thing falls of its own weight.

Someday, just for fun, I should like to talk to a dyed-in-the-wool believer in this welfare state business just to see how he rationalizes this eventual ending.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, also with respect to the medicare debate which currently is being waged from Madison Square Garden and other points in the United States, in the Monday, May 21, 1962, issue of the Christian Science Monitor there was published a lead editorial entitled "The Medicare Bill Bluff," which merits the attention of all concerned. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MEDICARE BILL BLUFF

The administration is pretending to be much more sure than anyone can be that its particular bill for hospital care financed under the compulsory formula of the social security system will pass.

President Kennedy twice took this posture in his speech on the subject in New York. The bandwagon appeal is a familiar political campaign tactic. In this case it is being used as if the bill could be enacted by a kind of hypnotic reiteration. The tactic will not succeed if the opposition is alert.

The President objects to what he describes as misinformation in the campaign of the American Medical Association and others against the social security tax method of accomplishing what all agree is a desired objective.

The objective is to assure that all those past retirement age who encounter overwhelming health care costs shall have help in bearing what would be tragic burdens for them and their families.

This kind of help already is being given extensively by public and private health facilities, by voluntary insurance plans of many kinds, and by State and local welfare departments under the Kerr-Mills Act adopted by Congress 2 years ago.

Proponents of the King-Anderson bill for blanket coverage under the social security system and with an added social security tax seem often to imply that this problem is being wholly neglected and that any who disagree with their particular method of meeting the need are cold-heartedly unsympathetic to the "old folks" of the Nation.

The President and others speak scornfully of any methods based on need as involving a pauper's oath. This is misrepresentative of the state of welfare administration in the United States.

Two or three generations ago persons of wealth objected to invasions of their privacy by the income tax. Is it any more unreasonable for people who deserve and should receive help to make a statement of their resources than for others to file a tax return?

The means test need not involve any public obloquy. Most States permit relief recipients to obtain a helpful amount of property, and any charge against this can be in the form of a lien enforceable only after the owner is gone.

Mr. Kennedy noted the objection that the King-Anderson bill would pay benefits even to those of ample means. He was sure, he said, that millionaires would not mind paying the small social security tax for this purpose.

That is not the point. The person who should be concerned is the small salary or wage earner who will be paying this tax for many years, financing the benefits for two generations of millionaires—those of his own age and those who are now retired—in order to obtain eventual protection for himself.

If there is widespread misunderstanding of the proposal for social-security-type hospital care, this is no more attributable, if as much, to those who oppose the bill than to its advocates. If the American people take pains to inform themselves reliably on the whole subject, we believe they will reject compulsory processes for voluntary ones, and resist blanket expenditures in favor of more carefully directed ones.

Mr. MILLER. On the same subject, Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star for May 23, 1962, there appeared another one of the timely and appropriate articles by the distinguished columnist David Lawrence, entitled "The Method of Medical Care," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

THE METHOD OF MEDICAL CARE—THE GOAL IS ADVOCATED BY ALL SIDES, BUT FINANCING PLAN IS AT ISSUE

(By David Lawrence)

Everybody is for medical care for the aged. Republicans and Democrats, critics and advocates of specific legislation alike—all recognize that the sick must be cared for always.

The real debate is over what method, what plan, what means of financing shall be adopted. Demagoguery will not help to find the solution.

President Kennedy's speech on Sunday was not an adequate outline of the basic issues. He talked off the cuff on a television hookup and said some things he never would have said if he had prepared his speech in advance. There were, for instance, sentences like these:

"I visited twice, yesterday and once today, a hospital, where doctors labor for a long time, to visit my father. It isn't easy—it isn't easy. He can pay his bills, but otherwise I would be. And I'm not as well off as he is. But what happens to him and to others when they put their life savings in, in a short time?"

It so happens that the elder Kennedy is reportedly worth more than $100 million, and the President, himself, it has been estimated in the press reports, is worth a sum up in the millions—some say $10 million.

The above quotation might give the impression that the President was worrying about hardship upon the wealthy. Actually, he wasn't. Later on, in the same speech, he said the millionaires would not mind contributing $12 a month to social security and that, anyway, "the National Government, through the tax laws, already takes care of them, because over 65 they can deduct all their medical expenses."

The President certainly wasn't describing a situation analogous to that which confronts many people. His plan calls for an increase in social security taxes—in some cases by as much as 17 percent. The new tax will apply to 74 million persons under social security.

All this is designed to take care of the minority who may get sick in old age and have to go to a hospital or nursing home. The new project, however, doesn't provide payments for doctors' bills, but only hospital costs and nursing care over and above the first $90. Opponents insist that the needy can be taken care of by a direct appropriation by Congress each year without raising the social security taxes. The objection of the President to this is that it requires a means test, or what he called in his Sunday speech a pauper's oath.

But the fact is that the document signed by the patient would be confidential. It's like his income tax return, which certainly is not open to public view.

Many persons who go on relief have to sign certain papers. They don't seem to mind a means test. The Government could, of course, designate by another name the money to cover the needy. It could be called a refund on previously paid taxes. Persons who are 65 years of age or over and who now are without means would hardly object to a refund of what they have paid before over the years to cover a variety of social-welfare programs of the Government that didn't benefit them directly.

There's a law on the statute books now to take care of the aged who are sick. It is called the Kerr-Mills Act, passed in 1960. It matches funds put up by the States to care for those who cannot pay their medical bills. It covers doctors and nursing as well as hospital bills. It is in operation in many States.

Funds for hospital bills for the aged can be provided through private insurance or from general taxes and thus avoid another cut in take-home pay for the workers of America. The average employee realistically considers his take-home pay as the net amount available to him for current expenses, whether he or she is 21 years old or 60.

The added social security tax for medical care for the aged is estimated at $1.6 billion for the first year and would rise to $1.9 billion in 5 years. This means that the total take-home pay of the employee and the profits of corporations will be cut by that amount. For the employer pays half of the extra social security tax increase.

Also, when an item of $1.6 billion is added to wage costs in the national economy, it is eventually reflected in higher wages and higher prices. Workers are promptly told by the labor unions that the cut in take-home pay will be offset by an increase in wages.

A direct appropriation by Congress could eventually mean less expense than the social security levy. It could be imposed through the general tax structure on those who could best afford to pay it.

The administration plan, moreover, doesn't cover everybody. There are, for instance, 9 million persons in the labor force, including the self-employed, who are not covered now by social security. Also, about 3 million individuals already 65 years of age or older are not eligible for social security benefits and would receive no medical-care aid under the Kennedy plan.

So it isn't a case of hardhearted folks opposing medical care for the aged. Everybody is in favor of this benefit. But it is a case of hardheaded financing that will put the least burden on the middle-aged and the young, so many of whom for long years ahead are going to be paying to the Government money for some things their families may never need. Systems of voluntary insurance are popular nowadays and are gradually covering more and more people.

There is supposed to be political mileage, however, for the administration in raising

the issue of medical care for the aged and giving the impression that the critics are cruel persons who are opposed to providing such care.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at my request, Mr. Douglas Bryant, associate director of Harvard University Library, has recently prepared a memorandum on the subject of the Library of Congress and connected library matters.

To my mind, there is considerable merit in many of the comments he has to make. I am hopeful that these proposals will be widely discussed, and that some constructive thought will be given to this field, which has not lately received much attention.

Mr. President, it is my impression that we have tended to take for granted our Library of Congress—our basic working tool which underlies all our useful scholarship, the responsible work of our Congress, and the very culture of our Nation. It is essential that the libraries function efficiently.

The time is here when we should concern ourselves with these matters and should attempt to develop a well-coordinated and forward-looking plan.

I ask unanimous consent that this very interesting memorandum be inserted in the RECORD.

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

HARVARD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 1, 1962.

To the Honorable CLAIBORNE PELL:

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this memorandum, prepared in response to your request, is to consider what the Library of Congress does and what it ought to do for the Government and the Nation generally. The Library of Congress has major responsibilities for an area in which the Nation urgently needs wise and vigorous leadership. Consequently, other agencies with closely related functions will be taken into account, and some attention will be given to the whole question of Federal participation in the affairs of American research libraries, both public and private.

The present program of the Library of Congress and related agencies will be outlined, and reasons will be given for regarding it as inadequate. Specific suggestions will be made for improvements in the present program and for additions to it that clearly seem to be in the national interest. Finally, questions of administrative machinery will be examined.

THE PRESENT PROGRAM OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND RELATED AGENCIES

The major functions of the Library of Congress might have been assigned to three or four separate agencies. Though an explanation of why they have been combined would call for a study of history rather than of administrative logic, the results appear to be reasonably satisfactory.

First, of course, it is the Congressional Library as its name proclaims. Provision of superlative reference service to the legislative branch of the Government is paramount; indeed, a special department, the Legislative Reference Service, has been responsible for this function since 1915.

Second, it serves as the general library for the Federal Government as a whole. Scores of working libraries must be maintained by Federal agencies of all kinds, but the Library of Congress is the central collection to which all may turn for library materials and reference assistance. Coordination of Federal libraries can prevent needless duplication of facilities and improve the service that is provided; this calls for continued effort by the Library of Congress, which has a clear responsibility for leadership.

Third, it has long been evident that the Library of Congress, despite its anachronistic name, is the National Library of the United States. It has received American publications by copyright deposit for more than a century, and, in the national interest, it has built up the largest collection of books in the country, going far beyond the probably direct needs of Federal agencies. Service, moreover, has been given on a national basis; the Library is open to scholars who visit Washington, it lends books in great numbers to libraries throughout the country, and it makes thousands of photographic reproductions to serve research needs everywhere.

Fourth, it has become a national bibliographical center and the keystone in a national system of research libraries. The National Union Catalog, which records the location of books in research collections throughout the country, is an indispensable feature of the machinery of interlibrary cooperation that aspires to enable all scholars to draw upon the holdings of all American research libraries. Printed catalog cards have been sold by the millions, thus avoiding great expenditures by American libraries for duplication of cataloging. The development and publication of its system of classification and subject headings have benefited libraries everywhere, as have numerous bibliographical publications and other projects, many of them handled by the Library of Congress under contract with other Federal agencies.

Finally, the National Library's functions are not confined to the collection, cataloging, and circulation of books; there are many other ways in which it enriches the cultural life of the Capital City and of the Nation as a whole. This calls for particular emphasis in view of the fact that the American Government has not concerned itself with cultural affairs to the extent that many others have done. Washington would be poorer artistically and intellectually without the concerts and lectures that are provided by the Library of Congress. Among the members of its staff are leaders in many fields of research, and the program for consultants and fellows has given recognition to achievement in literature and music as well as in scholarship. The Library is a major collector and publisher of recorded folk music. Its Hispanic Foundation, bringing together and emphasizing resources in an area of particular importance, has genuinely contributed to cultural relations with the countries of Latin America.

It has been indicated that activities of some other Federal agencies are closely related to those of the Library of Congress. Indeed, the Department of Agriculture Library and the National Library of Medicine, now recognized as the national libraries in their fields, maintain the national research collections in their two important subjects, and collecting policies of the Library of Congress reflect this.

The Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare compiles useful statistics of libraries of all kinds. It administers the program of grants for rural public library development under the Library Services Act of 1956, as well as library aspects of the National Defense Education Act, but it has been chiefly concerned with public and school, rather than research, libraries.

An account of Federal activities directly affecting libraries would be incomplete without mention of the fact that the Government is a major publisher. In addition, many of its libraries serve the general public to some extent, though not on the same scale as the Library of Congress and the national research collections in agriculture and medicine, and many of its agencies sponsor important bibliographical work, some of which, as has been noted, is done under contract by the Library of Congress.

Interlibrary cooperation has been mentioned, and it ought to be emphasized that libraries work together and share their resources to an extraordinary degree. Federal libraries, university and other research libraries whether tax-supported or private, major State and municipal libraries, and special libraries maintained by great business and industrial firms—all have tried to make their holdings known to one another and to scholars generally through the national bibliographical machinery of which the National Union Catalog is the major feature, and all have cooperated by means of loans and photographic reproduction. Sixty research libraries, under a specialization agreement known as the Farmingtor plan, have tried, in the national interest, to insure more comprehensive and coordinated coverage of current foreign publications. The Midwest Inter-Library Center in Chicago is a regional collection cooperatively managed and supported by member libraries, and there are several regional bibliographical information centers. Research libraries throughout the country draw upon the Library of Congress and other Federal institutions; they also contribute, both directly and indirectly, to supplying the Federal Government's needs for research materials.

WHY THE PRESENT PROGRAM IS INADEQUATE

Libraries are not ends in themselves. The present research library system of the country has grown up in response to the needs of scholars; during recent years, however, as it has become evident that research is essential to national survival, needs have increased more rapidly than libraries have been able to meet them. It is hardly necessary to dwell upon the importance of research, but it may be worth while to point out that the materials it requires are growing enormously in complexity and in bulk. American libraries are not collecting enough. The world of scholarship was once relatively small; now it embraces every country and draws upon material in nearly every language. The printing press, moreover, has been supplemented by a variety of inexpensive devices for reproducing and disseminating the written word.

It is not enough to collect the output; bibliographical apparatus must be provided if the scholar is to know what has been published, whether it is likely to be pertinent, and where it can be obtained. Scholarship no longer moves at a leisurely pace; the needs are urgent. Bibliographical machinery has failed even more seriously than library collecting to keep up with the current flood of publications relevant to serious investigation and research. There is evidence that the present systems are breaking down, and electronic remedies have yet to be proved generally feasible.

A scarcely less serious problem confronts libraries in the form of disintegrating paper. Most of the books published during the past century have been printed on paper that cannot be expected to last for another hundred years; it will be necessary to reproduce millions of books, presumably by microphotographic means, if their content is to be preserved.

The present program of American research libraries is not good enough, and it cannot be made adequate without materially increased Federal participation. The foundations, particularly the Council on Library Resources, support experiments, but not the long-term programs that must be undertaken if libraries are to collect all they should, to provide satisfactory catalogs, indexes, and other bibliographical tools, and to preserve for posterity as much of the

record of our civilization as ought to be preserved. Cooperation by libraries has great achievements to its credit, but the strong libraries, which are always taxed most heavily by cooperative efforts, cannot spend great sums in the national interest if they must do so at the expense of their own constituencies whom they are not serving adequately. It is not enough to share resources if their total is inadequate.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE BY THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Strong and imaginative leadership is a prime need. Library service to research is a national concern, the major research libraries are already functioning as national institutions, and only planning on a national basis can hope to accomplish what must be done. Leadership in such planning and in moving toward its objectives ought to come—not exclusively, to be sure, but in generous measure—from the National Library.

New Federal programs are needed in at least five specific areas:

1. Research and experimentation should be undertaken on a large scale in the application of modern technology to library purposes. Applications of mechanical techniques to bibliography and mechanical methods of information storage and retrieval appear to be so promising, at least in some fields of study, and the benefits to American research of a breakthrough here would be so great, that a more ambitious effort is justified than the uncoordinated experiments now underway.

2. The underdeveloped countries should be assisted in creating or strengthening their own national libraries and bibliographies listing their current publications. This will benefit scholarship throughout the world, will contribute to friendly and fruitful cultural relations with such countries, and will directly aid American libraries in building up their resources without wasteful and expensive duplication of bibliographical work.

3. Our responsibility for preservation of research materials on disintegrating paper calls for both a national plan of action by American libraries and encouragement to other nations in efforts to preserve their own publications. The material that deserves to be preserved must be identified and selected, large-scale photographic reproduction must be undertaken, adequate bibliographical apparatus must be provided, and machinery for dissemination should make what is reproduced available to scholars everywhere. If the effort fails, large segments of the useful record of civilization will be lost; if it succeeds, libraries will be enabled to serve scholarship better than every before. The costs will be large, and some Federal support is essential for the Nation's well-being.

4. Federal support for research libraries in the form of grants-in-aid is needed, just as support for scientific research and the training of scientists has been needed during recent years. Indeed, unless libraries are helped to meet their growing obligations, there is a danger that their strenuous efforts to serve the urgent requirements of science will cause them to neglect other fields. Furthermore, it should be recognized that non-Government institutions, such as the Midwest Inter-Library Center, have an integral part in the national research library system, and they should be federally supported through contracts or other appropriate means.

5. Research libraries are encountering a serious shortage of qualified personnel; at the same time they require special skills in languages and in subject fields as never before. A program of scholarships and fellowships is needed to recruit and train professional librarians; unless such aids to training and recruitment are available, there are real risks of siphoning off too high a proportion of talented young people into science technology, and other disciplines that are critically dependent upon our ability to mobilize the pertinent literature effectively.

Emphasis on the new programs that have been described above should not be allowed to obscure the importance of improving or extend a number of programs to which the Library of Congress is already committed.

1. The scope of its acquisitions programs should be considerably broadened, to assure adequate growth of the collections, both in retrospective publications and in the vastly increasing world output of research materials. It should also actively assist other research libraries to develop satisfactory channels for the procurement of materials otherwise unusually difficult to obtain, such as the official government documents of other nations and microfilms of archival materials.

2. Library of Congress holdings and Library of Congress cataloging will not serve the Nation as effectively as they should until extensive backlogs of uncataloged materials have been incorporated into the regular collections, and the Library has been provided wih manpower sufficient to catalog current acquisitions promptly.

3. Funds should be appropriated to eliminate the current arrear in recording the holdings of American libraries in the National Union Catalog. This is the most comprehensive bibliography in existence; it should be edited, extended, and published in book form. Current additions are being issued in printed volumes, and the practicability of the project has thus been demonstrated.

4. The current National Union Catalog should be mechanized (by the use of punched cards or other electronic techniques) in order to facilitate its use for subject bibliography, to reduce duplication of effort in research library cataloging, and to provide more efficient service in locating research materials.

5. The Library's currently limited program of specialized subject and other scholarly bibliographies should be greatly expanded.

6. Interlibrary loan and photographic reproduction services ought to be improved; what the Library of Congress does in these fields is so useful that it is worth doing very well indeed.

7. Service to research is not the sole mission of the Library of Congress; it should initiate and develop other appropriate activities contributing to American cultural life. Its concerts and lectures, consultants and fellows, and recordings have been mentioned, as well as the Hispanic Foundation. A review of such activities seems to demonstrate that they have been undertaken and subsequently supported only when private gifts or foundation grants were made for the purpose. Private benefactors are welcome, but it should not be necessary for the National Library to depend upon them. Late in 1959 the Carnegie Corp. made a grant to establish a small Africana section and to assist in the development of the Library's African resources. This is clearly a governmental responsibility, however, and if the Library now ought to go further and establish an African Foundation, public funds ought to be made available for the purpose.

HOW CAN THE FEDERAL PROGRAM BE ADMINISTERED?

The Federal Government is now participating in research library affairs almost entirely through the Library of Congress, and it is evident that most of the activities that have been proposed here would also directly involve that institution. It should be recognized officially as the National Library (without necessarily changing its name), and its national responsibilities should be stated explicitly enough to make it clear that the Congress will henceforth recognize an obligation to support work that the Library must undertake in order to carry out this mission. Any such legislative statement ought, of course, to be formulated very carefully; the following language is offered only as an indication of the approach that might be desirable:

"The mission of the National Library is to collect, preserve, and disseminate the word's recorded knowledge for the benefit of mankind. It should inform the American people of its holdings and facilitate their use. It should supplement the collections and further the work of other libraries in the United States, taking the lead in efforts to provide American scholarship with library service of the high quality that it deserves and that the national interest requires. It should stimulate and enrich the cultural life of America and its cultural interchanges with other nations."

The proposed legislation should also recognize the special status of the two national research collections for agriculture and medicine, and provide for the possibility of other similar collections in the future.

As in the past, the success of the Library will depend significantly on the interest and understanding of the members of the joint committee. In the future it will be even more important that joint committee members be legislators genuinely concerned with the well-being of research and scholarship throughout the Nation.

A National Library Advisory Board should be created. It is of the utmost importance that the executive branch have an agency—and one in which it has full confidence—to advise it on library affairs and to speak for it. The officers of a great institution, particularly one that is not a part of the executive branch, cannot serve this purpose; they inevitably become identified with their institution, while the administration needs objective advice on this institution and its relations with others. Likewise, it is essential that those for whom research libraries are created and maintained, the scholars, be well represented at top levels of the national library planning.

The Board, then, should be appointed by the President and should be given responsibility for reviewing policy and operations and for advising the President and Federal agencies on the planning and execution of national library programs and on interdepartmental library matters within the Federal establishment. Its members, perhaps 10 or 12 in number, should include leaders in research, scholar-administrators such as university presidents and deans, librarians of major research libraries, Members of the Congress, and other distinguished citizens. It should work closely with the Librarian of Congress as the head of the major Federal agency operating in this field, but should have a small staff of its own.

From what has been said already it is evident that, while the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is appropriately attached to the legislative branch of the Government, the Library's other functions—the Copyright Office, services to agencies of the Government generally, and services as the National Library—logically ought to be attached to the executive. If, however, it was thought that a proposal for transferring the Library of Congress from the legislative branch to the executive would encounter serious practical difficulties, it would not be essential to pursue it.

There is a need for an executive agency to be responsible for leadership, planning, and coordination in the research library field. The decision to recommend an independent advisory board was reached after a variety of possibilities had been considered. At first sight there might appear to be alternatives, and these ought to be mentioned here even though the first two are regarded as thoroughly unsatisfactory, the third would not meet national research library needs, and the fourth is probably unfeasible.

1. An Office of Library Affairs might be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; this would supplant the Library Services Branch that is now within the Office of Education and would be coordinate with that Office. Health, Education, and Welfare, in any case, presumably should administer grants to research libraries if they are made on the basis of a simple formula. Departmental bureaucracy, however, does not seem to promise the sort of leadership in research library affairs that is needed.

2. The Smithsonian Institution might seem a logical agency for coordination of Federal library programs and development of national research library resources. It is chartered, after all, as an establishment for the "increase and diffusion of knowledge among men," it includes such institutions as the National Gallery, and is an independent agency in the executive branch with a high-level Board of Regents. Such an assignment, however, would not be in line with its present scope of activity, and could not be recommended.

3. It might someday be desirable to establish a Department of Cultural and Scientific Affairs and transfer to it such agencies as the Office of Education, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Science Foundation. This would not be a good place for either the Library of Congress or the Advisory Board, and in any case it appears that now is not the time to advocate a new Cabinet Department in this field.

4. In many ways, the proposed Federal participation in research library affairs resembles the work of the National Science Foundation in its area (though the financial magnitude of the library program would be small by comparison), and there would be advantages in establishing, instead of the National Library Advisory Board that has been recommended, a National Research Library Foundation. Such an organization would use existing agencies and machinery insofar as possible, contracting with the Library of Congress and other governmental and nongovernmental organizations for specific purposes, but would have funds of its own with which to make grants for work undertaken in the national interest. The major argument against this is that public sentiment might not favor the establishment of a foundation in a field that lacks the broad appeal of science. The Advisory Board offers a more cautious, but probably more feasible, approach.

The Library of Congress differs significantly from other governmental agencies. It is a great institution with special responsibilities to its Government, but it also serves individual scholars and other libraries of all kinds throughout the Nation. In addition, it is the major instrument through which the Government participates in research library concerns. Furthermore, the Library of Congress is anomalous because of the historical accident of its attachment to the legislative branch of the Government.

Though it would be desirable, it is not essential to transfer the Library of Congress to the executive; but it is essential that legislation recognize officially what the Library is and what it ought to do, and that a National Library Advisory Board (if not a National Research Library Foundation) be established in the executive branch.

The Federal Government must lead, not by imposing a program upon the Nation's research libraries, but by encouraging scholars and librarians to formulate their needs and to plan nationally. Leadership calls, above all, for appointment of the best men available to the Advisory Board and for a Librarian of Congress who is determined to make the Library all that it ought to be, both within the Government and in its role as the leading library of the Nation. The Librarian of Congress must be a man who can administer an extremely diversified and organically complex institution; in addition, he must make important decisions on technological innovations in bibliography profoundly affecting the access of scholars to information, supervise the building up of enormous research collections, exercise imaginative leadership nationally, and take advantage of the Library's unique opportunities for contributing to American cultural life. Even an ideal Librarian would require the support and counsel of a strong advisory board.

Appointing a board and defining a program will accomplish little, however, unless continued support for the Board and its program can be enlisted from the Congress, the numerous nongovernmental institutions that must participate, and from the public generally. The Library of Congress and America's other major research libraries are large and complex; the Nation must make sure that they are also strong enough to keep up with the growing requirements of both Government and modern scholarship, and agile enough even to anticipate these demands.

Respectfully submitted.

DOUGLAS W. BRYANT.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR AGED PEOPLE UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in his article in the May 14 issue of Newsweek magazine "Who Would Pay For It?" Raymond Moley discussed the administration's proposal to provide health insurance for aged people under the social security system.

Mr. Moley discussed at some length the alleged limitations of the social security approach to health care costs, but his own recommendation for solving the problem of the costs of health care of the aged is not set forth until almost the end of the article. He recommends a study of the facts. If the facts show that the health needs of the aged are not now being adequately met by private and philanthropic sources, then "Government should help." Mr. Moley makes no presentation which suggests the facts are not available—as they are—or have not been studied—as they have. He omits mentioning that Marion Folsom and Arthur Flemming, the Secretaries of HEW under President Eisenhower, and every person who has held the office of Commissioner of Social Security under any administration—the very people who had the responsibility to make such studies—are unanimous in their conclusions. Not only do they all find a great need but they all find that basic health insurance for the aged under social security is the most appropriate solution.

In point of fact, Mr. Moley is about 170 years late in raising his question about whether "Government should help." Since 1793 when the Congress provided for health care aid to some members of the merchant marine, the Federal, State, and local governments have continued to carry on health care programs of various kinds. For the health care costs of the aged population, Government sources already contribute over $1 billion annually, one-quarter of their total expenditures for health care. No reputable student of the subject believes that the medical care of the aged can be met without some Government programs. The question is obviously then not "whether" but "how" it shall be done.

Mr. Moley suggests help to the aged through "private insurance, philanthropy, the doctors themselves and relatives." It has been well established that aged people, living on small retirement incomes—mainly social security benefits—cannot afford the high premiums necessary to buy adequate private health insurance protection. The premiums for their insurance must necessarily be high to cover the costs of the higher rate of illness of aged people. The children and other relatives of the aged must, of course, raise and educate their own children; often, they can pay for the cost of their parents' serious illnesses only at sacrifices to the third generation. Philanthropy and the doctors themselves are helping, but no one believes that charity—no matter how well intended—is, or should be, a solution. Doctors cannot pay hospital bills for their patients, and the practice of undercharging poor patients and overcharging rich ones is possible only for those doctors with rich patients. This Robin Hood method of charging is not an appropriate solution to the problem.

Mr Moley's specific objections to the social security approach are confusing. He expresses his concern that health insurance under social security would not provide enough—it would not provide enough health services, it would not cover enough aged people. Would he favor it if it covered more? He suggests he is countering "extravagant claims" about the proposal, but indicates nowhere who made such claims. The administration has made it clear that the proposal would cover costs of hospital care and some related services—outpatient diagnostic services, posthospital nursing-home care and visiting nurse and similar home care. The proposal concentrates on the cost of serious illness where hospitalization is needed and the cost is often catastrophic. Does Mr. Moley suggest it should concentrate on routine day-to-day health expenses?

Mr. Moley also alleges that the proposal "does not cover all the old people who may need help." In 1964, the first full year the proposed program would be in effect, 5 out of 6 aged persons would be immediately eligible under the proposal. The number will continue to rise in the future until 95 percent—or more—would be eligible. Of the relatively few not covered, most would be eligible for health care under other public programs—from which they are often already receiving cash payments—such as the Federal employees' retirement program, the veterans' program and old-age assistance. Retired physicians would generally not be covered. Would Mr. Moley favor the plan if it were broadened to include all these groups?

Mr. Moley tells us that "the worker can easily calculate what he will pay" under the health insurance proposal and concludes that "it is a lot of money." However, he omits to say what the cost of health insurance to the worker would be; instead he gives the cost for the entire social security program. The answer is that an employee earning $4,800 a year would pay $1 a month for

health insurance. The employee earning over $4,800 would pay slightly more—because of the proposed increase in the social security earnings base from $4,800 to $5,200—but he would receive in return not only health insurance but increased cash monthly old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits protection based on his higher covered earnings.

The increase in taxes which Mr. Moley discusses is, in major part, the increase already provided for in law to finance the present social security program. His complaint that the social security tax is "discriminatory" since it falls only on those protected under the program also applies to the present program. He apparently objects to the basic principle of social security—protection only for those who contribute. His thesis—unspoken though it may be—is therefore one of opposition to the social security program in general. Does he propose the abolition of social security?

Mr. Moley believes that the additional taxes under the King-Anderson bill will not be sufficient to meet the benefit cost. He tells us that "the total cost to which I have referred must be a vague guess," because the plan must deal with "psychological imponderables." Such "psychological imponderables"—if they existed—might, of course, mean that the cost of the proposed program might be overestimated—but Mr. Moley is sure it would be the other way.

There is nothing mysterious about figuring the cost of health insurance benefits. If this were true, no private insurance company or Blue Cross organization could provide health insurance for the aged. These costs have in fact been calculated, but the premium rates for adequate private insurance are too high for most aged people to afford. The estimate of the cost of the administration's proposal was prepared on a sound basis, after careful study of all available data including several national surveys of aged people and the experience and records of private insurance carriers. The "competent actuaries" who made the higher estimates, to which Mr. Moley refers, are those in the employ of health insurance companies where some self-interest may be present and may influence the figures. The Government actuary who made the estimates used for the proposed program is a nationally and internationally known authority whose competence is unquestioned in the profession. Does Mr. Moley have evidence to the contrary?

The vague charges about "imponderables" are reminiscent of the charges leveled in 1956 at the cost estimates for the proposal to provide disability insurance benefits under social security. Five years of actual experience with the disability program has proved beyond a doubt that the estimates were not too low, but instead included a substantial safety margin. The same actuary who made the disability estimates is now making the health insurance estimates.

Mr. Moley seeks evidence from British experience for his charges that the administration's cost estimates are too low. Of course, the proposed health insurance program has no resemblance whatsoever to the British National Health Service, which owns the hospitals and employs the doctors, covers people of all ages, and is financed mainly from the General Treasury rather than through social insurance. Furthermore, the British experience over a period of years shows that the cost of their health services has been a very stable percent of gross national product, so that costs do seem predictable. Even if British experts could not prepare good estimates it would not show, as Mr. Moley says, "That no Government experts could safely estimate" the costs. Is Mr. Moley suggesting that experience—which he inaccurately describes—with one estimate in one country, for a different kind of program, is the kind of fact that is needed to evaluate the proposal to include health insurance for aged persons in our social insurance program?

In another article, in the May 21 issue, "A Word to the Elderly," Mr. Moley again discusses the health insurance proposal and states we must "consider the subject in the light of clear reason." As mentioned above, in his previous article he has said that we need a "real examination of the facts" to determine "if Government should help." One week later, he has apparently decided unequivocally that there is "a grave public problem" and "that problem is the individual, personal plight of an indeterminate number of elderly Americans." He is unfamiliar with the facts about the number of the aged who face financial crises because of ill health—apparently he is unaware that the average person attaining 65 can expect two or three hospital stays before he dies and a couple can expect twice as many. How many aged couples can face 4, 5, or 6 hospital stays without fear of financial catastrophe? Fifty percent of the aged have less than $1,000 in the bank or in bonds or similar assets.

Mr. Moley also has arrived at a solution to the grave problem of health care. The word to the elderly is that their health care should be provided on the basis of a means test—that there should be no objection to the pauper's oath. He alleges that "without such tests there can be no solution for the real crises that some Americans must face as the shadows darken in the twilight years of life." Does Mr. Moley suggest that these elderly Americans will find their twilight years brightened through means-test investigations of their personal financial affairs—or, as many States require, an investigation of the financial status of their adult children and their families to determine if they should pay their parents' medical bills? Is Mr. Moley suggesting a reversal of the decision made in 1935 that social insurance without a means test should be the basic system used to provide security against the fear of dependency upon charity and public assistance in old age?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles from Newsweek by Mr. Raymond Moley, the first, under date of May 14, entitled "Who Would Pay For It?" and the second entitled "A Word to the Elderly," under date of May 21.

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

[From Newsweek, May 14, 1962]

WHO WOULD PAY FOR IT?

(By Raymond Moley)

The idea of Government medical care for the aged under social security was not new in 1960. But in that year there were exhaustive congressional hearings and debates, and the subject was a campaign issue. Since then it has been a leading subject of discussion everywhere.

Considering this full educational coverage, the wonder rises that, even with the cynicism concerning public intelligence which is so characteristic of political life, extravagant claims are now made about the King-Anderson bill, claims as to cost and also benefits. The matter is not complex when we limit ourselves to who would pay for it and how much and how long, and who would receive and what they would get.

Under the proposal, there would be added to the present and future rates of social security taxes, in 1963 and thereafter, one-fourth of 1 percent on employer and employee alike. Employees are told that this will buy protection in their old age. That protection would be up to 90 days of hospitalization, up to 180 days of skilled nursing-home services, home health services not exceeding 240 visits a year, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services. The patient would pay $10 a day for 9 days for hospitalization. Also, $20 for diagnostic service. There would be no free medical or surgical services by physicians, and the kind of drugs, etc., would be limited. For every beneficiary there would have to be a 90-day wait before a repeat.

LOW GUESSES

That is what the workers would get when he is old enough. He can easily calculate what he would pay for this future benefit. It is a lot of money. And it has nothing to do with his own protection meanwhile, or his children's, or his wife's.

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.

INEQUITABLE COVERAGE

This tax is discriminatory. It falls on only those who pay social security taxes, excluding all others. It is compulsory. But the need is alleged to be a national responsibility, and if that be so it should be paid by all, not some, of the taxpayers.

And consider the small businessman with a few employees. He cannot generally increase his prices to cover this expense. His plight is already obvious. It would be much greater under the King-Anderson plan.

There can be no argument about the fact that there is a national obligation to make sure that no elderly person shall lack medical and nursing care. This country is rich enough, and its people are humane enough to recognize that. Help is and should be

provided by private insurance, philanthropy, the doctors themselves, and relatives. If, after a real examination of the facts, this is proved to be inadequate, the Government should help. But the King-Anderson bill is not really protection for the aged. It is inequitable because it does not cover all the old people who may need the care.

The total cost to which I have referred must be a vague guess, because the plan must deal with psychological imponderables. It is not based upon demonstrated need, and it was shown in Britain that no government experts could safely estimate the number of those who would avail themselves of something free.

Next week I shall consider the plan from the standpoint of the present and probable aged population.

[From Newsweek, May 21, 1962]

A WORD TO THE ELDERLY

(By Raymond Moley)

It is unfortunate, not to say tragic, that the problem of medical care for the aged may be resolved in a climate of blazing emotion. And so it will be well to consider the subject in the light of clear reason.

This is not merely a scramble for votes by the President on the one hand and the organized medical profession on the other. It should not be regarded as a test of Presidential or party prestige. Nor as a preliminary to the autumn elections. Nor as a game of matching statistics.

It is the determination, perhaps for all time, of the answer to a grave public problem. That problem is the individual, personal plight of an indeterminate number of elderly Americans. There has been no way to determine the identity and number of elderly people who are in need of medical care which they are unable to get. There is also an indeterminate number of people over 65 or approaching that age who, because of a physical or financial crisis, may be in need in the future. Many an individual who is presently enjoying the best of health and is well protected by savings may face difficulties because of the onset of illness or the withering away of savings because of Government-promoted inflation. These are the people we must think about. And a solution of the problem in Congress should be such as to make sure that such cases shall be helped.

TOO MUCH, NOT ENOUGH

The King-Anderson bill is not such a solution. Its roots go back to a foolish and demogogic political slogan. There should be, as it was shouted from hundreds of platforms, no pauper's oath. This meant that there should be no consideration of need in providing medical benefits for the elderly. Such tests of need, it was said, are degrading. The orators said that there should be no prying eye of authority into the personal affairs of Americans. And so the answer was to spray the bounty over everyone getting social security payments.

Such an atomization of the resources of government would not be a solution to the individual problems which I have mentioned above. It would give too much for many and not enough for some. It would make available to certain millions a number of days in a hospital and/or a nursing home. But the recipients would have to pay certain initial costs. It would not supply surgical or medical care by a practicing physician. The drugs available would be limited. And because of the heavy demands for unnecessary care, there would certainly be a deterioration of the services to the most needy cases. After 10 years of experience with generalized medical services in Britain, it was shown that with the influx of the less needy, the more needy were getting less than before the plan was initiated.

MANY CIRCUMSTANCES

The Federal Government would be spending a great deal of money for such a shotgun approach. Proponents estimate the cost at $1 billion a year. Competent authorities put the figure at more than twice that amount. And experience shows that such Government estimates are almost always too low. After a few years, the costs rise higher and higher. Consider the costs of OASI benefits. In 1949 we were told that the OASI cost would not reach $12 billion until 1999. But in the 10 years that followed, the cost rose to $11 billion. Meanwhile, it was necessary to raise social security tax rates threefold, and by 1968 the tax bite on employer and employe together will be more than 9 percent without the tax raise required by the King-Anderson proposal.

It is also obvious that the people over 65 are alike only with respect to age. Four million are working. Four million pay income taxes. Some millions are getting pensions or annuities in addition to social security benefits. And there are between 2 million and 3 million people over 65 who would not be eligible under the King-Anderson plan. Also, among all the elderly there is an infinite variety of healthfulness, productivity, and physical and mental vigor.

There are, in fact, needs tests now for practically every benefit given by the Government. Without such tests there can be no solution for the real crises that some Americans must face as the shadows darken in the twilight years of life.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, 25 years ago today the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the constitutionality of the Social Security Act. In delivering the opinion of the Court, Justice Cardozo wrote:

> Needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well-being of the Nation. What is critical or urgent changes with the times. The hope behind this statute is to save men and women from the rigors of the poorhouse as well as from the haunting fear that such a lot awaits them when journey's end is near.

Justice Cardozo went on to say:

> The number of persons in the United States 65 years of age or over is increasing proportionately as well as absolutely. What is even more important, the number of such persons unable to take care of themselves is growing at a threatening pace. The problem is plainly national in area and dimensions. Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all.

A quarter century after this decision, the contributory social insurance program has grown to be the largest and most important source of retirement income for the aged of this country. For more than half of the aged social security beneficiaries, the benefits paid under this program are the only significant source of regular income, and for most of the others it is their major source of income. Social security now provides the economic base for retirement planning for practically everyone. Eighty-seven percent of the people now becoming 65 are protected under the program and in the future this percentage will rise to 95 percent or more. Seventeen million beneficiaries—aged people, the disabled, widows, and orphans—are receiving $1 billion monthly in benefits.

Although social insurance was little known in the United States at the time of the Supreme Court's decision in 1937, today it represents a vast investment in economic security for practically every American family. The younger generation takes its social insurance protection for granted as much as it takes for granted public education or a Government-operated postal service. And this wide acceptance has been earned. Twenty-five years of operation of the program has shown that social insurance has been successful in protecting the families of America against the poverty that would otherwise result from the old age, disability or death of the family breadwinner in a modern industrial society. The basic soundness of this program has been affirmed time and again.

Only recently—in 1960—the Supreme Court spoke again on social security:

> The social security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress power to "spend money in aid of the general welfare," whereby persons gainfully employed, and those who employ them, are taxed to permit the payment of benefits to the retired and disabled, and their dependents. Plainly the expectation is that many members of the present productive work force will in turn become beneficiaries rather than supporters of the program. But each worker's benefits, though flowing from the contributions he made to the national economy while actively employed, are not dependent on the degree to which he was called upon to support the system by taxation. It is apparent that the noncontractual interest of an employee covered by the act cannot be soundly analogized to that of the holder of an annuity, whose right to benefits are bottomed on his contractual premium payments.

Does the Supreme Court suggest in these words—indicating clearly as they do that there is not a contractual right to benefits—that the program is therefore unsound and unable to meet today's needs? Not at all. The Court goes on to say:

> To engraft upon the social security system a concept of "accrued property rights" would deprive it of the flexibility and boldness in adjustment to ever-changing conditions which it demands. It was doubtless out of an awareness of the need for such flexibility that Congress included in the original act, and has since retained, a clause expressly reserving to it "the right to alter, amend, or repeal any provision" of the act. That provision makes express what is implicit in the institutional needs of the program.

And the Court went on to say:

> The interest of a covered employee under the act is of sufficient substance to fall within the protection from arbitrary governmental action afforded by the due process clause.

We have had, then, 23 years after the Court's original decision, a reaffirmation by it of the validity, the vitality, the insurance character and the reality of the benefit rights of our social security program.

In spite of this clear and unmistakable record, there are still those who say that this program, so successful in meeting the problems to which it has been applied, and so able to adjust "with flexibility and boldness to ever-changing con-

ditions," should not be applied to the emerging problems of today.

The words of Justice Cardozo still ring true today. His description of the challenge we face in providing for the aged is as valid now as it was 25 years ago. He might well have been speaking of the extension of the social security program to cover the risk of expensive illness in old age when he said:

What is critical or urgent changes with the times. Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all.

POLICIES OF NEW ADMINISTRATION IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an address delivered by Ambassador Emilio Abello at the Far East America Council on May 2, 1962, dealing with the policies and aims of the new national administration in the Philippines.

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

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR EMILIO ABELLO, AT THE FAR EAST AMERICA COUNCIL, MAY 2, 1962

The year 1962 will be an eventful and crucial year for my country. A new national administration has just taken over in the Philippines; and even now, barely 120 days after the assumption of office by our new President, Diosdado Macapagal, a few decisions have already been taken and policy directions have already been announced which, I am certain, will revolutionize the economic and social order in the Philippines and affect or cast an influence on events in the Philippines for many years to come.

President Macapagal has set five tasks or goals for his administration, and three of them are economic or have socioeconomic implications or impact. He has pledged:

1. The attainment of self-sufficiency in the staple foods of our people; namely, rice and corn;

2. The creation of conditions that will provide more income for our people—income for those who have none and more income for those whose earnings are inadequate for their elemental needs; and

3. The launching of a bold but well-formulated socioeconomic program that will place the country on the road to prosperity for the benefit of all our people.

Underlying the above goals or tasks is the desire of President Macapagal to return to the regime of free and private enterprise, because, as he said in his inaugural speech last December 30, he "strongly believes in placing the burden of economic development in the hands of private entrepreneurs with the least government interference while making the government assume the full responsibility for implementing the social and public welfare program."

When the new administration took over last December 30, it found a country faced with serious monetary, fiscal, exchange, and economic problems.

The Philippines in 1948 was faced with the need to choose between devaluation and the maintenance of the prewar exchange rate. It chose the latter and found it necessary to introduce the entire gamut of restrictions, from import and exchange controls to a formidable array of credit and taxation measures, without which the exchange rate could not have been constrained within the narrow limits deemed necessary.

At the same time, in the effort to industrialize and industrialize fast, new industries were given all the assistance the Government could grant, such as guaranteed foreign exchange quotas, exemption from all taxes and duties, highly protective tariffs, and credit assistance.

Measured by the usual statistical yardsticks of per capita income and output, rates of increase of production units, and even employment ratios, the choice of this avenue of development appeared sound. In fact, the annual rate of growth of industrial output reached levels comparable to those of Japanese industry during the "take-off" period of the Japanese economy so that it was believed the Philippine economy had also taken off and that we could look forward with complacency to a period of self-sustaining growth.

Whether it did or not, the fact remains that, by December 30 of last year, it was abundantly clear that the country had fully exhausted the potentialities for growth offered by the policies enunciated and followed from 1948 clear through the decade of the 1950's. The impetus to investments which exchange controls, an overvalued peso, and various tax incentives had provided, had worked itself out. In other words, the measures which had been adopted had outlived their usefulness and, in fact, had become a major source of moral deterioration in public administration and in private business and trade. In the meantime, our population was growing at the rate of 3.2 percent per year, one of the highest in the world, with the labor force growing at the rate of about 360,000 every year.

There was need for a new approach, for new methods, for bold measures, and for extra courage to face the challenge of the new era in our national life—an era which our President has dedicated to effectively provide for the needs of our people and to transform our country "at an early time into a land of abundance not only for a favored few but for each and every Filipino."

So, the President, within 1 month after assumption of office, did the following:

1. With a view to attaining self-sufficiency in our staple foods—rice and corn—he recommended to our Congress the creation of the Rice and Corn Administration, upon recommendation of the Presidential Rice and Corn Committee, which even now, pending the creation of the Rice and Corn Administration, has evolved and is implementing a new plan not only for increasing productivity in these basic foods but also for making a more effective Government buying program, assuring to the producer a fair price as an inducement to greater productivity and to the consumer, a price within his means.

2. To solve the problem of unemployment, he recommended to our Congress the creation of an Emergency Employment Administration which would undertake a program to assist private enterprise in the creation of job opportunities, like land resettlement, forest conservation and reforestation, and public works which would directly promote economic growth.

3. He authorized the abolition of exchange controls so as to make the peso seek its own level in a free market and make the peso freely convertible, thereby permitting also the remittance of profits; all of these, in order, in the words of President Macapagal, "to remove an important source of corruption and to unshackle the economy so that through its innate vigor it may propel its expansion in free enterprise."

4. He authorized the adoption of safeguards to cushion the immediate impact of full decontrol on prices and local industries and curb inflation, by establishing credit restrictions, revising the tariff, and negotiating a stabilization fund.

5. He submitted to our Congress a 5-year integrated socioeconomic program, the objective of which, again in his own words, being "the attainment of our main goal of a better life for our people."

6. He has given impetus to every measure designed to expand credit facilities for productive investments by strengthening the financial position of, and providing funds to, the Development Bank of the Philippines and throwing his full support behind the establishment of a new private development or investment bank. At this very moment, steps are being taken both in Manila and in Washington to make the dream of a private development or investment bank a reality, with initial lendable funds of over a hundred million pesos, equity capital to be contributed by Filipinos and foreigners at the ratio of at least 60 percent by the former and 40 percent by the latter and the balance to be loaned to the bank by the Agency for International Development of the United States and by the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, at low rates of interest and repayable over a long period of time.

The 5-year integrated socioeconomic program formulated and recommended to our Congress by President Macapagal envisages an economic development for the Philippines which will increase employment opportunities for our people, solve our unemployment problem, raise the overall standard of living, provide the country with essential public services, and meet the essential requirements of housing, health, and education for our growing population.

It is planned to increase our gross domestic product over the 5-year period at a compound rate of 6 percent, the annual growth rate to rise from 5.5 percent between 1962 and 1963 up to 7 percent from 1966 to 1967. To meet this target, we have to channel into gross domestic investments during the next 5 years an average of 16.1 percent of our gross domestic product; our gross domestic savings, including reinvestments of foreign earnings in the Philippines, must reach from 13 percent of gross domestic product in 1963 up to 16 percent in 1967; our export earnings must total $3.7 billion during the period or an average of $740 million annually; and we must attract to the Philippines a total net inflow of new foreign capital of about $860 million during the 5-year period.

The program gives priority to the production of import substitutes such as integrated iron and steel, basic chemicals, pulping plants, expansion of agricultural food production and processing, the development of the cattle and dairy industries, the improvement of water supply, the construction of roads, highways and irrigation systems, the development of power, and the expansion of railroad lines and of telecommunications. The total program will be financed entirely from non-inflationary sources: from domestic savings and foreign loans and investments.

Our President's socioeconomic program has been studied carefully by his economic advisers and personally by him. Its feasibility has been checked with the result of an economic survey that has just been completed by a team of experts from the World Bank which made a very careful study of our economic potentialities and the requirements for a well-balanced economic development of the Philippines within our means.

The implementation of the program will naturally depend largely on the honesty, sincerity, and effort which our own people will expend; but our own selfless dedication and our own mighty strivings will not and cannot suffice. We are realistic enough to admit that we need the assistance and help of our friends abroad, especially our friends in this country.

What can we offer to you and what do we need from you?

We have abundant natural resources—rich lands, virgin forests, untapped mineral deposits, and seas and rivers teeming with fish and other marine products.

The industrial, commercial, and technical advance of the West has been ascribed mainly to three factors:

First, the existence, in fairly large numbers, of entrepreneurs who, with their initiative, enterprise, and even daring, have welded together diverse forces responsible for production, distribution, and servicing. It has been said that Western capitalism owed its existence to these entrepreneurs, who sparked and gave life to the abstract notion of economic development and actually set in motion the new processes toward that development. What motives inspired them and drove them to action—whether it was purely a spirit of adventure, or of restlessness, or of gain and profit or even of love for their fellow men—the desire to see them live and grow and prosper is beside the point. What is important to bear in mind is that this search for new economic ventures, and the study, planning, and aggressive implementation of the blueprint drawn in order to insure the success of the venture, have been, in the main, responsible for the economic and technical advance of Western society.

Secondly, an efficient and cooperative labor force, which man the factories and other centers and instruments of production, distribution, and servicing. The condition of underdevelopment of our part of the world has been blamed on the absence of such a labor force. There are millions of idle hands; but it has been charged that their attitude is one of apathy and unconcern for worldly goods, indifference to learning and applying themselves assiduously to the work at hand.

This has not been so with the worker in the highly or moderately developed countries. His acquisitive spirit, the wage incentive, the feeling of satisfaction felt when the foreman compliments him for a work well done, have invariably spurred him to a steadily rising productivity.

The third factor responsible for the high degree of economic development of Western countries is and has been the existence of capital, whether indigenous or foreign, with which to finance new or expanded enterprises. As my good friend and former associate, Mr. Leo Virata, has very beautifully expressed it, it is capital which brings about a wedding between natural resources and an adequate labor force. Without capital, he says, no amount of natural resources and no labor, however efficient and cooperative, can bear fruit.

The class of entrepreneurs and of managerial personnel exists in the Philippines. Trained, competent, and honest managerial personnel have been developing during the last several years through inservice training, the IDC, and Management Institutes.

With respect to entrepreneurs, we have lately seen groups of young businessmen and technical men who have shown, by their initiative, enterprise, daring, and inspired and high-minded leadership, that we are coming of age in this respect.

The bleak picture of a labor force, uninspired and unspurred by the acquisitive spirit, the wage incentive and the will to work and work well, or of a labor force which has not learned and is disinclined to learn, to which I have referred in another part of my speech, does not exist in the Philippines. We can say that efficient and cooperative labor is available there or, if not actually existing, can be created and trained in a very short while. Labor in the Philippines has shown an adaptability that is amazing.

We have also seen how men and women working with us have spared no effort to learn and become proficient in their jobs; how they have, the 8-hour labor law notwithstanding, stood by their lathe and sat at their desks, to render overtime work and thus earn a few more pesos to add to their take-home pay, many a time at the risk of their lives and physical well-being. True, there are still vestiges of indolence among a few of our people, the vice against which our national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal wrote; but, by and large, we have an adequate, able, and cooperative labor force, both skilled and unskilled, to support an economic development program of a magnitude much higher and more massive than we have mounted so far.

So, we offer you natural resources, entrepreneural and managerial personnel and a cooperative labor force, skilled and unskilled. What we need from you is capital; and the magnitude of this, during the next 5 years, is $860 million. The climate in the Philippines is propitious for foreign investment.

We have a stable government, a working democracy. Remember that we are in a part of the world where the democratic way of life is not known or very little understood. As a matter of fact, in some places in our area, representative government, as we know it, still yields from time to time to the exigencies of military power or still accepts the iron rule of a dictatorship by whatever name called. Yet, in the Philippines, since 1946, popular elections have been held with clock-like regularity, and the results of the elections have been accepted by the losers in the best of grace. Since 1946, we have had a succession of national administrations; and to the credit of our democracy and as evidence of the political maturity of our people, the opposition party won in the national elections of 1946 and again in 1953 and once again in our election, just last year.

The national election of last year is especially interesting. The incumbent President was running for reelection. He had behind him his entire party, a majority in both Houses of our Congress, the Government machinery, entrenched political authority, funds for expenses, and all the other valuable aids in an election contest. The opposition party had none of these. It was a hotly contested election. The issues were well defined after several months of campaigning on the part of both parties. The preelection forecasts were that the incumbent President and his team would win. The elections came; and the people voted for the opposition candidates for President, Vice President, and six of eight seats in the Senate, but the majority in the lower House of our Congress went to the candidates of the then Government party. I have gone to some length in describing our last national election, because it proves, in my opinion, that our voters in the Philippines have come of age in that they exercise their right of suffrage with evident discrimination, freely and without fear. It also proves that a change of government takes place in the Philippines without the violent upheavals that attend changes of government in many parts of the world. This is something of a triumph in Asia, for which all free peoples should rejoice.

To the American investor, we offer another very solid basis for confidence. We have, through the years, demonstrated that we are your best friends in the world today, one of your staunchest allies. Only a few days ago, we again proved to you and to the whole world the identity of purpose that animates us and the close link of amity and understanding that binds our two countries and peoples together. Immediately after you started your new series of nuclear tests, many people in many countries which you have considered as your friends and allies and which you have assisted during these many years have mounted massive demonstrations protesting against the tests. My country is among the very few where no such unfriendly exhibitions have taken place and our Government came out immediately with an official declaration where we expressed our regret for the circumstances that made it necessary for you to resume the tests, and openly justified it as indispensable for the security not only of the United States but also of the entire free world.

One of the great deterrents to foreign investment in the Philippines is the absence of guarantees against non-business risks. President Macapagal is now urging on our Congress the enactment of a Foreign Investment bill which seeks to encourage and protect certain foreign investments and offers them several incentives. The bill makes available to foreigners specific areas of investments, which shall include (but is not exclusive) basic metal manufacture, metal products, basic chemicals, fertilizer, drug manufacture from basic materials, food processing, wood products, textile manufacture, electrical industries, cottage industries and deep sea fishing.

It grants to qualified foreign investments certain rights which the Government guarantees irrevocably, among them being the preclusion of any form of capital levy, the repatriation of capital, and the remittance of profits. It assures to these foreign investors that no Government business which will compete with a qualified foreign enterprise will be established. These investors will be permitted to employ foreign nationals in administrative, supervisory, technical, and advisory positions, except that at least 90 percent of those employed in the Philippines would have to be Filipino nationals. Various tax incentives are given to these foreign enterprises, the principal one being the exemption from income tax for 5 years from the date of the commencement of the business.

In what form the foreign investment bill will finally be approved by our Congress remains to be seen; but whatever it may be, there is every reason to expect that, under it, foreign investments will be encouraged and facilitated.

One deterrent to foreign investments during the last several years was the announcement and implementation of the "Filipino first" policy. We have always believed in the Philippines that nationalism is a legitimate national feeling and that it is not an unusual phenomenon. It exists and has existed in all countries and among all peoples. Usually, it is a smoldering fire, and erupts into an open flame only in the face of crisis, economic or political. However, the "Filipino first" policy, even to ardent nationalists among our people, has not altogether been acceptable. As one knowledgeable columnist in the Philippines has said: "We have not been enthusiastic about 'Filipino first' because we have always believed that legislating a people into business never worked."

A business writer in the Philippines, known for his nationalist views, has declared: "Undoubtedly, the said trade policy, as it was implemented, was too faulty and jingoistic. It not only caused a moral disintegration among our people in private and public life; it also caused much alarm among foreign traders already with us and among alien investors." He added, however, that "regardless of its fault, the fact remains that it caused the proliferation of industries in our midst—industries which would not have thrived under different conditions. Local investors plunged into new investments because they had the assurance of market protection." He admitted that "Filipino first" spawned weak industries.

Before the members of the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce and their guests, meeting in New York over a week ago, I said that the new Philippine administration has dropped the "Filipino first" slogan, because the new administration believes that the country's economic development cannot be advanced within the narrow context of that slogan. However, I wish to state that while we have dropped this slogan, yet the new administration will give every opportunity to the Filipino to assume a larger and more important role in the economic de-

velopment of our country. We will exert every effort so as to prevent wresting from Filipino citizens and enterprises owned by Filipino citizens their supremacy over our own economic affairs, protecting our nationals in their legitimate aspirations, but insuring the just treatment of aliens and alien capital.

Ample credit assistance will be given to Filipino enterprises, something which they have not received during many years and which accounts for the failure of Filipinos and Filipino enterprises to occupy their legitimate place in the national economy. Filipino traders and Philippine businesses, whether owned by Filipinos or jointly by Filipinos and aliens in whatever proportion, will be protected from unjust and unfair foreign competition. It is on the foregoing basis that the new administration believes it can drop the "Filipino first" slogan, without endangering the interests of our own nationals.

I have attempted to explain the accomplishments of the new national administration in the Philippines during its first 100 days, in the fields of economic development and the advancement of the welfare of the masses of our population and have indicated the measures which have been or will be taken in those fields in order to promote the social and economic progress of our nation. We feel very strongly that the initiative and responsibility for achieving the ends that we pursue rest primarily on our Government and our people. The stakes are fundamentally ours but you, our friends, have also a stake in the success of our endeavors. To extend and spread the blessings of liberty and freedom to the masses of our population, under the regime of the free enterprise system, is a function of every democracy, and if we failed in this task, then the people will despair of democracy and the free enterprise system, and might embrace another—something in which you, as the leaders of democratic thought and the democratic way of life, have as much at stake as we have. Therefore, as I spread before you our program for the socio-economic development of our country, I extend to you a combined invitation and challenge: the invitation to engage in a profitable enterprise and to join a worthy cause, the cause of helping the Philippines methodically to banish want from the masses of our people; and the challenge to prove that the free, private enterprise economy is the far more rewarding way of life than all the other systems inimical to it. I wish to express the hope and the prayer on this day that you will accept both the invitation and the challenge.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? There being no further morning business, morning business is closed.

THE BILLIE SOL ESTES CASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald there was published a letter written by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the title of which is "Not Beholden." It is an answer by the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] to an editorial which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on May 21 concerning the Senator, with respect to which he, in his usual frank and forthright manner, finds discrepancies and faults.

I believe the Senator from Texas has laid his cards on the table so that the people of Texas and the United States will know where he stands in respect to the matters which have been called to the attention of the press.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald by our distinguished colleague may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

NOT BEHOLDEN

Your editorial of May 21, concerning me, is a masterpiece of omission and misrepresentation.

In a five paragraph attack, you say in one sentence that "In one instance Senator YARBOROUGH obtained $1,000 from Mr. Estes to pay for 10 tickets to a Democratic National Committee dinner celebrating President Kennedy's birthday," and in effect you charged that that opened the door to corruption.

Do you feel the same way about the other millions of dollars worth of tickets to fundraising dinners sold each year by both the Republican and Democratic Parties?

Do you know that each Democratic Senator is asked to sell tickets for each of these party fundraising dinners in Washington? Certainly you must know that in a broad based appeal to many persons, some will volunteer support, who, like Mr. Estes, later fail to live up to their public reputation. When one makes an appeal to all of the people, as the Democratic Party does, one always runs a danger of finding some contributor who does not turn out well later on. Neither I nor the Democratic Party has found it possible to screen contributors with a lie detector, or look in a crystal ball to see how they will turn out in the future.

You feigned shock that I had a radio fund to report weekly to the people of Texas. That fund is common public knowledge among those participating in politics in Texas because support for it has been openly sought in letter solicitation and, by friends, by advertisement in a newspaper.

You publish a newspaper here in Washington. Do you claim that you didn't know of these radio and TV reports by members of Congress until I reported that Mr. Estes contributed to mine in 1960 and 1961? A copy of each of my broadcasts so labeled was mailed weekly to The Washington Post news desk and a copy was also delivered to the Senate Press Gallery for the benefit of all correspondents.

Following my election to the Senate in 1958, it was apparent to me that if I were to be able to keep my constituents informed in Texas, I would have to resort to the radio to do so, because I could not depend on the newspapers in Texas to do the job for me. I am told that Franklin D. Roosevelt once estimated that 92 percent of the newspapers opposed him. I must be on the right track because my percentage must be even higher.

Of the approximately 125 daily newspapers in Texas, not over 7 ever endorsed me for public office in one race. Of the 12 large population centers in Texas, in only 1 has a daily newspaper endorsed me. I discovered that, in one instance, a newspaper publisher who has a chain of newspapers in Texas instructed their Washington correspondent never to file a story with my name in it unless it was "derogatory." I found out that in another chain of Texas daily newspapers, instructions were given that my name was to be removed from syndicated columns and syndicated news stories out of Washington, and this policy has been followed religiously by this chain for the past 4 years.

This being the situation, in talking with my supporters in the State, I determined that the only way I could get any of my reports on the issues to the public was to resort to a weekly report on radio. It costs $1.50 per tape at the Senate recording studio for a 4½-minute tape; or roughly $5,000 per year for the 100 or so stations carrying the programs. We set out to raise the money publicly through public subscription. Public committees were set up and solicitations were made annually by the committees, by mail, or in person, or in ads, with some 15,000 letters being sent out one year by the radio fund committees in the State in connection with public fund raising dinners to help raise money for these reports. One year, newspaper ads were used with coupons, inviting people to contribute to the radio fund. The cost of this program since January 1, 1959, has been approximately $24,400. I had paid $20,384 on this amount, and now owe the Senate recording studio $3,982.90.

I have long felt that all political contributions, as well as income of any type, to or through an elected official should be made, by law, a matter of public record, as the Washington Post suggests. However, so long as a segment of the press continues in a frenzy to impute "guilt by association" to anyone who ever knew Billie Sol Estes, I see no reason why these other innocent persons who contributed to my radio fund should be dragged into the Estes case.

I have been a candidate for statewide public office in Texas five times since 1952. In those campaigns, over 10,000 Texans have contributed to my campaigns, and thousands of others contributed their time, sweat, tears and labor. These campaign contributions are a matter of public record on file with the secretary of state at Austin, Tex., as required of all candidates by law.

I campaigned in Texas unaided by any large newspapers. I conducted my campaigns in the traditions of Jim Hogg and Jimmie Allred, under whose banner I enlisted and trained. Texas is larger than each of 78 of the 104 independent nations on this earth; it has a larger population than each of 72 of those nations. Campaigning in Texas creates in a native son a dedication not attainable in a critic's easy chair. It burns deep in a man ideals never learned in easier ways. But time to stop and fly-speck every citizen and every contributor isn't there.

I hold my office in the tradition of Sam Houston, Thomas J. Rusk, John H. Reagan, and Tom Connally, and with as much independence of choice of position as any of them. I reject as puerile and weak slander any hint, suggestion or subtle slur that I am beholden to anyone, big contributor, or small contributor, honest man or one who turns out dishonest. I feel my votes over the last 5 years are proof of the truth of my statement. You, or anybody else, who hints that I improperly used one bit of power of my office for Mr. Estes, lies. With your innuendo of guilt by association, go burn your incense before Joe McCarthy's image—you owe him an apology for having opposed him.

If the Senate is composed of the band of weaklings contemplated by your editorial owned by whoever made a campaign contribution, then God help this Republic.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senator From Texas.

WASHINGTON.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall yield to the Senator after a brief additional comment.

I wish to say I am delighted that an investigation of the Billie Sol Estes case is being undertaken by the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished, fair-minded, and determined Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I know

that the Senator from Arkansas has been diligently pursuing the matter, through the sending of investigators to Texas during the past 3 weeks. I know the Senator decided long ago that he would undertake no action unless and until he had the facts on which to base his action. For that reason he sent something in excess of a score of "bird doggers" to Texas to look into the question.

I am glad the Senator has announced that thorough hearings will be held; as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I assure the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, that if he desires any additional funds to carry on this or any other investigation all he will have to do, so far as I am concerned personally, is to make his request, and it will be granted.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am very glad that the distinguished majority leader has seen fit and proper to introduce into the RECORD the letter of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] in answer to what I consider to be a very poorly timed and poorly written editorial in the Washington Post.

As the distinguished majority leader knows, for many years I have been chairman of the Republican Senatorial campaign committee. I know what it is to try to raise money for Senators and for campaigns. I can see nothing wrong in the acceptance by the Senator from Texas of money from Mr. Estes long before there was any indication or inkling that Mr. Estes was engaged in wrongful practice. From my knowledge of the case, the Senator from Texas was merely doing his duty for a constituent, such as we do every day, when our constituents ask us to intercede here, there, or elsewhere on their behalf. Unless proven to the contrary—and I do not think it will be—I think that the distinguished Senator from Montana has done for the Senator from Texas an act of justice.

This week in Dallas I was asked by the press what I thought about the Senator's accepting money from Mr. Estes. I said I could see nothing wrong with it because at the time he accepted it, which was long ago, nothing had been disclosed on Mr. Estes.

I recall that in my own career I was approached by a relative to see if I would be interested in receiving a check. Well, I had never seen a man in politics who is not interested in receiving a check. I did not know the man to whom my relative referred. I had never heard of his name. I did not meet him until the campaign was over. Then I found him to be a very notorious individual. Had I known that previously, I probably would have refused the check. But under the circumstances I took it. I point that out because all of us engaged in politics have that problem to solve. It is almost an unsolvable one when we are dealing with money during a campaign. I think the Senator has done a justice to everyone running in politics or participating in politics.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for what he has just said. As usual, he has shown his fairmindedness and awareness that there is a problem, and I think he has performed a service in making his remarks today.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of us who are friends of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] have read with sympathetic understanding his letter which was published today in the Washington Post.

I had intended to request unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD; but I understand that the majority leader has already made that request.

Mr. President, we need no reassurance in regard to the character and the integrity of RALPH YARBOROUGH. We know him; we have worked with him; we have watched him in his devoted service to the people of Texas and to the people of the United States.

RALPH YARBOROUGH's record speaks for itself. It needs no defense.

THE SS "HOPE"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the good ship *Hope*, our noblest American vessel, is now in Latin American waters, to repeat the miracle it performed in southeast Asia in 1960 and 1961.

The SS *Hope*, a unique yet typically American venture, will bring the best American medical expertise, teaching, supplies, and help to Peru, a friend who needs them badly.

If anyone has any doubts about the merits and the outlook for success of the SS *Hope* in its first Latin American visit, let me pass along what Dr. William B. Walsh, *Hope's* founder and president, has told me already about the Peruvian mission.

As Senators may know, Peru invited the SS *Hope* to visit Salaverry, the port for the city of Trujillo, last year.

And in April, an advance unit of 25 of our top doctors, dentists, and nurses went to Peru to plan for the arrival of the mercy ship.

As my colleagues know, there have been a number of activities in the Nation's Capital and throughout the United States to help finance the operation and program. To the people who have engaged in those activities, I wish to pay my tribute and thank them for what they have done in terms of their generosity and cooperation.

Preliminary planning indicated 130 doctors and dentists, 35 nurses, and a dozen technicians would meet the needs outlined by Peruvian medical experts.

But news stories about *Hope's* coming soon blossomed throughout Peru and Latin America. These were not angry "Yankee go home" stories, but elated "*Hope* is coming" accounts.

The reception was overwhelming. Other Latin American countries immediately put in their bids for the SS *Hope*. Physicians in other areas of Peru brought forth their needs and their requests. And now *Hope* must also visit Huancayo, Oroya, Tarma, and Piura.

For these Peruvian cities are areas of critical need, too.

So now it is estimated that 250 doctors and dentists, rather than 150, will be needed to fulfill the Peruvian mission.

What will happen in Peru, a country beset by the tyranny of poverty and the slavery of disease that communism feasts upon, is this:

First and foremost, each of the American doctors, dentists, nurses and technicians will train a Peruvian counterpart in each port of call.

The Peruvians will learn American surgical and medical techniques through hundreds of lectures, seminars, clinics, and closed circuit television of operations. They will learn also through donations of medical journals, drugs, and supplies.

Thousands of children will be inoculated against such ancient killers as diphtheria, typhoid, tetanus, and pertussis. Thousands will be vaccinated against smallpox. And local vaccination teams will be trained and supplied to repeat the process throughout the whole country.

Thousands will be X-rayed for tuberculosis. Hundreds of major operations will be performed. Oral hygiene will be introduced to thousands who never knew the words.

There is a new medical school in Trujillo, which *Hope* will help staff and develop. There is also an old hospital in the same city, where there are 500 beds, but only 16 sparsely trained nurses and no sterilizers. When *Hope* leaves, this will have been remedied.

These are just some of the things *Hope* will accomplish in Peru.

I do not think it can be stressed enough that the SS *Hope* is a private, really all-American endeavor. It is the American people, and American business, industry, and labor, who make it work.

The doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians have all volunteered their services, without pay. And they are among the best we have. For example, there will be at least 30 full professors from American schools aboard the *Hope* this year.

The drugs, medical supplies, surgical instruments, food, and fuel for the ship are the result of private donations.

It is, as Dr. Walsh has said, a demonstration of the heart of America.

But it is a costly demonstration, of course. It cost the American people $3.5 million to operate the SS *Hope* during its year-long maiden voyage to Indonesia and South Vietnam.

The U.S. Government played no part in the Indonesia mission, except to help rehabilitate and refit the ship.

The SS *Hope* needs help, continuing help, from all of us.

Dr. Walsh feels now that if the Government could give some help toward the operating funds of the ship, *Hope* could divert all of its private contributions to its expanding medical program.

I support his request, and I trust our Government will provide that aid.

For the SS *Hope* flies the American flag. And no ship, no American program, flies the American flag higher or more proudly than the *Hope*.

And the people in Peru, who are not able to read, nevertheless recognize that

flag and understand what it and the ship mean.

As our President once said:

> To these people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves for whatever period is required—not because the Communists are doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right.

The SS *Hope* is a dramatic, tangible expression of what is right in America.

HAITI

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, State Department officials are to be applauded for their action in ordering the return to Washington of our Ambassador to Haiti, Raymond Thurston, and his deputy, Philip Williams, for consultations. This may be regarded as a repudiation of Haitian Dictator Francois Duvalier and his claims that our Nation is backing his regime.

Tuesday of this week was designated as the "Day of National Sovereignty" by this Caribbean despot. It was also the first anniversary of his declaring himself reelected for a term of office ending in 1967. His legal term was to have expired in May 1963. Let us hope that the absence of our ambassador will demonstrate to the people of Haiti that the United States is not supporting Duvalier's dictatorship.

State Department officials are also to be commended on the strong protest sent to Duvalier after his speech to the Haitian Legislature on April 16 in which he seemed to equate American economic aid with support of his regime. It is time that we took action to be sure that this tyrant and others like him will never be able to insinuate that our assistance signifies our approval of totalitarian forms of government.

Our experience has taught us that foreign-aid programs have been a basic influence in building and preserving the strength of the free world. But experience has also shown that foreign aid can be subverted and used to strengthen undemocratic and authoritarian regimes.

Mr. President, the situation in Haiti merits our close attention and consideration. Since the early years of the Eisenhower administration the United States has given Haiti more than $85 million in aid. Since 1956, we have paid more than $4 million in military aid. I take a dim view of President Duvalier and of our giving him military aid.

May I express every sympathy for the unfortunate men, women, and children living in squalor, misery, hunger, and idleness in this nation so close to our shores and in a land richly endowed by nature.

What result can really be claimed by us as an accomplishment of our aid over the years? We have spent millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. At the present time we are about to loan Haiti $3.4 million for construction of a road and $2.6 million for an airport. This in addition to our regular assistance program there. We shall undoubtedly continue this spending to the year 2000 and beyond.

At this time we have in this little poverty-stricken island nearly 200 American officials and employees. Over the years we have had approximately this number, year after year, sometimes more, sometimes less.

Presently in our State Department there are approximately 30 American officials and employees. In addition, of course, there are native employees.

In our Agency for International Development program there are 75 people, including 14 executive officers and staff members. Then, in addition, the U.S. Information Agency has a group of officials in Haiti. There is the U.S. Army, and then, believe it or not—and this is astonishing—we have a U.S. air mission of approximately 10 officers and enlisted men presumably engaged in training air fighters for the dictator running that little country. In addition, there is a U.S. naval mission of approximately 50 officers and men.

When the time comes for appropriations for foreign assistance, we should give a sharp look in connection with disbursements for Haiti.

What has been accomplished by the millions of dollars spent and the hundreds of Americans in that unfortunate country? If this is continued, where will it lead?

Today the people of Haiti live in an abysmal poverty. Four million people live in an area approximately the size of Maryland. Ninety percent of the people are illiterate. The per capita income is less than $70 per year. Malnutrition, tuberculosis, and malaria are widespread. Medical and sanitation facilities are almost nonexistent.

Today some families try to survive with less than one-fortieth of an acre of fertile land. Coffee, the major money crop, often grows wild in the mountains and is handpicked basket by basket and carried down to the local marketplace mostly by hardworking and undernourished women and children.

The man chiefly responsible for this misery and suffering is President Francois Duvalier. Millions of dollars of American aid plus American arms and military training have been sent to Haiti. What happens to this money and military support? The weapons go to Duvalier's armed forces, which he uses as a combined army-police force, primarily to control and tyrannize the populace.

Part of the aid supports the national budget which in turn supports Duvalier who spends these funds in secrecy to strengthen his own position. The rest of the aid is aimed at economic development. Here again Duvalier and his clique intervene with inefficiency and dishonesty at the expense of his own people.

Last year a $350,000 program sent American light weapons and munitions to the Haitian army. A 50-man U.S. naval mission has been training Haitian troops since 1959. Though the arms may seem modest and the mission small, they have served Duvalier well by implying American approval of his regime and by training his army and police force.

Duvalier, like Castro, Khrushchev, and Franco, is a ruthless dictator. He maintains his own terror group. This secret police force is made up of about 10,000 wandering shoeshine boys, taxi drivers, waiters, and sundry ruffians. By day this group of hoodlums spreads out in civilian garb to spy, eavesdrop, and blackmail the citizenry.

At night they carry out the more violent Duvalier missions. Since May 1958, a state of seige has been in effect in Haiti. Homes are searched without a warrant and people are imprisoned without a trial. Freedom of the press has been obliterated. Three newspaper printing plants have been ransacked and dynamited. Editors have been jailed or have fled into exile. Labor unions have been destroyed. The working class knows the most degrading misery without power to protest. A union president was arrested, tortured, drenched with gasoline, and set on fire because he opposed the Duvalier regime.

Mr. President, can we afford to contribute to a budget which allows for such military expense? Is this foreign assistance, or is it blackmail to a ruthless dictator and his henchmen?

What else has been done with our money? The Arbonite River Valley which sweeps across central Haiti is a would-be garden spot which could some day feed the whole country. In a concept similar to our own TVA 80,000 acres could be irrigated and a hydroelectric plant could be built. Construction of such a project began in 1953. It is still to be completed. Cost estimates climbed from an original $6 million to $32 million by 1956. Delay, waste, mismanagement, and corruption have been the hallmarks of this project.

Are there any good reasons for our policy in Haiti? There is no military advantage as we have no bases in Haiti. Politically there is no advantage. We are supporting a dictator who is blackmailing us with threats to turn his people over to the Communists. There are no sizable private American investments which demand our protection.

Not having any good reasons to justify our aid to Haiti's dictator, we have adopted bad ones. Fear is the main reason for our aid. Fear that the Dictator Duvalier will turn to the Communists or refuse to support us in the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Many policymakers argue that, if Duvalier should go, a Castro-like catastrophe might take place. I hold this view to be completely backwards. The Castro-type revolution will be more likely to come if Duvalier stays. If we think back to the Batista era in Cuba, we can see the parallel.

In 4 years' time Duvalier has had thousands killed. Countless others have disappeared. Still others rot undefended in jail. Duvalier even depletes his own camp. He practices a perpetual purge of his cabinets, the Army, and his own political party. He will do anything to prevent anyone from gaining power and becoming a threat. The man in the street walks in fear of arrests and beatings.

Mr. President, intervention may be an offensive word in our hemisphere, but we are already intervening on behalf of

Duvalier instead of the people of Haiti. Let us for once decide to give aid constructively or not at all.

When asked what we could do to help Haiti, Duvalier, instead of thinking of the millions in his country living in squalor and hopelessness, asked for more jet bombers for his air force.

If U.S. aid to Haiti were ended, the Duvalier regime would surely fall. Duvalier realizes this. We should insist that he hold a free election supervised by the Organization of American States before we grant any more aid.

Mr. President, the Republic of Haiti is the first free Negro state in modern times and the only one in our hemisphere. Its language is French and it is the one country in the Western Hemisphere not joined to the Latin American bloc by ties of language and culture. These people have inherited a heavy burden of poverty and distress from the past. They are a friendly, kindly, good people. Their history and tradition proves they are a liberty-loving people. Let us not add to their misery by supporting a harsh, ruthless, tyrannical dictator who seeks only to increase his own power and wealth.

We should stop a policy which aids and abets the dictatorship of Francois Duvalier, and direct our efforts to securing freedom and democracy for the people of Haiti. We should ask members of the Organization of American States to cooperate with us. Aid to needy and deserving people is something that all Americans support. Aid to a greedy, bloody dictator is something all Americans abhor.

IMPRESSIVE PLEAS FOR COURT-SUPERVISED WIRETAPPING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has conducted extensive hearings on the subject of wiretapping over a period of several years. These hearings are still in progress, but it is expected that they will be concluded in the near future.

Last week the committee heard the testimony of two widely experienced and very thoughtful witnesses, Judge Pecora, a leader of the New York bar, and Francis Biddle, the former Attorney General of the United States. The careers of both these men attest to their deep concern with civil liberties and individual rights. They have been devoted to the cause of justice and brought to this difficult problem of wiretapping insights based on decades of personal experience in the highest echelons of Government.

Both men strongly supported legislation to permit wiretapping by law enforcement agencies under court supervision. The common theme of their presentations was that wiretapping under the aegis of a judicial warrant was in harmony with constitutional limitations and was essential to any effective fight against the awesome power of organized crime.

Judge Pecora spoke extemporaneously and a copy of his statement is therefore not available. Former Attorney General Biddle, however, did have a prepared statement. Since very few Members of the Senate had the privilege of hearing his testimony, I ask unanimous consent that its text 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 OF FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL FRANCIS BIDDLE

I am inclined to think that my experience, both as Special Assistant U.S. Attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, from 1922 to 1926, and as Attorney General of the United States from 1941 to 1945, and my active interest in the defense of civil liberties, both in writing and in trial work, entitles me to speak on the subject of wiretapping before your committee. As U.S. attorney during prohibition I saw the widespread corruption and violation of the law that was perhaps the beginning of modern organized crime. Lord Acton said that all power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. The immense sums of money at stake, cheerfully furnished by a complaisant public, who insisted on buying their liquor at any cost, necessitated the formation of a vast criminal network which could afford to bribe public officers at almost every level. The bootleggers bribed the prohibition agents, and even reached up to the U.S. marshals and other officials, and pulled in many politicians who took their cut in campaign contributions. We did not use wiretapping in those days. I have no doubt that interception of telephone conversations would have greatly strengthened our hand in getting the leaders of this criminal ring to jail. But, as usual, we caught some small fish now and then, but almost never the big shots.

Twenty years later I was confronted with the problem of wiretapping immediately before I was confirmed as Attorney General. At a hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee considering my nomination, witnesses for Harry Bridges, the west coast labor leader, whose deportation I later directed as a Communist, testified that they had watched an FBI agent through binoculars from a neighboring building tap Bridges' telephone wire in New York City. The agent had left a letterhead identifying him with the FBI as he made a hasty escape. The Bridges group demanded that I make clear my position on wiretapping. Senator Tom Connally, the chairman of the committee, said to me that it was unnecessary for me to take the stand. I could be confirmed at once. But I insisted on testifying for the record. My position then was as it is today.

I testified that I would permit wiretaps in certain investigations, particularly espionage, and subversive activities, but only on my written approval, given on written requests from the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, until the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the action was illegal. Most of the taps were on suspected German and Russian espionage agents. I occasionally turned down a request, but granted most of them, as I had confidence in Edgar Hoover's integrity and judgment. My action was taken in pursuance of a confidential memorandum from President Franklin Roosevelt to my predecessor, Bob Jackson, on May 21, 1940, as follows:

"I am convinced that the Supreme Court never intended any dictum in the particular case which it decided to apply to grave matters involving the defense of the Nation.

"It is, of course, well known that certain other nations have been engaged in the organization of propaganda of so-called fifth columns in other countries and in preparation for sabotage, as well as in actual sabotage.

"You are, therefore, authorized and directed in such cases as you may approve, after investigation of the need in each case, to authorize the necessary investigating agents that they are at liberty to secure information by listening devices direct to the conversation or other communications of persons suspected of subversive activities against the Government of the United States, including suspected spies. You are requested furthermore to limit these investigations so conducted to a minimum and to limit them insofar as possible to aliens.

"F.D.R."

I have said that I had taken an active interest in civil liberties. I was brought into the notorious Emerson Jennings case by Arthur Garfield Hays, then counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, in 1935. Emerson Jennings who, in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., had made a nuisance of himself by standing up for the underdog, and continually preaching his constitutional rights, was framed by the local police. He was tried and convicted on a charge of dynamiting an automobile from which the daughter of one of the local judges had just descended. The record was full of perjury, and on appeal to the Superior and certiorari to the Supreme Courts of Pennsylvania, Jennings was cleared. Part of the testimony was in a doctored record of a wiretap by the police on Jennings. I had a vivid example of how viciously the police and county detectives could act.

To legalize wiretapping involves a serious decision between two conflicting principles, each fundamental to our American system, and each of great importance, the one to protect society, the other to defend the individual. Weighing one against the other I have come to believe that a carefully drawn wiretapping bill should be adopted by the Congress, that authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to intercept wire communications, permits the States to adopt similar legislation, makes it criminal to tap except by officials specifically authorized to do so, under court orders, makes any other tapping criminal, and provides a system of centralized Federal reporting that will show how these powers and prohibitions are being obeyed. I have come to these conclusions for three reasons, based, as I see it, on such facts and information as we have: (1) wiretapping is not only useful in most criminal cases, but indispensable in uncovering organized crime; (2) our evidence of wiretapping, particularly in the city of New York where it has been chiefly used under a permissive State statute, does not show abuse by the district attorney or police; and (3) because of the present uncertainty as to the legal status of wiretapping, and the resulting indiscriminate tapping that probably results therefrom.

The chief evidence on which I rely is that of Frank S. Hogan, district attorney of New York County, backed by similar evidence of the district attorneys of Queens County and Kings County, N.Y. Frank Hogan has had 26 years' experience in investigating crime and convicting criminals in New York City, and has been district attorney since 1942. He is nationally known for his extraordinary success in this field. He is able; he is honest; and above all he is a humane liberal.

Frank Hogan believes, without any reservation, that "telephonic interception is the most valuable weapon in the fight against organized crime." (Senate hearings, May 9–12, 1961, p. 430 and following.) To show this, he instanced the unearthing of the widespread bribing in college sports, the breaking up of a crooked gambling policy ring, the facts about the fake charity racketeers, and the conviction of the waterfront labor bosses, Mike Clemente, Saro Mogavero, and Louis Gaccione, and of six leaders of the Teamsters Union.

You may remember that Senator MCCLELLAN, who had learned something about the spread of organized crime as chairman of

the select committee investigating improper and criminal activity in the field of labor, said: "In many cases, prosecution and investigation of crimes would be completely thwarted and would collapse, were wiretapping to be denied to the law enforcement agencies."

And the taps in New York were certainly not excessive—about 75 a year, when Hogan was handling an annual average of 34,000 cases. Usually 25 to 30 interceptions were going on at one time. At present, in the area of organized crime, law enforcement is crippled because interceptions are forbidden, particularly, for instance, in the narcotic field—and drug peddling has spread into Westchester County—when it comes to a choice between protecting schoolchildren from narcotics, and protecting the public who use public telephones from having their conversations occasionally overheard by law enforcement officials—I prefer to protect the children.

Stephen P. Kennedy, former police commissioner of New York, testified before the Commission of New York State investigating wiretapping that in the city of New York over an 8-year period between 1952 and 1959 the police department obtained only 290 court orders a year on the average (transcript of public hearings, Apr. 5 and 6, 1960, p. 129)—less than 60 a year for each borough.

We have the testimony of Edward H. Silver, district attorney of Kings County, Brooklyn, which shows that in operating under the New York statute for 20 years there has not been a single instance where the district attorney has abused his right. (Senate hearings, p. 22. Sam Dash's testimony was almost entirely based on hearsay and guessing as to police infringements.)

Frank O'Connor, the district attorney of Queens County, testified that we would never be able to prosecute criminal abortion cases without the assistance of wiretapping (Senate record, p. 327); and that although he gets frequent complaints about police corruption and refusal to enforce the law, he has never had a complaint "that private rights have been invaded by illegal wiretapping."

Directing your attention to S. 2813, the bill sponsored by the Attorney General, I have a few suggestions for changes. On the whole the bill seems to me to give sufficient authority to the Attorney General of the United States and the State enforcement authorities, and to limit and protect their wiretapping activities so far as is consistent with their effective use.

In section 5(a) the Attorney General is permitted to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to intercept wire communications without any court order in crimes of espionage, sabotage, treason, sedition, and subversive activities where obtaining a court order would be "prejudicial to the national interest." This is a loose phrase, but pretty obviously means where it is feared that the information contained in an application for a court order is secret, and a leak is feared. I think such fear is unnecessary, and the provision overcautious. I should take my chance on trusting it to the judge, and treat (a) and (b) together, requiring court authority for all proposed wiretaps.

I should add gambling to the crimes for which wiretapping may be authorized. Gambling, narcotics and prostitution are the stakes of organized crime, the chief field of their activities, the trades from which the greatest profits arise. Perhaps prostitution should not be added out of some illogical fear that the lesser crimes should not be opened to taps, but only the more serious ones.

The opponents of wiretapping complain that it should not be used to pick up information, should be strictly held to the discovery of the crimes enumerated, citing the analogy of search warrants, where criminal evidence of other violations of law, against which the warrant is not levelled, cannot be used. But I do not admit the analogy. Wiretapping is not entering a man's house and seizing his effects—it is far more like the use of spies and stool pigeons, a dirty business if you like, but legal. To limit excessive wiretapping, the technique of court orders, as in search and seizures, is used. But that does not make a wiretap a search or a seizure. And it must be remembered that the phrase "a dirty business" was used by Mr. Justice Holmes not, as is generally believed, to characterize intercepting telephone messages, but to describe the use by the prosecuting attorney in a California case of evidence which had been illegally obtained by wiretapping.

And now a word about the reporting of wiretaps (sec. 9(a))—that each court order shall be reported (within 30 days) seems to me another paper burden that is unnecessary. I suggest that the judge transmit once or at most twice a year the orders, but not the applications for orders, which contain highly secret material, the names of the suspected criminals and the specific crimes suspected or perpetrated. All the reported information is useless unless made public for discussion and possible amendment to the act; and there is little point in reporting secret information. The reports should be ample, and the administrative office permitted to require information from the law-enforcement officers under regulations to be promulgated by it. It is to the enforcement officers that we must look for information, not to the courts, who usually know nothing more than what has appeared in the petitions. Section 9(b) contains no provision requiring reports by the prosecuting official and police.

The section also is inadequate since it is confined to obtaining only the numbers of applications, orders, etc. But other information is far more important, such as the number of arrests and convictions resulting from wiretaps, the number of cases in which information obtained by wiretaps was used in court, the information leading to the discovery of crimes not set forth in the application, and the disposition of any resulting prosecutions, the number of any illegal wiretaps by police officers and by other individuals, and the disposition thereof, and any other pertinent information. This section seems to me to be the weakest in the bill.

I think the bill needs tightening and clarifying here and there. For instance, section 5(a) speaks of "reasonable ground for belief," and 8(c) uses the expression "probable cause for belief." The latter clause has, I should think, been more frequently construed by the courts, and follows the language of the fourth amendment.

In finishing I think it worth pointing out that the British and, I believe, the Canadian Governments permit wiretaps. The British public is as insistent on protecting individual rights as we—perhaps more so. When there is any alleged police brutality or infringement of individual rights, a dozen members of the House of Commons are on their feet at once to challenge the Prime Minister and Home Secretary to explain—and to make an immediate investigation. Yet, although they believe strongly in individual rights, the British are equally insistent on law enforcement. They give their officials great powers—but if their powers are misused they at once demand appropriate action. I once asked my friend, the late Lord Birkett, who was the English alternate at the Nürnberg trials, had been the leading barrister of his day, and was then on the Court of Appeals, whether wiretapping by the police was permitted. He answered that it was, as a matter of course, and he had never heard it questioned.

NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL EVENTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a series of historical events that recently occurred in North Carolina. On Sunday, April 29, 1962, three separate events took place, which I feel are not only of importance and interest to North Carolinians, but to all of the people of the United States. One of these was the dedication of the battleship U.S.S. *North Carolina* in Wilmington as a living and permanent memorial to U.S. servicemen. The saving of this ship from destruction, after the announcement by the U.S. Navy of plans for scrapping her, is in some ways akin to her dramatic and proud record during World War II. Upon learning of the Navy's intention, the North Carolina Battleship Commission, under the leadership of Mr. Hugh Morton of Wilmington, N.C., was established to save the great vessel. The commission took its mission to the people of our State and the people responded. Among the many contributors are listed 700,000 school children who gave to the effort to bring the battleship *North Carolina* home for her new assignment.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles, published in the April 30, 1962, edition of the Wilmington Morning Star concerning the dedication ceremonies, be placed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Apr. 30, 1962]

BATTLESHIP "NORTH CAROLINA" IS DEDICATED

(By Bob Garsson)

With thousands of persons looking on from all parts of the ship and from the parking lot, the U.S.S. *North Carolina* was dedicated Sunday as a permanent and living memorial to U.S. servicemen.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, former chief of naval operations, made the dedicatory address and other remarks were made by Gov. Terry Sanford, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, former Tar Heel Governor, and Adm. Claude V. Ricketts, vice chief of naval operations.

Much tribute was paid to Hugh Morton, chairman of the North Carolina Battleship Commission, and to countless others who helped with the work of raising funds to bring the battleship to the State and to prepare her for visitations by the public.

Hodges outlined the preliminary work done to bring the battleship here, which began under his administration, and said "It is an historic moment in the history of our State because here today we are launching this great battleship on a second cruise of duty as a permanent memorial located in our great State."

At the same time, Hodges said, "We give recognition to the people of North Carolina whose contributions made it possible to save this great ship for its new assignment here as a permanent memorial."

Hodges said an early report recommended not bringing the ship back to the State, but "knowing the capacity of North Carolinians to tackle the difficult goal, I appointed an advisory committee to see what could be done."

From this point on, Hodges said, plans progressed well and the ship was eventually saved from the scrap pile and brought "home."

Hodges said many people helped with the work but "it always takes the active leadership of a good man to direct such a campaign. We are fortunate to have the creative energy and determined drive of Hugh Morton, a remarkable North Carolinian who has done so much for our State."

Sanford said the State is "grateful to many people for making this day possible. My 5-minute talk would last until sundown if I were to list the people to whom we owe our gratitude so I must deal in generalities."

The Governor paid tribute to the Department of Defense, the Battleship Commission, the 2,200 admirals of the North Carolina Navy and the more than 700,000 schoolchildren who contributed to the fund drive.

"We thank from the bottom of our hearts," he said, "the men and women of all of the U.S. military forces who served in World War II. They won the war, and we dedicate the U.S.S. *North Carolina* Battleship Memorial to them today."

In appreciation for what so many people have done toward the project, Sanford said, "I pledge to you today * * * that no stone will be left unturned to the end that this will be the greatest World War II memorial in the United States.

"This is an exciting prospect, this chance to preserve within our shores what is perhaps North Carolina's most historic link with World War II. We are determined to do it the way it should be done."

Ricketts said the Navy is "happy that the citizens of North Carolina have wanted this battleship permanently stationed in their waters, that they have made the sacrifices necessary for her to be here, that they have dignified her dedication by an inspiring program and that future plans provide for a proper use and respect for this shrine."

Ricketts said the hull and weapons of the ship may represent a "bygone era in the story of naval power and naval tactics, but her spirit remains modern and she will thereby continue to contribute in a great measure to the security of the United States and to the moral fiber of her citizenry."

Special awards were presented to many persons during the ceremony, most of them consisting of a color photograph of the ship's arrival here signed by commission members.

The awards were presented by commission Chairman Hugh Morton to Sanford, Hodges, Mrs. Craig, whose late husband James was one of those who originated the idea of bringing the ship to the State; Capt. B. M. Burriss, pilot who brought the ship up the river from Southport; Ricketts, Burke, Adm. William S. Maxwell, battleship memorial superintendent; Adm. Henry J. Wuensch, 5th District Coast Guard commandant; Voit Gilmore, head of the U.S. Travel Service; the State highway commission, the VFW, Navy Reserve Training Center, State Parent-Teachers Association, Corps of Engineers, Sunny Point Army Terminal, Mayor O. O. Allsbrook, who heads the Navy League chapter here, the American Legion, and many others.

Morton's son, Jimmy, who was poster boy for the fund drive last year, presented a signed copy of the poster to Sanford on behalf of the State's schoolchildren.

The Right Reverend Thomas Wright, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of East Carolina, gave the invocation, the Reverend Charles J. O'Connor, pastor of St. Mary's Catholic Church, gave the dedicatory prayer, and Rabbi Samuel Friedman of B'nai Israel Synagogue pronounced the benediction.

The program ended with maneuvers by minesweeping boats from Charleston, S.C., and flyovers by military aircraft.

Following the ceremonies, refreshments were served to guests on board the ship.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Apr. 30, 1962]

ADMIRAL CAUTIONS AGAINST APATHY TO RED MENACE

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke warned Sunday that this Nation's "greatest danger lies in apathy (and) indifference" to Communist attacks on the American way of life.

Burke, former chief of naval operations, made the major address at ceremonies marking the dedication of the U.S.S. *North Carolina* as a permanent memorial to U.S. servicemen.

"This great battleship," Burke said, "has been dedicated many times in the past—dedicated to our country and to our way of life. It has been dedicated under fire. The men who served aboard this ship, who worked and fought and died for the United States, dedicated the *North Carolina* many times to the cause of freedom.

"That is why it would be more precise to say that we are here to rededicate her now to the memory of brave North Carolinians who died, not just at sea, but in all the battlefields and theaters of World War II."

The battleship, Burke said, is "berthed here in Wilmington as a reminder that those who, like this ship, will never fight again, are not forgotten. Their courage, their gallantry, their hard work and their sacrifices are not forgotten and this ship is a fitting memorial because her record is also a record of courage and gallantry, a record of hard work and sacrifice.

"In her first battle, her first combat action, the *North Carolina* sent up such a fierce barrage of antiaircraft fire that the carrier *Enterprise* sent the message: 'Are you on fire?'

"And it was this ferocity, this fighting spirit, that the *North Carolina* took into the battle in those days after Pearl Harbor when perhaps at no other time in our Nation's history were our fortunes, our morale, and our hopes at such a low ebb."

Burke outlined the many points in the Pacific where the battleship left her mark during the war and told of the bombardment of Iwo Jima, which he had watched.

"We dedicate this ship," he said, "to the memory of the war dead (but) we should not forget that the battle stars and battle scars of the *North Carolina* are really the stars and scars of strong men, of Americans from every State, from every walk of life.

"We should hope that no one, whether old man or child, should fail to appreciate and remember the courage that ordinary Americans took into every combat zone. And we must not forget, especially, those who did not come back.

"We would do well to remember also those who were willing to die, but were not called upon to do so. Over 370,000 North Carolinians were in the services during World War II. Many thousands were wounded and many of them will never be the same.

"This mighty ship is no less dedicated to them."

Burke said the battleship "as she fought face to face with the enemy was truly backed up by the citizens at home and she would not be afloat here today if this same devotion to duty, this acceptance of responsibility by so many thousands at home, had not been behind her once again.

"Just as the credit for bringing this ship here is shared by many Americans who contributed toward the effort, so are the freedoms and liberties which this ship and its men fought to preserve shared by Americans everywhere.

"The responsibilities that walk hand in hand with freedom are shared by all of us and they are grave responsibilities. For today the challenges to our Nation are greater than ever before, even greater than the challenges of World War II."

Burke said we live "in a sober moment when history is being decided at its deepest level. The tide of conflict runs high and any thoughtful citizen cannot but be impressed by our problems.

"The insidious specter of communism * * * is particularly dangerous to us because the challenges often bring no sudden Pearl Harbor to galvanize our selections. This threat is a slow deliberate force that threatens every area.

"And our greatest danger lies in apathy, indifference to these attacks" on the American way of life.

"It lies in our wishful belief that the threat has gone and that communism and democracy can coexist.

"The most dangerous threat is our own unwillingness to act—our own indifference. And individual interest and positive action will continue to be America's greatest need in the years to come. For time does not wait. Destiny moves with the sun.

"We have survived against odds before. Hard times are nothing new to Americans.

"But we must continue to guard against a great danger within our own Nation, within our own minds. We must demonstrate our willingness to be not just Americans, but good Americans, responsible Americans.

"To some," Burke said, "the challenges of our times are not sharp and pointed. They are dull and blunted from repetition and easy living. We learn to put up with the challenges and they inch forward, gradually, and with our permission. That is why it is our own resolve that must be maintained and strengthened."

In the years ahead as thousands of persons visit the battleship, Burke said, "let us hope that these visitors remember not only those who died, but why they died. And from this memory let us all strengthen our own resolve to protect and preserve the blessings of freedom at whatever the cost may be.

"I am confident *North Carolina* will succeed in her mission and in doing so once again earn a 'well done' from our Navy and our Nation."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, some 150 miles west of Wilmington, near Durham, N.C., transpired the second event of the day. This commemoration was based on an incident of an earlier war than the one in which the battleship *North Carolina* won her fame. Here, near a monument to unity, was located the humble homeplace of James Bennett where two generals met to sign the surrender in the second and last major stage in the peacemaking process of the War Between the States. Gen. Joseph E. Johnston's signing of this Civil War surrender to Gen. William T. Sherman, undoubtedly saved countless lives on both sides of the line and prevented further destruction. The Bennett place has been a North Carolina memorial park since 1923 but had been devoid of any buildings since a fire destroyed the original house in 1921.

At the dedication on April 29, 1962, of the replicas of the Bennett place house and kitchen, Mr. R. O. Everett of Durham, N.C., a member of the Bennett place commission since it was created by the State legislature in 1921, and chairman of that commission for the past 38 years, presided. It was largely through his interest in preserving this historic site, where the Civil War came to an official end April 26, 1865, and national unity was reborn, that the 1923 General Assembly of North Carolina, of which Mr. Everett was then a member,

accepted the generous offer of the family of the late Samuel Tate Morgan to donate the Bennett place grounds to the State of North Carolina, and to erect there a monument to the cause of national unity.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Everett's remarks at the 1962 dedication printed at this point in the RECORD:

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

DEDICATORY EXERCISES, REMARKS OF R. O. EVERETT, APRIL 29, 1962, DURHAM CIVIC CENTER

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege and, indeed, a pleasure to welcome you here as participants in these exercises. There is no precedent, indeed there could be no precedent, in American history for such an occasion; and only a sense of its fitness could have brought together such a gathering of so truly interested and distinguished people. The historic background of the Bennett place, and the family relationship of many of you to the principal figures whose acts made the Bennett place famous gives a feeling that we are again in the making of history.

There are two avowed purposes of this meeting: First, to take part in the national observance of the century of peace; and secondly, the dedication of the Bennett place house and kitchen to the cause of national unity. These two purposes, a century of peace and national unity, are quite distinct and may be obtained in entirely different ways, one without the other; for it is possible to have peace without unity. For example, the greatest period of peace in classical or modern history was the Pax Romana—the Roman peace. Yet this peace was maintained solely by the Roman legions, and when the legions of Rome were gone, the entire Roman world collapsed. The world peace of today—the Pax Americana—is maintained largely by the nuclear warheads of the United States and her allies, with all of its uncertainties and forebodings.

The American century of peace which we are now observing began at the Bennett House April 26, 1865, at the point of a sword, as we all well know, when General Johnston surrendered his army to General Sherman, and President Davis and the Confederate Government, then in Greensboro—three cabinet members of which had been at the Bennett House during the negotiations—collapsed and scattered. Yet, in the very act of surrender and disintegration of the Confederate Government, General Sherman and General Johnston undertook to avoid for America a Roman peace based on force; and zealously sought to reinclude the Confederate States in the Union, and establish a government based on national unity where there would be a developing feeling of mutual interest among all the States in maintaining the social order.

This plan on the part of General Johnston and General Sherman, contained in the convention signed at the Bennett House April 18, 1865, authorized by President Lincoln March 28, 1865, and approved by President Davis, provided that upon the surrender of the Confederate armies and the taking of the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, the Confederate States should resume their functions and place in the Union. However, this effort by General Sherman and General Johnston was frustrated by the assassination of President Lincoln, whose death was reported to General Sherman on his way to the Bennett House, and instead of a government based upon national unity, there was precipitated an aftermath of reconstruction with all its suppressed bitterness and disappointment.

However, the seed sown by General Sherman and General Johnston took root in our soil and began to bear fruit, both commercially and emotionally, for it was realized that the war had been inevitable; that the social revolution inaugurated by Jefferson's ideals of equality had been blocked by the Southern States under the absolute power and right contained in the U.S. Constitution itself; and that the issue raised between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States was so deep and fundamental that only the sword could, and did, settle it. Therefore, the only sensible course was to follow the example of General Sherman and General Johnston at the Bennett place in their mutual friendship and to seek to build a desire for national unity within the framework of the amended U.S. Constitution. The sentiment for this course had so far advanced in our State that the General Assembly of North Carolina, in 1921 and 1923, authorized the acceptance of the offer by the Samuel Tate Morgan family of Virginia—natives of Durham County—to donate to the State of North Carolina the Bennett place grounds, and to place a monument thereon dedicated to the cause of national unity. The general assembly appointed the Bennett Place Memorial Commission to carry out the plans, and this commission has been in existence since, and in April of each year the Bennett Place Memorial Commission has held commemorative exercises to promote the cause of national unity.

The obvious reasons for the choice of the Bennett place for the memorial site were that it was the scene of the closing of the Civil War; the beginning of a century of peace; and here was given the inspiring and fruitful example of friendship between former enemies which developed there during the negotiations of peace.

This act by the State of North Carolina and by the Morgan family 40 years ago in behalf of national unity was the first of its kind in the South, where alone it would have been significant, or in the Nation, and has been followed by contributions from within and without the State until we have arrived at this day, for the dedication of the Bennett House and the Bennett kitchen, both erected in the spirit of national unity. We are deeply grateful to Mrs. Magruder Dent, of Connecticut and North Carolina, for her contribution of the replica of the Bennett House, and to Mr. Samuel Tate Morgan, Jr., of Richmond, Va., and the late Mrs. Robert Cabell and Mrs. Gourmajenko—both of whom died since the completion of the kitchen—for their contribution of the Bennett kitchen, and to Mr. J. J. Freeland of Hillsboro for his contribution of the smokehouse, in process of construction, given in memory of his father.

The cause of national unity during the past 40 years has so far progressed that we have in this audience today persons whose ancestors were on opposing sides, and whose presence with us makes this truly a national event of significance. We welcome each of you, whether from the North or the South, and hope that as many of our local citizens as possible will have an opportunity to meet and talk to you at the tea at the Bennett place following this meeting, where you will enjoy patriotic music from the 50-piece band of the 82d Airborne Division sent to us from Fort Bragg for that purpose by Gen. Hamilton H. Howse.

May I express my appreciation for the services of the Dedication Committee, and the Restoration Committees, and House Furnishing Committee, and to each person who has made a contribution to the Bennett place, whether in material gifts or in time and work. We have truly been most fortunate, and we thank each of you.

May I introduce to you Mr. H. C. Bradshaw, chairman of the Bennett Place Dedication Committee, who will present to you some of our distinguished guests. Mr. Bradshaw.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in order that additional background material on these historic events may be available to interested persons, I ask unanimous consent that a feature article, entitled "Old Bennett Farmhouse Saw the Curtains Drawn on Confederacy," from the April 29, 1962, edition of the Raleigh News & Observer, and the proclamation of National Unity Day by Durham's Mayor E. J. Evans, that appeared in the Durham Sun on April 28, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Raleigh (N.C.) News & Observer, Apr. 29, 1962]

OLD BENNETT FARMHOUSE SAW THE CURTAINS DRAWN ON CONFEDERACY

(By Perry D. Young)

(A ceremony today on the grounds of a restored farmhouse west of Durham will mark the dedication of one of North Carolina's simplest yet most significant historic landmarks. There, in April 1865, Johnston surrendered to Sherman and there descendants of the two generals will join in commemorating the part James Bennett's place played in bringing the war to an end. The author has commuted from Chapel Hill every weekend since September to work at Bennett place and says his article presents "a guide's eye view" of the story.)

James Bennett's farm, 3 miles west of Durham on old U.S. 70, was and is a very simple place. The building and land, a tract of over 200 acres, were valued in 1860 at only $500. And the building was rebuilt for a mere fraction of the cost of any of North Carolina's other historic sites.

Plain though it may be, the Bennett place is a landmark in history. There in 1865 Gen. Joseph E. Johnston surrendered his army to General Sherman and the curtains were drawn on the Confederacy.

Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman and his men, some 60,000 strong, marched through Georgia "to the sea" and up into the Carolinas—leaving a path of destruction, in some places 50 miles wide. Plantations and even whole cities were left in ruins.

But North Carolina's capital—though squarely in Sherman's path—escaped the fates of Atlanta and Columbia and dozens of other cities in Georgia and South Carolina.

AS THE SOUTH CRUMBLED

The last resistance to Sherman's march was at the Battle of Bentonville, 18 miles southwest of Goldsboro. Johnston, with less than 30,000 men, fought from March 18 to 21 to destroy the left wing of the Union line, but even this failed and the Rebels were forced to retreat.

After this battle, with his men camped near Goldsboro, Sherman left for talks with President Lincoln. With victories at Bentonville, Petersburg, and Richmond behind them, the Union men talked of surrender terms and how they would treat the defeated Rebels.

Sherman returned to his troops on April 10. That same day, news of Gen. Robert E. Lee's surrender reached him—and also General Johnston, who was in Greensboro. The Union men were already on their way to Raleigh. The Confederate general was asking President Jefferson Davis and the cabinet for authority to surrender.

Lee's surrender affected both actions. Davis had wanted a renewed offensive until John C. Breckenridge, Secretary of War, brought confirmation of the surrender at Appomattox.

And in the Morehead house in Greensboro, the Confederate cabinet gave Johnston the "authority" to surrender all of the men then in the field from North Carolina to the Rio Grande.

A PROPOSAL FOR PEACE

Meanwhile, Serman's army met no resistance and reached Raleigh on April 13. Gov. Zebulon B. Vance had sent a peace delegation to the Union commander offering to "surrender the State upon his promise to help terminate hostilities and to recognize the State government." But Vance was gone before they occupied the city—and the Union general spared his city anyhow.

Johnston wrote to Sherman asking for "a temporary suspension of active operations in order for the civil authorities to enter into the needful arrangements to terminate the existing war." He also proposed April 17 as a meeting date and it was accepted.

Just before he left Raleigh for the meeting, General Sherman received a dispatch from Secretary of War Stanton. It read, "President Lincoln was murdered about 10 o'clock last night in his private box in Ford's Theater. * * *"

Sherman saved North Carolina's capital city by his treatment of this message; he made the telegrapher promise not to tell anyone about Lincoln's death until he had returned from the meeting with Johnston.

A GENTLE CONQUEROR

That the Union men would have taken their vengeance out on Raleigh is not mere speculation. One soldier wrote (after the men were told of the assassination) that "the army is crazy for vengeance. If we make another campaign it will be an awful one," he said. "God pity this country if he (Johnston) retreats or fights us."

Bruce Catton, perhaps the most distinguished of all Civil War historians, describes this meeting at the Bennett Place: "It was a strange meeting, in a way, even without the overtone that went with Sherman's secret knowledge. Here was Sherman, whose very name had come to mean unrelenting wrath and destruction. In his own person he seemed to embody everything that a defeated South had to dread from a triumphant, all-powerful North. Yet as he went to see Johnston—they met in a little farmhouse between the lines—he was oddly gentle."

Though the two generals were both West Point men, they met for the first time on the old Hillsboro Road, near James Bennett's farmhouse. Inside the house, Sherman showed Johnston the telegram and "beads of sweat came" on the Confederate general's forehead.

General Sherman first offered the same terms Grant had given Lee at Appomattox. But when Johnston unexpectedly offered to surrender the entire Confederacy—both political and military—the talks took on a different tone.

TERMS FOR SURRENDER

From his talk with Lincoln, Sherman felt that a broad surrender was what the President had wanted. So the next day, April 18, he signed an agreement which provided for: an armistice terminable in 48 hours; recognition of the State governments when the oaths of allegiance had been taken; a general restoration of political rights and franchises as well as rights of person and property; a promise of general amnesty.

But the Government in Washington was far from accepting any sort of broad surrender terms—especially relating to political questions.

Secretary of War Stanton, who had all but stepped into Lincoln's very shoes, went into a "public tantrum." He denounced Sherman and set off bitter criticism of him in the northern press.

Gen. U. S. Grant was sent to Raleigh to take over the negotiations, but he was not to "discuss, concur or confer on anything of a political nature."

So a second meeting was arranged for April 26. Jefferson Davis opposed the new demand and Johnston actually disobeyed orders by going to the Bennett Place.

The agreement was a simple military surrender, carrying the same terms as Lee's surrender. There were two Confederate armies still in the field after this—Gens. E. Kirby Smith and Richard A. Taylor surrendered to Gen. E. R. S. Canby on May 4 and May 26. But Johnston had surrendered by far the greatest share of the Confederate armies—more than all the others combined.

RESTORED FOR HISTORY

After the war, the old farmhouse stood until 1921, when all but the chimney was destroyed by fire. Samuel T. Morgan of Richmond, Va., had bought the place some time before the fire from Broady Duke.

After Morgan's death, his wife and children gave the property for a State park and money to erect the "Unity" monument.

Until 1958, the monument, the chimney and part of the old well were scant reminders of the historic meeting. But with the revived interest in Civil War sites caused by the centennial preparations, a move was started to rebuild and furnish the Bennett place.

And Mrs. Magruder Dent of Greenwich, Conn., provided the money for the "big house," where the papers were signed. Then the children of Morgan gave money to rebuild the log kitchen.

The houses are being furnished in farm pieces of the period. Though two descendants of Bennett own several pieces that were in the original house, they feel "obligated to keep them in the family."

Relatives of both generals will be on hand for the formal dedication. Mrs. Frederick Cauldwell of Groton, Conn., is Sherman's granddaughter. Johnston's grandnieces and nephews will come from Richmond and Norfolk, Va., Mrs. Dent and Morgan Reynolds, a grandson of Samuel T. Morgan, will also take part.

The dedication program will begin at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon at the Durham Civic Center and will move from there to Bennett place for an open house and tea.

The reunion of the two families will, in itself, be a commemoration. For Johnston and Sherman corresponded for many years after the war. And even in the final chapter of both men's lives there is something "oddly gentle."

Joe Johnston died in 1891 from pneumonia he had contracted while he stood (as a pallbearer) in the rain at the funeral of his friend, William T. Sherman.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Sun, Apr. 28, 1962]

UNITY DAY IS DECREED TOMORROW—BENNETT PLACE OBSERVANCE SET FOR AFTERNOON

Mayor E. J. Evans today issued a proclamation in which he named tomorrow, Sunday, April 29, as Day of National Unity in Durham in honor of the signing of the surrender of the last major Confederate army in the field on April 26, 1865, at Bennett place, just west of Durham.

The annual Bennett Day observance will be held here tomorrow, with a special program at 2:30 p.m. at the Central Civic Center, with an open house and tea following, at the Bennett place.

The proclamation is as follows: "Whereas on April 26, 1865, Gen. Joseph E. Johnston surrendered the last major Confederate army in the field to Union Gen. William T. Sherman at the Bennett place not far west of Durham; and

"Whereas this surrender both brought to an end effective Confederate resistance and helped to mark the beginning of the reunion of the Northern and Southern States; and

"Whereas the site of the Bennett place has been preserved since 1923 as a historic shrine, and a monument and other gifts made to mark the site; and more recently the buildings there have been restored through private munificence as they were at the time the events took place there which molded the Nation's history; and

"Whereas a program of dedication of the restored buildings at the Bennett place has been planned for Sunday, April 29, 1962;

"Therefore, I, E. J. Evans, mayor of the city of Durham, do proclaim Sunday, April 29, 1962, as a Day of National Unity to be observed in the city of Durham, and do commend to the citizenry the spirit of national unity exemplified by this shrine."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the third and final dedication of the day was one to gladden the hearts of all, but especially those members of the Methodist Church in our State and throughout the Nation. A magnificent new building, which will house the official headquarters of the North Carolina Methodists, has been erected in our State capital city of Raleigh. I rejoice in this fine edifice and the achievement it represents of North Carolina Methodists. And I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the April 30, 1962, edition of the Raleigh News & Observer.

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

METHODISTS DEDICATE NEW HEADQUARTERS

North Carolina Methodists dedicated a new headquarters building on Glenwood Avenue Sunday afternoon and heard Bishop Paul N. Garber, of Richmond, Va., say: "We are adapting our program to modern times."

Bishop Garber, presiding episcopal head of the Richmond area, led the consecration service in the assembly room of the new Methodist Building.

"We consecrate this building as a symbol of the upreach of the church of God in faith, and the outreach of the church in service to our fellow men through the conference boards and agencies which shall be housed here," he said.

More than 200 persons attended the services and hundreds more toured the new building's open house which followed the services.

The new $650,000 headquarters building houses the offices of the boards of education, evangelism, missions and church extension, Christian higher education, the conference of lay leaders, conference treasurer, the Methodist Foundation, Inc., the department of gifts and wills, the Raleigh district superintendent, and the television, radio, and film commission.

GENERAL WEDEMEYER'S VIEWS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army, retired, is one of America's top soldiers. Few individuals, if any, have had a greater training or wider experience. His motives are unselfish and patriotic. He is a statesman whose judgment is worthy of attention.

On May 14, 1962, General Wedemeyer wrote a letter to our colleague, the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, which, in my opinion, merits the consideration of the Congress and the Executive. I ask unanimous consent to include that letter in my remarks. I have informed Senator JACKSON of my intentions and he has no objection.

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

MAY 14, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR: The views you expressed on the television program yesterday concerning our policies and actions in the Far East, particularly Laos, are, in my judgment, sound and in the best interests of the United States as well as of other free nations, including those in that turbulent area. If my knowledge of and experience in the Far East and also my exposure to global strategy prior to and during World War II qualify me in your opinion to express views or make suggestions, I certainly heartily endorse what you said.

Years ago when SEATO was organized, I was still in uniform and had planning responsibilities in the Department of the Army. I urged my then chiefs, both civilian and military, to insist upon the inclusion of Japan, Nationalist China, and South Korea in that Organization, for obviously they had equal stakes in the future of the Far East region. But more to the point, Senator, those three countries had proven their capability and their resolution to fight against the spread of communism. I did understand one objection voiced by a friend in the State Department to the admittance of Nationalist China since the British, who were members of SEATO, had already diplomatically recognized (1949) Red China. However, the Peiping regime had not exchanged diplomatic amenities with the British, so if they had joined us in extending an invitation to Nationalist China, it would not have been a breach of international propriety. Furthermore, it was my experience that realism must strongly influence our policies and actions in the international arena.

It is my considered opinion that it is not too late to invite those countries (Japan, Nationalist China, and South Korea) to join SEATO. But even if this is not done, I am confident that the following ideas are realistic: I believe that the nations geographically situated in the Far East, including southeast Asia, should be given the primary responsibility of maintaining the military security and economic stability of the region. Nations remote geographically from the area but maintaining strategic interests there should guarantee moral and material support. This might include limited technical advisers. But, Senator JACKSON, it is, again in my humble opinion, unrealistic to believe that white men should be sent into this region on punitive or so-called defensive missions. I might add that this statement has equal application in Africa. One should note that very few white Communists are found in the area, yet the orders emanating from Moscow are being carried out diligently—at times fanatically—and with inexorable success.

This letter is written in a constructive spirit. Both of my sons were in the Korean war—one a lieutenant of infantry and the other a jet pilot. I was told that both of them gave an excellent account of themselves, and I am sure they are prepared to do so again if circumstances require it. But having commanded large numbers of men and having given orders which require men to go forth—some of them to die, others to be maimed—in defense of American principles which you and I believe in, I think that I can speak for thousands and thousands of parents and loved ones of those boys who may now be called upon again to go forth and make similar sacrifices for similar principles.

In submitting these views to you, I do not do so in a critical vein, and I am not questioning the loyalty of responsible officials, military or civilian, but I am, of course, by implication questioning judgments.

Faithfully,

A. C. WEDEMEYER,
General, U.S. Army (Retired).

FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1962

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

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.

A PROGRAM FOR OUR FISHERIES

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this spring, a fleet of over 100 Russian fishing vessels has been operating as close as 15 miles from Cape Cod, Mass., on Georges Bank. This fleet is fishing our coastal waters with the most modern equipment yet developed anywhere in the world. Fish are brought through the stern of the Russian trawlers at up to 75,000 pounds a haul. This catch is processed on board ship with a minimum of waste and spoilage.

This is the second year that the Soviets have fished these waters, and they are here earlier this year than last. They have also 150 to 200 fishing vessels off Alaska in the Bering Sea where they have been fishing since 1959. This fleet has already taken 50 percent more herring than called for in its 1962 winter plan. These ships are all part of a mammoth state enterprise which has recently placed Russia ahead of the United States in world fishery production.

I would like to speak today about our own fishing industry, in the light of recent strides by the Soviets. I do so not to suggest that our security is in danger, nor that we imitate their every move. I bring up Russian achievements—and I shall talk about those of other nations as well—to emphasize the fact that the United States has a third-rate fishing fleet by world standards. The march of technology, which has transformed agriculture and so many other industries, has hardly brushed our fisheries. American fisheries desperately need to modernize, and this modernization cannot take place without the help of the Federal Government.

The fisheries, as I shall use the term, comprise all the separate operations which take fish from water, process it into food, and bring it to market. Fishing is our oldest commercial industry. It stretches back to 1602, when the Englishman Bartholomew Gosnold made the first commercial fishing expedition off the Massachusetts coast, and was so impressed by the abundance there that he named the area Cape Cod.

The fisheries have been most important to the economic development of our country. They are a significant industry today in almost all the 23 States that border on our great oceans and the Gulf of Mexico, not to mention many inland States that have fresh-water fisheries. Fisheries employ, directly and indirectly, 540,000 American workers. They are a major industry in my State of Massachusetts. Both the past fame and the present distress of my home town of Gloucester are largely attributable to this industry.

I speak today on the problems of our fisheries for all these reasons. And I would add one more: that if I, as a freshman Senator, am going to take the floor of the Senate, it should be on a subject I know well; and all my life has been spent in this industry.

The fisheries in America are in very serious condition. The total catch of fish landed in the United States last year was 5,100 million pounds. This was less than was landed 20 years ago, even though our population increased during this period by 45 million people. In the last 10 years the number of fishermen in the United States has dropped by 31,000; the number of fishing boats by 16,000. More and more of the fish consumed by Americans is imported. Imports have doubled since 1949, and in 1961 accounted for 44 percent of our total consumption. We import more fish than does any other country in the world. Distress in the fisheries is especially severe in New England. At the end of World War II the fleet operating out of Boston had 120 trawlers. Now it has 61. At the end of the war, the Gloucester fleet had over 400 boats. Today it has only about 100, and almost every month another fishing boat gives up and goes out of business.

Salmon production in the Northwest has been declining for many years. The Alaskan salmon pack, which averaged 5,900,000 cases in the 10-year period from 1936 to 1945, was reduced during the 10 years of the 1950's to 2,800,000 cases. The Columbia River pack for the 1936–45 period averaged 327,000 cases. During the 1950's it dropped to 157,000. The low abundance of salmon is aggravated by the fact that other countries take on the high seas fish that originate in Alaskan waters. It is estimated that the Janpanese alone may take 2 million Alaskan salmon this year.

The tuna fleet operating out of San Diego has declined in the last 10 years from 833 to 210 vessels. The sardine industry in Maine is plagued by wide fluctuations in the catch. Last year, Maine sardine canners experienced their worst season in years, as landings dropped by nearly 100 million pounds.

Water pollution and the invasion of the lamprey have virtually wiped out our $8-million-a-year trout industry in the Great Lakes. Fishermen of this region who used to bring in pike, whitefish, and other valuable species, in addition to trout, are now reduced to trying to market smelt, carp, and lesser value fish.

A serious shortage of shrimp has developed in our traditional fishing grounds in the Gulf of Mexico. The domestic shrimp catch from the Gulf of Mexico in 1961 was 72 million pounds lower than in 1960. As a result of this, imports of shrimp rose last year to over 50 percent of domestic consumption.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts on the very able statement which he is making with regard to the depressed condition of our domestic fishing industry and the need for some corrective action. Although my own State of Georgia does not have nearly so large a fishing industry as does Massachusetts, fishing is a substantial industry along Georgia's coast—particularly shrimp fishing. I am sure that the many problems which the Senator has enumerated are equally applicable to the situation in my area.

Even before the serious shrimp shortage which developed on the Atlantic coastline and the Gulf of Mexico last year, our domestic shrimp industry was in a serious condition because of excessive foreign imports.

Shrimp may be caught in virtually every country of the world that is not landlocked. More than 50 foreign countries ship shrimp into the United States, which is the world's largest and most important market. These imports have grown at an increasingly higher rate during the past few years; and as the Senator from Massachusetts has stated, imports accounted for over 50 percent of our domestic consumption last year. I, along with 10 other Senators, cosponsored proposed legislation in the 2d session of the 86th Congress which would have set up a country-by-country quota system to control excessive imports of shrimp. This proposal, if adopted, would have provided for a stable and adequate supply of shrimp and at the same time would have granted annual increases to the foreign suppliers on an equitable basis. Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain favorable consideration of the proposed legislation, and the lot of our domestic industry has grown steadily worse.

Again, I wish to compliment the Senator for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, I hope that it will receive the very careful attention of our colleagues.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his excellent contribution to this discussion. I realize that the shrimp industry of Georgia has been an important part of the economic life of that area and that it is experiencing serious difficulties at this time.

While unutilized species of shrimp have been located in deeper waters, most boatowners cannot afford the navigation instruments, bigger engines, and extra wire required to fish these grounds.

Oyster production has declined in the last 10 years by 19 million pounds, primarily due to depreciation of stocks by parasites, predators, and diseases. Oystermen are having trouble finding suitable oysters to market or sufficient oyster seed for planting. Many oyster companies on Long Island Sound, Delaware Bay, and Chesapeake Bay have gone out of business.

The result of this accumulation of difficulties in various of the fisheries is that America, after many years as the world's second largest producer of fish, has been displaced by Russia. In 1960, we actually fell to fifth place behind Japan, Russia, Red China, and Peru.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the catch of fish by leading nations of the world from 1951 through 1960.

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

World catch of fish, crustaceans, mollusks, etc., by leading countries, 1951–60 (live weight basis)

	Million pounds
1951:	
Japan	8,100
United States	5,200
U.S.S.R.	4,400
Norway	4,000
China (mainland)	2,900
1952:	
Japan	9,937
United States	5,270
U.S.S.R.	4,162
Norway	4,002
China (mainland)	3,748
1953:	
Japan	9,875
United States	5,374
U.S.S.R.	4,372
China (mainland)	4,167
Norway	3,433
1954:	
Japan	9,803
United States	5,967
China (mainland)	5,057
U.S.S.R.	4,978
Norway	4,560
1955:	
Japan	10,831
United States	6,152
China (mainland)	5,551
U.S.S.R.	5,512
Norway	3,998
1956:	
Japan	10,500
United States	6,590
China (mainland)	5,820
U.S.S.R.	5,776
Norway	4,853
1957:	
Japan	11,903
China (mainland)	6,878
United States	6,084
U.S.S.R.	5,578
Norway	3,869
1958:	
Japan	12,136
China (mainland)	8,951
United States	5,972
U.S.S.R.	5,776
Norway	3,172
1959:	
Japan	12,973
China (mainland)	11,067
United States	6,373
U.S.S.R.	6,085
Peru	4,745
1960:	
Japan	13,652
China (mainland) [1]	11,067
Peru	7,785
U.S.S.R.	6,724
United States	6,216

[1] Data are for 1959.

NOTE.—Data reflects latest information published in "Yearbook of Fishery Statistics," Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Source: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Branch of Statistics, March 14, 1962.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the basic problem pervading every part of our fisheries is backwardness of technology. It is technology, even more than wages, that allows fishermen of other countries to undersell us in our own ports. It is our dependence on old methods and obsolete equipment which makes costs so high that many fishing-boat operations no longer pay. If there is to be any improvement of the fisheries in this country, it will only come about through the application of modern scientific technology.

Fish is a highly perishable item, traditionally caught a long distance from where it is sold. The voyage from port to fishing grounds and back involves heavy expenditures for fuel, maintenance, and wages. The secret of economical operation, therefore, is to make the largest possible catch on a single trip and to process the catch as soon as possible to avoid spoilage.

The Russians have solved this problem through a considerable investment in a modern fishing fleet. Russian fleets are built around large "factory ships" 250 to 300 feet long, weighing 2,500 gross tons or more. These ships have complete facilities for filleting and freezing the catch. As many as one-half million pounds of processed fillets can be stored on such a ship at one time. This means the Russian trawlers do not have to journey to and from Russian ports. They operate from the mother ship. While almost all American vessels are forced to operate within a few hundred miles of home port, the Russian fleet can go almost anywhere and stay away from port for many months. The Russians have at least 100 trawler factory ships in operation and plan to have 160 more by 1965. We have none.

The Russians have also considerably outdistanced us in trawlers, the ships that pull the fish from the sea. The average trawler in use in the New England fleet is over 25 years old. Most Russian trawlers have been built in the last 10 years. Our fishermen, using traditional methods, must cast their nets over the side of the boats and haul in the catch either by hand or by winches. Nets that can be used in this way are strictly limited in size. Many Russian trawlers are of the more advanced stern chute variety, which can use much larger nets operated by machine. As a result, it can take a small New England trawler an entire week to take in as much fish as a stern chute trawler gets in one haul. The Russians also have combination factory trawlers with processing facilities on board. Their large trawlers can fish in the kind of weather in which a New England trawler cannot even leave port.

The Russians have also mobilized the most advanced technology for the improvement of fishing methods. They are preparing to equip their boats with electronic computers, which will adjust the depth of the trawl to the depth at which the fish are concentrated. Last November the Russians launched a whaling ship with facilities for all types of processing and canning the catch. The ship also had a helicopter for aerial spotting of whales and schools of fish.

Other nations have also modernized their fishing fleets. The Japanese have trawlers comparable in size to those of the Russians. Japanese fleets, with integrated facilities for catching and processing fish at sea, go regularly to many areas of the world. Japanese tuna boats have, on the average, a carrying capacity 60 percent larger than American boats.

A large Polish factory ship, able to process 30 tons of fish a day, was in Boston Harbor for repairs last year.

Canada is proceeding with expansion and modernization of its fleet. With the help of subsidies and loans from the National and Provincial Governments, the groundfishermen have replaced many of their old, small boats with larger, more mobile vessels.

Three hundred and twenty-four new vessels have been built with the assistance of the Government's subsidy. This in turn has helped improve the economic position of over a thousand fishermen. This fleet now accounts for more than 20 percent of the total groundfish landings on the Atlantic coast.

Peru increased its catch from 124 million pounds in 1950 to nearly 8 billion pounds in 1961. Even as underdeveloped a nation as Ghana, only 5 years independent, has trawlers much more up to date than ours.

The antiquity of our fleet is at the root of the problems of our fisheries. The number of new fishing boats built in the United States has been declining steadily. Last year's total was less than half that of 12 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum on the new fishing vessel documentations in the United States in the years 1947 to 1961.

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

New fishing vessel documentations in the United States, 1947–61

1947	1,300
1948	1,184
1949	1,002
1950	812
1951	780
1952	675
1953	729
1954	717
1955	418
1956	521
1957	601
1958	684
1959	479
1960	408
1961	430

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, outmoded trawlers cannot return to port with a large enough catch to pay their way. They cannot control the quality of the fish as well as modern boats.

The backwardness of our technology explains why many of our processors find it cheaper to import fish in frozen blocks than to buy domestic fish, whose cost may be inflated by poor handling methods and equipment.

Outmoded trawlers cost more to repair. They cost more to insure. In fact, they involve such a great insurance risk that in New England a few years ago no company would insure fishing vessels. Now, a few companies will cover them; but their rates have soared as the trawlers have aged.

That is why last year we imported over twice as much groundfish, fillets and blocks, as we caught ourselves: a record 195 million pounds.

From the trend of imports and the economic state of the industry, I think it is clear that American fisheries must either adapt to modern methods or slowly die. It has been estimated that by 1980, the Nation will be using 3 billion pounds more fish. But as long as other nations are able to produce a better product at less cost, they will increase their share of our domestic market, and will reap the benefit of any increase in consumption here in America.

Modernization, then, is the key to progress. But the fishing industry's ability to modernize is severely limited by the economic troubles experienced in the last few years. The vast majority of owners of fishing vessels have a net worth of less than $500,000. When we consider that a modern groundfish trawler costs $450,000 to construct in the United States; a 450-ton tuna clipper, $740,000; a factory processing ship, $8 million, we can see that almost none of these owners is in a position to modernize on his own. The new boats that are being built are of conventional types, without necessary modern equipment.

The precarious financial condition of the industry also makes it hard for owners to get bank credit for modernization. Nor have companies with large resources been known to enter the fishing industry in recent years, as current prospects do not make it an attractive field for investment or diversification.

Other industries seeking to modernize have the option of purchasing abroad. Modern boats, with modern equipment, could be obtained abroad at considerable savings—about 50 percent for steel vessels, and almost as much for wooden. But this option is not open to our fisheries. A Federal statute passed in 1792 prohibits any boat not built in the United States from landing fish in an American port. This law is unique in its field. No other industry is forbidden to use foreign capital equipment. This law operates harshly on our fisheries; but it has strong support in Congress, and cannot be changed at this time. Nevertheless, the effect of this statute makes it all the more important that ways be found to encourage the building of modern boats in the United States.

The American fishing industry suffers not only from outmoded equipment, but also from backward techniques of harvesting, preserving, producing, and marketing. Fish competes for the consumer dollar with poultry, meat, and eggs. For many years now these segments of American agriculture have been in the midst of a technological revolution. We have learned to grow more food on less acreage, to prepare and package it better, to develop new foods, and to keep the costs at stable levels.

Take, for example, the poultry industry. It competes directly with fish as a low-cost, high-protein food. This industry has made phenomenal scientific advances. Chickens used to be fed in the barnyard, killed at the chopping block, and sold fresh at local markets. Today, they are born in incubators, fed on assembly lines, killed and frozen by machine, and shipped all over the world. American poultry can now underprice French poultry in France. Exports of poultry products last year amounted to $94 million. Exports of edible fishery products amounted to $19 million. Fifteen years ago, exports of edible fishery products amounted to over $40 million.

Technological backwardness is most prevalent in the following areas:

(1) FINDING AND HARVESTING THE FISH

A number of advanced fishing methods are under development in various parts of the world to take the uncertainty and unnecessary expense out of catching fish commercially. The traditional method, still used by almost all American fishermen, is to cast nets at random in an area where fish have been known to feed. This method involves a large measure of chance and a good deal of wasted time and effort.

The Japanese and Russians carry on extensive exploratory operations for fish in all parts of the world. Research vessels precede their fishing fleets to scout promising areas and test the abundance of fish in various locations.

Underwater sonar equipment is used by other nations to a much greater extent to spot schools of fish. Some Russian factory ships are equipped with aircraft for this purpose. With modern telemeter it is possible, once the school is located, to determine its depth with sonar and to adjust the depth of the trawl to that of the fish. Other methods are being developed to herd fish toward nets by means of electric shocks. In the Caspian Sea, fish are attracted by lights and then sucked up into boats with suction pumps. This method could prove most useful to us, for example, in the Maine sardine industry, where thousands of bushels are lost each year because antiquated seining gear cannot be used off the rocky coast.

While a few of our fisheries, notably tuna, have taken steps to modernize locating and harvesting of fish, most fishing boats are deprived of valuable catch because of adherence to traditional methods. Looking beyond these methods, it will be necessary in the future to explore the possibility of salt and fresh water farming of fish. Many parts of the sea, most convenient to our ports, attract few fish because little food grows in them. Scientists have proposed a number of methods for enriching these areas, many of which would vastly benefit our fisheries. With proper treatment large schools could even be attracted to shore areas. Eventually, fish could be grown and harvested in one operation and at a minimum of expense.

(2) CONTROL OF QUALITY

Many of our fisheries are also deficient in controlling the quality of their product. Fish is a highly perishable item. Because of this, its appeal to consumers is greatly affected by small variations in color and looks. Many of our fishing boats, especially in New England, lack adequate facilities to guard against spoilage during the long trip back to

port. The common preservative is ice, but it is bulky and expensive to carry for so many days. As a result, it is difficult to keep high fish quality standards. This, in turn, hinders efforts to increase consumption.

Although the Federal Government has set up quality standards for various species, they are not mandatory. In the breaded frozen shrimp industry, for example, processors that comply with these standards are at a competitive disadvantage with those that do not.

(3) MARKETING

At a time when other foods are marketed through effective mass distribution techniques, fish marketing is characterized by disorganization. If the income of fishermen is inadequate, it is partly because the prices they receive bear no stable relationship to the retail market price.

In my hometown of Gloucester, fishermen are receiving 1½ to 2½ cents for a whiting, which retails for 26 cents a pound a few blocks away. Schrod haddock fillets, which bring between 5 and 10 cents ex-vessel, retail for 55 to 59 cents a pound.

The unstable price situation occurs partly because the industry is selling a very perishable product. If some method could be devised to catch the fish and economically preserve it at sea, like freezing it on board the vessel as soon as caught, it would be possible to sell fish in a more stable market.

Fishermen and vessel owners, like farmers, are supplied with market information daily so that they can plan their marketing. Even with this help, however, the high perishability of the product and variations in quality adversely affect the marketing of fish and shellfish at the point of landing. Fishermen and vessel owners can make ends meet at present only by going out and bringing back all they can catch. If supplies are large, prices drop to low levels because the product cannot be stored until market conditions improve. On the other hand, if supplies are light or scarce, prices become abnormally high.

(4) PROCESSING

The spread between the price at which fishermen sell and that which housewives buy is largely a matter of processing costs. These costs are necessarily high because of the way Americans like their fish. They like them individually cleaned, usually frozen and packaged, and often precooked. When preparing a fish for eating, two-thirds of its weight is frequently discarded.

In order for our industry to successfully compete with imported products and lower their costs, it will be necessary for it to modernize. Experience in Gloucester with processing of ocean perch showed that mechanization is the only way that our plants could successfully compete with imports. Jobs were actually saved by machines in this case. I am convinced that in the present economic situation, better processing machines, instead of reducing the number of workers, would lower prices and expand markets, and thus enhance employment opportunities in the industry.

These are the problems of our fisheries as I see them. The trend has been against us. The outlook is grim, but not hopeless. I believe that if the industry follows a prudent course, the downward trend could be stopped and our fisheries could obtain a larger share of the American market. But I am firmly convinced that in its present financial condition the industry cannot modernize without Goverment assistance. I therefore intend to outline specific measures our Government should take for the fisheries.

The fishing industry has not abused its constitutional right to petition the Federal Government for assistance. In fact, they have received less help from the Government than other basic foods. In the upcoming fiscal year our Government plans to spend $35.4 million on programs for the fishing industries. This compares with $5.8 billion on agricultural programs. Of course, agriculture is a much bigger industry, but even discounting this fact, our Government is spending over three times as much money on agricultural programs per dollar of product produced than on fisheries.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table entitled "Ratio of Federal Expenditures to Gross Value of Product, 1959."

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

Ratio of Federal expenditures to gross value of product, 1959

AGRICULTURE	
(a) Federal agricultural expenditures	$3, 222, 265, 000
Dollar value agricultural products	32, 700, 000, 000
FISHERY	
(b) Federal commercial fisheries expenditures	11, 102, 200
Dollar value of fish and shellfish landings	360, 000, 000

$$(a)\ \frac{3,222,265,000}{32,700,000,000}=.09854$$

$$(b)\ \frac{11,102,200}{360,000,000}=.03084$$

The Federal Government spent 9.854 cents or nearly 10 cents on agricultural programs for every $1 of product produced. A little over 3 cents for each $1 of fishery products produced is spent by the Federal Government on work programs for the fishing industry. Approximately the same ratios were believed to exist for the 1960–61 period.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I do not begrudge our farmers one dollar of this expenditure. Their problems are great and the returns over the years have been meager. I merely make this comparison to show that greater Government support for fisheries would not be excessive by comparison with competing products.

In other nations—even those which practice private ownership—governments have taken important steps to help their fisheries modernize. Fisheries in these nations operate under elaborate systems of price supports, subsidies, tariffs, import quotas, and favored tax treatment. Britain, Canada, Finland, West Germany, and Ireland help fishermen pay their interest on money borrowed for modernization of vessels. The Governments of Malta, Ireland, and France make outright grants for this purpose, equal to up to 50 percent of the cost. Norway has a price support program for fish. When market prices drop below a certain level, fishermen are compensated out of an equalization fund. In Canada a fisherman can build a $150,000 boat for $9,000 down. He receives a subsidy from the Canadian Maritime Commission of 40 percent of the cost. His Province will also provide an interest-free loan for the bulk of the remainder. In Quebec the loan can go up to 90 percent of the cost remaining after the subsidy. Little wonder the conditions are so good in Canadian boatyards, as indicated in an article published in the Boston Herald, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

NEWS OF THE MARITIMES—BOATYARDS BOOM IN NOVA SCOTIA

(By Al Savage)

HALIFAX.—Major Nova Scotian boatbuilding yards are bulging at the seams with orders for several million dollars worth of wooden fishing vessels in the 100-foot class.

The boom could push the $10 million mark by the end of this year and is expected to create an estimated 1,000 new jobs ashore and afloat.

And while steel shipbuilding yards aren't sharing in the boom they expect to climb aboard the gravy train in the not too distant future when Nova Scotian fishing companies will begin contracting for steel draggers.

Halifax Shipyards, Ltd., is working on contracts valued at between $8 and $12 million. It is working at about 75-percent capacity.

UPSURGE SEEN

The situation at Ferguson Industries, Ltd., in Pictou was described as only fair—the work force was only slightly better than half of full capacity—and business at Steel and Engine Products, Ltd., in Liverpool was reported slack, operating with a work force of about 140 compared to 300 last fall.

But officials of all three steel shipbuilding yards were optimistic of an upsurge in business within 6 weeks. At least one, if not all three, was actively engaged in negotiating for construction of steel fishing vessels.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it is ironic and instructive that while our fishing fleet decays, many nations are building up their fleets from money they receive from us.

Since World War II $115 million in American foreign aid of various types, and $182 million in counterpart funds have been used by friendly nations to build up their fisheries. This sum of $297 million exceeds—by about $88 million—the sum our Government has spent on our own commercial fishing industry during the same period. I think we can do better than that.

We need a thoroughgoing program We must assist the fisheries in the same way as the Government assists agriculture—at every phase of the operation from the raw to the marketed product. The fishing industry has deteriorated too far to be helped by any quick spot solution.

The loss of our fishing industry would cost our country dearly. One-half million people would be added to the rolls of the unemployed. The price of fish to consumers would be set outside the country. Millions of consumer food dollars, which should be staying in this country, would go abroad. This is already happening. Last year per capita fish consumption in this country rose one-half pound. This was a substantial gain, but it was completely absorbed by rising imports.

Congress has set up a number of assistance programs for the American fishing industry. They are administered by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The Bureau gives help in every phase of fishing, from exploring the waters to marketing the finished product and finding new uses for fish. The Bureau issues marketing reports, runs voluntary quality control programs, builds fish ladders to save salmon, and develops poisons to kill lampreys.

The Bureau has done an excellent job with the tools it has, in introducing modern methods to an old-fashioned industry.

At this time I wish to pay tribute to the able leadership of the Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Don McKernan. The tasks faced by Mr. McKernan and the Bureau are enormous, compared to the funds available for the work. The Bureau is short of badly needed, advanced equipment. In the whole North Atlantic, for instance, it only has one exploratory vessel of its own. All too often the Bureau, like the fishermen, must spend its money simply keeping its vessels up to date.

The fishermen also receive assistance through the Fisheries Loan and Mortgage Acts and the Vessel Subsidy Act.

The Fisheries Loan Act, passed in 1956, authorized a $13 million loan fund for repairing fishing and boat gear and for financing or refinancing the operators. Under this program, 560 loans totaling over $13½ million have been made to vessel owners and operators. It has been most successful where it has helped fisheries such as the tuna and salmon fishermen on the west coast buy newer, more efficient equipment. It does not, however, help build new vessels.

The Vessel Mortgage and Insurance Act, passed in 1960, provides Government insurance for mortgages for building or reconstructing fishing boats. This program has been in operation for about a year and a half. It is helpful in fisheries where the price of boats is not prohibitive. It is of no use, however, to fishermen who cannot afford to buy new vessels in this country.

The Vessel Subsidy Act, passed in 1960, provides a maximum Government subsidy of one-third the cost for vessels built for fisheries hurt by import competition. It has not been effective, and later I shall offer several ways it should be changed.

These programs represent a step in the right direction. They have not, however, done the job of putting the industry back on its feet.

Our fishermen must convert quickly to modern techniques or they will not survive. In order to do this, they must have both immediate and long-term assistance. I think Congress should pass a program that will help save the industry from further decline and enable it to compete with foreign producers. In addition, the Government should take steps to make our fisheries an effective weapon in our battle against hunger in the underdeveloped nations of the world. I, therefore, propose the following 7-point program:

1. OVERHAUL OF THE VESSEL SUBSIDY ACT TO ALLOW GREATER GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION IN SUBSIDIES TO BOATOWNERS AND TO MAKE A GREATER SEGMENT OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE

Vessels are at the heart of the fishermen's problems. At best the American fishermen can keep his present equipment up to date and in good repair. At worst, he cannot do this and the vessel deteriorates. Yet even if his equipment is in good condition, it is still far poorer and older than any being used by his principal foreign competitors.

If Congress will not let our fishermen shop on the open market, in any country, for the best vessel their money can buy, it should amend the Vessel Subsidy Act to make it truly effective. Since the act was passed, only one payment has been made under it. Although other applications are now pending, it is clear that this law is too restrictive to provide the fishing industry with the strong ship construction incentive and assistance it needs. A vessel built with this assistance must always carry at least half a cargo of the fish for which it is getting the subsidy. Yet, fish in this category make up only 7 percent of the domestic catch.

The terms of the act should be broadened to make a greater portion of the industry eligible for its help. It should also allow a subsidized vessel greater flexibility in the catch it may take. The procedure for applying for a subsidy should be simplified. The applications must now be approved by three different Government agencies. It often takes several months to clear them, and vessel costs rise while the applicant waits for the paperwork to be finished. The procedure also discourages the boatbuilders from trying new or different designs. Instead they use the same old ones, the ones that have been approved before.

The present maximum possible subsidy on steel-hulled vessels is 33⅓ percent. The actual price differential, however, between American and foreign shipyards for these vessels is now 40 percent to 50 percent. Since the American fishermen are, in effect, being forced to subsidize our boatyards by not being permitted to buy their vessels at the best possible prices, they should be paid the full difference whenever necessary. For this reason, Congress should increase the subsidy maximum to 50 percent.

2. WE SHOULD PROVIDE FEDERAL LOANS TO FISH PROCESSORS TO HELP THEM MODERNIZE THEIR PLANTS

New processing machinery has shown in several instances that it will not only pay for itself but can revolutionize the industry. Yet the processors, like the fishermen have not been attracting private capital. And the Small Business Administration, which is supposed to handle loans rejected by commercial sources, has approved only three loans to New England fish processors in the last 9 years.

Congress should set up a loan program to help the processors purchase new equipment. This could be done either by amending the Fisheries Loan Act to include processors, or by inaugurating a separate program under the Small Business Administration.

3. WE SHOULD EXPAND RESEARCH INTO THE FINDING, CATCHING, PROCESSING AND MARKETING OF FISH BY ENLARGING PRESENT RESEARCH PROGRAMS, AND PROVIDING NEW EQUIPMENT FOR THE BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

A strong exploratory fishing program, which could pinpoint known locations of fish, would take much of the guesswork out of present fishing methods. This alone would greatly improve the economics of the industry. More exploratory fishing could also locate new sources of fish. From Maine to the Gulf and Alaska, major fisheries have been badly hurt through loss of stocks. Yet scientists estimate our coastlines hold, in locations yet undiscovered, an additional 7 billion pounds of fish a year—double our present catch.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries' exploratory fishing program has produced excellent results in the past. It should be broadened and strengthened in order to locate new and unused stocks. Congress should provide the Bureau with funds for new research vessels, to cover our present fishing grounds more thoroughly and to explore more distant oceans.

Congress should also support research on new equipment for the fisheries. One example of this is the proposed program of the Atomic Energy Commission to build two new portable food irradiators, machines which destroy bacteria in food through low-level radiation and allow the food to be kept fresh at room temperature at long periods of time. Perfection of such equipment would help solve the present problem of extensive spoilage.

It would thereby create large new markets for fresh fish in areas of the country distant from the oceans. The funds for this program will, I hope, be approved by Congress this year.

4. WE SHOULD STRENGTHEN STATE COMMERCIAL FISHERIES PROGRAMS BY A SYSTEM OF FEDERAL MATCHING GRANTS

State assistance is needed particularly for research in conservation, and in onshore waters, where the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries does little work. A worthwhile bill to give assistance to the State fishing groups has already been introduced by my colleague, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and I hope hearings on it will be reopened.

5. WE SHOULD CONSTRUCT A MODERN STERN-CHUTE FACTORY-TRAWLER FOR PROCESSING FISH AT SEA

There is at the present time a bill before Congress to appropriate funds to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to build a modern, stern-chute trawler and factory ship for research purposes. No

such fishing vessel has ever been built in an American shipyard. Yet, if our fishermen hope to compete on an equal basis with foreign fleets, they must have larger, more modern vessels of this type. The proposed vessel to be operated by the Bureau would carry the most modern freezing, filleting, canning, and other machinery aboard for processing fish at sea. It would give both the American fishermen and boatyards an economical laboratory in which to test and evaluate advanced fishing methods.

A bill to construct this trawler for operation in the Bering Sea and northern Pacific Ocean has been introduced in the Senate by my colleague the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I would hope amendment would be in order to permit the vessel to operate in the Atlantic Ocean as well.

6. WE SHOULD OBTAIN APPROVAL OF FISH PROTEIN FOR DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION BY THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Our fishing industry can play a vital part in the worldwide battle against hunger. In the underdeveloped areas of the world, the most critical health problem is protein malnutrition. This is a disease which affects an estimated 500 million people—1 of every 4—on this planet.

The means to alleviate this problem lie in the seas off the nations of Africa, Asia, and South America. While almost all these nations are within easy reach of the oceans, with few exceptions, none have developed modern fishing industries. They lack the capital and the technical know-how. Many of these countries are in tropical climates, but they have no method of preserving fish and consequently cannot use them to feed the people. Lake Chad in Nigeria, for example, contains sufficient fish to supply the entire country. They spoil, however, even before they are brought ashore.

The nation that can catch fish off the shores of these countries, process them, and make them available to the people cheaply will have tapped major new markets and also created a strong weapon in the cold war. Russia, through its trawler-factory ships has the means to do just this. We do not. We do, however, have one advantage: that there has been developed, in this country, the means to manufacture from fish an inexpensive high protein food additive called fish protein. A few cents' worth of this powder added daily to a person's diet can supply him with all his protein needs. Fish protein can be produced for as little as 15 cents a pound, and can be stored indefinitely in any climate without spoiling.

The value of American fish protein has been established in feeding experiments throughout the underdeveloped nations of the world. The United States has achieved a clear lead in this field by developing a finished, tested product ready for large-scale manufacture. This product is of great potential benefit to our fisheries. It is an excellent example of what modern technology can do for the fishing industry.

Full promotion of fish protein, however, has been hindered by the Food and Drug Administration ruling that, for "esthetic" reasons, it cannot be sold in the United States for human consumption.

This decision has been discussed on this floor previously by a number of distinguished Senators, including my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. This is a shortsighted decision and does not represent, to our thinking, the type of cooperation which the industry should receive from the Government when it has made a significant breakthrough in new products and technology. A hearing will be held on this problem in the near future, and I hope that fish protein concentrate will, as a result, gain approval on its own merit.

7. WE SHOULD CONSTRUCT A PILOT PLANT FOR MANUFACTURE OF FISH PROTEIN ON LAND AND AT SEA, ABOARD SHIPS

Congress appropriated $50,000 last year for a worldwide study of fish protein manufacturing methods. In order that this country may receive the full benefits of fish protein, I propose Congress appropriate funds to set up a pilot plant operation to determine the most economical way of producing fish protein on a large scale. With this support, we could design a plant to manufacture fish protein at sea aboard ships.

Once this is done, I hope the plant can be placed aboard a surplus freighter and sent to produce fish protein in those areas of the world where it is needed. Thus the United States could show dramatically its deep concern for feeding the world's hungry people. We must, however, do this as soon as possible. The Russians can easily convert the fishmeal processing machinery aboard their factory ships to produce fish protein. And we know that they are already working to develop a fish protein manufacturing process of their own. We should not let our lead in this field go to waste.

Fish protein has received the support of many prominent Government officials, including the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Stewart Udall, and Director of Food for Peace, Mr. George McGovern. I hope my colleagues in Congress will join me in supporting the effective use of this valuable product.

Recently, the Peace Corps received requests from Brazil, Venezuela, and Togo, for volunteers with expertise in the fisheries. A fisherman from my hometown of Gloucester, Michael Ruggiero, of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, volunteered to help the Corps recruit the people it needed for this work. The interest the Peace Corps has shown in our fishermen indicates to me that they are a skilled and valuable resource to our country—a resource we cannot afford to lose. They were the first commercial workers in the United States. There were times when only their skill saved the early settlers from starvation. They still represent an invaluable asset to this Nation, providing us with a valuable food product and showing the needier nations of the world the way to combat hunger.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Peace Corps Discovers Gloucester," published in the Boston Globe.

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

PEACE CORPS DISCOVERS GLOUCESTER

With Soviet trawlers on Georges Bank, the Sacred Cod, hanging above the speaker's chair in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, has replied in character by joining the Peace Corps. Long the symbol of the fishing industry that gave this commonwealth its start, this cod now stands for a contribution to the effort to help "people struggling to break the bonds of mass misery." Three countries, Brazil, Venezuela, and Toga in West Africa, have asked for expert American fishermen to teach them their trade.

This project's chief promoter, Michael Ruggiero, specialist at the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries office in Gloucester, already has three recruits, an Essex shellfish expert, and two Gloucester fishermen also skilled in making, repairing, and handling nets. The oldest is a grandfather of 48, the youngest 30. Their ages, far greater than those of other Peace Corps members, are significant.

Young people are not going into fishing nowadays because there is more money to be made ashore.

If the skills of three centuries should become lost, there would remain little real meaning in the Sacred Cod. That would be unfortunate, for this has long been widely used as a symbol, in early colonial days on coins, stamps and seals, and, in our own time for years, on automobile number plates. Peace Corps fishing experts abroad might help keep these skills alive. They might even discover ways to rebuild here a waning industry, which is achieving great growth in foreign countries. Such a development is long overdue.

The Peace Corps effort is admittedly a pilot project. But so was Massachusetts. When James I was told that the Pilgrims were to sail for this continent, he asked how they would support themselves here. "By fishing," was the reply. That there is a demand for the skills of the Bay Colony's earliest industry is heartening. Somehow, the Peace Corps would not seem complete without a contribution from Massachusetts fishermen.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the fishing industry, through 300 years, has often faced adversity. Today, another dawn is breaking. I hope my fellow Members of Congress will join me in giving this industry the assistance it so richly deserves.

We have a great opportunity in this field. We can begin today to rehabilitate our fisheries and regain our rightful place among the nations of the world. The benefits, to our economy and our foreign policy, will greatly exceed the costs.

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

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to suggest to my colleague from Massachusetts that this is the most thorough study and analysis of the fishing situation in industry that I have ever heard. As one who has worked on this subject for many years, as my colleague knows, I commend him on his position and appreciate what he has said.

In substance, as the Senator and I know, the important question is the

modernization of our equipment and the modernization of our fishing fleets, and then, finally, to stimulate a greater marketing of our fishing products. The Senator and I have been working on the fish protein flour. Certainly we should get it as a food product here in the United States.

I should like to ask the Senator two questions. First, is it not true that we are not meeting the competition of other countries in modernizing our fishing fleets? Not only are we failing to replace obsolete vessels, but virtually no larger vessels are being constructed. For example, no trawler over 100 feet in length has been added to the Boston fleet in more than a dozen years, and it has been 7 years since a 100-foot boat was built in the Senator's home city of Gloucester. In addition, it is very difficult for the industry to attract young people. It is my understanding that in 1959 nearly 70 percent of the Boston fishermen were over 51 years of age, and less than 10 percent were less than 41 years of age.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. For years it was the practice for young boys out of school to go into the fisheries, to join the fishing fleet. Today, as the Senator says, they are not attracted to this industry. It has become an occupation for elderly people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Today they find something else more attractive.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we had more modern equipment, young people would be attracted to the industry, to find a living in it for years.

My second question is this. In our State, employment on trawlers has dropped nearly 60 percent since 1949. If something is not done soon to revitalize this important industry there is every reason to believe that it will cease to be a factor in world fishing circles and we will become dependent on the fishing industries of other countries to supply us with fish products. Is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. Not only that, but I think we are losing a great opportunity in this country to help underdeveloped countries throughout the world by not keeping up our technology and building up our fleets so that they can move throughout the world on peaceful missions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Russians do now. They are coming off Nantucket and onto the Grand Banks.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Yes. They go where the fish may be found.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have one final question. It relates to the question of the tariff, which we are going to consider very shortly. It is my opinion that we can never get a tariff that will protect the fishing industry in this country. Rather than relying on the tariff, we should modernize our equipment and modernize our method of marketing through research and other means.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. We should help build up our own fisheries constructively, rather than depend on the tariff.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for his contribution, which is a very valuable contribution indeed, to this subject which means so much to us in Massachusetts.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished Senator for his kind remarks. I know full well of his many years of diligent work for the fisheries, both as Governor of Massachusetts and as a Senator. One of the most important pieces of legislation affecting the fisheries, the Saltonstall-Kennedy law, has helped considerably in the fishing industry.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Throughout the major address made by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, the junior Senator from Ohio listened with rapt attention. I feel the Senator from Massachusetts has rendered a distinct national service in making the outstanding speech he has made today.

One might wonder why a Senator from a central State, from what is considered an interior State of the United States, should be so interested in this subject were it not that each of us is a Senator of the United States as well as a Senator from his own State.

The facts are that we in Ohio, since the construction of the great St. Lawrence Seaway, also front upon what is now a seacoast, Lake Erie. The waters of Lake Erie may now be used for direct transportation of products of farms and factories of the Middle West to the ports of the world.

The fishing industry, which has been declining, would further contribute to the welfare of the people of our own country and certainly to the welfare of the underprivileged people throughout the world if something could be done about the problems that affect it. The junior Senator from Massachusetts has certainly rendered a great service to the Nation by the immense research that he must have made personally on this subject, and by the delivery of this magnificent statement to the Senate.

I know that tomorrow, as a service to my constituents in the great cities of Cleveland, Lorain, Sandusky, Toledo and other ports of the State of Ohio, it is my intention to send out marked copies of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the Senator's address. I feel that the people of this Nation should be informed on the statements that the Senator has made.

If, for emphasis, I were to pick out one subject that the Senator has dealt with, it would be the one in regard to having the fish protein concentrate approved and produced and processed in all of the places in the United States where there is a fishing industry. Here is something that our Government should do, where taxpayers' money will not be wasted, and which will help raise the standard of living throughout the world. In that way we would also promote the welfare of our great fishing industry, which is now on the decline. If we could send modernized fishing fleets out of our ports, following the suggestions made by the Senator in his address, a great accomplishment will have been made for the welfare of all Americans and people everywhere.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his kind remarks and for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to commend the junior Senator from Massachusetts for the comprehensive and challenging study that he has presented to the Senate this morning. I come from a State which at one time had a rather important fishing industry. In common with most other areas in the Nation, the importance of that industry has declined. I believe that the statement the Senator has presented to us outlines completely the problems and the possibilities of the industry, and will have great value if we follow through on it.

I was impressed, and to an extent shocked, by the statement that since World War II our Government has spent $88 million more in aiding fisheries in foreign countries than it has in our own country.

I hope that the seven points which the Senator has presented will be taken seriously, and that something constructive can be done.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Hawaii. The 50th State to enter the Union certainly has more ocean surrounding it than has any other State and, therefore, should be in an outstanding position to be one of the great fish-producing States of the country.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I hope we may take advantage of our position.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Not only do I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts for the able, soundly factual speech which he has presented to the Senate this morning, but on behalf of my State of Oregon and the fish economy of my State I wish to thank him for making a case on the floor of the Senate that needs to be made in the interest not only of the fish economy, but, through the fish economy, of the best interests of the economy of the country as a whole.

I was not able to hear all of the Senator's speech, because while he was speaking I was testifying before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations concerning the plight in which the Nation's private shipbuilding and ship repair yards find themselves. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts and I engaged in a little reciprocity this morning, because while he was pleading the interests of the fish economy of my State and his, and other States, as well which rely so heavily upon income from fisheries, I was pleading his case before the Committee on Appropriations, because Massachusetts and many other States, as well, have deep concern about what is

happening to the Nation's private shipyards.

I have now read the Senator's entire speech, having heard a part of it, and I thank the Senator from Massachusetts because, in my judgment, he has laid out and analytically documented the case in support of the need for the U.S. Government to give some support and consideration to the fishing industry at once.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] referred to a part of the Senator's speech which I had already marked, I may say to the Senator from Hawaii. I wish to enlarge upon his comment by repeating what the Senator from Massachusetts said and then commenting upon it. On page 10 of his manuscript, the Senator from Massachusetts says:

> Since World War II, $115 million in American foreign aid of various types, and $182 million in counterpart funds have been used by friendly nations to build up their fisheries. This sum of $297 million exceeds—by about $88 million—the sum our Government has spent on our own commercial fishing industry in the same period. I think we can do better than that.

I think that is an understatement on the part of the Senator from Massachusetts; but that is typical of his modesty, it is typical of his caution, and it is typical of his recognition that it is better to understate than to overstate.

Rather than say, "I think we can do better than that," I suggest we say, together, "We must do better than that." The people of the country, as well as the fishing industry, are entitled to have their Government do better than that. Then the Senator from Massachusetts continues:

> We need a thoroughgoing program. We must assist the fisheries in the same way as the Government assists agriculture—at every phase of the operation from the raw to the marketed product. The fishing industry has deteriorated too far to be helped by any quick spot solution.

In making these comments, I wish to underscore every point which the Senator from Massachusetts has made. But I should like to dwell for just a moment, with the Senator's permission, upon the implications of the important fact which the Senator from Massachusetts brought out when he said that $115 million in U.S. foreign aid of various types and $182 million in counterpart funds have been used by friendly nations to build up their fisheries. The Senator from Massachusetts says that the sum of $297 million in foreign aid really is some $88 million in excess of what the United States has spent in our own self-interest in connection with our fisheries.

There are those who are becoming more and more critical of our foreign aid program; and their number is increasing, and the Senator from Massachusetts and I, and other Senators, have to answer them with increasing frequency. I do not share their point of view. I take the position that if political freedom is to be maintained in the world, it is necessary to strengthen economic freedom, for there can be no political freedom in any country unless its people all enjoy economic freedom. Our country's whole foreign aid program has been devised to strengthen economic freedom in those countries in which the people are willing to come over to the side of freedom. So I am not arguing against foreign aid.

But what I am arguing for is that we must recognize that the greatest defense weapon we have is our own economic freedom—and I think that it is implied in the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts, and rightly so. It is well that we strengthen economic freedom elsewhere, but we cannot justify strengthening it elsewhere if we weaken it at home. That is the burden of the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts on this point, as I see its implication. I think he is unanswerably correct that it is proper to help to build up the economic institutions, including fisheries, of other countries so long as we do not at the same time tear down our own economic institutions.

In my judgment, the treatment which American fisheries have been receiving at the hands of our Government cannot be justified in light of the preferred treatment which foreign fisheries have been receiving. So I quite agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that we must consider our fishery problem in the same category that we consider our other food production industries in the various segments of agriculture, because there is a need for the Government to enter in to enable them to compete with the fisheries which our Government assists by way of the foreign-aid program.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Exactly.

Mr. MORSE. We ought to do it. That will strengthen the whole front of economic freedom everywhere—both here and abroad.

I am so glad the Senator from Massachusetts has raised this point. He has brought it out over and over again. I can speak with knowledge of the needs of the fisheries of my own State, because my State is a great fisheries State.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. It certainly is.

Mr. MORSE. There is a need for the modernization of our fisheries. They are confronted with credit problems. The Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned that. He has not dwelt on it at any great length, and I shall not, except to support the reference which the Senator has made in his able speech. Our fisheries are having serious credit problems. It is hard to get loans. The banks are shying away from granting credit to the fisheries, and the only reason why they are shying away is that they see the steady growth of foreign fisheries, which are placing our own fisheries at a competitive disadvantage. We do not like to admit it, but it is true that many fisheries in the United States can no longer compete successfully with the more modernized fisheries of foreign countries, some of which we have helped to modernize with our economic aid. Again, I do not say that we should propose to withdraw such aid. I do not say we should not have granted it. However, we ought to have been of greater assistance to our own fisheries than we have been.

So I support the position of the Senator from Massachusetts that it is in the interest of the people that credit be made available and that the type of support be given to our own fisheries which we give to various segments of agriculture. In some instances, as the Senator knows, such aid can be on a loan or a credit basis, which will pay off; and because of the increased number of tax dollars the taxpayers will invest in our fisheries, there will flow eventually into the Treasury an increased number of tax dollars to pay for the investment of the taxpayers in the economic strengthening of the Nation's own fisheries.

There is one point upon which the Senator did not dwell, but which I think, in support of his speech, I ought to emphasize as I close my comments. I address this remark to the State Department. I believe the State Department needs to take a long, hard look both at some of the existing treaties in the field of world fisheries and at the need, undoubtedly, to start to attempt to negotiate some new treaties. I say this because there are many complaints, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, at least alleging that some of the foreign governments are invading our fishing waters, and thereby our fishing rights, by sending in fishing fleets in competition with American fishing vessels.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree with me that the State Department should review our international fishing problems as they involve other nations, and should give careful consideration to the complaints of American fisheries, as regards the need for greater treaty protection of the American fishing industry?

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator from Oregon on this matter. The United States now participates in a number of treaties and conventions with other nations in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to conserve fishery stocks and to protect species such as salmon which originates in our own waters. Foreign fishing fleets, however, have increased their activities enormously in recent years and, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said, are pushing further and further into our tradition fishing grounds. Thirteen nations alone now fish in the North Atlantic. Furthermore, many of them are fishing these areas far more thoroughly than we. Massachusetts fishermen who have watched Soviet fishing fleets in action off New England have been particularly impressed by the efficiency with which the Russians clean out the areas they are working in.

Because of these developments, I feel the Interior and State Departments should be doubly careful to see that American fishing rights are properly protected off our shores.

I might mention that American representatives are leaving soon for the annual June convention in Moscow of the 13-nation International Convention for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries. There they will take up a number of matters of prime importance to our fishermen including the extension of net regula-

tions to species not now protected. This is a conservation measure which protects undersized fish and allows them to grow to a marketable size. I feel we should make every effort to extend regulations such as these and to protect our fisheries through the work of international fisheries groups.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his fine suggestions concerning the fishing industry. I know of the problems which the Oregon fisheries have, and I am hopeful that the program which I have outlined today will provide the fisheries of his State and mine with the assistance they both need and deserve.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] for his remarks, and to say to him, in speaking for my State, that we are greatly beholden to him, coming, as he does, from Gloucester, which for nearly three centuries, I believe, has been the center of the fishing industry in the Northeast. We appreciate his friendship, and the thorough way in which he has gone into this matter. I commend him for his scholarship, and for his suggestions, all of which I approve.

Mr. President, in supplement to the statement made by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to say that I believe the State Department has a real task to perform. I believe that some years ago, at the conference at Geneva, the question of control of the Continental Shelf lands, for the developments for oil, was worked out in such a way that it has now become part of our international law. I only wish they had been equally diligent and equally successful in working out something in relation to the field of fisheries, because a large part of our troubles in connection with the shrimp fisheries comes from the disputed question of how far out the jurisdiction of the respective States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean extends, insofar as the shrimp fisheries are concerned.

I thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, and congratulate him; and I promise him my support.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Florida and also the Senator form Oregon for their kind remarks and also for their most helpful contributions to this debate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH]; and I wish to state that although the fishing problems of the South Atlantic States are somewhat different from those of the North Atlantic States, we are much interested in what the Senator from Massachusetts is proposing to do.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts on his remarks, and I thoroughly concur in them.

I, too, am very much interested in fisheries, since fishermen have sailed and steamed out of my home city of Newport, the city by the sea, and our whole Narragansett Bay area for hundreds of years. Moreover, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] has well demonstrated his substantive analysis of the problems of this vital industry with which, to my mind, he is more familiar than any other man in the Senate.

I am especially in agreement with his statement that—

> Our fisheries desperately need to modernize, and this cannot take place without the help of the Federal Government.

In my own State of Rhode Island in 1950 there were 1,875 commercial fishermen. Yet, 10 years later in 1960 there were only 1,475 so employed. In the year 1950 there were 1,438 commercial fishing motorboats and small boats, while in 1960 this had declined to a total of 967 such craft. Let me further state that while even in 1960 the fish and shellfish industry in Rhode Island grossed $3,846,324, in just one year this had declined to $3,196,227.

Mr. President, if this trend is allowed to continue, my own State's small, but vital, fishing industry will shrivel up in a few years as will that of our whole Nation. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] has cogently pointed out that our fishermen, our individualistic farmers of the sea, cannot afford to continue to work in the fishing industry unless they receive support and help from the Federal Government as is envisaged in Senator SMITH's seven-point program.

Technical obsolescence and the strong competition we are receiving from the Communist bloc has put our fishing industry on the defensive. Within the last few years the United States has dropped from second place in the world fish production to fifth place, with Japan, Russia, Red China, and Peru producing more than our country.

In the last 10 years New Bedford is the only New England fishing port that has not had a large decrease in the amount of fish landed each year. No new large trawler has been built in New England since 1954. And, as you know, Mr. President, the U.S.S.R. has 87 factory ships operating in the North and South Atlantic, 75 of which are stern trawlers, a type of vessel we have never even built. This startling statistic alone graphically points out the need for a complete modernization of our fishing fleets. This can be done mainly by an expansion and streamlining of the Vessel Subsidy Act and by strengthening of State commercial fisheries programs by a system of Federal matching grants.

To my mind the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has been of great assistance in helping to slow the decline of our fishing industry. However, this has not been enough. It would appear that there should be a substantial increase in the amount of funds which the Bureau uses in order that it can be of more assistance to our American fishing industry.

I, along with many other Senators, have continually fought for the approval of fish protein concentrate for domestic consumption. If the Food and Drug Administration reversed its previous ruling and allowed the sale of fish protein concentrate domestically, it is my belief that this would open up the great foreign market in the underdeveloped nations. This would serve a twofold purpose: First, an increase in the exports of our industry; and, second, an extension of our policy of aid to those friendly underdeveloped nations.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his contribution to this presentation.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 12 o'clock noon having arrived, the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into becomes effective.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Louisiana controls the time available to those who favor his amendment; and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], controls the time of those who are in opposition to the amendment.

NO SEGREGATION UNDER THE FARM BILL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is temporarily absent from the floor. For the time being, he has delegated to me control, of the time available to those in opposition to the Ellender amendment.

Mr. President, on that basis I now yield myself 10 minutes of the time available to those who oppose the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, many of us have protested over and over again the expenditure of vast amounts of Federal revenues on segregated schools, hospitals, housing, and even research projects. I believe it is unconscionable as well as unconstitutional to use Federal taxes to foster Jim Crow facilities. Federal officials have no more right than do State officials to approve such grants.

I have been concerned about the absence of any express safeguards in title I of this bill against the use of Federal funds to develop racially segregated parks and similar recreational facilities. It would certainly be unfortunate if this program were marred by such racial practices. In order to preclude such a situation, I prepared an amendment to title I of the bill, requiring guarantees that any public facilities developed with public assistance be available to all persons without discrimination on account of race. This amendment was sent to the desk last

night, and it is now on the table. It consists of only one sentence, which is proposed to be inserted as section 104, on page 8, in line 20, as follows:

SEC. 104. No agreement or payment shall be made under this title unless the Secretary determines that any public facilities which may be developed with Federal assistance will be available to all persons without discrimination on account of race.

The amendment was proposed on behalf of myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. President, such an amendment on this subject should be unnecessary. The Constitution is part of every one of our enactments. Its commands cannot be ignored by officials in the executive department sworn to uphold the law, just because the particular statute they administer does not reiterate all the controlling constitutional limitations on their actions.

I considered that this amendment might be necessary only because in recent months several key officials have expressed a different view on the relevancy of the Constitution to their actions. They have asserted, in effect, that their hands are tied and that without a congressional mandate they cannot enforce the guarantees of equal protection. Mr. President, that is nonsense. No statute can override constitutional requirements, and their mandate to act comes directly from the fundamental law.

Fortunately, the debate on this measure has made this clear. Both those in favor of title I and those opposed to title I have stated unequivocally that under its provisions, the Federal Government would have to take steps to assure that any public facilities developed with Federal funds would have to be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

For example, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who I believe, opposes this title, posed this question to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]:

Is is not true that, under the interpretation which the Supreme Court places on the Constitution, these recreational facilities will be racially integrated facilities?

Senator HOLLAND replied:

The Senator from Florida so believes and would have no hesitancy in saying that is the case.

I recognize that it was not the purpose of that colloquy to reassure the junior Senator from New York that these Federal funds would not be used to build racially segregated facilities. Nevertheless, I do find the colloquy very reassuring since it will provide a clear expression of legislative intent to those charged with administration of this program. Our intent will be especially clear, since these expressions are uncontradicted and, as I have indicated, they are supported by those who favor title I. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for example, has made remarks to the same effect. Under these circumstances, perhaps no such amendment is needed. The debate up to this point precludes any misunderstanding of the congressional intent, and leaves no room for any argument that because this statute is silent on this point, it is intended to overturn constitutional safeguards. On the contrary, this is one Federal grant-in-aid program which will have to be administered in complete conformity with constitutional requirements.

This will not be a case in which the Department of Justice will have to sue the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of seeing that the Constitution is carried out, and no long and expensive litigation to open these facilities to all members of the public will be required.

The duty of those charged with the administration of the act has been made crystal clear by the debate to this point, and there will be no excuse for any inconsistent course of action.

I hope we can set a precedent here which will serve far beyond the recreational facilities provided under this title. The principles involved here affect every Federal grant-in-aid program. It would be indeed gratifying if this debate and program caused a complete reconsideration of the administration's position on this issue and resulted in its insisting henceforth on a nondiscriminatory policy for all projects supported by Federal funds.

The President not only has the authority, but the responsibility, to make certain that all executive departments comply with the Constitution. It is incredible that a principle so self-apparent and compelling should continue to be widely compromised in practice.

If this legislative intent is not seriously challenged in the debate and it continues to be clear that funds can be used under the bill, as worded, only for public facilities which will be made available to all persons without discrimination on account of race, it will not be necessary to press the amendment which is at the desk. On the other hand, if it becomes necessary to clarify the issue beyond any question, my amendment will be offered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for one or two questions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. How would the grain amendment affect Virginia and the Southeastern States?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it would affect Virginia very little, if at all.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Three of the national farmers' organizations operate in Virginia. The National Grange says it favors the Senator's amendment because it is stated it will save $500 million. The Farmers Union favors it because it wants high rigid supports and knows it cannot have them without production controls. It is not favored by the Farm Bureau Federation because it wants controls taken off the farmer and wants to be free of controls and cut down on production by putting land into the soil bank.

Will a wheat farmer in Virginia be able to grow the same amount of wheat he has been growing?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a provision in the feed grains program that makes it possible for the farmer to plant wheat on feed grain acreage, or vice versa. There is the 25-acre minimum, which makes it possible for a farmer who in the past has planted less than 25 acres of feed grains to be able to continue to plant the same as he did in the past with no reduction at all. If he wants to come in under the program, he can do so, provided he takes the same reduction the larger farms take.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then I understand a wheat farmer, if he wants to continue to grow wheat, can grow it. If he wants to use some of this land for feed grains, he can grow them on that land?

Mr. ELLENDER. He can grow feed grains. We exempt rye——

Mr. ROBERTSON. If he wants to grow wheat as a feed grain, he can do so?

Mr. ELLENDER. He can do it under the optional plan in the feed grain program.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Georgia said yesterday that in the Southeastern States, including Georgia, more feed grains could be grown under the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana than are now grown.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason for that is that many farmers have chosen not to plant this year in order to qualify for payments under the emergency feed program. In order to qualify for payments they have voluntarily taken out more feed grain acreage than they would be required to take out under this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What is the Senator's estimate as to what will be the reduction in cost if we adopt his two amendments?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me answer in this way: Last year the wheat program alone cost in excess of $600 million. The program for corn and other feed grains cost in excess of $800 million. It is my belief those costs will be cut, probably in half or more, and as time goes on, when we get controls and have production in keeping with our requirements, the program should carry itself, almost as in the case of cotton, tobacco, and rice.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that under the present program, where we have given farmers price supports but no controls, we have accumulated surpluses of 75 million tons of corn and other feed grains?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was 85 million tons a few months ago. It has been reduced to 75 million tons. That is about four times as much as our ordinary carryover.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it the purpose of the Senator's feed grain amendment to hold production down to normal demand?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are many dairy farmers and poultry and turkey producers in Virginia. Will they have to pay more for their feed, or will this measure stabilize prices?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think this provision will lead to stabilized prices. As the Senator has pointed out, we have on hand about 75 million tons of grain. The program the administration has in effect now has raised the price of feed grains a little. I do not believe this program will raise it any higher than it now is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has earned our commendations for his clear and lucid presentation of a very complex and most important agricultural measure. I have reviewed his statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past 3 days with great care. His arguments, in my judgment, for the bill as he proposes it be amended are most compelling. I am strongly inclined at this point to support his position, on the basis of the case he has made.

I am pleased particularly to note from his colloquy with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that his wheat amendment follows the general approach developed in the letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, which the Senators from Oregon joined in signing. Since that letter was sent, I have received strong support for the proposals from a number of Oregonians and representatives of the wheat farmers of my State. In a letter dated May 17, the Oregon Wheat Growers League, for example, informed me that it is the desire of wheat producers that there be permanent legislation as they are finding it most difficult to operate upon a year-to-year basis. They also approve of eliminating the 2-year extension option in the referendum.

The feed grain amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, since it includes, as I understand it, provisions permitting wheat to be grown for feed on feed grain acres, and feed grain to be grown on wheat acres, has also received the strong support of Oregon wheat farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana there be printed several representative letters and telegrams I have received in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BEALL in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, concern has been expressed to me by representatives of Oregon livestock producers in Malheur, Baker, and Wasco Counties among others about authority in the bill which would permit grazing on grain acres which have been diverted.

One wire reads, "Urge you oppose bill permitting grazing on soil bank acreage," from the Wasco County Livestock Association. One from a farmer in Malheur County states that if the provision were enacted into law many new producers "would be attracted into livestock production. This would cause greater surplus in livestock, bringing the livestock producer under unneeded controls."

It is my understanding that no more authority in this respect is contained in the bill than is contained under existing law, which, if I am correctly informed, is limited to emergency situations. But these cattlemen do not think so. Can the Senator clarify this point for the legislative record?

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, it is left to the Secretary. As the Senator well knows, we passed special laws lately in order to permit grazing; but under the act as now presented, the Secretary would have the right to permit grazing if he saw fit.

Mr. MORSE. Would not the chairman agree that this discretionary authority vested in the Secretary to permit grazing ought to be exercised with great caution and be limited to emergency situations?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. Elmer E. Peterson, president of the Oregon Association of Soil Conservation Districts, has informed me as of May 1, 1962, that his organization favors titles I and V of S. 2786 for the reason that, if enacted, the legislation would materially speed up the watershed, soil and water conservation work as well as flood prevention work, in the 59 soil conservation districts in Oregon. Am I correct that these titles have survived in a materially unchanged form in the pending bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. They have, except that a limitation has been placed in the bill as to the amount of money to be spent. We have stricken from title I the authority of the Federal Government to purchase any land. The Secretary of Agriculture could, of course, cooperate with local agencies, including soil conservation groups, to carry out certain programs which would be planned.

There would be retained, under the terms of the bill, contracts not exceeding 15 years, which could be entered into with farmers. That provision would be unchanged.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, again I thank the Senator for his helpful response.

The able chairman of the committee may be interested to know that the executive board of the Oregon-Washington Farmers Union last March 31 by resolution stated:

We hereby express our approval of the principles embodied in the new farm program and endorse its passage as a practical means of reducing surplus, of regulating production, and of securing a fair price for our commodities.

We would prefer a plan of unit measure. We are thoroughly disillusioned with a system that has moved thousands of our farmers off the land and these proposals offer some answer.

Low prices and increasing production costs have forced many of those who remain into a precarious position of overcapitalization, in the race for more land, more machinery, and more fertilizer; to produce more for less.

Farm prices in equality with the rest of our economy are not only fair but a vital necessity, that should be, and we believe is, a matter of real concern to both producer and consumer.

Much has been said about loss of liberty and freedom and we are not unappreciative. But freedom to bankruptcy and liberty to leave the land are not our goals.

To be practical and objective, any plan must have enforceable controls. Such plans can be democratically developed, and we are not needlessly frightened by the sound of our own voice.

The job needs to be done and now.

We endorse the farm program as set out in the principles of H.R. 10010 and urge its passage.

Mr. President, with the indulgence of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I turn now to a further point which was brought to my attention by representatives of the Oregon-Washington Pea Growers Association. The association represents growers farming about 35,000 acres of green peas in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington. They indicate that they oppose any legislation which would permit the production of green peas for processing to be grown on acreage diverted from wheat production. Could the chairman comment upon the provisions of the bill to give an indication that it is not the intent of the committee to impose an economic hardship upon our green pea growers?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no intention to impose any hardship on the green pea growers. No crop in surplus or which would impair the program could be planted on diverted acres. I would assume that green peas probably could not be planted.

Mr. MORSE. The farmers could not plant them on diverted acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; not if that adversely affected the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana may proceed for 5 more minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator most wholeheartedly for his courteous response. In closing, I should like to bring to the attention of Senators the viewpoint of Senator Loyd Key, a member of the Interim Committee on Agriculture of the Oregon State Legislature, who on May 7 sent the following telegram to Secretary Freeman:

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Your very able handling of the questions presented to you by the press, possibly a hostile press, during the "at the source interview" relating to the administration's farm bill deserves the praise of all enlightened people engaged in agriculture and allied industries of agri-business. Your program for wheat embodies all of the features that growers in eastern Oregon and Washington have been seeking for 30 years. The certificate provision allowing growing of wheat for feed grain on feed grain acreage is particularly desirable to growers here, as it permits entering two markets, comparable to having some beef cuts for the carriage trade and hamburger for the lower priced purchaser.

I wish you success in enacting the program.

Mr. President, Senator Loyd Key has expressed the point of view which is shared, judging from my correspondence, by most sectors of Oregon's agricultural community. To be candid, not all Oregon farmers agree with him, as evidenced by a number of telegrams which I have received from representatives of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation.

Although, as I have indicated, the presentation made by the chairman of the committee has impressed me to the point where I intend to support his position on the amendments and on the bill, in fairness to those Oregon farmers who are seriously disturbed about the proposals which they feel will give to the Secretary more power than these citizens deem wise, I feel it proper to bring to the attention of Senators the points which have been raised. I, therefore, will include in the representative group of communications for which I have already received insertion approval a number of such communications.

One of them, in particular, from Mr. and Mrs. Leland Mayhew, of Maupin, Oreg., states in part:

I was raised on a farm and my husband was born and raised on this farm which has been in the family for 50 years. We had hoped one of our children would also carry it on, but there is no incentive left for them.

Originally we had 550 acres of wheat land a year. With the last cut, it went to 318 acres. Another 20 percent cut would not even make farm expenses, let alone a living for our two families.

Expenses continue on at an ever climbing rate with repairs, replacements, gas, fertilizer, taxes, etc., but income keeps dropping. Have been keeping books on our family living, and find we are spending under $200 a month, not buying except for essentials, so this isn't the high living we are accused of.

A good many will have to leave the farm if the present plan goes into effect taking jobs away from other men or going on welfare in many cases. I wonder, too, how much thought has been put to how this will affect other industry, such as tire and equipment dealers, and the loss of revenue from income tax.

The farmer has always been dedicated to his work. He has to be or he wouldn't stick it out with the poor pay and long hours—in our case 12 hours a day, 6½ days a week.

We have sold our wheat on the open market for several years—so the Government is not supporting us. Our wheat in the West certainly has no surplus from recent years. We can't diversify because of lack of water.

I would very much appreciate the comments of the able committee chairman with respect to the safeguards in the bill which are designed to help the family-sized farmer in a situation such as faces Mr. and Mrs. Mayhew, and many others who have written me to similar effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, one of the purposes of the bill is to stabilize and to increase farm income. Necessarily, if that is done it will help the smaller farmers.

We are trying to keep the farmers in business. The Senator must not overlook the fact that should the wheat acreage be cut under the terms of the proposal the farmer would be paid for the diverted acres for at least 3 years after the law becomes effective. In the meantime, the farmer could adjust himself to the new situation. After the 3 years no doubt surpluses will be reduced to manageable levels and perhaps allotments will be increased.

Mr. MORSE. The farmers could grow other feed grains?

Mr. ELLENDER. Surely; they could grow all the oats they wished to, or they could grow all the rye they wished to. They could grow feed grains for pasture for their cattle. There is no restriction on that at all.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his usual courtesy.

EXHIBIT 1

LEGISLATIVE MESSAGE CONCERNING AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1962

To Members of the U.S. Senate:

Passage of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee would be a step toward the development of a farm program that will lead to a sound agriculture economy.

Its enactment would strengthen farm income and curb the cost to the Federal Government.

However, to further these goals, the following amendments are needed:

1. Reinstate more realistic choices in the wheat referendum.

2. Replace the temporary extension of the feed grain program with the permanent program.

3. Reinstate the provision that would allow wheat to be grown on feed grain acres or feed grain on wheat acres.

We respectfully request your support of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 with these amendments.

NATIONAL GRANGE.
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS.
MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION.

MAY 21, 1962.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, S. 3225, as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry provides a vehicle for the establishment of a sound agricultural program.

As you are aware, the National Association of Wheat Growers has long advocated a bushel management plan for wheat, and has endorsed the principles of supply control on a commodity by commodity basis.

The fundamental principles of the bushel management plan are contained in S. 3225, but there are three major amendments which should be adopted if the program is to be effective in maintaining farm income and reducing the costs to the Federal Treasury.

Briefly, these needed amendments are:

1. Eliminate the referendum choice between a permanent certificate program and a 2-year extension of the 1962 emergency wheat program.

2. Replace the temporary extension of the feed grain program with a permanent mandatory feed grain acreage control program.

3. Reinstate the substitution clause permitting wheat to be grown for feed on feed grain acres, or feed grain to be grown on wheat acres.

For your convenience there is attached a copy of the association's recommendations in respect to these amendments, together with our reasons for making them.

If you desire further information concerning these amendments, I will be happy to discuss them with you at your convenience.

We respectfully request your support of these amendments, and of S. 3225 after these amendments are adopted.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. DYESS,
Executive Vice President.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS WITH RESPECT TO THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962, S. 3225

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 as reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would keep the door open for substantial progress towards the goals of returning to agriculture its rightful place in the Nation's economy. However, the bill as written will not be sufficiently effective in maintaining farm income and reducing the costs to the Federal Treasury.

In order to more fully accomplish the purposes of the act, we believe the following three amendments are essential:

1. Amend section 316 of the bill by deleting all of section 336(b), and delete all of sections 326, 327, and 328.

This amendment would permit wheat producers, by referendum, a clear choice between a program which would balance supply with demand, at a fair return to the grower, or no program, with price supports limited to not more than 50 percent of parity to cooperating farmers.

The alternative proposals provided in the committee bill force producers to choose between the supply management program contained in sections 310 to 325 of the committee bill, or a 2-year continuation of the present inadequate wheat-control program as provided in sections 326 to 328 of the bill. This will create confusion in the minds of the producers, and could result in failure of the act to accomplish its purposes.

It is evident from the following facts that the present emergency wheat program will not meet the needs of the wheat growers or of the Nation as a whole. By comparison with the bushel management program provided by sections 310–325, the present program is wholly inadequate because:

(a) It is far more costly to the Federal Treasury since rental payments would be at least $100 million higher.

(b) There is no assurance that wheat marketings will be in balance with needs.

(c) There is no guarantee of a reduction in CCC stocks.

(d) Net farm income could not be improved.

Under the committee bill, the million or so eligible voters would be called on to make a choice between a known program and one with which many of them are not familiar. If, due to lack of understanding on the part of many voters, the present program were to be selected in this popularity contest, the wheat problem would still be with us, and the Congress at the end of 2 years would once again be faced with the problem of providing constructive wheat legislation.

A year ago when the emergency wheat program was being considered by the Congress, our association reluctantly endorsed the provisions of this program, only because we recognized the urgency of reducing supplies and raising farm income. We stated then, and we now reaffirm, that this emergency type program was inadequate to meet the needs of the wheat producers and the Nation.

We do not believe an inadequate program such as this should be offered as one choice in a referendum.

2. Amend title III, subtitle A, to provide producers a choice between a permanent feed grain program with mandatory acreage controls which will balance supply with de-

mand, at a fair price, or no controls with prices free to seek their own level.

Most wheat producers are also feed grain producers, although the volume of feed produced on wheat farms is only a fraction of the total feed grain production.

The problem of surplus productive capacity is equally as serious with feed grains as it is with wheat. The stringent control of wheat acres, without similar controls on feed grain acres will not solve the entire grain problem.

As in the case of wheat, the emergency type feed grain program is inadequate to meet the needs of producers, or the Nation. The land retirement payments needed to divert sufficient acres to effect a reduction in supplies is quite costly, and with only a voluntary land retirement program, cooperating producers must make a greater reduction than would otherwise be the case to offset the increased acreage on noncooperating farms. Typical of this is the fact that in 1961, noncooperating farmers increased their feed grain acreage by about 5 million acres, thus offsetting much of the effect of the acreage reduction on cooperating farms.

Feed grain producers have long enjoyed the privilege, denied producers of other surplus commodities, of unlimited production with guaranteed prices. It is almost tantamount to class legislation to continue to offer feed grain producers such privileges and require producers of wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts to make a choice between strict controls with guaranteed prices, or no controls with no effective price guarantees. This is especially true since the CCC stockpile of feed grains is larger than of any other commodity.

3. Amend the proposed act to permit the substitution of wheat on feed grain acres, or feed grain on wheat acres.

Under the terms of sections 310 to 325 of the proposed legislation, the use to which wheat is put is the primary determinant in the price level. Wheat for human food is priced at one level, and wheat for seed, feed, and industrial uses is priced at a lower level. Since this is the case, each producer should be given the opportunity to determine which feed grain he desires to produce on his own farm. Some producers undoubtedly will prefer wheat for feed instead of barley, corn or grain sorghum. Such a substitution, however, would not increase the total output of feed on the farm, but would simply provide each grower with more freedom of operation on his own farm, and at the same time limit the total output of feed grain.

The National Association of Wheat Growers strongly urges that you support these amendments to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and after these amendments have been adopted, that you support the passage of the bill.

OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., May 17, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is my understanding that the Senate is to start debate on the farm bill Monday, May 21. We are again sending Don Woodward to Washington in regard to this bill and I have requested Don to contact you upon arrival.

Our executive committee meeting will also be held Monday, May 21, and no doubt you will receive a telegram from me on that day pertaining to any action the committee might take on the farm bill. The Umatilla County Association has gone on record favoring the bill passed by the House, and I believe the league will do the same. We are particularly interested in amendments that should be added to the Senate bill. It is our understanding that the substitution clause permitting wheat to be grown for feed on feed grain acres, or feed grain to be grown on wheat acres must be in the Senate bill. The growers in the Pacific Northwest feel that this is a must.

Two other points that will come up for discussion, which I think the league will favor, will be to eliminate the referendum which will give a choice between a permanent certificate program and a 2-year extension of the 1962 emergency wheat program.

The third point will be acted on and I will notify you Monday in regard to our action. This deals with the feed grain program. We think at present that we should replace the temporary extension of the feed grain program with a permanent mandatory feed grain acreage control program.

In talking to many of our wheat producers, it is their desire to have permanent legislation as they are finding it most difficult to operate on a year-to-year basis.

You will hear from me either Monday evening or Tuesday morning in regard to the league's actions on Senate legislation, after our meeting on Monday.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. WELBES,
Executive Vice President.

PENDLETON, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Oregon Wheat Growers League executive committee endorsed the House committee version of the farm bill dealing with wheat and feed grain. We definitely feel the substitution clause must be in the Senate bill along with a mandatory cut in feed grain acreage.

JOHN WELBES,
Executive Vice President,
Oregon Wheat Growers League.

RESOLUTION OF OREGON-WASHINGTON FARMERS UNION, SALEM, OREG.

The executive board of the Oregon-Washington Farmers Union in session, March 31, 1962, passed unanimously the following resolution:

"We hereby express our approval of the principles embodied in the new farm program and endorse its passage as a practical means of reducing surplus, of regulating production and of securing a fair price for our commodities.

"We would prefer a plan of unit measure. We are thoroughly disillusioned with a system that has moved thousands of our farmers off the land and these proposals offer some answer.

"Low prices and increasing production costs have forced many of those who remain into a precarious position of overcapitalization, in the race for more land, more machinery and more fertilizer; to produce more for less.

"Farm prices in equality with the rest of our economy are not only fair but a vital necessity, that should be, and we believe is, a matter of real concern to both producer and consumer.

"Much has been said about loss of liberty and freedom and we are not unappreciative. But freedom to bankruptcy and liberty to leave the land are not our goals.

"To be practical and objective, any plan must have enforceable controls. Such plans can be democratically developed, and we are not needlessly frightened by the sound of our own voice.

"The job needs to be done and now.

"We endorse the farm program as set out in the principles of H.R. 10010 and urge its passage."

R. J. ELKINS,
President.

PENDLETON, OREG., *May 17, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The farmers of this area will appreciate your effort to amend S. 3225, to restore administration feed and grain and wheat program as they were introduced in the original Ellender bill.

W. C. ROSEWALL,
President, Morrow County Farmers Union.

PETITION—FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.:

We the undersigned respectfully urge you to support, with our recommended changes, the Kennedy administration's Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

We support these supply management proposals because we feel they will (1) bring a balance between production and use of farm commodities, (2) reduce the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture, and (3) more effectively utilize and conserve our land.

We urge, however, that the legislation be strengthened by providing for full parity of income goals by 1965; that the interests of family farm operators be more fully clarified in the transfer of allotments; that only one type of certificate accompany all wheat consumed domestically or exported; that no fixed value be placed on wheat certificates so that producers would receive the benefit of any increase in prices above the support level; and that a 10-year base be used for arriving at individual producer allotments.

We feel that these changes are only fair consideration for providing our Nation and much of the world with an abundance of food. We sincerely seek your interest and help in this appeal because the welfare of thousands of farm families is at stake.

M. J. Vanderzanden, Bernard W. Gent, Karl Schaefer, Joe A. Jaross, Pauline E. Wambaugh, Lela M. Plass, Mrs. Karl Schaefer, Cecilia F. Gent, Mrs. Dora Vanderzanden, S. D. Smith, John Plass, R. E. Wambaugh.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Malheur County Livestock Association views with alarm the section in farm bill allowing grazing of acres which have been idled because of provisions of this bill and for which payment is being received. Strongly urge this section be deleted.

WILLIAM G. ROSS,
President.

BAKER, OREG., *May 18, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Livestock producers here oppose grazing acres diverted under farm program. Places majority producers at disadvantage. Urge you oppose this feature H.R. 11222.

JOHN S. OSBORN,
President, Baker County Livestock Association.

THE DALLES, OREG., *May 22, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please oppose bill permitting grazing on soil bank land.

BILL RUPER,
President of the Wasco County Livestock Association.

BAKER, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Why are you permitting livestock to graze growing crops on diverted grain acreage? We don't mind supporting grain growers once, but as a cattleman I object to this potentially destructive second subsidy. Do you think this kind of insanity will make it easier for us to work for Kennedy in 1964?

BOB STEWARD.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am opposed to this bill as it would allow land that is idled under the wheat and feed grains provision to be grazed. As many as 60 million acres could be idled under the proposed bill.

If such a provision were enacted into law many new producers would be attracted into livestock production. This would cause a greater surplus in livestock, bringing the livestock producer under unneeded controls. This competition seems to me to be an unwise move for the Government to make.

Yours truly,

CARL E. HANSON,
Diversified Farmer.

MAY 7, 1962.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.:

Your very able handling of the questions presented to you by the press, possibly a hostile press, during the "At the Source Interview" relating to the administration's farm bill deserves the praise of all enlightened people engaged in agriculture and allied industries of agribusiness. Your program for wheat embodies all of the features that growers in eastern Oregon and Washington have been seeking for 30 years. The certificate provision allowing growing of wheat for feed grain on feed grain acreage is particularly desirable to growers here, as it permits entering two markets, comparable to having some beef cuts for the carriage trade and hamburger for the lower-priced purchaser.

I wish you success in enacting the program.

LOYD KEY,
Senator, District No. 19.

(Copy to Senator WAYNE MORSE.)

LEXINGTON, OREG., *May 22, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Oppose passage farm bill, S. 3225. Recommended amendments on floor in line with H.R. 11222.

NORMAN NELSON.

PENDLETON, OREG., *May 22, 1962.*

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I have a ranch in Morrow County, Oreg., on which I grow wheat and cattle. I am opposed to the feed grain restrictions in H.R. 11222. I am in favor of the feed grain amendment proposed by Senator ELLENDER, which would favor raising wheat on feed grain acres and feed grain to be grown on wheat acres.

I would like to see the northwest wheat farmers on a competitive basis with midwest corn and milo growers.

I feel any controls on feed grains is a step toward controlling cattle feeding. The cattle business has survived the last several decades without control. I would like to see it continue this way.

I appreciate your efforts toward helping stockmen and hope you continue to do so. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN THOMPSON.

SARVIS SPRINGS RANCH,
Echo, Oreg., May 1, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: There are two items that I would like to bring to your attention:

First and foremost I would urge you to support the three amendments that the National Association of Wheat Growers have recommended for the administration's farm bill:

1. Eliminate the referendum choice between a permanent certificate program and a 2-year extension of the 1962 emergency wheat program.

2. Replace the temporary extension of the feed grain program with a permanent mandatory feed grain acreage control program.

3. Reinstate the substitution clause permitting wheat to be grown for feed on feed grain acres, or feed grain to be grown on wheat acres.

Secondly, I do not think that H.R. 10650 that is being considered in the Senate is fair and I would urge you to work against it.

Very truly yours,

HARRY PROUDFOOT.

OREGON ASSOCIATION OF
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Eugene, Oreg., May 1, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your letter of March 28, 1962, and the comments of Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum on our resolution No. 1.

Our State association will no doubt again consider this resolution at our forthcoming State meeting on November 8 and 9 at Eugene, Oreg., and incorporate various suggestions received.

Incidentally, I note that many proposed amendments to Public Law 566 are now incorporated in H.R. 11222 (S. 2786) under title I. Our State association, at their recent meeting on April 27, 1962, went on record as supporting title I and title V of this bill.

Attached is a copy of a letter which I sent to each of our Representatives, asking them to support this proposed legislation.

It is my understanding that the Senate committee has already reported favorably on this S. 2786. Your continued support for this proposed legislation will be appreciated.

Again, I wish to thank you for your interest and prompt attention to matters relating to our soil and water conservation work in Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER E. PETERSON,
President.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C. May 18, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Two parts of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 which you have under consideration are of direct concern to rural electric systems throughout the country. One provision is the REA direct loan account which was contained in the administration's proposal and which is a part of S. 3225. Other provisions are those which would implement the rural areas development program.

At our annual meeting in March, members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association stated their position on these two segments of the farm bill. Copies of these resolutions are enclosed for your information. We would appreciate your support of our position on these issues.

Sincerely yours,

KERMIT OVERBY,
Director, Legislation and Research Department.

RESOLUTION ON RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT ADOPTED BY THE DELEGATES TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION IN ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., MARCH 5–8, 1962

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

Whereas rural electric systems have always been in the forefront of the struggle to improve conditions in rural America; and

Whereas more than half the poverty in America is to be found among rural residents, although they make up less than one-third of the Nation's population; and

Whereas a massive assault is required before any permanent improvement in the economic and social conditions in many low-income rural areas can be expected; and

Whereas the interests of rural electric systems are inseparable from those of rural America; and

Whereas rural electric systems are already actively supporting present Government programs to help rural areas improve their economies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to support those provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 which would implement the comprehensive, closely coordinated rural renewal approach to revitalizing rural America as recommended in President Kennedy's recent farm message and by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and in addition, would strengthen and expand existing USDA rural area development programs.

RESOLUTION ON REA DIRECT LOAN ACCOUNT ADOPTED BY THE DELEGATES TO THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION IN ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., MARCH 5–8, 1962

REA DIRECT LOAN ACCOUNT

Whereas the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 as introduced in the Senate and the House contains in title V an amendment to section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 which would create an REA direct loan account; and

Whereas the proposed direct loan account would reflect more clearly than present procedures the fact that the REA program is a loan program, not a program of Government grants or expenditures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we support the amendment of the Rural Electrification Act to create the direct loan account; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly oppose any attempts to add any crippling amendments to this provision.

OREGON-WASHINGTON
PEA GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Milton-Freewater, Oreg., March 1, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Oregon-Washington Pea Grower's Association represents 35,000 acres of green peas for canning and freezing in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington. This is approximately 60 percent of the free tonnage of this crop in the area.

This association is opposed to any legislation or regulation which will permit the production of green peas for processing on those acres which will be set aside from wheat production, as written in the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

We realize that these acres are at present intended for soil conserving purposes, or are to be taken out of production of any commodity that may be in or near a surplus situation. It is in this light that we would like to emphasize the fact that should these acres, either by administrative action or regulation, be made available for the production of green peas, it would most likely be detrimental to the well-being of pea producers.

Your consideration and attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated. Will you please keep us informed of further developments.

Sincerely,

ORLO S. CARVER,
Executive Secretary.

HERMISTON, OREG., *May 23, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We urge you to support Ellender amendments to S. 3225.
HARRY PROUDFOOT.
ECHO, OREG.

GERVAIS, OREG., *March 9, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As cooperative members, we are entirely in agreement with the intent of the 1951 Revenue Act and urge legislation to that effect.
We favor the continuation of the agricultural conservation program.
We favor the proposed wheat and feed grains program. Production must be brought into balance with use, before farmers will get a fair return for their efforts.
We have farmed in the Willamette Valley for 39 years.
Thank you for your good work for the creeping red and chewings fescue committee before the Tariff Commission.
We enjoy reading your letters. Good luck in November.
Very truly yours,
ROBERT M. HARPER.
VERA P. HARPER.

ATHENA, OREG., *May 22, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a farmer-rancher and one of your supporters who doesn't spend much time in politics, I want to put myself and my family (about 40 of us more or less) on record as opposing the new feed grain restrictions in House bill 11222.
We are already at the mercy of the Midwest on feed grain availability and prices. Our land the Government spent so much for so long to conserve is eroding away because it is supposed to be left out of production. What we need is to allow wheat as a feed grain as the Wheat League wishes and be allowed unrestricted planting of feed grains.
I hope you can do something for us.
BILL JOHNS.

IONE, OREG., *March 11, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR MR. MORSE: This letter concerns Senate bill 1786, The Food and Agricultural Act of 1962.
As a grain farmer in the Pacific Northwest, in northeastern Oregon, I would like to have your utmost support for this bill. I am a member of the Oregon Wheat Growers League and feel that their recommendations for this bill is necessary to this area.
I am also a Farm Bureau member and I can say that I cannot go along with their national farm program or the farm program Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER has introduced.
I am also concerned about the 30 million bushels of Pacific Northwest white wheat that the CCC is planning as a carryover. We feel approximately 15 million bushels would be sufficient. This would give us 15 million more bushels for export and also cut down on the surplus.
Sincerely,
ROBERT H. JEPSEN,
Public Relation Chairman, Oregon Wheat League.

MCMINNVILLE, OREG.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE.
DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you in regard to the Kennedy-Freeman farm bill. The version sent to the Senate floor by your Senate Agriculture Committee isn't so bad, but it undoubtedly will be changed back to try and conform to the one on the House floor (H.R. 11222) and that bill I feel we can't live with. It will completely stifle the initiative and ability of a farmer to get ahead, and will make just another Government hired hand out of him. Inasmuch as you own a farm yourself, I felt you should be in a position to see the danger in this sort of approach to the farm problem.
Respectfully,
M. E. TOLIVER.

LA GRANDE, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Opposed to agricultural bill S. 3225. Favor S. 2786 as revised.
DALE CARSON,
SUMMERVILLE, OREG.

VALE, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Please oppose Senate bill 3225 or any amendments from Senate bill to S. 2786.
JOHN G. TUCKE,
President, Malheur County Farm Bureau.

VALE, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Please oppose Senate bill 3225 or any amendments from bill S. 2786. This is bad policy for farmer.
KAY NAKAMOTO,
Chairman,
Willowcreek Farm Bureau Center.

PENDLETON, OREG., *May 17, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Please amend S. 3225 to its original feed grain bill.
ORVIL CUTSBORTH.

MAUPIN, OREG., *May 14, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR MR. MORSE: We are writing to you to see if you can give us any help on the farm bill proposal. We understand it has passed the Agriculture Committee by only one vote. Naturally we are against any more cuts in acreage allotments for wheat by reason that the average family will not be able to survive with another cut. There will be no choice, but for the farmer to vote "yes" when we are told that the Government will ruin the market otherwise.
I was raised on a farm and my husband was born and raised on this farm which has been in the family for 50 years. We had hoped one of our children would also carry it on, but there is no incentive left for them.
Originally we had 550 acres of wheatland a year. With the last cut, it went to 318 acres. Another 20-percent cut would not even make farm expenses, let alone a living for our two families.
Expenses continue on at an ever-climbing rate with repairs, replacements, gas, fertilizer, taxes, etc., but income keeps dropping. Have been keeping books on our family living, and find we are spending under $200 a month, not buying except for essentials, so this isn't the high living we are accused of.
A good many will have to leave the farm if the present plan goes into effect taking jobs away from other men or going on welfare in many cases. I wonder, too, how much thought has been put to how this will affect other industry, such as tire and equipment dealers, and the loss of revenue from income tax.
The farmer has always been dedicated to his work. He has to be or he wouldn't stick it out with the poor pay and long hours—in our case 12 hours a day, 6½ days a week.
We have sold our wheat on the open market for several years—so the Government is not supporting us. Our wheat in the West certainly has no surplus from recent years. We can't diversify because of lack of water.
When we are dictated to at every turn and cut and cut then this is no longer the free country we believed it to be.
Sincerely,
DONA L. MAYHEW,
Mr. and Mrs. Leland Mayhew.

ENTERPRISE, OREG., *May 23, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Wallowa County Stockgrowers Association vigorously oppose the present administration farm bill.
HOWARD M. JOHNSON.

VALE, OREG., *May 20, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Please vote against bill S. 3225.
ALBERTA and DON DELONG.

SALEM, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Polk County Farm Bureau members, we protest the passage of bills S. 2786 and S. 3225.
Mr. and Mrs. ROLLIN BEAVER,
Publicity and women's chairman.

MAUPIN, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
We strongly urge you to oppose S. 2786.
MEMBERS, SOUTH WASCO COUNTY FARM BUREAU.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Please oppose S. 3225 or any amendment from S. 2786. Very poor bill for farmers.
RUSSELL FULLETON.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Please oppose S. 3225 or any move to substitute provisions of S. 2786. Important to we farmers.
JOE and IRENE HOBSON.

THE DALLES, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
DEAR SIR: In expressing the wishes of North Wasco County Farm Bureau it is our hope that your vote will be "no" on the farm bill, S. 2786.
Sincerely,
ALBERT FRANCOIS.

SALEM, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Please for America and freedom defeat S. 3225 and S. 2786. Pass voluntary cropland retirement program
WAYNE HEIBENTHAN,
President, Polk County Farm Bureau.

BAKER, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
No compulsory farm legislation. We are not in favor administration's bill over amended form S. 3225.
PETE SCHOENINGH,
President, North Powder Center Union County Farm Bureau.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Vale Farm Bureau Center urges you oppose farm bill S. 3225.
BEN JUSTUS,
Chairman.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We urge you to oppose farm administration bill, S. 3225, calling for tighter farm control.
Mr. and Mrs. FORD NELSON.
VALE, OREG.

LA GRANDE, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Urge vote against Senate bill 3225. Unfair.
F. M. KOVACH.

HOLDHILL, OREG., *May 22, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We do not favor Senate bill 3225 and amendment or substitute.
ERNEST RADOMSKE,
Chairman, County Farm Bureau.

IMBLER, OREG., *May 12, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Union County Farm Bureau opposes return of administration amendments to Senate farm bill S. 3225.
H. CLAYTON FOX.

BAKER, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Not in favor compulsory farm regulations, especially administration's bill. Prefer S. 3225, or better, Benson plan.
JACK WILSON,
Chairman, Livestock Committee, Northpowder Center Union; County Farm Bureau, Northpowder, Oreg.

YAMHILL, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Get the Government out of agriculture. Vote "no" on S. 3225.
WALDRON JOHNSON.

HOOD RIVER, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We urge you to minimize Government control in S. 2786 as much as possible.
ROBERT O. TALLMAN.

HOOD RIVER, OREG., *May 20, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Violently oppose S. 2786, counting on you to vote "no."
SIDNEY BABSON.
PARKDALE, OREG.

HOOD RIVER, OREG., *May 20, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Urge you to vote "no" on S. 2786. It is step in wrong direction.
R. W. ARENS.
PARKDALE, OREG.

HOOD RIVER, OREG., *May 20, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Please vote "no" on S. 2786. It gives Secretary of Agriculture too great power.
J. P. BOOPER.
PARKDALE, OREG.

LA GRANDE, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I oppose S. 3225, and all of the neighbors I have contacted are definitely opposed.
BERNAL HUG, Jr.
ELGIN, OREG.

LA GRANDE, OREG., *May 23, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
I and others in community are strictly against farm bill S. 3225. Must eliminate controls.
R. K. WALLER.
ELGIN, OREG.

YAKIMA, WASH., *May 23, 1962.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Am against farm bill's compulsory quota provision regards feed grain and poultry. Maintain free enterprise.
FRANK and MARIE DENSEL.
HERMISTON, OREG.

UNION COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Island City, Oreg., March 28, 1962.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR MR. MORSE: Union County Farm Bureau legislative committee representing the members here oppose S. 2786 because such rigid controls of production and marketing as proposed would reduce farm efficiency and remove much of their incentive.

This bill calls for a major extension of Government efforts to fix farm prices and restrict or ration the right to produce farm products. Individual farmers themselves should be left the opportunity to make adjustments for changing conditions.

Generally, we oppose the excessive power or authority this bill would grant the Secretary of Agriculture. Specifically, we oppose the power to determine the amount of national marketing quota and national acreage allotment; the amount the national quota is to be reduced to permit disposal of CCC stocks; the portion of estimated exports to be covered by export certificates and the value of such certificates, and the levels of price support for the three kinds of wheat—domestic, food-export and noncertificated.

The controls proposed by S. 2786 would lead to inefficiency rather than efficiency. The future of agriculture lies in producing for the market, in producing the things for which consumers indicate a preference by the way they spend their money in the marketplace. This means that the price system must be allowed to guide changes in production and consumption.

With these points in mind the members of Union County Farm Bureau strongly urge your support in opposing this bill.

The following is a brief outline of a program which we feel would make for a more free and prosperous agriculture:

Farm Bureau favors a practical, voluntary land retirement program to accelerate the adjustment of farm production to effective market demand.

It would call for legislation to:

1. Provide opportunity for the renewal of expiring conservation reserve contracts.

2. Authorize new long-term contracts for cropland retirement on purely voluntary, competitive basis.

3. Remove from production the additional cropland, if any, necessary to balance output and market demand on an annual contract basis, as a qualification for price support on certain commodities.

Very truly yours,
CLAYTON FOX.
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

SUMMERVILLE, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR SIR: I urgently ask you to oppose Senate bill 3225, the administration farm bill.

I sincerely believe this drastic approach to our farm problem could do nothing but entirely upset our farm economy.

Again, I urge your opposition to this bill.

Respectfully submitted.
HENRY W. FRIES.

SUMMERVILLE, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR SIR: We sell 650 market hogs each year and we do not feel the Government is honest or fair competition. I am opposed to compulsory Government control of farming, particularly the proposed administration feed grains section of Senate bill 3225.

This country was built through private enterprise initiative and we should do nothing to kill this drive by private citizens willing to risk everything they own in order to produce food and fibre.

We feel the wheat allotment program has not proven flexible enough to allow farmers here to take advantage of the need for soft white wheat. We are aware that we could produce more soft white wheat if it weren't for rigid Government controls.

Therefore, I am opposed to the proposed compulsory farm program as recommended by the present administration.

Vote "no" to S. 3225 (formerly S. 2768).

Thank you,
GRANT HENDERSON.

ALICEL, OREG., *May 21, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR SIR: Senate bill 3225, the blueprint for socialized farming, is not in the best interest of the farmers.

Other countries who are suffering under government control of food production are an example that we would be taking a backward step if we were to approve of the administration's proposals for agriculture.

Your help in defeating this bill will be appreciated. The farmers can and will adjust to the law of supply and demand if given a chance to operate freely.

For instance, I have a large family (seven children) to support. It would be impossible for me to provide even the necessities for them if we are forced to curtail even a small part of our farming. The wheat problem is an example of what happens when government dictates what, where, and how much we can plant. Let's leave it up to the managers (owners) of the land to use it as they feel practical. We do not need socialism in America.

Please vote "no" to S. 3225 (was S. 2768).

Yours truly,
HOWARD J. HENDERSON.

HERMISTON, OREG., *May 20, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
DEAR SIR: The following is in reference to the Senate farm bill S. 3225. I sincerely hope you will direct your efforts to the defeat of this bill as it is not good for the overall agriculture program or the public's interest.

1. This bill is in direct opposition to the basic desire of a farmer. Most farmers wish to be independent businessmen and produce from the soil the crops best fitted to their soil and those they can produce most efficiently.

2. Because of continued additional acreage cuts and restrictions most wheat farmers are now operating inefficiently. We have a great deal invested in equipment which

is not being used to capacity and many cannot maintain their help full time. We are gradually being squeezed down to the point that we can't stay in and we can't get out.

3. Because of the high support price on wheat many acres in nontraditional wheat areas are now producing wheat with very high yields due to the use of fertilizers and irrigation. This bill will not eliminate these areas and their production accounts for the majority of our surplus.

4. This bill does not treat equally the traditional wheat areas, which use summer fallow, with those areas which have an annual crop. For this reason, the choice between a 2-year extension of the present emergency program and a wheat certificate program is no choice. To properly farm summer fallow areas our costs and operations are the same as if cropped but without the crop income.

I believe Senate bills S. 2823 and S. 2822 are more sound and would be more realistic in solving our agriculture problem. I have thought of you as one who has always stood for the rights of individuals and I believe now is the time for you to take a definite stand against strict Government-controlled agriculture as opposed to the farmer's individual rights. I feel that the threat by Government to farmers to conform to their program or face bankruptcy because of surplus dumping is intolerable.

I feel that any attempt to put strict production controls on the dairy farmer would not only be unworkable but would be disastrous to this industry.

I sincerely hope you will consider the above comments and I again recommend defeat of Senate bill S. 3225.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the 1962 Yearbook of Agriculture, "After 100 Years," if you still have any available.

Sincerely yours,

S. HAROLD BEACH.

IMBLER, OREG., *May 20, 1962.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was surprised to learn yesterday that S. 2225, which I believe is the number of the administration farm bill, had been reported out of committee and was scheduled for consideration on the Senate floor tomorrow. I have read this bill and have read much of the comment and argument both for and against it. I believe this to be an extremely dangerous piece of legislation. That is why I was surprised it came out of committee and was scheduled for such speedy floor action.

This program takes us in the wrong direction. First, it freezes the production of each commodity that comes under the allotment program right where it is. We have already had too much of this. Example: (1) The Northwest could sell more white wheat, but we can't produce it and we are prevented selling what we do have by the Secretary of Agriculture. The allotment program effectively keeps the Northwest from producing wheat that is wanted and keeps other regions producing wheat that is not wanted. (2) Cotton: The same process is working. When Mr. Nehru was here 6 months or so ago he tried to buy a substantial amount of quality cotton, but while we have lots of cotton our Secretary of Agriculture had to tell Mr. Nehru that we were short of good cotton and could not fill his order. As with wheat, the areas that can produce the kind of cotton Mr. Nehru and most of our own industry wants is held down and the areas producing the less desirable kinds on today's markets are helped stay in production. Both commodities are froze where they are with no chance of making necessary adjustments to meet changing markets and demands. Suppose some years back we had required every manufacturer who had a history of making farm wagons or harness for draft horses during a given period to continue with those products instead of changing to something that was needed more. Ridiculous comparison, perhaps, but the same idea.

Second, it puts each farm in a straitjacket. My own operation consists of 50 to 60 Hereford cows, 150 to 200 hogs per year, wheat has run 112 to 118 acres since allotments became effective, most years about 50 acres of seed peas grown under contract, with hay, pasture, and feed grain to match the livestock. About half our land is subject to flood some years, only part of it is satisfactory for pasture because of the location of the water, and about half of it is unsatisfactory for peas. Now, put all the grain crops under allotment; figure out a nonsoil depleting base to be kept just right (it has to be big enough but you are afraid to let it go over the minimum, especially when you are already high as I am; because you never know what year will be picked for a base for some new version of a program); decide where you can put your diverted acres to raise the least hell with things if you get a flood or some other unpredictable thing happens (and in my instance the diverted acres will have to be fenced hog tight because our hogs have the run of the ranch from about August 15 until spring). Add all these circumstances together and you can see why farmers are objecting to this "straitjacket" type of program.

I agree with Mr. Freeman that the size of our agricultural plant must be cut. I do not agree that the best way to get all the cut is to cut a corner off each farm. This retires the land but leaves the other factors of production, labor, and capital, to be applied to the remaining land thus partly nullifying the expected results of the cut. I think a large part of the reduction could be obtained voluntarily if whole units were allowed to go out. This would retire all the factors of production—not just one. It would leave remaining units more efficient.

Third. This legislation places too much power in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. Reflect for a moment the power that office has over our entire food supply, in the production and marketing fields, under this type of legislation. I am not questioning the integrity of anyone, but I do question the ability of any human mind to administer such a far-reaching program as is contained in this bill without developing more and more of the inequities and dislocations we have seen develop under our previous farm programs—much less complicated than this one. I am enclosing an article appearing in a recent farm magazine which illustrates these points better than I can.

If you have read this far, Senator MORSE, I wish to apologize for not writing more briefly. However, I feel very strongly about this. I think there is more reason for the farmer to be discouraged today than there was in the 1930's. At that time we always had the feeling that we would work our way out to something better. But today it looks like we are sure to go under the hammer of big Government bureaucracy where all our business and economic problems will be drug through the quagmire of political bickering. From this there is no return. I am mindful of the many good things that has been accomplished with the aid of Government in the field of agriculture. But when Government tries to concern itself with individual farm and commodity detail to the extent envisioned in the pending agricultural legislation I see nothing but trouble for everyone.

Sincerely yours,

BEN L. ROBINSON.

COVE, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The administration's farm program is in reality offering the farmer an ever devaluating dollar in return for the freedoms his forefathers fought and died for. Which do we value, our freedom or an easy dollar?

The farm products that the Government has interfered with are the ones that are in trouble today. The farm products that have not been tampered with are in a more healthful economic situation. The Government should ease the surplus and ease away from supports and controls.

Sincerely,

M. M. LEWIS,
Rancher, Wheat and Cattle.

ENTERPRISE, OREG., *May 20, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Farming offers a man such a freedom as no other form of life. Now some officeworkers have come up with a plan to destroy the farmer's freedom.

Let's have supply and demand. The cattleman makes a good living without price supports and allotments.

We are opposed to the proposed Freeman farm bill in its entirety.

Sincerely,

NORMAN and DOLORES BEACH.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words with respect to the pending amendment and the reason for it.

For the past 5 years the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been attempting to strike from the present law the 55-million-acre minimum which was fixed in 1938 when the wheat law became effective. As the law now reads, the Secretary of Agriculture is prevented from curtailing the production of wheat below the minimum national allotment of 55 million acres.

When that law was enacted in 1938 the production of wheat was 13.2 bushels per acre. Today the production of wheat has increased to 26.2 bushels per acre. We are still confronted with the same minimum acreage provided in the law. That, to my way of thinking, has accounted for the enormous surpluses of wheat which have been facing our country for quite some time.

Since the war the United States has been accumulating wheat to the point that today there are on hand 1.2 billion bushels, a little more than a year's supply. The money tied up in the wheat now on hand aggregates $2.5 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What we seek to do is to provide for a new approach on the wheat program. We are desirous of changing the present law.

There is proposed some permanent legislation referred to as the two-price system, which I believe will work. An amendment was submitted by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to give an option to farmers, to vote either for the permanent program which we seek to provide under the terms of the bill, or for a continuation of the emergency program, which is in effect this year, for 2 years thereafter. At the end of those 2 years we would revert to

the old law which has given us so much trouble.

The object of my amendment is to strike out that alternative, because to me it would be senseless for us to authorize the temporary program for 2 more years, since it would cost the taxpayers, according to the most recent estimate $333 million per year to reduce wheat production by about 100 million bushels. In other words, it would cost the Government $3.30 per bushel to curtail production of 100 million bushels of wheat per year.

The emergency program, under the Senator's proposal could be extended for 2 more years. Worst of all, after the 2 years had elapsed with very little reduction in our surpluses of wheat we would revert to the old law which has caused us such expense.

Senators should by all means vote for a permanent program. They did so in the past. Three or four years ago we succeeded in passing a law which would have reduced the minimum acreage from 55 million to as low as 42 million, but unfortunately the bill was vetoed by the President. The next year, in 1960, the Senate passed another bill that would have had the same effect, but somehow our friends across the Capitol did not favor it, and I understand that much pressure was exerted through certain channels not to bring the wheat bill up. So the effort of the Senate to reduce acreage in keeping with what we believe is necessary to produce what we need has failed. Now we have ample opportunity to accomplish that objective and thereby decrease the cost of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to squeeze some of the fantasy out of the administration's proposals for new farm programs. I should like to devote myself particularly to the promises that the program would cost less and less, until it would cost nothing further. The administration might as well go further and say that eventually the program would bring in enough money to the Treasury to pay the national debt, because their conclusions and proposals are that fantastic.

The administration's proposal would require all of our wheat and feed growers producing over a certain amount to go into the program. Last year more than 40 percent of the feed grain producers participated in the program for feed grains. Next year all farmers would be required to participate. Last year the program cost $825 million in payments and administrative expenses alone. We can conclude that if it cost $825 million to bring in 40 percent of the farmers, it would cost a great deal more to bring in nearly all of the farmers.

But the administration goes further than that. We are told, "Next year we will make generous payments to the farmer for not producing, not only for 1 year, but for 3 years." What would the increased cost be? In the first place, thousands of police would be required to handle the program, to police most of the farms of America, at least half to two-thirds of all farms. Several thousand employees would be required in order to begin to do the job of policing the farms, the handlers, and the processors. Certainly those employees would not quit their jobs at the end of the 3-year period. They would be in office for life. The proposal is one for job perpetuation. Under the program which was in effect from 1958 to 1961 the Department was beginning to find that there were many employees whose services were not necessary, so the proposed program would not only perpetuate all the jobs now in the Department but would also create a need for many thousands more.

Generous payments were promised to the farmers. Last year the Department paid the growers of grain sorghum and corn alone $782 million. To that amount should be added probably $50 million in administrative costs.

It is estimated that under the proposed program corn and feed grain farmers would be paid $500 million the first year, $400 million the second year, and $300 million the third year, which would be 1965. The wheatgrowers would be paid $250 million for 1963, $200 million for 1964, and $175 million for 1965 for diverting acreage.

If $782 million did not suffice for corn and grain sorghum last year, how would $1,200 million suffice for the next 3 years?

Of course, the answer is that the producers would receive a steadily increasing price for the commodity.

But how would that program fit in with the pledges of the administration to the consumer that costs are not to be raised? It is assumed that no costs of the dairyman and poultryman and livestock producer would be raised, although the farmer would receive a much higher price for his wheat, his corn, his sorghum, and his oats. The fact is that the dairyman, the poultryman, and the beef producer would pay a much higher price for his feed. It is said that the consumer would not pay any more. That statement is sheer nonsense. The entire proposal is so fantastic that it is almost impossible to analyze it.

Anyone wtih a primary school education—he would not even have to have a sixth-grade education—would realize how fantastic is the proposal.

The amendment would require all the giveaway wheat and all wheat sold under Public Law 480 to be included in the primary market. With such wheat included in the primary market, it could not help but mean an added cost, because certificates eventually paid out of the Federal Treasury would be issued for all of the giveaway export wheat.

It is the announced intent of the proponents of the plan to get the price as near as possible to 90 percent of parity, or $2.20 a bushel. Obviously that would also cause the certificate to cost more. After certificates are issued for the export wheat, then under the Government giveaway programs the Government would proceed to give the wheat away; and the higher value placed on the wheat under the program would mean a material addition to the export costs. The added export cost could run into several hundred million dollars of expense.

The way to judge the promises of persons or departments is to look at past performances. Let us look at last year's performance under the special emergency feed grain program. We were told that there would be a 500-million-bushel reduction in the carryover of corn and sorghum, but on January 25 of this year the Department had to admit that the carryover of corn and sorghum would probably be reduced about 210 million bushels.

On April 1, 1961, the Commodity Credit Corporation had commodities with a book value of $5.7 billion. A year later, on April 1 of this year, the book value of the commodities being carried was $6.1 billion. Besides, last September, in order to hold down apparent costs, it was decided, in order to make the transaction look better, to discontinue the practice of carrying storage and other charges as a part of the value of the commodity.

The Department points this year toward selling 785 million bushels of corn and feed grains out of CCC stocks. What is not emphasized is the fact that it expects to take into Commodity Credit holdings this year 800 million bushels of corn and grain sorghum from the 1961 crop.

But the real joker is that the public is not told that the 785 million bushels of corn and feed grains being sold was taken in at a cost of $1.06 a bushel for corn, and the 800 million bushels that will be taken in this year are costing $1.20 a bushel for corn, with a corresponding higher rate for grain sorghum.

Furthermore, some may think that we are foolish or ignorant enough to assume that it does not cost anything to move the commodities in and out of storage. I do not believe that transportation and handling are free yet. Certainly, the shipment of 34 million bushels of wheat from Kansas to Texas to be stored was not a free job. Shipping 20 million bushels of sorghum to the California coast to be put into permanent storage was not done free of cost to the Government. So we would have to add the cost of moving grain in and out of Government storage to the cost of the 1961 program. The estimates of savings over the previous program are inaccurate and misleading.

They are based on what would have been produced, rather than on what actually was produced. They ignore the fact that farmers had indicated an intention to plant several million acres less of corn, and they use such estimates for purposes of convincing Congress. They also use the same acres twice. Corn acreage was used for the production of soybeans, and then, in the estimate of savings to the Government that was supposed to result, the Department includes the same acres as if they had been planted to corn.

How they can get anyone to believe it, I do not know. Certainly they cannot get me to believe it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield myself 1 more minute.

The program last year resulted in a big increase in farm income, it is claimed. However, those people who make that claim failed to inform the public that that big increase in farm income came during the months of January, February, and March, before they had a chance to upset the previous program, which was working, and put into effect a program that will not work.

The 1961 feed grain program failed. If I had time, I would submit a great many figures to show where they have been misrepresenting to the public. I do not want to take the time away from my colleagues in the Senate. I merely wish to say that this program which is now being proposed for wheat and for feed grains will cost infinitely more than the old program, or a simple extension of the program which was in effect last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it would be of great interest to anyone who is interested in the farm program to read an excellent article entitled "A Farm Plan That You Run," written by Claude W. Gifford, in the June 1962, issue of the Farm Journal. It is an exposition of a substantial land retirement program. It shows the economics of it and clearly sets out that this is the most feasible and proper plan before us at this time. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

A FARM PLAN THAT YOU RUN

(By Claude W. Gifford)

Do farmers have to take compulsory quotas, as the administration is suggesting? Or is there another way to cut production and improve incomes?

There is, say three Purdue farm economists. They are the main authors of a remarkable publication in which no less than 23 State agricultural colleges were involved. The three economists are: J. Carroll Bottum, John O. Dunbar, and Richard L. Kohls. The publication is called "Land Retirement and Farm Policy."

The method they suggest is a voluntary land-retirement program, in which the Government would make it attractive enough for farmers to retire 80 million acres.

We've dabbled at land retirement before, but never really in earnest. The acreage reserve became a drouth relief program. The conservation reserve didn't bite deep enough to be effective. The feed grain program isn't getting long-range adjustments.

The voluntary plan that the Purdue economists propose is outlined at the top of this page. It is so significant that Farm Journal sent me to ask the questions you yourself would ask.

Then you believe that we have to really cut production in order to have higher farm prices and farm incomes?

KOHLS. Most everyone agree on that. The argument is over four ways of doing it: with a free market, compulsory quota controls, mandatory land retirement, or with a voluntary land-retirement program.

We think the voluntary land-retirement program should be seriously considered. It is the least painful, the cheapest, and keeps the most freedom.

How much would the payments run per acre in a voluntary program?

BOTTUM. We retired 28½ million acres in the conservation reserve with a national average cost of $11.85 per acre. And farmers offered another 3½ million acres at the time. If we had taken all 32 million acres, this would have cost $379 million per year. But you have to take more acreage to be really effective.

DUNBAR. We could retire an additional 50 million acres by offering $16 to $18 per acre rent. People would stand in line to get in. That would cost the Government about $850 million—a total of $1¼ billion for the 82 million acres. To be safe, let's say it would cost $1½ billion to retire 80 million acres and get it into grass, timber, watershed development, and recreation.

But wouldn't the Government just get low-producing land; wouldn't you have to retire some good, high-producing land, too?

BOTTUM. Yes; you take out poor land first. But that's not bad. You not only retire the most production at the lowest cost—but this is the land that should be retired and put into other uses.

In a voluntary land-retirement program, farmers can either raise the crop or rent the land to the Government. They'll do what they think is best for them. In Indiana, it costs about $46 per acre to plant and harvest a corn crop on 50-bushel land. On 90-bushel land, the cost is around $56. Figuring corn at $1.10 a bushel, the net return on the 50-bushel land would be $9 per acre; the net on 90-bushel land, $43.

It takes about a five-times-larger rental payment to get the 90-bushel land into the program. So, with other things equal, you can retire around 5 acres of the lower producing land (about 250 bushels of production) for the same cost as retiring each acre (90 bushels of production) of the better land.

What kind of crops would be retired on the 80 million acres?

DUNBAR. It would follow somewhat the same pattern as the 28½ million acres that were put in the conservation reserve. About 15 million of those 28½ million acres, or 53 percent, came out of feed grain and soybeans; 17 percent out of hay and pasture; 11 percent out of wheatland; 9 percent was idle and summer fallow land; and 3 percent came out of southern allotment crops—cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco.

If you went up to 80 million acres, you'd get a large proportion of the high-profit crops. For instance, the 3 million acres of wheatland that were retired in the 28½ million in the conservation reserve would increase substantially. You'd also take a much bigger bite out of southern allotment crops.

How much would this cut overall production? And would this reduce the surplus crops—or all crops?

BOTTUM, DUNBAR, AND KOHLS. We estimate that it would reduce farm output about 5 to 8 percent a year. This is ample when you consider that the CCC accumulated about 2½ percent of our yearly production between 1953 and 1959.

Farmers would soon adjust voluntarily from one crop to another, keeping supplies and prices in reasonable balance. Even a strict control program wouldn't come up with precise adjustments commodity by commodity.

Would the bidding be similar to what was tried in some States in the 1958 conservation reserve?

DUNBAR. It would be an improvement in that the county committee would suggest a "fair" rental so that you would have a guide. You could then bid your farm in lower than this if you wanted to.

We'd suggest a premium for signing whole farms and for longer sign-ups. The same land should be retired for the life of the contract. The idea is to get land into other uses, not just rotate it around in a crop program.

Why take out whole farms rather than part farms across the board as in the feed grain program?

BOTTUM. You retire more production at lower costs when you take out whole farms; and you help more people make changes. Some farmers would retire from farming earlier; others would use their land-retirement payment as security while getting located in a job or in a small business.

The free market, or tight controls, would both force people out of farming. With a voluntary program, you help those people who want to leave.

Would acreage payments have to be boosted each year to keep up with increased yields? And would this program call for perpetual cost, year after year, with no chance of shucking it?

DUNBAR. We'd expect that after the major adjustments were made, we could gradually reduce the cost.

It will be easier for the Government to ease out of this program than out of quota controls.

As an individual, you can stay out of a voluntary land-retirement program—or you can sign up and leave when your contract expires. You decide, not the Government.

What about the charge that retiring whole farms is hard on local businesses, and ties up land that young fellows want to buy or rent?

BOTTUM. Young fellows can see the land sitting idle and, of course, this irritates them. But if someone doesn't retire land, no one will make much money, and young farmers will have a harder time getting started. Under a voluntary land-retirement program, the owner often will retire earlier and will sell his land sooner than he otherwise would.

Slightly more than 70 percent of the 28½ million acres in the conservation reserve was from whole farms. For social and political reasons, the total land in any one county could be limited.

KOHLS. Local businesses in some areas will have to adjust under any program, or under none.

On the optimistic side, a voluntary land-retirement program will put more money in rural communities—from payments and the overall desirable effect on farm prices and incomes.

What does this program do for the man who doesn't go in the program—and for livestock farmers?

DUNBAR. Every bushel of grain that you take out reduces the supply by that much—and this reduces the competition for the man who doesn't go in the program. Since some pasture and roughage land would be retired, this will reduce the number of cows and help dairymen and beef raisers all across the country.

Livestock farmers who also raise crops would benefit from land-retirement payments and from higher crop prices. Higher feed prices will indirectly reduce livestock numbers and raise livestock prices.

Some city folks say that land retirement is paying farmers for doing nothing—a payment for "rocking on the porch." How could you convince them—and Congress—that we ought to put up the money for this program?

KOHLS. Land retirement is "readjustment compensation" for some farmers—similar to unemployment compensation for city people. It's in the same category as urban renewal in the cities, slum clearance, job retraining, and aid for businesses and labor that are hurt by lower tariffs.

Agriculture is already doing a great deal on its own. Through its tremendous efficiency

and willingness to earn less, it is giving society its food at low cost.

Nowadays, society says—and Congress concurs—that we as individuals no longer have to pay the entire cost of adjusting to economic forces beyond our control.

BOTTUM. Congress is going to have some kind of farm program. Let's hope that it will be one that will now help the problem—instead of making it worse, as in the past. There wouldn't be so many complaints if the money spent really helped solve the problem.

You believe, then, that voluntary land retirement would help preserve farmers' freedom?

KOHLS. Yes; and that's important. Managerial freedom is what runs the efficient, high-producing "engine" in our agriculture. Russia and Red China wish they had it. Ours isn't the result of just monetary incentive; it's the freedom incentive that's important.

If we don't save that, all the land that we have in this country won't be enough for the future.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I have long favored farm price supports. I believe that as a nation we long ago came to recognize that they are necessary to preserve some semblance of balance in our economy. Back during the 1930's, we had a very bad imbalance in income. In 1929 the farm economy collapsed. Shortly after that we had a great national depression.

Farm supports were talked of long before this time. In the 1920's, the first farm price support legislation ever passed by Congress was legislation sponsored by Senator McNary, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, later Republican leader of the Senate, and still later our party's candidate for Vice President.

On the House side, Congressman Haugen, a Republican, then chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, jointly sponsored the same legislation.

I am proud of their record as Republicans.

The first price support program ever put into effect was that under the Hoover Farm Board. It was under the Hoover Farm Board that the price of wheat and corn was first pegged. It was an attempt to do something about low farm prices. I cite this only as an example of the need for this kind of legislation. I believe that when we have programs such as these and we build up surpluses, farmers must accept some controls. However, I believe that we should use controls sparingly and only when absolutely necessary.

One of the features of the wheat certificate plan now pending before the Senate is that it would impose considerable controls. I am not opposed to this part of the plan. I do believe that the plan goes farther than it should in controls and is much more complicated than it should be. Had the bill we are considering today been the program sponsored by the Grange, the simple two-price system, I would gladly and wholeheartedly support it, and we would have little trouble getting such a program through Congress today. While the proposed pending certificate plan has many fine features, it is difficult to explain to the farmers of the Nation.

It is for that reason that I doubt the wisdom of trying to present this plan to the farmers in this very short remaining time between now and their wheat referendum, which could not possibly be held later than the middle of July.

I am opposed to the present motion by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], which would eliminate the choice that farmers would have of choosing between the program now in effect for another 2 years or the wheat certificate plan. I do not believe it is unreasonable to give farmers this choice. The corn farmers had almost exactly the same choice some 4 years ago, when they chose between the present law and the plan that was proposed at that time. In the referendum the farmers chose the program now in effect that allows 65 percent price support and no production controls. This law has temporarily been set aside for the feed grain program now in effect.

I do hope that the motion of my good friend from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, will be rejected, because I feel in the short time between now and the referendum the farmers would not have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the complicated wheat certificate plan. As I said, it does have a great deal of merit, and I would like to see it tried out sometime. However, it would be in the best interest of the country if the farmers could have the choice now in the bill and more time to consider the wheat certificate plan.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have no argument with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when it comes to a permanent wheat program. I have for years advocated a permanent wheat program. I really have no argument at all.

My difference in view, however, so far as it relates to a difference between him and myself, lies in the fact that I do not believe that the proposed certificate plan in the bill can be put into effect without a great period of education. For that reason I shall support the committee proposal and vote against the chairman's pending amendment.

The certificate plan is not the same plan we introduced originally, for which I secured the approval of the Senate by a vote of 54 to 32 in 1936. It has many fine features. It can be sold to the wheat producer, but I do not believe it can be sold if the bill is not enacted until after July 1. I can see some reason why it might be considerably later than July 1. To spring this on the wheatgrowers of this Nation, as they are preparing the ground for seeding, would be most unfortunate, if we are really interested in giving them a permanent program. That is the reason why I am taking this time today to discuss this program in this section of the wheat bill, in which, as I have said, I have been greatly interested for many years.

I am hopeful that permanent wheat legislation can be enacted. The chairman has brought out some excellent features. I have no doubt that after an experience of a year or so, some changes will be proposed, and I am confident that the chairman will work with us to make whatever changes may be necessary.

I return to the section relating to the educational program. It is in the interest of the Department of Agriculture, as I know it is in the interest of the State ASC committees and the county committees, to enable farmers to have sufficient time in which to become thoroughly acquainted with the provisions of the bill.

Yesterday, in the debate on the feed grain amendment, the question of substituting wheat on feed grain acres or feed grain on wheat acres was discussed at considerable length. At that time I pointed out that in case a mandatory feed grain program were defeated in a referendum, it appeared most unlikely that the Secretary would permit the seeding of wheat on feed grain acres, but that with a voluntary feed grain program the Secretary undoubtedly would permit such a substitution on farms participating in the feed grain program.

However, a strict interpretation of the substitution clause contained in the proposed feed grain amendment, would not preclude the Secretary from permitting this substitution in special or peculiar circumstances upon his determination that the objectives of the program would not be jeopardized.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD some views of farmers of Greeley County, Kans., and also a letter signed by hundreds of farmers in the western part of Kansas regarding some of the problems with which they are confronted in an area which has summer fallow and limited acreages for feed. The letter discusses the benefits of the substitution clause.

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

GREELEY FARMERS' VIEWS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Chester Johnson wrote a letter giving some of his views on farm legislation, and George Stafford, secretary to Senator CARLSON, asked for comments on a State committee's reply. This led to an impromptu meeting on Thursday evening, March 29, at the courthouse in Tribune, to ascertain opinions of those present with regard to the present Federal farm programs as they apply to Greeley County.

There were representatives from all parts of the county present, although many who had conflicts could not be present, said Johnson. All who attended were actual farmers. There were about 25 present, and State Representative Jess Taylor and Robert Brunswig presided.

The minutes of the meetings were sent to the two Kansas Senators, and the two Representatives from this area.

The minutes of the meeting in Tribune were printed in the April 10 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after Senator CARLSON made a short speech and said, "Mr. President, as this session of Congress considers farm legislation, I think it is important that we get the views of actual farm operators who work and cooperate with the programs day in and day out." He then asked that the minutes of the meeting be

made a part of the RECORD, and they read as follows:

"It is believed that a large majority of those present were agreed as follows: That the present acreage allotments for Greeley County are inequitable for two reasons:

"(A) By 1951 it had become a standard practice in Greeley County to summer fallow nearly all land which was to be planted to wheat. Therefore, the acreage available to wheat had been reduced by approximately one-half before the period used for apportionment started. Other areas have adopted the practice at a later period and thereby increased their production on the larger bases apportioned to them.

(B) Drought conditions and early spring rainouts materially curtailed feed grain production on many farms in the country during the years 1959 and 1960 which were the years used as a basis for feed grain program allotments.

This point might be summarized by stating that in this particular area the feasibility of planting any particular crop during any particular growing season is dependent upon the vagaries of the weather. This statement is much more true in western Kansas than it is in eastern Kansas. Because of the well-known wind erosion problem farmers in Greeley County need more flexibility than is permitted under the present program.

It is believed that the above-mentioned inequities could be corrected and the desired flexibility obtained by adoption of the following:

First. Readjustment of feed grain base, using Greely County ASC records on the 10 years preceding the first year of feed grain controls.

Second. Combining the wheat and all feed grain bases, including milo, barley, rye, silage or feed, after readjustment of feed grain base.

Third. Permit the planting of any crop or combination of crops on the combined base. Only one harvest of the base acres to be permitted in 1 year. But, for example, if entire base is planted to wheat and wheat were destroyed before feed grain planting time, feed grains could be planted on base acres and harvested.

Fourth. It is believed that there is no surplus of the quality of wheat that is normally produced in Greeley County. Therefore producers should be permitted to plant all of their combined base acres to wheat if they desired to do so. They would then be permitted to sell the wheat produced on their wheat base on the open market under price supports. However, if production on the wheat base acres falls below the established Greeley County average they will be permitted to market enough of the wheat produced by them, on non-wheat-base acres, to bring them up to the normal Greeley County average. Other non-wheat-base acre wheat could be sold at feed grain prices and under feed grain price supports, or carried over under bond or certificate to be sold in a future crop failure year as milling wheat under the county average quotas.

5. That because of the size of normal operations and the large number of nonresident landowners, each farm should be considered to be a separate unit for the purposes of determining compliance in any program. In other words, some landowners may desire to participate in the program and some may not.

6. That the combined base should not go below 50 percent of the total cultivated acres of any farm.

7. That since wheat harvest in Greeley County normally does not start until around July 1, the plow-up date on excess acreage under the existing wheat program should be extended to June 1.

It is believed the above would:

1. Permit operators to engage in many more desirable soil conservation practices.

2. Permit operators to plan ahead because the suggested program is far less complicated.

3. Reduce problems of administration.

4. Reduce cost to the Government.

5. Not increase surplus.

Congressmen BREEDING and DOLE indicate that it will be some time after Easter before the farm bill is passed.

In a letter, George Stafford remarked that he thought most of the suggestions as reported by the Greeley County group would be incorporated into the wheat bill when it is finally passed.

OAKLEY, KANS., *April 6, 1962.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to express our opinions on the administration farm bill which is being presented to Congress. We believe this program contains many very good points and could become a definite benefit to the western Kansas area. There are some things in the bill that we feel should be more definite and some additions that could be made. We will attempt to explain our stand and would appreciate having your comments on the same.

First of all, we are very much in agreement with the interchangeable base of wheat for feed grains and feed grains for wheat. This would allow us to return to a more normal farming practice and still not be contributing as much surplus of all grains as we have been. In reality, this area would no doubt return to wheat. We realize that we would receive a lower price support for part of our wheat production based on a feed-wheat support price. It is our belief that we can farm wheat more economically than feed grains. This same interchanging base proposition would allow the return of feed grain production to the feed grain area, as it should be. Our concern is the wording in the bill that the Secretary of Agriculture may allow wheat to be grown on a feed grain base. The wording in the pamphlet received by our local ASCS officials stated on page 12, under statement No. 12 that "Wheat could be planted as part of feed grain allotment." We feel that the bill should be worded as the pamphlet and that we be assured of this system. There is no doubt that this would be a contributing factor to favorable support of this bill and if enacted, a favorable vote in the referendum. Examples will follow of why we think interchangeable bases will be a key to the program as it concerns us.

We have the problem of our farms with either a very low feed grain base or none at all. We realize this was caused from the overseeding of wheat in the 2 base years of 1959–60. This was not an uncommon practice in western Kansas and was certainly permitted under the law then existing. Since we do have a very low wheat allotment and wheat is our most profitable crop, it was not surprsing that farmers resorted to this system. Our basis for believing we do have a very low wheat allotment is backed by reference to our example 3, which shows a wheat allotment of 113,111 acres in 1961 compared to a total cropland of 362,134 acres. This reflects a percentage of 31 percent when a comparison is made of allotment to farmland. We believe there are relatively few areas of commercial wheat producers that have less. Our periodic and regular drought periods also contributed to this situation since many producers elected to have excess wheat to cover the year they would not be able to raise a crop or at least a very short crop. We are now faced with a situation that causes these same farmers undue hardship since they followed this route during years it was not an uneconomical thing to do. With the advent of the 1961 feed grain program and now with the new program coming up, we feel something must be done to give our producers a way to participate and exist in their chosen field. It is also understandable and agreed that the overseeder should not be given a better deal than the compliers. We would like to follow a method partially based on the recent change in normal conserving adjustment procedure for Kansas and a plan that the excess wheat farmer did establish a base when he was overseeding.

We do not believe he should receive wheat allotment for overseeding but should receive a feed grain base since the wheat he now has in storage could be considered for all practical purposes as feed grain. An example, using our county as a guide, could be a method of determining the number of acres needed to give farmers an equal chance under the new program and not create additional headaches of more excess wheat being produced, will follow.

The information that has been made available to us concerning this bill has been rather derogatory. It seems that everyone wants to concentrate on the penalty provisions and few expressions are made of what the bill actually contains. We realize that not all things concerning farm legislation can be exactly as we would like to see it. The Farm Bureau bill as presented to Congress seems a rather prohibitive substitute for one that will guarantee us much more and will maintain the businessmen in our small towns. We feel the Farm Bureau bill might put as much or more money in our pockets if we could retire all of our farms but we cannot feel "good" about pushing practically all of our merchants out of business.

Our stand is this—the administration farm bill will work to our advantage, will not increase costs to consumers or taxpayers, will reduce surplus commodities, will give us more freedom to farm as we did before acreage controls, will return us to a normal farming system, will move feed grain and wheat to their appropriate areas and it will not lower our income; in fact, it could increase our income and lower our expenses.

We are signing this as farmers and businessmen and not as members of one particular political party. We believe this is a farm program that can work and ask you to support it and also our requests to make it a better program.

Thanking you for your consideration, efforts, and assistance.

Yours very truly,

FARMERS AND BUSINESSMEN OF LOGAN COUNTY AND NEARBY WESTERN KANSAS COUNTIES.

Please refer your comments and questions to the following individuals if you cannot reply to all those signing:

A. B. Kruse, Oakley, Kans.
Delton W. Hubert, Monument, Kans.
Jack Lewallen, Winona, Kans.

(See examples 1, 2, and 3 following:)

EXAMPLE 1—INTERCHANGEABLE BASES

All examples based on a 600-acre farm:

	Acres
Wheat allotment	200
Feed grain base	200
Summer fallow (normal conserving)	200
Wheat allotment	200
Reduction—20 percent	40
Balance	160
Diverted	40
Feed grain base	200
Probable choice of most of our farmers—30 percent	60
Balance	140
Diverted	60

Normal conserving plus diverted would equal 300 acres. This allows a farmer to plant on our old system of half wheat and half summer fallowing.

160 acres times farm wheat average times 90% times high support price for wheat
10 percent balance at feed grain price or store
140 acres times feed grain price or store for future bad years
Diverted payment:
40 acres times wheat payment
60 acres times feed grain payment

This is our understanding of the proposed legislation and if we are in error, please inform us at once.

EXAMPLE 2—OVERSEEDED FARM IN EITHER 1959 OR 1960

This farm had a 200-acre allotment in 1961.

The 1959 history: 200-acre wheat; 400-acre summer fallow.

The 1960 history: 400-acre wheat; 200-acre summer fallow.

Normal conserving equals 300-acre (unadjusted):

	Acres
Wheat allotment	200
Reduction—20 percent	40
Balance	160
Diverted	40
Can be planted	160
Summer fallowed for next years wheat	160
Cannot be utilized due to cross compliance	280

This man would need 340 acres for his normal conserving and his diverted but would have 440 acres in actual normal conserving.

Since this farm may be adjusted, the normal conserving and his diverted would be 240 acres but with the cross-compliance provision, he still has very little opportunity to produce a crop of any kind.

The above example may seem extreme but we do have cases of this type and quite a few not quite so severe. A very sad situation exists in that he may have overseeded in just the one year and complied in all other years.

EXAMPLE 3

This is a summary of Logan County and what we feel we need to rectify the situation.

Year 1961 used in some cases since wheat allotments will be based on that year and 1962 in some cases since we have actual figures:

1961 total cropland in county	362,134
1961 wheat allotment	113,111
Summer fallow—based on normal conserving adjustment procedure using 36.7 percent of total cropland—36.7 percent represents county average	132,903
1962 feed grain base—using the 5 percent increase allowed under regulations	67,364
1962 barley base	8,865
1962 corn base	1,394
Items below based on CSS-532's:	
Sweet sorghum for dry feed	2,466
Rye	633
Dry edible beans, estimated	250
Oats	35
Total cropland acres	362,134
Total acres in crops and summer fallowing	327,021
Balance	35,113

The above balance would be the feed grain acres needed to bring our farmers into workable units. It goes without saying, that we would settle for less. Since, as our letter states, the excess farms should be willing to settle for something below the farmers in compliance.

This information was obtained from our local ASCS office at the request of the farmers.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the present bill would provide a wheat acreage allotment which would produce sufficient wheat for domestic food, seed, and export requirements, and the normal amount of wheat being used for feed. Certificates will be issued authorizing the sale of wheat into the domestic food and export markets at a fair price of about $2 per bushel. Wheat used for seed and feed will be supported at a much lower price—competitive with other feed grains.

After the farmer has made his required land diversion, he will have his feed grain acres to produce feed. Now, under the certificate plan, with feed wheat priced competitive with other feed grains, it makes no difference in the total feed picture whether the feed grown is barley, grain sorghum, corn or wheat. Thus, the substitution clause is really a key to the successful operation of the certificate wheat plan, because it leaves the farmer free to choose the type of feed his land and equipment is most adapted to produce.

The other major difference between the present bill and the bushel management plan is in the pricing policy. Under this bill, certificated wheat will be supported at between 75 and 90 percent of parity. It is my understanding that the Secretary has stated his intentions of supporting the price of certificated wheat for 1963 at $2 per bushel, and with the limited quantity of producer's wheat which can be sold into the primary market, and with the resale price from CCC stocks at $2.10, the return to growers will be about $2.05 per bushel.

Under my bill, the price support for certificated wheat would have been 75 percent of parity, but the resale price of CCC stocks would have been fixed at parity. Thus, under the bushel plan, returns to growers would approach full parity on the certificated wheat.

These are the only major differences between the wheat section contained in the present bill, and the bushel management plan which was introduced last fall by Senator NEUBERGER and me, and cosponsored by 15 other Senators from the major wheat States.

As I said at the beginning, I am pleased to have an opportunity once again to support a certificate plan on the floor of the Senate. With the one amendment, permitting the substitution of wheat on feed grain acres, or feed grain on wheat acres, this bill will provide a good, long-range solution of our perennial wheat problem.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, all of us are aware that there are three chief issues before the Senate in connection with the farm bill. One relates to wheat, and is the matter of concern in the pending amendment. Another relates to milk. The third concerns feed grains. These issues were also before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I have been a member for 3 years.

In committee, I opposed, as did almost all the other members of the committee, the administration program to impose allocations and quotas on the sale of milk by farmers. I did so because there have never been compulsory controls on the amount of milk which a farmer may sell. I opposed this proposal also because dairy farmers have shown in the past that they can balance the production of milk with the sale and use of dairy products. I opposed the provision, third, because I believe the administration's policy, last year—its unnecessary increase in the support price of milk—was the first cause of the increased production and the present surplus of milk and dairy products.

I mention milk and feed grains because I want to draw some distinctions between them and wheat.

The second question before the Senate will be limitation of the production and sale of feed grains proposed by Senator ELLENDER's amendment, which is the administration proposal. I voted against this proposal in committee, and it was rejected in committee by a 9 to 8 vote. Congress has never imposed compulsory acreage allotments and quotas on feed grains. I oppose the feed grain amendment for if it should be adopted, it would prohibit many farmers from producing grain to be fed out and used on their own farms. It is a radical approach and ought not be adopted by the Congress without much more thought and debate than has been given to it. It is a a serious thing to tell farmers by legislative fiat that they may not produce grain for their own farm needs.

The committee revised the wheat proposal contained in the administration plan which was sent to us. It was modified and improved largely through the efforts of the chairman. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] then offered an amendment, which was adopted by the committee, which would offer farmers a choice.

The amendment of Senator MUNDT provided that farmers could vote for either the revised administration wheat certificate proposal, or for a 2-year extension of the 1962 emergency wheat program. I voted against the Mundt proposal in committee. I shall vote against it today, by supporting the Ellender amendment.

I draw a distinction between wheat and the other items I have discussed, on these grounds: First, there have been no controls on the production and prohibitions against the sale of livestock feed grains and milk. But the whole history of the wheat program since 1938 has been one of mandatory acreage allotments and quotas. They have been approved year after year by wheat farmers voting in the annual referendums.

I do not believe there would be a very clear choice for farmers between the administration's wheat certificate pro-

posal, as modified by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or extension for 2 years of the 1962 program, for both include mandatory allotments and quotas. However, as between the two alternatives, I think the likelihood is that farmers would vote for the program they have now, which is a failure. The national minimum acreage of 55 million acres for wheat, now in the law, below which acreage cannot be reduced, makes the wheat program a built-in failure.

It is argued that we should give wheat farmers a choice. But I believe that after all these years, during which there has been the experience of the present program, perhaps there has been enough experience. We can make the decision that the 1962 emergency program cannot do anything except to continue a failure with the additional cost of land diversion payments, and that we must come to grips with the wheat situation.

A certificate plan was voted by Congress in 1956. Twice since then, in 1959 and 1960, the Senate has adopted modifications of the wheat program designed to reduce acreage by 20 to 25 percent and increase wheat support prices. But the existing program, with its old troubles of surplus production, increasing Government stocks and high costs has dragged on. It would likely be continued under the Mundt proposal.

I summarize my position, which is the position I took in committee: I oppose any compulsory programs for milk or for feed grains because such control programs would be a radical departure from our traditional agricultural practices and philosophy. I think these proposals express an overweening desire on the part of the administration to control farmers completely.

The history of the wheat program has been one of acreage allotments and marketing quotas since 1938, but the program has not worked because of the guaranteed total of 55 million acres. As I see it, the choice offered farmers in the bill as reported would be between a certificate plan which might solve the wheat problem—whether it will or not, I do not know—and the present program, which is a failure and will remain a failure for 2 more years, and which if chosen by farmers would raise great opposition to the whole agricultural program.

For myself, I shall vote for what I believe is the lesser of two evils. I expect to vote for the Ellender amendment.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I concur in the statement of the Senator from Kentucky, especially his comment concerning the lesser of two evils. If the Ellender amendment is adopted—and I intend to support it—I expect to offer a further amendment, which will differentiate among the types of wheat. Unfortunately, wheat is thought of simply as wheat. But there are various types which have different end uses.

I am hopeful that the Senate will be sympathetic to a proposal which will differentiate the various types of wheat, because some types are actually in short supply today. Durum and soft wheat are in short supply, and their acreages should not be cut 20 percent, 30 percent, or whatever percentage is necessary in the overall picture, because such varieties have different end uses.

When the proper place is reached in the parliamentary procedure, I hope I shall have the support of my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The junior Senator from Kentucky has had extensive experience in farming, and also in considering wheat problems from the miller's standpoint. I know he has vast practical knowledge of this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator ELLENDER.

First, I wish to commend him for the great patience he has shown in handling farm legislation this year, and also through the many years during which he has tried to work out a satisfactory agricultural program. He has worked not only for the crops which are of a special interest and importance to the people of his own State, but also he has taken responsibility for agriculture throughout the country. His approach has been a balanced one and a responsible one.

Through recent years he has tried many times to secure the enactment of what we hopefully call a permanent wheat program. However, I am not of the opinion that we can develop a permanent wheat program very soon; that development probably will have to extend through the years. But because of the dedicated work of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, we have come much closer to establishing a sound formula and a sound procedure by which the solution of such problems, particularly the problem of wheat production, may be reached.

I wish to call particular attention to the table which appears on page 18 of the committee report, especially as it relates to the carryover and to the production and the consumption of wheat during the years between 1952 and 1962. The record shows very obviously that we have had a continuing increase in wheat production; and it also shows that there has not been a comparable increase in the use of wheat in the United States.

The record in regard to exports appears to be somewhat encouraging, on its face; but if we consider the fact that much of the exports of wheat have been subsidized—some of this very necessary and desirable in terms of the economics of the problem—we realize that the figures on the export of wheat really reflect a situation which is the result of the enactment of Public Law 480. So, Mr. President, it is clear that we need a program which will result in a reduction of wheat production.

Our concern here is not with milling wheat, inasmuch as in the judgment of some millers this kind of wheat is in short supply. A year or two ago we made special exemptions for Durum wheat; and in this bill we give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to provide sufficient acres and authority to arrange for the production of all the milling wheat necessary in the United States.

The wheat with which we are concerned here is that which on the whole is not used as milling wheat; it is wheat which tends to end up as feed for animals. This is the wheat which, for the greater part, is going into storage bins around the country. It is the production of this kind of wheat which we are attempting to reduce.

I believe that the choice offered by the Senator from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman of the committee, is a fair one. It is one to which the wheatgrowers can respond, taking into account all the economic problems involved and their own rights as producers and as farmers who have devoted their lives and their capital and their efforts to wheat production, and at the same time realizing that they have some public responsibility and duty.

I believe the proposed referendum will have the effect of reducing the production of wheat and reducing the storage costs the Government must now bear; and I believe that when all these factors are taken into consideration, a sound choice will be made by the wheatgrowers and also by the Members of Congress.

It is interesting to note that when this administration took office last year, it proposed that commodity programs be developed and submitted to the farmers and that they be allowed to pass judgment on them by means of indicating their preference; but a great outcry arose over that proposal. It was said that such an arrangement would be almost unconstitutional, and there was comment to the effect that such procedure would mean that Congress would be virtually abdicating its responsibility in connection with the matter.

This year the Secretary proposed specific programs for wheat, feed grains, and dairy products. But now it is said that the farmers must make the choice—even though last year it was said that that should not be done. Now it is suggested that the situation be cluttered up by means of the addition of four or five additional propositions, and that in the meantime the surplus should be allowed to accumulate, the cost to the Government should be allowed to grow, and the time for arriving at a sound program should be postponed.

Mr. President, I say that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is a worthy one which deserves the support of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time required for the quorum call be divided and charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while awaiting one member of the committee who wants to be heard before the time is up, I thought I would address a few observations to the general concept of land adjustment that is carried in the bill. There is an emphasis on the whole question of recreation and the development of recreational facilities by adjusting land out of tillage and making it possible for public bodies, with whatever help is offered, either by dipping into the Bankhead-Jones Act or subsequently into other funds, to make that kind of development possible.

I think, first of all, it is conceded that, as time goes on, a great deal more will have to be done in the field of recreation and recreative land use by the Federal Government. I say that mainly because at some time we are going to have to address ourselves seriously to the general philosophical problem of the constructive use of leisure time.

For a good many years now the general retirement age for people in all walks of life has been steadily becoming lower. I think I can appreciate the time when nobody thought too seriously about retiring until he had reached the age of 75; but as the States and the Federal Government dipped into this field, and as we witnessed the development of private pension funds, we saw that age drop; and there are pressures presently, not only upon industry but upon government as well, for a further lowering of the age.

It was last year or the year before that Congress undertook, in the case of women under social security, to drop the age from 65 to 62. It is proposed now that, with the sacrifice of some benefits, the retirement age for men be lowered to 62 also. There is pressure on the Congress today to lower the retirement age in the case of railroad workers. I think we see it in other industries as well.

As a result, there is coming an increasing population of retirees who must have some constructive way to employ their leisure. It may seem proper simply to say, "That is the easiest thing that confronts humanity," but I think people have discovered that the sudden transition from a rather busy and fruitful life into a life of leisure is not quite so easy as it seems. So something must be done to provide what, for lack of another term, might be called the moral equivalent of work, for then, and only then, can those who have leisure be kept rather happy.

I think the step proposed is one in the right direction, but I am afraid it is in the wrong place. It seems to me when we deal with recreational pursuits, and land use for it, we are dealing in a predominant way with urban appeal and with urban people. As a consequence, it departs somewhat from what a measure of this kind, a farm bill, ought to pursue. That is the reason why I say I think the provision is in the wrong bill. In addition, I believe that if we are to attack the problem seriously it ought to be done on a coordinated and integrated basis.

On occasion I have thought of introducing, and I probably shall yet do so in the future, a proposal to set up in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Recreation. It should be in the Department of the Interior, because related activities come under that Department.

In the Department of Interior there is the management of public lands. In the Department of Interior there is the authority for the general disposition of public lands and of nearly everything that relates to them. In the Department of the Interior there is the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. In that Department also is found the Park Service.

All these in one way or another are related to the outdoors. I can easily see how one could coordinate them and bring them all together so far as a recreational program is concerned, then transferring from other agencies and departments of government, if necessary, the related activities to give the program an integrated and coordinated basis. Of course, the program would have to be implemented with the necessary amounts of money. This would be a direct approach which would be predicated on direct appropriations.

So far as the problem relates to land adjustment, for the purpose of achieving certain agricultural gains and certain agricultural goals, obviously cooperation could be effected between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. The bill indicates it is essentially designed to subserve the recreational needs of the people. It speaks of reservoirs and other things which we identify with recreational pursuits. It probably would have little real agricultural effect. To be sure, some land would be taken out of cultivation. I would rather put that land in the hands of a department or a bureau properly staffed with people who have the necessary background and the necessary touch and talent in this field, thus making them responsible for a program which would work. They could put all the emphasis on it, and could secure whatever other cooperation was necessary in order to make it quite a feasible program.

I believe it should be pointed out, with respect to the adjustment and removal of tillable land and placing it into the hands of public bodies for recreational purposes, that, among other things, the land is to be removed from the tax rolls of the communities involved. That is a fact which must never be forgotten.

That is conjoined with all the other interests which would make this a coordinated program.

In my judgment, the general land adjustment program would fit better into the Department of the Interior. There could be a cooperative effort to bring about whatever goals we must achieve insofar as supply management and the reduction of acreage and production is concerned. I hope that if that is done, certainly it will be done on an entirely voluntary basis.

Compulsion is one of the things which I find difficult to accept in the pending bill. I have not familiarized myself too thoroughly with the wheat provisions of the bill, but we are approaching a kind of compulsory attitude now which is certainly anything but to my liking, and which is a retreat from what I had always hoped would be the real goal, that is, the free market goal for agriculture and its preservation as a way of life for the farmers of the country.

It is rather amazing that it was 30 years ago when I first encountered the word "parity." I remember when the first Agricultural Adjustment Act was considered by the Congress, "parity" was an entirely unknown term on the horizon of the country and in our agricultural lexicon. Other terms came along with it.

That first measure was considered by the Congress when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture. It was hoped then that perhaps the supply could be geared to the use of agricultural products and that, by striking something of a balance, it would be possible to give the necessary leverage to the price mechanism in a free market. After 8 or 9 years that problem was not solved. A substantial income for agriculture had not been achieved. Meanwhile, vast sums of money had been expended on the continuing program.

There came a solution, Mr. President, but it was an unhappy solution indeed, for it was the solution of blood which came in 1941. We could then pretty well forget everything we had learned in the field, all the formats and all the formulas, and we could think only in terms of the "spanking" of the tillable acres of the country; on the ground that we were pursuing a very persuasive thesis, that food would win the war. It was food not only for our own people but also for our military forces. It went further than that; it was food for the military forces of other countries with whom we were allied in that struggle, whose manpower had to be taken from the fields of those countries.

So there was a solution, but at long last that struggle had to come to an end; and it had to be followed by some kind of an adjustment, in the hope that catastrophe in the agricultural field would not descend upon us.

I remember the struggle at that time to find a compromise formula, in the hope that we could somehow extricate ourselves from the distortions of war which affected every segment of the economy, including agriculture. It was hoped we could let ourselves down very easily and resume some kind of normal course.

But we quickly found that the old format, like Banquo's ghost, came back to haunt us. We were in the serious business of trying to equate acres or bushels or bales on the one side with our needs both in the domestic and in the export field on the other. After a long effort, 30 years after having first ventured into that field, we find ourselves confronted with the same old problem and with the same general kind of proposal except for one addition, which is that now we speak a little more lightly when we discuss the so-called compulsive feature.

I think it is one reason why not only Members of both the House and the Senate but also, more importantly, the farm producers of the country find themselves inhospitable to what is before us. How easy it was to talk about compulsion when they were talking about turkeys, the possibility of setting a base and an allotment, and putting it on a national scale. I recall being in Chicago when the turkey raisers were in convention. I know the bile and hostility with which they considered that matter.

Then came the dairy proposal as first submitted by the administration in the original bill. What hostility it created, not to speak of the severe penalties and recordkeeping which was required.

I remember the Secretary's answer when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and he were discussing the question on a TV panel. He passed over the question very lightly by saying that evidently some rather overenthusiastic young gentleman in his shop had written that penalty language into the bill. That is rather cavalier treatment for language of that kind. Such attitude and approach have now descended upon us.

Compulsion is easily come by. But I am sure it will not set well with the farmers and generally with the people of the country. I know how easy it is to say that all of this can be done only if there is a referendum and if farmers vote themselves into it. It would be a kind of self-enslavement. It is pointed out that those who produce peanuts or tobacco have no particular animus toward referendums and toward putting limitations upon their productive efforts.

I believe it should be pointed out, first, that those crops are not generically food products. Second, I point out that only a very limited amount of acreage is involved. If we consider for the moment tobacco acreage, it is a little over 1 million acres, as against 240-odd million acres that are considered in the whole feed grain and wheat field. That is quite a difference. The competitive factor is not involved. So we could hardly draw an analogy there. But compulsion seems to come to the end of the tongue very lightly; and for myself, if that is the best we can do, I want no part of any compulsive effort. I propose, after my feeble observation, to register myself against the measure that is now before us.

Mr. President, I inquire how the time stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to comment in some detail upon the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I support those amendments, the first being called the wheat amendment and the second the feed grain amendment. I do so particularly in the first instance—the wheat amendment—because I think the choices that ought to be offered to the wheat producers, in light of the current supply of wheat, should be narrowed to a program of allotments and a certificate plan, as compared to no allotments and no certificates under an open planning or open acreage program with a maximum of 50 percent of parity price supports.

Some people have said that is a rather tough choice to have to make. My response is that it is a choice that in the long run will be beneficial to the farmer, surely beneficial to the taxpayer, and at the same time will meet the requirements of our domestic consumption of cereal grains, the requirements of our commercial exports, and the requirements of our international commitments.

If such is the case—and the statistical information presented to us by the Department of Agriculture indicates that my statement is true—I believe that the Ellender amendment, which would strike out one of the alternatives in the so-called Mundt proposal in the committee bill, ought to be adopted.

Furthermore, while the voluntary programs which we inaugurated a year ago have been helpful, they have been costly and have not fully met the problem. Under the voluntary programs we have the problem of the so-called noncomplier. He is the one who gets the benefit of a better market because of the cooperation of the cooperators—those who are the compliers—but the same noncomplier who gets the benefit of a better market price, because he is under no obligation due to his failure to sign up, proceeds forthwith to expand his acreage. That is what happened in the feed grain program last year, and it is what has happened in the wheat program.

Another way of putting it is that even though a voluntary program under emergency provisions last year did reduce the overall cost of handling the quantities of feed grains and wheat that we had, and even though the voluntary program did bring increased income to the individual farm operator, that program was limited in its effectiveness in part because the noncomplier—the one which did not cut back his acreage, the one who did not sign up under the provisions of the program—was able to get a free ride. He did not do anything but increase his acreage. He planted more, harvested more, and took a price that was favorably affected by the compliance of the cooperators.

The Ellender amendment seeks to remedy that condition. I think it is the sort of amendment which, if given an opportunity, could and should be exceedingly helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The central advantages of the marketing certificate porgram proposed by both the administration and the chairman of the committee are lower cost to the Government—which is another way of saying to the taxpayer—and greater flexibility for the farmers. The marketing certificates make it possible to limit the price support obligation of the Federal Government by providing a means of distinguishing between wheat for food and export, to be supported at the higher price, and wheat for feed or for export without a subsidy cost to the Government.

The present proposal has been before the Senate in one form or another on other occasions. I am hopeful that Senators who voted for it on other occasions will find it possible to vote for it now.

The certificate provides a practical means for continuing an attractive price support permanently on wheat consumed in this country while keeping the door open for gradually reducing the subsidy on exports over a period of time. That would be done by limiting the volume of marketing certificates issued, as provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. As long as the 1962 wheat program, which is the emergency temporary program, is continued, there will be little prospect of reducing the export subsidy cost to the Government. Nor is there any prospect that farmers can grow wheat as a feed grain in place of sorghum or barley, as both of the key advantages could be gained only by means of the marketing certificate program.

The basic quantity and income comparisons for the wheat marketing certificate program in 1963, compared with the old program in 1961, are as follows: The support price in 1961 was $1.79 a bushel. Under the voluntary program the support price under the certificate plan was about $2 a bushel.

The volume of production will come down substantially. In other words, there will be a saving from $2,228 million to $2,106 million. The carryover will be dropped approximately 200 million bushels. I believe this is the kind of program that we ought to embrace. I conclude on this note, and I ask my chairman if I am right. This program will bring about an orderly reduction in our carryover. It will not bring about a sudden cutoff, but by about 200 million bushels less than the first year, which means less cost for storage, which means less loss on inventory damage, which means less waste of our land resources. Over a period of 3 or 4 years we will reduce our carryover, and at the same time insure adequate reserves for our needs, especially reducing the cost to our taxpayers while at the same time providing a minimum price support of $2 a bushel.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time on this side to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time is involved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. In the ten minutes remaining I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to the issues which are involved in the forthcoming vote. We have had a great deal of discussion about the advantages of the so-called certificate plan for wheat; very little about the basic issue involved in the Ellender amendment.

As I said in my discussion of this subject in Tuesday's RECORD there are a great many wheat farmers who believe that there are advantages in the plan. At the same time, there are also a great many wheat farmers and a great many agricultural economic authorities who believe the plan is not satisfactory or acceptable.

The issue before us is whether we are going to permit the wheat farmers of America themselves to decide whether or not they wish to subject themselves to the functions, to the requirements, and to the authorities of a new proposal.

I confess that I am unable to follow the arguments of those who say, "This is a wonderful program, and this will be a great thing for the wheat farmer, it would protect his income and preserve his freedom, and this is a very attractive program, but we are afraid to submit it together with the present wheat program to a vote of the wheat farmers because we are convinced they will vote it down."

I cannot understand that kind of logic.

It seems to me such a sensible thing to say, "Let us present the program, with all its fine adjectives, and with its attractive statistics, and compare it with the alternative of continuing the present program, which has been working satisfactorily from the standpoint of reducing surpluses, and which has been protecting at least to a reasonable degree the income of the wheat farmer, although still inadequate and still below parity. What in the world is wrong with telling the wheat farmer that he can choose between two alternatives? Why should we tell the wheat farmers that we cannot trust their judgment? Why should we tell the wheat farmer, "We doubt your ability. We think you are too stupid and too selfish and too shortsighted to choose wisely between two possible programs for wheat"?

I am among those Senators who believe that we should not try to run everything from Washington. I say to my southern friends, who are determined to impose these new restrictions upon us, who suddenly have become infatuated with the idea of strict Government controls, that they are flirting with a dangerous undertaking which is certain to come back to plague them later. I say to them, "You may be able to get the votes on this amendment. You may be able to deny the wheat farmers of the North an honest chance to decide which program they want. You may compel them to face the ugly alternative of taking a program that you want them to take or have no price supports. You can do that, but you cannot do it and remain immune from what is going to follow."

I notice already some amendments among this great pile of amendments on my desk, which provide, so far as title I is concerned, "All right; so you want to involve the Federal Government in making recreational areas out of farm lands.

These amendments insist, in that case, that these areas be integrated areas." So far as I am concerned, I believe they should be. So far as I am concerned, we cannot spend public money, collected from all the taxpayers generally, and deny the advantages of these areas to any segment of the population.

That is inherent in the bill, because we are talking in terms of trying to develop additional Federal controls, because our southern friends are trying to tell us, "You cannot let people make any decisions." They are reversing themselves in this field, in this philosophy, from their usual stand, and are trying to force people to succumb to direction from Washington. They cannot do it and long remain immune from the other consequences.

It seems to me that when we open up the pasture and let the stalking horse of Federal control loose, we are not going to be able to put the bit in its mouth and tell it where it is to go, or whom the horse can kick and how hard.

The question is, "Do you trust the farmers, or don't you? Do you honestly believe that because you have been elected to the Senate you are so wise that you can tell the farmers that they cannot even have the right to vote as to which of the proposals they prefer?" If we go that far here we certainly are trying to arrogate to ourselves a wisdom and an omnipotence and an authority which we should be most reluctant to exercise.

If I know the farmers of America—and I think I know them well—they are not going to welcome the fellow who comes to them after the recess and addresses them and tries to explain to them why he did not trust their judgment and why he thinks he is so much wiser that he will not even give them a choice between two fairly attractive programs. I do not know how the farmers of South Dakota would vote on the certificate plan. They might vote for it, or they might vote against it. Speaking as one Member of the Senate, I have a great deal more confidence in the judgment of the wheat farmers of my State to solve this problem than I do in ability of the cotton farmers of the South, when they try to tell us what to do about wheat legislation. Normally those of us who represent the farming areas of the North have relied upon the judgment of the cotton people of the South to work out programs which are advantageous to the cotton industry. What they now propose is a poor kind of reciprocity, it seems to me. There will come a time when all the areas of the country are heard from, not only those that represent the cotton industry.

We are told, "Unless you take this program, something will happen to the cotton program sometime later." We spent all last week debating what should be done about cotton. We tried to say, "While you are saving the cotton farmer by tariff action, why do we not also do something for the poultry producer and the beef producer?"

The reply was, "No, we have got to take care of this cotton problem now. We will take care of you later."

So here we are again this week. Here we have the same representatives from the cotton States who tasted blood and success, saying, "We have this scheme for the wheat farmer, which is so bad that we know it would be rejected if the farmers had a chance to vote on it as an alternative to existing programs. However, we have the votes in the Senate to force it on the wheat farmers."

Perhaps they have the votes, Mr. President, but they are flirting with a dangerous philosophy. It is the kind of game that can be played on both sides of the line. I do not believe it is proper legislation, when we have a chance to act on behalf of the producers of the country, whose livelihood depends upon a good wheat program, not to offer them a choice between two workable alternative programs. I think we act in poor grace when we, as Senators, say, "We are going to deny you the right of franchise; we are going to deny you the right to vote as between two attractive programs concerning wheat. We are going to hold a pistol to your head. We are going to submit a new program and then we are going to put a pistol at your head and tell you how to vote. Either you vote on the administration's proposal or you lose all price supports.

I hope the Ellender amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I have listened with much interest to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. What he is now suggesting is not a choice between two new programs. The question is whether some old program which has caused so much trouble will be retained.

The bill contains a program for a two-price system, one which has been worked over for the past 20 years. The Senate should know about it and how it works. After the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry voted for the two-price system, it was then that the Senator from South Dakota said, "let us give the farmers an alternate plan." What is that alternate plan? It is to let the present emergency program continue for 2 more years, and at the end of 2 years, after hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent, to revert to the old program, a program which has, I repeat, given us so much trouble and has been so costly. That is what the Mundt proposal means.

If my amendment is adopted, the farmers will have the right to vote either for or against a new program, a program which, I believe, will inure in the long run to their benefit, because if the program which is now on the statute books continues, I have no doubt that the whole farm program will be endangered.

I have placed in writing a few of the losses which were sustained in recent years by the Government through the wheat program. Let us not forget that for the past several years we have tried in vain to change the program. Congress passed a bill in 1959 which was vetoed by President Eisenhower. That bill would have reduced the 55-million-acre minimum as it would be reduced in the bill before the Senate. Do not forget that the minimum acreage fixed in the law is 55 million, and the Secretary of Agriculture cannot deal with the wheat problem when the wheat acreage needed is less than 55 million acres. What we are seeking to do is to reduce that acreage so that production will be more in keeping with the requirements.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] pointed out the huge amount of wheat which has been made available under the Public Law 480 program.

Title I agreements as of December 31, 1961, have been signed for the sale of 2,322,770,000 bushels of wheat with an export market value of $3.8 billion; but the cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation was $6.3 billion. The rest was loss. That occurred under the program which we have been trying to get rid of for the past 4 or 5 years.

In addition, the Government has donated hundreds of millions of dollars worth of wheat and flour to the peoples in underdeveloped countries under titles II and III of the same act.

While the export market values of the wheat sold for foreign currencies amounted to $3.8 billion, the Government had invested in the same wheat $6.3 billion. In other words, the Government actually lost $2.5 billion on these sales.

Mr. President, the permanent wheat program that we now have on the books has been a very costly one. In my estimation, it must be changed to a more realistic program such as the wheat certificate plan now included in the pending bill.

Carrying charges alone for wheat in the last fiscal year amounted to $399.4 million. These carrying charges include storage, handling, and interest on investment. Yesterday I placed in the record a table showing these costs in detail.

As that record shows, of the $1,154 million which was paid last year for the storage, handling, and all other costs of wheat and other feed grains, 78 percent of that huge amount is chargeable to wheat, corn, and other feed grains.

The wheat program in effect for this year is only an emergency expedient which is costly and does not get to the root of the problem. The Department estimates that payments under this emergency program will amount to about $345 million. These payments will be in addition to the normal carrying charges that are incurred by the Government in storing the huge quantities now owned by them. Both the payments to farmers and the carrying charges are in addition to the export subsidies of about 60 cents per bushel that is paid on every bushel of wheat moving into export, whether it be for dollars or for sales for foreign currencies.

Mr. President, in my opinion, it is imperative that we take steps at this time to correct the inequities that exist in the permanent wheat law.

Under the price support program, losses on wheat from the beginning of the program through December 31, 1961, amounts to $1,798,261,275. The export subsidies paid amounts to $557,837,104. In addition, the export subsidy payment under the International Wheat Agreement amounts to $1,215,021,000. Section 32 funds, which were used for export payments during the interim periods when the International Wheat Agreement was unsigned, amounts to $24,232,000 for a total Commodity Credit Corporation cost of $3,595,351,379, excluding Public Law 480 costs.

No one can doubt that this is a costly program. This program needs to be changed in all good conscience. The Senate should act now to correct the situation by adopting my amendment and substituting for the present costly program a more equitable program which we call the Wheat Certificate Plan. Under this program, production will be brought in line with requirements, the cost to the Government will be minimized, because we will not have to acquire and store huge quantities of wheat which are neither needed nor necessary, and farm income of producers will in the long run be improved immeasurably under a realistic program.

For the first 3 years while Commodity Credit Corporation is getting rid of its stocks, farmers will receive payments of up to 50 percent of the normal production on diverted acres. At the end of this period, it is anticipated that stocks will have been reduced to reasonable levels and that acerage allotments could then be increased.

This program will be good for the farmers and be good for the Government and be good for consumers. It is imperative that we act now by adopting my amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

COST OF WHEAT PROGRAM

	Dollars
Price support losses October 17, 1933, through December 31, 1961	1,798,261,275
Other costs, including export subsidy	557,837,104
International Wheat Agreement export subsidies	1,215,021,000
Section 32 funds used	24,232,000
Total CCC costs	3,595,351,379

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, all I am trying to do is to bring to an end the huge losses which are being suffered by the taxpayers. I maintain that the two-price system of the wheat program will do no harm to the farmers, because in the next 3 years they will be paid for diverted acres. They will have their fair share of the billion bushels that will be required. In fact, in the law, as Senators know, the minimum is 1 billion bushels, and farmers will have their fair share of that production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the price support on what the farmer produces under the certificate plan will be approximately $2 a bushel?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the Secretary of Agriculture says. It is in the record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the program will reduce the supply by about 200 million bushels a year?

Mr. ELLENDER. Approximately so. It is believed that in 3 or 4 years there will be almost the normal carryover. That is the purpose, I am sure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the diverted acres will be paid for under diversion?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKEY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If the Senator from Colorado 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 Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Anderson	Hartke	Morton
Bartlett	Hayden	Moss
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan	Pell
Cannon	Kefauver	Randolph
Chavez	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Church	Long, Hawaii	Russell
Clark	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarthy	Symington
Engle	McClellan	Talmadge
Ervin	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morse	

NAYS—36

Aiken	Dirksen	Mundt
Allott	Dworshak	Murphy
Beall	Eastland	Pearson
Bennett	Fong	Prouty
Boggs	Goldwater	Proxmire
Bush	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Capehart	Holland	Scott
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Case, N.J.	Javits	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Thurmond
Cotton	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Miller	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Butler	Hickey	McGee
Carroll	Johnston	Tower
Dodd	Kerr	Wiley
Gruening	Kuchel	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments identified as "5-21-62—A," and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments offered by Mr. ELLENDER are as follows:

Beginning with line 6 on page 11, strike out all through line 15 on page 18, and substitute the following:

"SUBTITLE A—FEED GRAINS

"SEC. 301. Subtitle B of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by inserting after part VI a new part VII as follows:

"'*Part VII—Marketing quotas—Feed grains*

"'Legislative Findings

"'SEC. 360a. The production of feed grains is a vital part of the agricultural economy of the United States. Feed grains move almost wholly in interstate and foreign commerce in the form of grains, livestock, and livestock products.

"'Abnormally excessive and abnormally deficient supplies of feed grains on the national market acutely and directly burden, obstruct, and affect interstate and foreign commerce. When the available supply of feed grains is excessive, the prices of feed grains are unreasonably low and farmers overexpand livestock production to find outlets for feed grains. Excessive supplies of feed grains cause the marketing of excessive supplies of livestock in interstate and foreign commerce at sacrificial prices, endanger the financial stability of producers, and overtax the handling, processing, and transportation facilities through which the flow of interstate and foreign commerce in feed grains, livestock, and livestock products is directed. Deficient supplies of feed grains result in substantial decreases in livestock production and in an inadequate flow of livestock and livestock products in interstate and foreign commerce, with the consequence of unreasonably high prices to consumers and loss of markets for producers.

"'Although certain feed grains are better suited for production in some areas than other feed grains, in general, one of several feed grains can be grown on the same land. A marketing program which provides for a single quota applicable to feed grains and which permits producers to determine, within the quota, which feed grains they shall produce will tend to effectuate the policy of the Act and will permit producers the maximum amount of freedom of choice consistent with the attainment of the policy of the Act.

"'The conditions affecting the production and marketing of feed grains are such that, without Federal assistance, farmers, individually or in cooperation, cannot effectively provide for a balanced supply of feed grains and the orderly marketing of feed grains in interstate and foreign commerce at prices which are fair and reasonable to farmers and consumers.

"'The national public interest and general welfare require that the burdens on interstate and foreign commerce above described be removed by the exercise of Federal power. Feed grains which do not move in the form of feed grains outside of the State where they are produced are so closely and substantially related to feed grains which move in the form of feed grains outside of the State where they are produced, and have such a close and substantial relation to the volume and price of livestock and livestock products in interstate and foreign commerce, that it is necessary to regulate feed grains which do not move outside of the State where they are produced to the extent set forth in his Act.

"'The diversion of substantial acreage from feed grains to the production of commodities which are in surplus supply or which will be in surplus supply if they are permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage would burden, obstruct, and adversely affect interstate and foreign commerce in such commodities, and would adversely affect the prices of such commodities in interstate and foreign commerce. Small changes in the supply of a commodity could create a sufficient surplus to affect seriously the price of such commodity in interstate and foreign commerce. Large changes in the supply of such commodity could have a more acute effect on the price of the commodity in interstate and foreign commerce and, also, could overtax the handling, processing, and transportation facilities through which the flow of interstate and foreign commerce in such commodity is directed. Such adverse effects caused by overproduction in one year could further result in a deficient supply of the commodity in the succeeding year, causing excessive increases in the price of the commodity in interstate and foreign commerce in such year. It is, therefore, necessary to prevent acreage diverted from the production of feed grains to be used to produce commodities which are in surplus supply or which will be in surplus supply if they are permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage.

"'National marketing quota

"'SEC. 360(b). (a) Whenever prior to June 20 in any calendar year the Secretary determines that the total supply of feed grains in the marketing year beginning in the next succeeding calendar year will, in the absence of a marketing quota program, likely be excessive, the Secretary shall proclaim that a national marketing quota for feed grains shall be in effect for such marketing year and for either the following marketing year or the following two marketing years, if the Secretary determines and declares in such proclamation that a two- or three-year marketing quota program is necessary to effectuate the policy of the Act.

"'(b) If a national marketing quota for feed grains has been proclaimed for any marketing year, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the amount of the national marketing quota for such marketing year not earlier than January 1 or later than June 20 of the calendar year preceding the year in which such marketing year begins. The amount of the national marketing quota for feed grains for any marketing year shall be an amount of feed grains which, during such marketing year, the Secretary estimates (i) will be utilized in the United States in the production of the volume of livestock (including poultry) and livestock products determined to be needed to meet domestic consumption and export requirements, (ii) will be utilized for human consumption in the United States as food, food products, and beverages, composed wholly or partly of feed grains, (iii) will be utilized in the United States for seed and industrial uses, and (iv) will be exported either in the form of feed grains or products thereof; less (A) an amount of feed grains equal to the estimated imports of feed grains into the United States during such marketing year and, (B) if the stocks of feed grains owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation are determined by the Secretary to be excessive, an amount of feed grains determined by the Secretary to be a desirable reduction in such marketing year in such stocks to achieve the policy of the Act: *Provided*, That if the Secretary determines that the total stocks of feed grains in the Nation are insufficient to assure an adequate carryover for the next succeeding marketing year, the national marketing quota otherwise determined shall be increased by the amount the Secretary determines to be necessary to assure an adequate carryover: *And provided further*, That the national marketing quota for feed grains for any marketing year shall be not less than one hundred and ten million tons.

"'(c) If, after the proclamation of a national marketing quota for feed grains for any marketing year, the Secretary has reason to believe that, because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in the demand for feed grains, the national marketing quota should be terminated or the amount thereof increased, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether such action is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for feed grains. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds

that such action is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding and the amount of any such increase found by him to be necessary and thereupon such national marketing quota shall be so increased or terminated. In case any national marketing quota is increased under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide for such increase by increasing acreage allotments established under this part by a uniform percentage.

"'National Acreage Allotment

"'SEC. 360c. Whenever the amount of the national marketing quota for feed grains is proclaimed for any marketing year, the Secretary at the same time shall proclaim a national acreage allotment for the crop of feed grains planted for harvest in the calendar year in which such marketing year begins. The amount of the national acreage allotment shall be the number of acres which the Secretary determines on the basis of expected yields and expected underplantings of farm acreage allotments will, together with the expected production (1) on increased acreage resulting from exemptions pursuant to sections 360f and 360k, and (2) of silage on acreage excluded from the acreage of feed grains pursuant to section 301(a)(11), make available a supply of feed grains equal to the national marketing quota for feed grains for such marketing year.

"'Apportionment of National Acreage Allotment

"'SEC. 360d. (a) The national acreage allotment for any crop of feed grains, less a reserve acreage of not to exceed 1 per centum thereof for use as provided in subsection (b)(2) of this section, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the base acreage of feed grains for each State. The State base acreage of feed grains shall be the average acreage of feed grains in the State during the base period, adjusted pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"'(b)(1) The State acreage allotment for any crop of feed grains, less a reserve acreage of not to exceed 3 per centum thereof for use as provided in subsection (c)(2) of this section, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the base acreage of feed grains for each county. The county base acreage of feed grains shall be the average acreage of feed grains in the county during the base period, adjusted pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"'(2) The reserve acreage established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be used by the Secretary to make increases in county acreage allotments on the basis of the relative needs of counties for an additional share of the national acreage allotment because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of feed grains.

"'(c)(1) The county acreage allotment for any crop of feed grains shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the county committee, among the farms in the county on the basis of the base acreage of feed grains for each farm. The farm base acreage of feed grains shall be the average acreage of feed grains on the farm during the base period, adjusted pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"'(2) The reserve acreage established pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of this section shall be available:

"'(A) For apportionment to farms which were eligible to receive farm acreage allotments under this part, but which through error did not receive such allotments;

"'(B) For making increases in farm acreage allotments on the basis of any one or more of the following factors: tillable acres, type of soil, topography, established crop-rotation practices on the farm, hardships, inequities in allotments, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable farm acreage allotments; and

"'(C) For apportionment to farms for which farm acreage allotments were not determined because there were no acreages of feed grains on such farms during the base period on the basis of the following factors: the suitability of the land for the production of feed grains, the past experience of the farm operator in the production of feed grains, the extent to which the farm operator is dependent on income from farming for his livelihood, the production of feed grains on other farms owned, operated, or controlled by the farm operator, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable farm acreage allotments.

"'(d) In determining the State, county, and farm base acreages—

"'(1) the base period shall be the calendar years 1959 and 1960 for the purpose of determining acreage allotments for the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crop of feed grains; and for the purpose of determining acreage allotments for subsequent crops of feed grains, the base period shall be the two most recent calendar years during which a marketing quota program was in effect for which statistics of the Federal Government are available;

"'(2) the Secretary shall make such adjustments as he determines are necessary for abnormal conditions affecting the acreage of feed grains planted for harvest, land which is regarded as devoted to the production of feed grains under Federal farm programs, acreage diverted from the production of feed grains under this part, established crop-rotation practices on the farm, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable base acreages;

"'(3) the acreage of feed grains on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall be excluded in determining the average acreage of feed grains for the State, county, or farm, except that in the case of a farm which is exempt from the farm marketing quota under the small-farm exemption in section 360f, or under the exemption in section 360k, the acreage on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment but not in excess of the farm base acreage, shall not be excluded.

"'(4) the acreage of wheat produced on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment pursuant to the exemption provided in section 335(f), in effect prior to the enactment of this part VII, shall be considered as an acreage of feed grains in determining the average acreage of feed grains for the State, county, or farm, and shall not be considered as an acreage of wheat in determining the small-farm base acreage for wheat pursuant to section 335.

"'Geographical Applicability

"'SEC. 360e. This part VII shall be applicable to the continental United States excluding Alaska.

"'Small Farm Exemption

"'SEC. 360f. Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, no farm marketing quota for any crop of feed grains shall be applicable to any farm with a farm acreage allotment of less than twenty-five acres if the acreage of such crop of feed grains does not exceed the smaller of (A) the farm base acreage determined for the farm, or (B) twenty-five acres unless the operator elects in writing on a form and within the time prescribed by the Secretary to be subject to the farm acreage allotment and marketing quota. If the operator of any such farm fails to make such election with respect to any crop of feed grains, (i) for the purposes of section 360h, the farm acreage allotment for such crop of feed grains shall be deemed to be the smaller of (A) the farm base acreage, or (B) twenty-five acres, (ii) the land-use provisions of section 360j shall be inapplicable to the farm, and (iii) such crop of feed grains shall not be eligible for price support.

"'Referendum

"'SEC. 360g. If a national marketing quota for feed grains for one, two, or three marketing years is proclaimed, the Secretary shall, not later than sixty days after such proclamation is published in the Federal Register, conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers to determine whether they favor or oppose marketing quotas for the marketing year or years for which proclaimed. Any producer who has a feed grain base shall be eligible to vote in any referendum held pursuant to this section, except a producer who has a farm acreage allotment of less than twenty-five acres shall not be eligible to vote unless the farm operator elected, pursuant to section 360f, to be subject to the farm acreage allotment and marketing quota. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within thirty days after the date of such referendum, and if the Secretary determines that more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum voted against marketing quotas, the Secretary shall proclaim that marketing quotas will not be in effect with respect to the crop of feed grains produced for harvest in the calendar year following the calendar year in which the referendum is held. If the Secretary determines that two-thirds or more of the farmers voting in a referendum approve marketing quotas for a period of two or three marketing years, no referendum shall be held for the subsequent year or years of such period.

"'Compliance

"'SEC. 360h. (a)(1) The farm marketing quota for any crop of feed grains shall be the actual production of the acreage of feed grains on the farm less the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess shall be an amount equal to twice the normal production of the acreage of feed grains on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such crop: *Provided*, That the farm marketing excess shall be an amount equal to the actual production of the number of acres of feed grains on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such crop, if the producer, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary and within the time prescribed therein, establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary the actual production of such crop of feed grains on the farm: *Provided further*, That if there is an acreage of more than one feed grain on the farm, in determining which acreage is in excess of the farm acreage allotment, the acreage of the feed grain or grains which has the highest value, based on the normal yield of the feed grain on the farm multiplied by the basic county support rate for the feed grain, shall be considered as the acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotment.

"'(2) For the purposes of this section, (i) "actual production" of any number of acres of a feed grain on a farm means the actual average yield of such feed grain on the farm multiplied by the number of acres of such feed grain, and (ii) "normal production" of any number of acres of a feed grain on a farm means the normal yield of such feed grain on the farm multiplied by the number of acres of such feed grain. The normal yield of any feed grain for a farm shall be the average yield per acre of such feed grain on the farm during the five calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in yields. If for any such year the data are not available or there is no actual yield, then the normal yield for the farm shall be appraised in accordance

with regulations issued by the Secretary, taking into consideration abnormal weather conditions, trends in yields, the normal yield for the county, the normal yields for similar or adjacent farms, and the yield in years for which data are available.

"'(3) In determining the farm marketing quota and farm marketing excess, (i) any acreage of a feed grain remaining after the date prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of excess acres of such feed grain shall be included as an acreage of feed grains on the farm, and the production thereof shall be appraised in such manner as the Secretary determines will provide a reasonably accurate estimate of such production, (ii) any acreage of any feed grain classified as wheat acreage pursuant to section 360i shall not be considered feed grain acreage, and (iii) any acreage of feed grains disposed of in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary prior to such date as may be prescribed by the Secretary shall be excluded in determining the farm marketing quota and farm marketing excess, and (iv) any acreage of barley disposed of by grazing not later than thirty days prior to the date the harvest of barley normally begins in the county or the area within the county as determined by the Secretary shall be excluded in determining the farm marketing quota and farm marketing excess. Marketing quotas for any marketing year shall be in effect with respect to feed grains harvested in the calendar year in which such marketing year begins notwithstanding that the feed grains are marketed prior to the beginning of such marketing year.

"'(b) Whenever farm marketing quotas are in effect with respect to any crop of feed grains, the farm marketing excess of any feed grain shall be regarded as available for marketing, and the producers on a farm shall be subject to a penalty on the farm marketing excess of feed grains at a rate per bushel on the amount of feed grains in the farm marketing excess equal to 65 per centum of the parity price of the particular feed grain involved as of May 1 of the calendar year in which the crop is harvested. Each producer having an interest in the crop of feed grains on any farm for which a farm marketing excess of feed grains is determined shall be jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of the penalty on the farm marketing excess.

"'(c) If the farm marketing excess is adjusted downward on the basis of actual production as heretofore provided, the difference between the amount of the penalty computed upon the basis of twice the normal production and as computed upon the basis of actual production shall be returned to or allowed the producer.

"'(d) Until the producers on any farm pay the penalty on the farm marketing excess of any crop of feed grains, the entire crop of feed grains produced on the farm and any subsequent crop of feed grains subject to marketing quotas in which the producer has an interest shall be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for the amount of the penalty.

"'(e) Until the penalty on the farm marketing excess of feed grains is paid, each bushel of feed grains produced on the farm shall be subject to the penalty specified in subsection (b) of this section, and such penalty on each bushel of feed grains which is sold by the producer to any person within the United States shall be paid by the buyer, who may deduct an amount equivalent to the penalty from the price paid to the producer. If the buyer fails to collect such penalty, such buyer and all persons entitled to share in the feed grains marketed from the farm or the proceeds thereof shall be jointly and severally liable for such penalty.

"'(f) The persons liable for the payment or collection of the penalty on any amount of feed grains shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"'Substitution of wheat and feed grains

"'SEC. 360i. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall permit producers of wheat to have acreage devoted to the production of wheat considered as devoted to the production of feed grains, and producers of feed grains to have acreage devoted to the production of feed grains considered as devoted to the production of wheat, to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will not impair the effective operation of this subtitle B.

"'Land Use

"'SEC. 360j. (a)(1) During any year in which marketing quotas for feed grains are in effect, the producers on any farm (except a farm for which a farm acreage allotment is established pursuant to section 360d(c)(2)(C)) on which any crop is produced on acreage required to be diverted from the production of feed grains shall be subject to a penalty on such crop, in addition to any marketing quota penalty applicable to such crop, as provided in this subsection, unless (i) the crop is designated by the Secretary as one which is not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if it is permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, or as one the production of which will not substantially impair the purpose of the requirements of this section, or (ii) no feed grains are produced on the farm, and the producers have not filed an agreement or a statement of intention to participate in the payment program formulated pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. The acreage required to be diverted from the production of feed grains on the farm shall be an acreage of cropland equal to the amount by which the base acreage of feed grains for the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for feed grains. The actual production of any crop subject to penalty under this subsection shall be regarded as available for marketing and the penalty on such crop shall be computed on the actual acreage of such crop at the rate of 65 per centum of the parity price per bushel, as of May 1 of the calendar year in which the crop is harvested, of the feed grain determined by the Secretary to be the principal feed grain produced in the county, multiplied by the normal yield for such feed grain as defined in section 360h(a). Until the producers on any farm pay the penalty on such crop, the entire crop of feed grains produced on the farm and any subsequent crop of feed grains subject to marketing quotas in which the producer has an interest shall be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for the amount of the penalty. Each producer having an interest in the crop or crops on acreage diverted or required to be diverted from the production of feed grains shall be jointly and severally liable for the entire amount of the penalty. The Secretary may require the penalty on the production of crops on the diverted acreage to be collected by the purchaser of feed grains produced on the farm. The persons liable for the payment or collection of the penalty under this section shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"'(2) The Secretary may require that the acreage on any farm diverted from the production of feed grains be land which was diverted from the production of feed grains in the previous year, to the extent he determines that such requirement is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this subtitle.

"'(3) The Secretary may permit the diverted acreage to be grazed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"'(b) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and carry out a program with respect to the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crops of feed grains under which, subject to such terms and conditions as he determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this section, payments may be made in amounts not in excess of 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate on the normal production of the acreage diverted, taking into account the income objectives of the Act, determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to producers with respect to acreage diverted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary may permit the producers on the farm to divert from the production of feed grains an acreage, in addition to the acreage diverted pursuant to subsection (a), equal to 20 per centum of the farm acreage allotment for feed grains: *Provided,* That the producers on any farm may, at their election, divert such acreage, in addition to the acreage diverted pursuant to subsection (a), as will bring the total acreage diverted on the farm to twenty-five acres. Such program shall require (1) that the diverted acreage shall be devoted to conservation uses approved by the Secretary; (2) that the total acreage of cropland on the farm devoted to soil-conserving uses, including summer fallow and idle land but excluding the acreage diverted as provided above and acreage diverted under the land-use provisions for wheat pursuant to section 339, shall not be less than the total average acreage of cropland devoted to soil-conserving uses including summer fallow and idle land on the farm during the base period used in determining the farm acreage allotment adjusted to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate for (i) abnormal weather conditions or other factors affecting production, (ii) established crop-rotation practices on the farm, (iii) participation in other Federal farm programs, (iv) unusually high percentage of land on the farm devoted to conserving uses, and (v) for other factors which the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing a fair and equitable soil-conserving acreage for the farm; and (3) that the producers shall not knowingly exceed (i) any farm acreage allotment in effect for any commodity produced on the farm, and (ii) except as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, the farm acreage allotments on any other farm for any crop in which the producer has a share: *Provided,* That no producer shall be deemed to have exceeded a farm acreage allotment for wheat if the entire amount of the farm marketing excess of wheat is delivered to the Secretary or stored in accordance with applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty: *And provided further,* That no producer shall be deemed to have exceeded a farm acreage allotment for any crop of wheat or feed grains if the farm is exempt from the farm marketing quota for such crop under section 335, 360f, or 360k. The producer on any farm for which a farm acreage allotment is established pursuant to section 360d(c)(2)(C) shall not be eligible for payments hereunder. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of payment among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis. Payments may be made in cash or in feed grains.

"'(c) The Secretary may provide for adjusting any payment on account of failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the program formulated under subsection (b) of this section.

"'(d) Not to exceed 50 percentum of any payment to producers under subsection (b) of this section may be made in advance of determination of performance.

"'(e) The program formulated pursuant to subsection (b) of this section may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as the

Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this section.

"'(f) The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be desirable to carry out the provisions of this section.

"'(g) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to utilize its capital funds and other assets for the purpose of making the payments authorized in this section and to pay administrative expenses necessary in carrying out this section during the period ending June 30, 1963. There is authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary thereafter to pay such administrative expenses.

"'(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, performance rendered in good faith in reliance upon action or advice of an authorized representative of the Secretary may be accepted as meeting the requirements of this section, or of subsections (c) and (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and payment may be made therefor in accordance with such action or advice to the extent the Secretary deems is desirable in order to provide fair and equitable treatment.

"'Deficit Areas

"'SEC. 360k. Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, in any area (county, State, or region) in which the Secretary determines (1) that the application of the provisions of this Act would result in hardship to producers in such area, would unduly increase the price of feed grains in such area relative to other areas, and would disrupt normal farming practices in such area, and (2) that the exception provided by this section would not impair the effective operation of this Act, he may provide in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe that no farm marketing quota (that is, production on the acreage allotment) for any crop of feed grains shall be applicable to any farm in such area, if the acreage of such crop of feed grains does not exceed the farm base acreage determined for the farm. If the Secretary so provides, (i) for the purposes of section 360h, the farm acreage allotment for such crop of feed grains shall be deemed to be the farm base acreage, (ii) the land-use provisions of section 360j shall be inapplicable to the farm, (iii) such crop of feed grains shall not be eligible for price support, and (iv) the producers on such farm shall not be eligible to vote in any referendum on marketing quotas for such crop.

"'Authority To Exempt Malting Barley

"'SEC. 306l. Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, if with respect to any crop of barley the Secretary finds that there is not likely to be production of a sufficient quantity of malting barley to satisfy the demand therefor, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, the farm marketing quota or farm acreage allotment for any crop of feed grains shall not be applicable to malting barley on any farm, if (i) the operator elects in writing on a form and within the time prescribed by the Secretary to have malting barley exempt therefrom, (ii) such operator has previously produced a malting variety of barley, plants barley only of an acceptable malting variety for harvest during the crop year, and does not knowingly devote during such crop year an acreage on the farm to barley in excess of 110 per centum of the acreage devoted on the farm to barley in 1959 and 1960, or such later two-year period determined by the Secretary to be representative, and (iii) the farm base acreage and the farm acreage allotment for such crop of feed grains are adjusted downward by such amount as the Secretary determines appropriate to reflect the exclusion of such barley from the farm acreage allotment.'

"SEC. 302. Section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'and' immediately following the last semicolon, by changing the period at the end therof to a semicolon, and by adding immediately following such new semicolon the following: 'and to reduce the annual carryover of feed grains, to stabilize the supply of feed grains, and to provide for an adequate and balanced flow of feed grains so that the prices of feed grains are fair to producers and consumers and the total supply of feed grains available for utilization for livestock feed is maintained at a level which is consistent with the production of the quantities of livestock and the products thereof that will be consumed and exported at prices which are fair to producers and consumers.'

"SEC. 303. Section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

"'(10) The term "feed grains" means corn, grain sorghums, and barley.

"'(11) The term "acreage of feed grains" means acreage of feed grains planted for harvest (including self-seeded feed grains), but excluding the acreage of feed grains harvested for silage not in excess of the acreage of feed grains harvested for silage during the base period as defined in section 360d(d) if the operator of the farm elects in writing to have such feed grains harvested for silage excluded. The review provisions applicable to marketing quotas in sections 361–367 shall apply to the determination of the acreage of silage exempt under this subsection.

"'(12) The term "crop" as applied to "feed grains" means all of the crops of the agricultural commodities which comprise feed grains and which are produced for harvest in the same calendar year.'

"(2) Subsection (b)(6)(A) is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) (A) "Market", in the case of cotton, rice, tobacco, wheat, and feed grains, means to dispose of, in raw or processed form, by voluntary or involuntary sale, barter, or exchange, or by gift inter vivos, and, in the case of wheat and feed grains, by feeding (in any form) to poultry or livestock which, or the products of which, are sold, bartered, or exchanged, or to be so disposed of.'

"(3) Subsection (b)(7) is amended to read as follows:

"'(7) "Marketing year" means, in the case of the following commodities, the period beginning on the first and ending with the second date specified below:

"'Barley, July 1–June 30;

"'Corn, October 1–September 30;

"'Cotton, August 1–July 31;

"'Grain sorghums, July 1–June 30;

"'Peanuts, August 1–July 31;

"'Rice, August 1–July 31;

"'Tobacco (flue-cured), July 1–June 30;

"'Tobacco (other than flue-cured), October 1–September 30;

"'Wheat, July 1–June 30.

"'"Marketing year" means, in the case of "feed grains", the marketing years for the agricultural commodities comprising the feed grains.'

"SEC. 304. Sections 361, 362, and 363 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are hereby amended as follows:

"(1) Section 361 is amended by adding 'feed grains,' after 'wheat,', and by changing the period at the end of the section to a comma and adding the following: 'and to the review of land-use penalties assessed pursuant to sections 339 and 360j.'

"(2) Section 362 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notice of the land-use penalty assessed pursuant to section 339 or 360j shall be mailed to the farmer.'

"(3) Section 363 is amended by adding 'or land-use penalty' after the word 'quota' wherever it appears in such section.

"SEC. 305. Section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding 'feed grains,' after 'wheat,' in subsection (a) thereof.

"SEC. 306. Sections 373, 374, and 375 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are hereby amended by deleting 'corn' wherever it appears and by substituting in lieu thereof 'feed grains'; and subsection (b) of section 375 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and inserting at the end thereof the following: 'or to effectuate the provisions thereof.'

"SEC. 307. Section 385 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting in the first sentence after 'Soil Conservation Act payment,' the following: 'payment under section 360j,'.

"SEC. 308. The amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, made by sections 301 through 307 of this Act shall be in effect only with respect to programs applicable to crops planted for harvest in the calendar year 1963 or any subsequent year and to the marketing years beginning in the calendar year 1963 or any subsequent year.

"SEC. 309. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) By amending section 105 by deleting subsections (a) and (b) and substituting the following:

"'(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1963 crop—

"'(1) if marketing quotas for any crop of corn, grain sorghums, and barley are not disapproved by producers, price support for corn of such crop shall be made available at such level, not less than 65 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of (i) the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act, (ii) the supplies of feed grains that would be available during the marketing year at prices approximating the support prices of feed grains, and (iii) consumption goals during the marketing year for livestock and livestock products, taking into consideration consumption under special governmental programs, and imports and exports of livestock and livestock products.

"'(2) if marketing quotas for any crop of corn, grain sorghums, and barley are disapproved by producers, price support for corn of such crop shall be at such level not to exceed 50 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b).

"'(3) price support for each crop of barley and grain sorghums, respectively, shall be at such level as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level at which price support is made available for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of such feed grain in relation to corn and the other factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

"'(4) price support for corn, grain sorghums, and barley shall be made available only to cooperators.

"'(5) if marketing quotas are in effect for the crop of corn, grain sorghums, and barley, a "cooperator" with respect to any such feed grain produced on a farm shall be a producer who (i) does not knowingly exceed (A) the farm acreage allotment for feed grains or any other commodity on the farm or (B) except as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe, the farm acreage allotment on any other farm for any commodity in which he has an interest as a producer, and (ii) complies with the land-use requirements of section 360j of the Agricultural Adjustment Act

of 1938, as amended, to the extent prescribed by the Secretary. If marketing quotas are not in effect for the crop of corn, grain sorghums, and barley, a "cooperator" with respect to any crop of corn, grain sorghums, and barley produced on a farm shall be a producer who does not knowingly exceed the farm acreage allotment for feed grains. No producer shall be deemed to have exceeded a farm acreage allotment for wheat if the entire amount of the farm marketing excess of wheat is delivered to the Secretary or stored in accordance with applicable regulations to avoid or postpone payment of the penalty, but the producer shall not be eligible to receive price support on such farm marketing excess. No producer shall be deemed to have exceeded the farm acreage allotment for wheat on the farm, or the farm acreage allotment for wheat or feed grains on any other farm, if such farm is exempt from the farm marketing quota for such crop under section 335, 360f, or 360k of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.'

"(2) By amending section 105 by redesignating subsection (c) thereof as subsection (b).

"(3) By amending section 401 by inserting after the comma before '(2)' the following: '(2) the income needed to provide a farm operator and his family with a return for his labor and investment equal to the return earned by comparable resources in other occupations', and by renumbering (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) as (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), and (9), respectively.

"(4) By adding at the end of section 407 the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, (i) if a marketing quota for feed grains for any marketing year is disapproved by producers, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell for unrestricted use from its stocks during such marketing year not to exceed ten million tons, or the equivalent in bushels, of feed grains at not less than 2 per centum above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges, (ii) if a marketing quota for wheat for any marketing year is disapproved by producers, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell for unrestricted use from its stocks during the marketing year not to exceed two hundred million bushels of wheat at not less than 2 per centum above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges.' "

On page 34, beginning with the period in line 13, strike out through the period in line 18, and insert a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That no producer shall be deemed to have exceeded a farm acreage allotment for any crop of wheat or feed grains if the farm is exempt from the farm marketing quota for such crop under section 335, 360f, or 360k."

On page 45, beginning in line 2, with the word "No", strike out through line 6, and insert the following: "No producer shall be deemed to have exceeded the farm acreage allotment for feed grains on the farm, or the farm acreage allotment for wheat or feed grains on any other farm, if such farm is exempt from the farm marketing quota for such crop under section 335, 360f or 360k."

Beginning on page 53, in line 24, with the word "No", strike out all through line 3 on page 54, and insert the following:

"No producer shall be deemed to have exceeded the farm acreage allotment for feed grains on the farm, or the farm acreage allotment for wheat or feed grains on any other farm, if such farm is exempt from the farm marketing quota for such crop under section 335, 360f, or 360k."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is my understanding that, under the consent request, the next vote would come on the amendment now pending, offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee, and would come at 4 o'clock. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct, unless an amendment is offered to it prior to that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was my understanding that if a vote came on the feed grains proposal and it was adopted, it would be impossible to further amend the Ellender amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Deletions could not be made; additions could be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A further parliamentary inquiry. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi talked to me the other day about it, and I conferred very briefly with the majority leader at that time, but the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi would be amendatory of the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I am not quite clear whether it would be a deletion or an addition, but I thought I ought to raise the question to make sure that that amendment might be in order, for if it were not, then it would require unanimous consent to make it in order. That would be equally true of an amendment that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Proxmire amendment would be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would be in order, as would any other amendment which would amend the substitute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, would the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], which proposes to authorize, without paying support prices, the use of wheat grown on a particular farm for feeding on that farm, be in order?

Mr. EASTLAND. Feed grain consumed on the farm.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, if germane, would be in order; and the Chair considers it germane.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, within the limitations of time, the Eastland amendment could be offered, and the Proxmire amendment could be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is also an amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, which would be actually an addition and not a deletion. My query is: Would that be in order as an amendment to the Ellender amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is a parliamentary inquiry pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment would be in order. The Ellender amendment can be amended to one further degree, so that amendment would be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have three amendments to offer to the pending feed grain amendment. Would they be in order? Would the Senate still vote at 4 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order to offer the amendments when no other amendment is pending.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Would the Senate still vote at 4 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a 2-hour limitation on all debate for all amendments to the Ellender amendment. The 2 hours would expire about 4:15.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I read the unanimous-consent agreement, it says:

> Two hours, to be equally divided and controlled as above, shall be allotted for debate on the Ellender feed grain amendment or any amendment thereto.

It does not say, "and all amendments thereto."

It seems to me a clear reading of the unanimous-consent agreement provides for 2 hours of debate for any amendment to the feed grains amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator from South Dakota has put his own interpretation on this particular agreement. Certainly that was not the intent of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], or other Senators, when that proposal was made. If that were the consensus, it would have been useless, in my opinion, to offer the unanimous-consent agreement.

I invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to what I consider to be the intent at the time the agreement was entered. There are Senators present in the Chamber who were consulted, who can prove or disprove what I have stated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Presiding Officer will indulge the Senator from South Dakota, according to my recollection, when the Senate makes an overall time agreement the customary language used is "2 hours on such amendment and all amendments thereto."

When the language is used with the conjunction "or" and it is said, "2 hours on the Ellender feed grain amendment or any amendment thereto," the "or" gives 2 hours for any amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The written agreement differs from the

memory of the Chair of the verbal agreement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am reading from the unanimous-consent agreement as printed on the front page of the Calendar of Business for Thursday, May 24, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The word "and" was in the original agreement which was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The word "and" was used? Does the RECORD show that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair rules actually happened.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. How can the Presiding Officer make a ruling which runs contrary to the printed text of the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there was an error in the printing of the agreement and that the word "and" should have been written into the agreement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. President, I at least comment that the observation of the Senator from South Dakota was not capricious or anything like that, but was taken directly from the language of the agreement as printed on the front page of the calendar for today. I do not know, but I assume that would be the same as the agreement on the blue cards which went around.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that and regrets the error.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have no particular desires with respect to the outcome of this matter, but I should like to know upon what basis the Presiding Officer can rule that the printed unanimous-consent agreement on the calendar, which is the official unanimous-consent agreement, does not mean what it says, but means what somebody else says?

If we are to start utilizing this kind of a procedure in the Senate, we had better take a look at our "hole cards," because it might lead to a bad situation. Everyone knows that in any legislative body one cannot alter the legislative record except by a motion or by consent. Neither one of these has been attempted.

No matter what was said at the time, or what was supposed to have been said at the time, what the RECORD shows is that the word "or" is used, in the disjunctive. Therefore, there can be no question that, until the Senate changes it, the agreement is what should govern the procedure of the Senate.

Gentlemen and ladies, we are making a very serious mistake. As I have said, I have no interest in which way we do this, but we are making a very serious mistake to set a precedent in the Senate of deciding that what the RECORD says is not what somebody said or meant 2 or 3 days ago.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, off this serious subject, I wish to say that the Air Force has reported a life raft sighted, with Lieutenant Commander Carpenter, the astronaut, in it. [Applause.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to the printing of the unanimous-consent agreement in the RECORD for May 22?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct in the point he makes, but the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the word "and" was used at the time, and there is an error.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the RECORD does not show that. The RECORD, at page 8953, shows that the distinguished majority leader read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and later shows the agreement printed on the same page. In both instances the word "or" is used.

I further invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to the fact that in the center column the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] said:

> Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request to offer, which I think has been cleared by all Senators interested. I will read it at this time, because it may be difficult for the clerk to put it together.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There follows the proposed agreement. The word "or" is used.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield in just a moment.

Subsequently, when the Presiding Officer put the request to the Senate, he said:

> Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and without objection the order is entered.
>
> The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

In both texts the word "or" is used.

I do not know how Members of the Senate could be put on notice as to what was in someone's mind in any other way than by what is shown in the RECORD, what is shown on the blue cards which were sent around, and what is shown on the front page of the calendar for today.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not believe that the RECORD can be changed except by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have endeavored to give to the Senate the intent behind the unanimous-consent request, which was offered with the concurrence of all Senators concerned who could be reached day before yesterday. The reason I read the unanimous-consent agreement myself was because it was in disjointed shape, and I felt that I had to present it in the manner I adopted in order to make it as plain as possible. The Senator from South Dakota is correct in what he has said as to the language in the RECORD, in the cards distributed, and on the outside page of the calendar. But I hope that in view of the situation, the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators will agree to a unanimous-consent request that the word "and" be incorporated in the unanimous-consent request now under consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has no amendment ready at this time to offer, but he had considered the possibility of offering one, depending upon the fate of some of the amendments that have been printed and proposed. He had relied upon the language on the blue card, which would indicate that if we had an amendment to offer, he would be allowed 2 hours of debate on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request, but before I do so, I assure the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that under the unanimous-consent agreement, 2 hours are allowed on other amendments, 1 hour to a side. So I think perhaps the Senator from South Dakota could offer his amendment. I am not certain that if the amendment should involve a feed grains proposal it would be proper. But if it is on something else, I think there would be no question. If it were on a feed grain proposal, I assume that it would be in the same category as other amendments of that type.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has been courteous to me on many occasions, and I am reluctant to object to any request he may make. But I think we ought to let the debate continue for a little while, to see how it develops. I feel that if I were offering an amendment, I would be entitled to 2 hours on it. If the issues are sufficiently presented by the other amendments that will be offered, and they can be taken care of in 2 hours of time, perhaps the whole discussion is without any practical effect. But I hope the Senator will not press his unanimous-consent request at this time, before we see the fate of some of the other amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, I would not.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My only observation on the question is that I helped to draft the unanimous consent agreement. I discussed the subject with several other Senators. I regret that the RECORD does not show the discussion. I believe the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was present. We were concerned about the fact that earlier in the day, when we had discussed the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was not present. We wanted to make sure that his interests

were safeguarded on the subject of feed grains. The discussion proceeded as follows: We would vote at 2 o'clock on the wheat amendment. We would vote 2 hours after we had completed the yea-and-nay vote on any other matters relating to the wheat amendment. So there was a considerable amount of argument on the floor of the Senate—where the discussion is in the RECORD, I do not know—to the effect that we would not necessarily vote at 4 o'clock.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was present when we discussed the situation. We agreed that the Senate would vote 2 hours after we had completed the tally and the announcement of the vote on the wheat amendment, which, it was indicated at that time, might occupy the time until about 4:30 p.m.

The reason for the discussion was that certain Senators had other obligations and duties. It was then agreed that we would vote on the so-called feed grains amendment and any and all amendments thereto 2 hours after the yea-and-nay vote had been taken and tallied on the wheat amendment. A specific time could not be set. It was said that it might be about 4:15. Someone else said no, it would be about 4:30. The RECORD is obviously not complete. Anyone who was present knows what took place. The whole question was discussed in some detail, privately off the floor, publicly on the floor, and personally with several Senators.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the traditions of the Senate, particularly on questions of reconsideration, it is customary to recognize that a Senator might not be present, and if within the proper time he enters a motion for reconsideration, if reconsideration has not been denied, his right is protected for 24 hours. Obviously the leadership could not discuss with every Member of the Senate the question whether or not he had an amendment on the point. I believe any Senator would be entitled to look at the RECORD, look at the calendar, look at the blue card, and feel that he had adequate protection on the face of the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the Senator's interpretation of what the printed record shows is accurate. I say to him only that I was present and was involved in the discussion. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and other Senators were present. We discussed fully the desire to dispose of the two Ellender amendments before 4:30. At least we were hopeful of doing so. At first it was thought that perhaps the Senate should convene at 11 o'clock. Then it was suggested that the hour of meeting be 10 o'clock.

All that took place in a general discussion among Senators.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] then said that he preferred to have a vote on the wheat amendment at sometime between 2 and 3 o'clock. It was then agreed that 2 o'clock would be a good time.

Subsequently it was said that 2 hours later we could vote on the so-called feed-grain amendment. The question was then raised by one of our colleagues, "Two hours later than what? Two hours later than 2 o'clock or 2 hours after the yea-and-nay vote and the tally were completed?"

The point I wish to make, to avoid misunderstanding, is that it was clearly understood at that particular time that the Senate would vote on the feed grain amendment and all amendments thereto by 2 hours after the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was probably so understood by those who were present and participated in the discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Assuming that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana now begins discussion on his amendment, when will the vote take place?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote would begin at 4:20 p.m.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I now ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 minute.

ASTRONAUT LT. COMDR. SCOTT CARPENTER

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we have just received word that Lt. Comdr. Scott Carpenter has been found, apparently in good condition, in a life raft alongside his capsule. We in Colorado, of course, are particularly proud of Scott Carpenter. I am sure the world is proud of him. All Americans are proud of him today.

I wish to pay my own tribute to him and say to Senators that in the long struggle for scientific advancement and achievement there are those who have such a deep sense of loyalty to this cause and to their own Government, our own United States, that they are willing to risk their lives to advance that cause. At this point we do not know what went wrong to make impossible a quick recovery; but we do know that the incident points up the fact that in every such flight each of the men involved puts his life on the line for scientific advancement and for the glory of our country.

I thank the distinguished minority leader and the chairman of the committee for yielding me this time.

FUNDS FOR THE RS-70

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the 1963 budget provided $171 million and the House provided $223.9 million for the RS-70. The President and the Secretary of Defense sequestered during the past year $514½ million for long-range bombers, which has not been used. The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has signified his intention of offering an amendment that would increase the RS-70 program by $514½ million.

He has also signified his intention of holding to 700,000 the combined strength of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. He set this forth specifically in his statement before the Defense Department Subcommittee on Appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement, with which I concur wholeheartedly, may be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL HAYDEN, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE

During recent weeks I have had an opportunity to review some of the major issues involved in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1963. There are a number of complex and vital issues that the subcommittee must consider; but two of these are matters of such great importance that I feel I should take this opportunity to make my position known. I do not believe that either the sum of $171 million requested in the President's budget, or the $223.9 million included in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives, is adequate for the development of the RS-70 weapons system; nor do I feel that it would be wise to reduce the strength of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve as proposed in the budget.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE RS-70 WEAPONS SYSTEM

Mr. Chairman, the last of the B-52's and B-58's will come off the production line late in the fall of this year; and, as you are aware, we will not be producing any manned bombers after this time. This is a mistake, in my opinion. It is also a mistake in the opinion of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force and the former commander of the Strategic Air Command. You will recall that during the hearings of this subcommittee on the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year I asked General LeMay the following question: "Would you recommend that the Congress provide additional funds for the procurement of more B-52 and B-58 bombers?"; and the general replied, "* * * It is my personal opinion that we should not close down our bomber lines at this time."

Mr. Chairman, we all know what happened. The Congress appropriated an additional $514,500,000 and provided that these funds "shall be available only for the procurement of long-range bombers." However, on October 27, 1961, the Secretary of Defense advised in a letter to the chairman of this subcommittee that the additional funds provided for the procurement of long-range bombers would not be utilized. The President's budget for fiscal year 1963 requested that these funds be made available to finance the 1963 aircraft procurement program. As I stated, the budget program does not include any funds for the procurement of additional long-range bombers. In acting on the bill now before this subcommittee the House Appropriations Committee recommended, and the House concurred, that the additional $514,500,000 provided in the 1962 act be rescinded.

Mr. Chairman, the record is clear. The decision to close down the B-52 and B-58 production lines was made by officials of the executive branch of the Government, over the strong objections of the legislative branch.

As General LeMay has stated, it is too late to reconsider this decision on the part of the executive branch to stop the production of manned bombers. We must now consider what we should do in view of this decision.

We are all pleased with the progress we have made in our missile program. The Atlas, the Titan, and the Minuteman are proving themselves to be good weapons systems. But they each have limitations—they cannot think. As good as these systems are we cannot abandon the manned systems. With the missile systems you have absolutely no flexibility in the use of your weapons. You can either shoot, or not shoot. This is not true with the manned-bomber systems. General LeMay stressed this importance of flexibility in the manned-bomber systems during our hearings last year when he said:

"With the manned systems, you can maneuver them, you can change their position; you can threaten with them. You can launch them and recall them, and you have all the flexibility in the world necessary to do things that might well prevent the war from ever starting."

It is my view that the new missile systems complement our existing manned-bomber force and that these missile systems should not be considered as replacements for our manned-bomber systems.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Chairman, the question for this subcommittee is, What course do we take in view of the decision of the executive branch of the Government to discontinue the production of the B-52's and B-58's? During the course of the hearings last year, I addressed the following question to General LeMay: "Do you feel that a manned bomber will be required as a follow-on to the B-52 and B-58 even if our missiles continue to develop at a satisfactory rate?" And General LeMay replied, "Yes sir; I do. We want the missiles. They are coming along; they will take a place in our inventory and give good account of themselves.

"However, it is our feeling, and always has been, that we must have a mixture of manned and unmanned systems if we are properly going to defend the country."

Mr. Chairman, the production of B-52's and B-58's will be completed shortly. What will be the manned system to continue the missions of the present B-52's and B-58's? The answer, of course, is the RS-70 weapons system.

This committee has devoted a considerable amount of time to the RS-70, formerly known as the B-70. The change in designation is merely more descriptive of the mission to be performed and does not involve any major changes in the basic aircraft. The RS-70 weapons system would provide the Strategic Air Command with an aircraft that has a speed of three times that of sound, that could fly at 80,000 feet for a distance of 6,000 miles without being refueled. This aircraft equipped with air-to-surface missiles and advanced radar and communications systems will provide the Strategic Air Command with a capability to observe and report the condition of the enemy during and after the initial strikes; would give an increased assurance of destruction of priority targets; could seek out and destroy unique targets, which would include the extremely hard, the mobile, and the imprecisely located; and would maintain the precision, discrimination, and flexibility which is an inherent part of our strategic capability, and which is obtainable only in the manned systems.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress provided an additional $180 million for the development of the B-70 in the Appropriation Act for the current year. However, as in the case of the B-52's and B-58's, the executive branch of the Government decided not to use these additional funds.

The question of the rate of development of the RS-70 weapons system was considered by the Armed Services Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate in connection with the Defense Procurement Authorization Act for fiscal year 1963. Both of these committees recommended, and both Houses of Congress concurred therewith, a development program of $491 million, compared to a program of $171 million requested by the executive branch of the Government. The Department of Defense appropriations bill, 1963 (H.R. 11289), as it passed the House includes $223.9 million for this program—an increase of $52.9 million over the budget request.

On May 16, General LeMay appeared before this subcommittee at the invitation of the chairman to give his personal views on the RS-70. At this time he indicated that, in his opinion, an appropriation of approximately $491 million—the amount included in the Defense Procurement Authorization Act for fiscal year 1963 was needed.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time during the markup of this bill in the executive sessions of the subcommittee, I will offer an amendment to provide a total of $491 million, less any reduction suggested by the Air Force, for the development of the RS-70 weapons system. At that time, I will suggest to the subcommittee the possibility of utilizing the $514.5 million included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1962, solely for the purpose of procuring long-range bombers for the development of the RS-70 program. These funds were provided for the purpose of continuing the production of manned bombers, and it logically follows that if the funds are not going to be used for the original purpose, they should be used for the development of the follow-on weapons system—the RS-70. I submit the following amendment to the bill, as it passed the House, to accomplish this purpose:

On page 25, in lines 11 through 13 strike out "that funds restricted to procurement of long-range bombers in this appropriation for fiscal year 1962 shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1962", and insert "that the sum of $514,500,000 made available in this paragraph in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1962 (Public Law 87-144) for the procurement of long-range bombers, shall also be available for the production planning and long lead-time procurement of the RS-70 Weapons System."

Mr. Chairman, this suggested amendment is in accord with the provisions of the Defense Procurement Authorization Act, 1963 (Public Law 87-436).

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND ARMY RESERVE

In regard to the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard, the budget as submitted requested funds to support a combined paid drill strength of 670,000. This was a reduction of 30,000 from the amount previously provided by the Congress to maintain the Army Reserve at 300,000 and the Army National Guard at 400,000. On April 2, 1962, a revised proposal from the executive branch brought the total request down to 642,000. The House committee when it reported the bill stated that it was not in sympathy with either the original reduction or the later reduction, and provided the funds to support an Army Reserve component strength of 700,000.

I wish to wholeheartedly support the action of the House. This committee has for a number of years refused to permit these large-scale reductions in the Reserve and guard and has provided funds to maintain the combined strength at 700,000. At times it has had the assurance of the executive branch that the wishes of the Congress would be honored if the funds were provided. At other times it was deemed advisable to place mandatory language in the bill. It is my understanding that no such assurance has as yet been given.

The strength of the Reserve components is directly related to the reorganization which the Department of Defense now proposes. This realinement, as it is called, will, according to the National Guard Association, eliminate four Army National Guard divisions, for which brigades will be substituted, and 424 company-size units which will be completely eliminated as units. The Army Reserve will similarly lose four divisions, to be replaced by brigades. Obviously the Congress will not desire to hamper any modernization of the Reserve components, but I am sure that when it considers the matter it will recall that the Reserve and guard have been reorganized frequently in the recent past. It will recall even more vividly the outstanding history of the National Guard who have been called upon in emergency to serve in the first line of defense at least five times since the turn of the century. For these reasons I shall support an Army Reserve component strength of 700,000.

THE WITHHOLDING OF TAX ON INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an open letter written by me to Secretary Dillon, in which I comment upon his recent analysis of the 20-percent withholding provision on interest and dividends as proposed in H.R. 10650.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1962.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A few days ago I received from you a letter, apparently addressed also to every other Member of the Senate, enclosing a memorandum regarding the pending proposal for withholding of tax on interest and dividends. A copy of this memorandum was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 16, 1962, by Senator DOUGLAS (pp. 8577-8578).

A study of the memorandum compels me to reply.

I

Early in the memorandum it is stated: "The withholding proposal has been grossly misrepresented and distorted by those who have their own selfish reasons for wishing to see it defeated. They have fostered widespread misunderstanding of the plan and aroused baseless fears."

Without attempting to pass judgment upon the motives of all the many opponents of the plan, I think it only fair to say that many persons of good will, including many Members of Congress, have given the proposal much objective study and have concluded that it would be unwise to enact it at this time. The vast outpouring of heartfelt handwritten letters from citizens throughout the Nation cannot be dismissed by a wave of the hand as flowing entirely from misrepresentation and distortion. Nor does a study of the testimony of numerous witnesses before the Senate Finance Committee, including several Members of the Senate, indicate that they have fallen prey to "widespread misunderstanding" or have fostered it. Their testimony indicates to me that they understand it full well and are convinced that it is filled with complexities, difficulties, and hardships.

If all members of the public do not exhibit a complete comprehension of the proposal, I think they may well be forgiven. Let us not forget that the proposal covers 46

pages of highly technical language in the bill, and that in the past year the proposal has been frequently modified in basic essentials—particularly as regards the right to file exemption certificates and quarterly refund claims.

Moreover, the process of change in the position of your Department still continues. As recently as May 10, in a prepared statement before the Senate Finance Committee, you again suggested a further broadening of the scope of these procedures. This has been done despite the fact that in the original prepared statement of your Department before the Ways and Means Committee a year ago it was recommended that withholding "be universally applied to all interest and dividend recipients" except certain foreign persons, stating "any further extension of exemptions would complicate the withholding procedure and would be burdensome for payers."

Yet now that your Department embraces amendments authorizing a flood of literally millions of exemption certificates, the memorandum sent to me lightly dismisses the obvious complications and ignores the burdens your own Department pointed out.

In short, I believe opposition to your Department's proposal should not be met by impugning the motives of its opponents. Those who have no base motives but who simply differ with you on a highly debatable proposal will not take kindly to such personal criticism. I would urge you rather to understand that it is at the very least a matter on which reasonable men of good will may differ.

II

Your Department's memorandum states that the "misconceptions" of opponents of the proposal "deserve to be cleared up."

The first "misconception" it deals with by pointing out that "This is not a new tax. Withholding is merely a method of collecting taxes which are owed the Government but, because of ignorance or intentional deceit, are not now being paid. Dividends and interest are income and, as such, have always been subject to tax."

Certainly every Member of the Senate is aware that dividends and interest are income, and that the withholding proposal is not a new tax for those who owe at least 20-percent tax on such amounts. But as to those who, because of their personal exemptions or deductions, owe no tax or less than the 20 percent withheld, we must recognize some basis for their feeling that this is a new tax even though all or part of it may later be refunded. Even the bill itself refers to it as a "tax." It requires that every person who pays interest or dividends shall "deduct and withhold * * * a tax equal to 20 percent of the amount thereof" (secs. 3451(a) and 3461(a)); and for those entitled to quarterly refunds it provides that "the tax deducted and withheld * * * shall * * * be promptly refunded to him as an overpayment of tax" (sec. 3484(a)). Thus even the bill acknowledges that before the tax is refunded it is in fact a tax. How then can one criticize those citizens who suffer overwithholding when in laymen's terms they refer to it as a new tax?

III

The memorandum deals with the next "misconception" by saying: "Withholding will impose no hardship and little inconvenience on taxpayers. People who have such low incomes that they do not owe any taxes can easily prevent withholding by signing a simple form certifying that fact. Those under 18 can be exempted from withholding whether or not they owe any tax."

As noted earlier, a year ago you pointed out that such exemption certificates "complicate the withholding procedure." Whether they will entail a mountain of redtape, as some assert, or merely a complication, as you concede, may not be too significant. All agree that there will be millions of such certificates to be signed, processed and taken into account by payers.

The present bill requires that all nontaxable persons over 17 file the certificates with each payer every year, making this an annual chore for all concerned. You indicated before the Finance Committee on May 10 that your Department would agree to making "exemption certificates remain valid until revoked by the filer instead of requiring annual refiling." If, as you maintain, there is a widespread failure today to report dividends and interest, I think we may safely assume there would be a widespread failure to notify every payer that the taxpayer's right to exemption from withholding had expired. Since no withholding receipt would be given by the payer to the payee, confusion would be rampant.

In saying that people who owe no tax may easily prevent withholding, the memorandum fails to note, as the bill provides, that no exemption certificates may be filed for persons who receive their interest and dividend income through estates of deceased husbands or other relatives, or through trusts set up under a will or deed of trust; nor that the certificates may not be filed for interest-bearing U.S. obligations or interest-bearing obligations of corporations; nor for dividends on stocks held for convenience in a broker's name; nor except as may be provided in regulations, on securities held in joint names, et cetera.

In sum, the memorandum's dismissal of the obvious complications of the exemption certificate procedure leaves considerable question as to whether your Department or the public is operating under a "misconception."

I might also note that some persons, particularly those in small communities, who are not fortunate enough to have sufficient income to owe a tax have misgivings about their being forced by the withholding procedure to disclose their income tax position to persons outside the Government. The extent to which a citizen owes an income tax has generally been regarded as a confidential matter between the Government and himself. I think it should remain so.

IV

The memorandum then deals with another alleged "misconception" by saying: "Elderly couples, widows and others who may owe a little tax but less than the amount withheld, can get quarterly refunds by filling out a simple refund slip which will be available at banks, post offices and other places."

On this "simple" refund slip as I read the bill, the claimant must calculate his "refund allowance." According to Section 3484(b) of the bill, "* * * the refund allowance of an individual as of the time the claim for refund is filed is an amount equal to the excess, if any of—

"(1) an amount equal to 22 percent of—

"(A) the total of the deductions which, on the basis of facts existing at the time the claim for refund is filed, such individual would be allowed for the taxable year under section 151 (relating to deductions for personal exemptions), plus

"(B) in the case of an individual who, at the time the claim for refund is filed, reasonably expects that he will be allowed a credit under section 37 (relating to retirement income) for the taxable year, the amount which, at such time, such individual reasonably expects to be the amount of his retirement income (as defined in section 37(c) and as limited by section 37(d)) for the taxable year, less

"(C) the amounts (other than amounts on which tax is required to be deducted and withheld under this chapter) which, at the time the claim for refund is filed, such individual reasonably expects to be includible in his gross income for the taxable year; over

"(2) the amounts of tax with respect to which an allowable claim for refund has been previously filed under this section during the taxable year."

Mr. Secretary, do you really believe that this will prove "simple" for "elderly couples, widows and others" to understand and calculate?

For those who master the calculation, it will have to be revised each quarter if their income fluctuates. And for the fourth calendar quarter in each year no refund can be obtained until the final return for the entire year has been filed, at which time the quarterly refund claims start all over again.

Moreover, the memorandum fails to note that the bill does not permit filing of quarterly refunds for a single individual who reasonably expects to have "gross income"—not net income, but gross income—of $5,000 or more; nor for a married couple with gross income of $10,000 or more. A widow with $5,100 of gross income and substantial medical expense deductions would be denied quarterly refunds although she might owe only a small tax. Or a widow with $3,000 of gross income would forfeit her right to quarterly refunds if she realized a capital gain of $2,000 on the sale of her residence or a stock, even though it might be offset by a capital loss or other deductions.

I believe the quarterly refund provisions are quite arbitrary in their application and will cause substantial misunderstanding. I realize that in your statement of May 10, you recommended that itemized deductions be permitted to be taken into account for quarterly refund purposes; but while this would ameliorate some of the hardships, it would increase the complications of quarterly accounting to the Government of the taxpayer's income and deductions.

V

In urging that no hardships are involved, the memorandum refers to the case of an elderly couple, both over 65, one of whom receives the maximum social security benefit of $2,178 and the other of whom is entitled to a tax credit on retirement income (I would think it unusual to find this combination). You point out that they could receive $3,199 of interest or dividend income and still relieve themselves of withholding by filing exemption certificates.

This is true. But, to say the least, the case cited is not necessarily typical. Let us consider also the case of a widow, aged 60, with $2,400 of interest income and no social security benefit. She would have withheld from her $480 for the year, or $120 a quarter, although by reason of medical expense or other deductions she might owe a final tax for the year of only $50. The point I wish to make is that the withholding system operates in arbitrary fashion, and its impact upon the elderly, the widowed and others cannot be judged by any single illustration. It affects different persons with different degrees of hardship, and this I believe is responsible for many of the letters of protest flowing from all sections of the country.

The memorandum suggests that persons with income in these ranges are "well-to-do" because, if we assume the income represents a 4-percent return, there must be a substantial principal amount available. For example, income of $2,400 in the case I cited might indicate at 4 percent that the widow owned a principal amount of $60,000. Yet this is by no means necessarily so. Not only might her return be greater than 4 percent, but she might receive the income as the income beneficiary of a trust under the will of her deceased husband, without any right to invade the principal; or she might receive the interest on his life insurance, without right to the principal.

Even if the principal is at her disposal, she has doubtless been lectured at length as to the imperative need of preserving her principal to make it last for the rest of her

lifetime. She must protect it at all costs against the inroads of illness or emergencies, or watch her income dwindle as principal is used. Thus we must understand that she views with alarm the suggestion of the Treasury Department that she invade the principal as an incident of a new withholding procedure. She is not "misled"; she is merely understandably concerned at the immediate loss of income and the necessity for compensating for it by use of principal.

VI

The memorandum states that: "The maximum additional tax that the Internal Revenue Service could collect effectively with ADP and a reasonable enforcement effort is $200 million" (out of the $800 million "which are now being evaded each year").

I fail to understand how a flat statement to this effect can be made. Automatic data processing (ADP) has scarcely begun to operate. On September 29, 1960, the able Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Bertrand M. Harding, said in a prepared statement that automatic data processing "gives us a tool for a much more effective matching of information documents (particularly from Form 1099) with tax returns so as to enable us to tighten up enforcement and thereby reduce very substantially the gap between dividend and interest payments, on the one hand, and the amounts of such income reported on returns, on the other hand."

And subsequently, when the Senate considered and passed in September 1961, the taxpayer account number legislation to go along with ADP, Senator BYRD reported to the Senate: "This legislation, the Treasury testified, would result in closing loopholes so that those who are now avoiding the payment of taxes would be compelled to pay by operating this new number system through computing machines. The tax revenue, the Treasury testified, would be increased by $5 billion * * *."

I fail to understand why the new electronic system and the account number system, which were so highly and so recently praised, are now considered to be so ineffectual before they have scarcely been placed in operation.

VII

The memorandum further states: "In addition, there is no ADP system fully in operation as of now—and won't be until 1966."

Considering that the withholding proposal would require payers and payees to put the entire withholding procedure, with its millions of exemption certificates, into operation by January 1, 1963, and that the ADP system has been in development since at least 1960 and is already partially in operation, would it not be possible for the Treasury to expedite the completion of the system well in advance of 1966? Can it not be installed in less than 6 years? If the energy, determination, and ingenuity which has made America great were brought full square into the expedition of this program, I have no doubt it could be brought to fruition long before 1966.

VIII

For the sake of reasonable brevity, I have confined my remarks to only a few of the points made in the memorandum. In his forthright statement before the Senate on May 21, Senator BYRD has dealt in greater detail with the considerations involved, and has concluded that the ADP-account number system should be given a reasonable trial—and given it as promptly as possible—before withholding, with all its complexities and difficulties, should be instituted as a last resort. I subscribe wholeheartedly to his conclusion.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

A few days ago I placed in the RECORD a full explanation of the pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent that that explanation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, in connection with the statement that I am about to make.

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

EXPLANATION OF FEED GRAIN AMENDMENT

This amendment would strike out that portion of the bill which provides for a 1-year extension of the 1963 feed grain program; and would provide for a permanent marketing quota program for corn, sorghum, and barley. The minimum national quota would be 110 million tons. Acreage diverted from the feed grains covered by the program could not be planted to crops in surplus or which might impair the diversion program. For the first 3 years, 1963, 1964, and 1965, payments could be made for such diversion at not to exceed 50 percent of the support rate for the normal production of the acreage diverted. The price support level for corn would be 65 to 90 percent of parity if marketing quotas were not disapproved, and not more than 50 percent of parity if quotas were disapproved. Barley and grain sorghums would be supported at fair levels in relation to corn, and oats and rye could be supported at zero to 90 percent of parity.

This amendment is the same as the administration feed grain proposal contained in S. 2786, except for the following:

1. Under the amendment marketing quotas are limited to corn, barley, and sorghum, whereas the original proposal would have also covered oats, and, at the Secretary's discretion, rye.

2. The amendment provides for a minimum national quota of 110 million tons.

3. The provision for a commercial area to be fixed by the Secretary would be omitted but the program would be limited to the continental United States, excluding Alaska.

4. The farm normal yield for penalty purposes would be based on past farm production instead of past production in the local area.

5. Excess barley acreage could be disposed of by grazing up to 30 days before harvest.

6. The provisions of S. 2786 for substitution of wheat acreage for feed grain acreage and feed grain acreage for wheat acreage have been consolidated into a single provision, and the direction to the Secretary to permit such substitution has been given a slightly more mandatory color.

7. Diverted acreage payments would be limited to not more than 50 percent of the estimated support rate for the normal production of the acreage diverted, and producers would have the election to increase their diversion to 25 acres, instead of 20, if their diversion would otherwise be less than 25 acres.

8. The amendment permits price support for corn, sorghum, and barley at up to 50 percent of parity when quotas are disapproved, and in such case producers would have to comply with their feed grain allotments as a condition of price support, but would not be required to cross-comply with allotments for other crops, or on other farms, or with land diversion requirements.

9. A producer would not lose eligibility for price support or land diversion payments by reason of planting up to his wheat or feed grain exemption on another farm.

10. Instead of authorizing the sale for unrestricted use from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of up to 10 million tons of feed grains and up to 200 million bushels of wheat at market prices if quotas for those commodities are disapproved, the amendment would authorize such sale at 102 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charges.

11. An exempt feed grain producer would not lose history by taking advantage of his exemption.

12. The excess acreage planted to wheat in past years under the existing feed wheat exemption (which would be repealed by the bill) would be counted as feed grain acreage toward a feed grain allotment.

13. If the producer so elected, acreage harvested for silage up to the acreage harvested for silage in the base period would not be counted as feed grain acreage, and the base period silage acreage would not be counted in computing the allotment.

14. In deficit areas the Secretary could permit producers to plant their full base acreage, but they would then lose eligibility for the feed grain diversion program, feed grain price support, and the feed grain quota referendum.

15. An exemption has been provided for Malting barley, modeled after the exemption contained in the 1962 feed grain program, but applied to quotas and allotments.

16. The amendment also makes minor corrections in the small farm exemption and other provisions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, S. 3225 would extend the 1961 and 1962 emergency feed grain program for another year.

This action, in my humble judgment, only puts off for another year a decision that should be made by Congress today. The emergency feed grain program treats the symptom and not the cause of the problem in feed grains. And this type of treatment is very costly.

I wish to remark that when the emergency feed grain program was agreed to last year, it was an emergency program, to give the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry of the House of Representatives and the Senate an opportunity for a complete study of the feed grain program, so that permanent legislation could be enacted.

We have such a bill before us. I may say that the purpose of the bill, in a nutshell, is merely to curtail production of corn, sorghum, and barley in keeping with our requirements. The way that that would be accomplished is by acreage controls as well as marketing quotas. The bill does not differ at all, in the way it operates, from what is in effect with respect to cotton, rice, and tobacco—in fact with respect to all basic commodities which are protected. It happens that the corn program is the only one under which farmers have been able to produce without any marketing quotas since the program has been on the statute books.

The emergency program that was placed on the statute books was a mere stopgap. It turned out that the cost of the program was a great deal more than the proponents anticipated. However, I wish to say that in the long run the cost to the Government will not be as great as it would have been had the 1958 permanent law on feed grain been pursued.

I am proposing an amendment as a substitute for subtitle A—1963 feed grain program, of title III of S. 3225. The amendment I am proposing is essentially the feed grain program originally proposed by the administration, which was in the bill when I presented it to the Senate in the early days of February. However, a few changes, most of which were suggestions of members of the committee, have been included in the amendment.

The administration proposed a mandatory marketing quota and acreage allotment program for corn and other feed grains, similar in nature to the programs now in effect for cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.

Mr. President, there is no denying the fact that the programs in effect for these four commodities have worked well and that they are heavily favored by the producers of these commodities. In the last referendum held, 96.9 percent of the cotton farmers voting were in favor of the program; 94.2 percent of the rice farmers voting were in favor of the program; 98.2 percent of the tobacco farmers voting were in favor of the program; and 94.9 percent of the peanut farmers voting were in favor of the program.

These four programs which I have mentioned are working fairly well.

Under the law the Secretary has the right under certain formulas written into the law to determine the number of acres necessary in order to produce the amount of these commodities that we actually need for domestic consumption, for export sales, and for a reasonable carryover.

What my amendment seeks to do is to apply the same method to corn, sorghum, and barley.

The reason these programs work well can be attributed to the fact that they are realistic in their approach to the management of supplies, and when weaknesses develop, the laws are changed. Generally speaking, when supplies become excessive, acreage allotments are reduced. When supplies are short, acreage allotments are increased. The Secretary has been given authority, for example, with regard to cotton and rice to set price supports at between 65 and 90 percent of parity and to set acreage allotments at a level designed to prevent undue accumulation in Government hands of stocks that are neither necessary nor needed.

Just a few years ago the carryover of rice was in excess of 34 million hundredweight. This is more than a year's needs for domestic use. However, through realistic administrative management and the cooperation of rice growers, these stocks have been worked off and the anticipated carryover this August 1 at 6.5 million hundredweight is now considered inadeqaute. As a result, the rice acreage allotment this year was increased by 10 percent.

The same degree of good management has been applied to cotton. Last year the national allotment was increased by over 2 million acres in excess of the minimum because of anticipated supplies and demand. This year the national allotment is 1.8 million acres in excess of the minimum. Next year, under the supply management program in effect for cotton, the allotment can be either increased or decreased depending upon carryover and estimated requirements.

The law applicable to these commodities has the flexibility so necessary to the successful operation of a program, and the Department is managing the program in a manner designed to benefit not only the cotton producers but the industry, as well.

The realistic supply management programs in effect for cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts are beneficial to producers in a number of ways. Prices have been stabilized and assured. Under these programs, producers have been able to plan their operations more thoroughly. They have been able to apply technology. They have been able to become more efficient.

The industry itself is also benefited to the extent that it can better plan based upon stable prices and known supplies. Organizations which provide services and supplies for farmers are also benefited through the knowledge regarding price, acreage, income, and stocks.

Consumers are benefited through abundant and stable supplies at fair and reasonable prices.

Had a realistic supply program been applied to the feed grains along the same lines of the programs that had been applied to the commodities previously mentioned, we would not today be faced with the situation wherein huge stocks had accumulated in Government warehouses, and the costs of the program would not have been nearly so high.

However, we have never applied a realistic program to the feed grains. We have tried a number of programs and all of them have been failures or, as in the case of the emergency feed grain program, so expensive that in all good conscience it should be discontinued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

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

I would never advocate controls simply for the sake of controls. However, in my judgment, this Government cannot continue to expend huge sums of tax money because a few farmers do not wish to be covered by a program. I honestly feel that if feed grain producers knew all of the facts, they, too, would be aghast at the costs and would insist on a program which would be designed to keep supplies in line with requirements. I want to give them this choice.

As of March 31 of this year, Commodity Credit Corporation had $3.0 billion invested in 2.4 billion bushels of feed grains.

Price support losses, and other related costs, experienced by the Commodity Credit Corporation in disposing of feed grains amounted to $2.2 billion as of December 31, 1961.

Carrying charges, that is, storage, transportation, handling, and interest, on corn and grain sorghum alone had reached a half billion dollars a year by the fiscal year 1961.

The permanent price support law now on the books covering feed grains was enacted in 1958. It provides for price supports for corn at 65 percent of parity or 90 percent of the 3-year average, whichever is higher, with comparable levels for the other feed grains and permits unlimited production.

Prior to 1958 price support laws treated corn differently from the other feed grains. For grain sorghums, oats, barley, and rye price supports were permissive at from zero to 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary, and unlimited production was permitted.

Corn, however, has always been considered a basic commodity and as such has received mandatory price support in the same way that other basic commodities subject to marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, have been supported, except that marketing quotas have never been made effective for corn. In fact, they have never been imposed.

Acreage allotments were established for corn, except for war years, beginning in 1938; but marketing quotas were never proclaimed. Then in 1954, the law was amended so as to exempt corn from the marketing quota provisions of the law.

From 1954 to 1956 price support was made available in the commercial area only to those who complied with allotments, but no marketing penalties were imposed on those who exceeded allotments. As a matter of fact, in 1954 about 40.2 percent complied with allotments; in 1955, 51.4 percent; and in 1956, 43.9 percent complied. Of course, the fact that a large proportion of the crop was entitled to price support and could move into Government storage provided a so-called umbrella effect on market prices to protect those who did not comply.

Under the program of acreage allotments, with price supports available only to compliers, but without marketing quotas, Commodity Credit Corporation holdings of corn increased from 857.6 million bushels to 1 billion 109.2 million bushels in September of 1956.

In 1956 the Department of Agriculture, under Mr. Benson, further aggravated the situation in corn by providing price supports not only to those who complied with allotments but to noncompliers as well. This opened the flood gates, and production jumped from 2.9 billion in 1955 to 3.4 billion bushels in 1958. Commodity Credit Corporation holdings also increased from 1.1 billion to 1.4 billion bushels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

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

This tremendous increase in production came about in spite of the fact that the so-called soil bank acreage reserve program was in effect. In 1956, 5.3 million acres of corn in the commercial area were placed in the acreage reserve pro-

gram at a cost of $179.7 million. In 1957, 5.2 million acres were placed in the soil bank at a total cost of $196.4 million, and in 1958, 6.7 million acres were placed in the soil bank at a total cost of $282.3 million.

As I indicated earlier, in 1958 the price support laws for corn and the other feed grains were changed. Support prices for corn and the other feed grains were made mandatory at 65 percent of parity or 90 percent of the latest 3-year average farm price, whichever was higher, and all restrictions on production were removed. Corn production soared to 3.9 billion bushels in 1960. In other words, the Government handed the feed grain growers a blank check to grow all they wanted, with the assurance that any excess production would be taken over by the Government and stored. This program was in effect for the crop years 1959–1960. During these 2 years, Government investment in feed grains, that is, corn, oats, sorghums, barley, and rye increased from $3,306 million to $4,202 million, an increase of $896 million. From these two crops of corn alone, Commodity Credit Corporation acquired over 700 million bushels at a cost of $770 million.

Last year, at the request of the administration, an emergency program for corn and sorghums was put into effect for 1961, and subsequently a similar program for corn, sorghums, and barley was enacted for the 1962 crop. The program was requested by the administration so as to give them time to develop a realistic long-range program for the feed grains.

This we have developed. It is now up to the Senate to vote it up or down. I hope the Senate will vote for it, because there is dire need of a program to curtail production in keeping with our requirements.

Under the so-called temporary program in effect in 1961 production of corn and grain sorghums decreased by 421 million bushels below 1960 levels. As a result there will be a longrun savings to the Government.

However, the most recent figures provided by the Department of Agriculture indicated that the costs of payments to farmers under the 1961 program amounted to $782 million and administrative costs were about $43 million, for a total of $825 million.

Further, estimates by the Department of Agriculture indicate that based upon the final signup figures for the 1962 program, payments to farmers may run as high as $896 million if the intended diverted acres materialize and the total cost of the program may well be in excess of $900 million when administrative expenses are included.

While there is no doubt that a substantial reduction in the production of feed grains will occur again this year and that there will be longrun savings to the Government, the fact is that these temporary programs are extremely costly and cannot in good conscience be long continued.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the Senate will face up to the realities and adopt a permanent program for the feed grains that on the one hand will be less costly than programs previously in effect for these commodities, and on the other hand be of greater benefit to farmers and consumers.

As I indicated earlier, we have tried a voluntary allotment program, a voluntary land diversion program, and an open end program coupled with price supports. All of these have not come to grip with the essential features of a desirable program.

My amendment provides for mandatory controls coupled with price supports. It is designed along the same lines as the programs now in effect for cotton, for rice, for tobacco, and for peanuts. Everyone knows that these programs have worked well, and all who are affected by the programs wish to maintain them.

I fear that unless we make permanent changes in these other costly programs that the good programs now on the books will be affected adversely. I am sure that Senators would not want this to happen. I know that farmers would not want this to happen. Therefore, in my estimation, it is imperative that the Senate act today to correct the inequities that exist under the unrealistic program in effect for the feed grains.

There are a number of other reasons why a realistic program should be adopted for the feed grains.

First, the cost to the Government will be significantly less than under either the voluntary feed program or the program authorizing unlimited production with price supports. The Department estimates that payments alone would be about $400 million less; under a realistic program than under the emergency feed program. Further, acquisition costs would be materially less, because of a realistic allotment in light of our requirements.

In addition, a realistic program would get the Government out of the storage business, by setting allotments at levels designed, over a few years, to reduce Government stocks to a minimum. In my estimation, this is a "must," if other programs are to be continued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Louisiana has yielded to himself has again expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, second, a realistic program would be fair to all producers. Under the voluntary programs, about half the producers must take the brunt of acreage reductions, while those who do not participate receive the benefits of increased production and the umbrella protection of price supports. If all producers are to participate, all will share alike in accepting small acreage reductions, in exchange for substantial cuts in production by some producers. In this way Government stocks of grain can be reduced more rapidly and with less cost to the Government.

Third, under a realistic program for feed grains, prices will be stabilized and farm income will be improved.

Fourth, this program will be permanent, and will give the farmers a realistic choice between fair and reasonable support prices with production limited at a level with our requirements, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the choice of unlimited production, with support prices set at levels that will not result in the accumulation of excess stocks in Government hands.

I may add that this program is not being imposed upon farmers, nor are they being forced to accept it. Farmers will vote for the program they desire. If two-thirds of the farmers vote in favor of a realistic supply program then and only then will it go into effect.

Feed grain producers cannot "have it both ways." They cannot expect the Government to guarantee prices by accumulating stocks that are unneeded.

In my humble judgment, the Congress must face up to the fact that this Government cannot continue to purchase excess stocks of feed grains or other commodities because of unrealistic programs.

Here producers are given a clear choice between a realistic supply management program or unlimited production.

It is my hope that the Senate will give farmers the opportunity to make this choice.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5–23–62—L," and ask that it be stated; and I ask unanimous consent that the names of the two Senators from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. MCCARTHY] be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, on behalf of himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MCCARTHY, was read, as follows:

On page 23, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(e) The Secretary may permit the diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, other annual field crops for which price support is not made available, and flax, when such crops are not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage, subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at the rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops: *Provided*, That in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which would otherwise be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses and no price support shall be made available for the production of any such crop on such diverted acreage."

Renumber the remaining subsections accordingly.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, let me direct the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the fact that this amendment would authorize the Secretary to permit acreage diverted from feed grains in 1963, 1964, and 1965 to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, other annual field crops for which price support is not made available, and flax, when such crops are not in surplus supply and will not be in surplus supply if permitted to be grown on the diverted acreage. The amendment is identical to the amendment to the 1962 wheat acreage diversion program as enacted by Public Law 87-451, which I sponsored in the Senate. As in the wheat program, feed grain producers devoting their diverted acreage to such crops would not be eligible for price supports on those crops, and could not be paid more than one-half of the rate for acreage diversion which would otherwise be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield, let me say that I understand that by means of this amendment he is attempting to apply to this feed grain program the same requirement which was included in the 1962 program—or almost the same.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct, with the addition of flax.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was about to raise the same point which the chairman of the committee has made, because the only addition is flax and the Senator from North Dakota was responsible for getting it approved and included, a few weeks ago. Is not that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So the amendment would result in a continuation of what is now in effect, would it not?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Can the owner or operator get credit for the diverted acres and also be paid for raising the crops, under this provision?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. He will be entitled to receive a payment, at the discretion of the Secretary, of up to 50 percent of the diversion payment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the justice of permitting payment for the diverted acres and then permitting crops to be raised on them?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Because these crops are in short supply, and the producers need some encouragement to increase their production.

What the Senator from Iowa has stated would be allowed, but only up to 50 percent of the regular payment. Of course, none of the crops grown on diverted acres are entitled to price supports.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But the farmers would be entitled to receive payments for the land they have taken out of production, and they also would be permitted to grow crops on them. If those crops are in short supply, the price should be made sufficiently attractive to result in the desired amount of production, so that it would not be necessary to rely upon production on the land being taken out or diverted.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But I think this will be a better incentive than increasing price supports, which method we sometimes use to encourage the added production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, under the amendment the crops would be planted under rules and regulations to be issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary must indicate that these crops are not in surplus supply.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Secretary may make no payments at all, if he does not see fit to make them; or he could make them in varying amounts, ranging from zero to 50 percent of the payments he would make under the law, could he not?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes, and that is true with respect to flax. The Secretary put that into effect about a week ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. And also under your amendment he could put it into effect for the next 3 years, as I understand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the order of the Secretary, I think there were a few items on which he would arrive at a payment of somewhat less than 50 percent. No payment would be made on flax or on safflower.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be according to the Secretary's discretion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would be under the order of the Secretary, after the signing of the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. I understand that the amendment includes only the crops which now are included under the present plan, with the exception of flax.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is that also true as regards the provisions for payment provided for by the amendment—in other words, that they are to be the same as those now provided under the existing arrangement?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that it will be the same as the 1962 program, and the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to make payments of up to 50 percent of the normal payments on the diverted acres.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would have no objection to that amendment; and I agree to accept it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield, let me say that it seems to me that, on the one hand, we would subsidize a farmer for not raising a crop, and, on the other hand, we would subsidize him for raising the crop. In addition, Congress would be saying that it would step aside and would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to run the entire show in his own discretion and according to his own judgment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But these are crops which are in short supply, and for which no price supports would be provided for that portion grown on the diverted acreage. Instead of these diverted acres being idle, my amendment would result in their utilization for increasing the production of these needed crops.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. From the debate just now had, am I to conclude that even though the agricultural commodity is in short supply or even though there may be a scarcity of it, the Secretary of Agriculture would have the power, according to his own discretion, to make the awards as an inducement to grow that crop?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; he could permit the planting of these commodities on diverted acreage—that is all it means—and reduce the payments on the diverted acres if the farmers exercised the right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Reduce it on other acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; on diverted acreage. Under the law, the Secretary has the right to pay up to 50 percent of the normal yield on diverted acres. This amendment simply provides that if the Secretary sees fit—and the commodities named are not in surplus—they could be planted and the farmers' payments would be reduced.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does not this mean, in substance, that a farmer could divert certain acreage, or that certain acreage could be diverted, and under the provision the farmers would be entitled to not to exceed 50 percent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the Senator yield me 10 more minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 10 more minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. ALLOTT. Therefore, a farmer would be paid up to 50 percent for the diverted acreage on which he was growing a crop which supposedly was in short supply, and which would demand a good price. I have been opposed to phases of measures that give the Secretary the choice of what he will pay. We do not know what he will pay. Granted that we have done a lot of foolish things in farm legislation, it does not seem to make commonsense to me to pay a man for diversion of acres and then permit him to grow a crop on those acres which is in short supply.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It does not make sense to curtail production of

crops that are in short supply. We should encourage the production of such crops.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is perfectly all right, but why should the farmer be paid in addition for producing crops which are in short supply and which should demand a good market price?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I pointed out earlier that in the case of flax the Secretary did not permit any diversion payment. This proposal would require that no price supports would be available to the farmer for that portion produced on diverted acres.

Mr. ALLOTT. Would the Senator be willing to modify the amendment to the extent that the farmer would receive no payment for diverted acres?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. He is already losing price supports on that portion raised on diverted acres. Surely, the Senator does not think we should go all the way and penalize him for planting crops which are in short supply. I would rather lose the amendment than do that.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what happened to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I accepted the amendment. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, but the Senator from Louisiana made the flat statement that if, under that amendment, the farmers planted flax or some other authorized crop on diverted acres, then the payment for the diverted acres should go down. I submit that is not the case; that the Secretary has the discretion to keep up the full payment for retiring the acres and also permit the planting of these crops. It is within his discretion.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is in error. The Secretary under the amendment could only make payments of up to 50 percent. He could pay only 1 percent if he so chooses.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand, but all I am saying is that the Senator from Louisiana made a flat statement that if these crops were planted on diverted acres, the payments for diverting the acres should go down. I submit that is not the case; that it is within the discretion of the Secretary whether they go down; he can hold the payments up; and I submit he would do it if it were politically expedient.

Mr. ELLENDER. The record will speak for itself.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, may we have a vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not the modification; the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The amendment is agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I object. I want the amendment to go to a vote. At least I want my objection to this amendment recorded.

Mr. President, what I have stated for the RECORD is sufficient for my purposes. I wanted to make my own position clear on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the Ellender amendment designated "5-23-62—M."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 20, line 24, to strike out all through line 2, on page 21, and insert the following:

(3) The diverted acreage shall not be grazed unless the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing on such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing thereon in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment would prohibit the grazing of acreage diverted from the production of corn, grain sorghum, and barley under the proposed marketing quota program unless the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing on such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing thereon in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing. This provision is identical to that contained in both the acreage reserve and conservation programs, as enacted in 1956.

I know this amendment is more controversial than the previous one. It is one with which the dairy industry and the cattle industry to a considerable extent is concerned. If we permit grazing of these diverted acres, it is bound to result in increased production of these commodities affected, and probably some trouble in the future pricewise.

Would the chairman of the committee be willing to take this amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will take it to conference. It incorporates in the law the same provisions that prevail now on conservation acres. Am I correct?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am willing to take it to conference.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is it this section in the present law that was broadened to enable harvesting of hay and other products on the land to be used in drought situations?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I may say that this amendment will put diverted acreage in the same category with the conservation reserve lands. They could be grazed if an emergency were declared by the Governor and Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HRUSKA. But it is limited to grazing and not cutting of any crops?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Grazing is permitted now under the soil bank conservation reserve, but only in time of drought or disaster and then only after approval of the Governor of the affected State and the Secretary of Agriculture. Under this bill as it now stands, diverted acres could be grazed with no limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "5-23-62—K."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 8, line 1, strike out "(1)".

On page 8, beginning in line 2 with the comma, strike out through the comma in line 4.

On page 27, line 9, after "barley", insert a comma and the following: "excluding any such grains harvested for silage".

On page 27, beginning in line 12 with the comma, strike out through line 20.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this amendment would exempt any feed grain harvested as silage from marketing quotas for feed grains as proposed in the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and designated as "5-21-62—A." This amendment would authorize any producer to plant and harvest whatever acreage he needed for silage. Under the amendment, acreage devoted to the production of silage would not be counted in computing the feed grain base acreage for purposes of acreage allotments, and would not be considered in the establishment of future allotments.

We had an amendment similar to this in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which would exempt all corn and feed grains for silage. I understand the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Louisiana would limit the amount of silage only to the acres a farmer had in the past planted to these silage crops. A new farmer getting started would not enjoy this exemption, or if he built a silo last year and needed corn to fill it, he would not be able to plant it. Silage is not in surplus. I believe it would be helpful to the bill if this exemption were provided.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am opposed to the amendment because it would, in my

opinion, kill the whole provision in regard to feed grains. It is my belief that we have included in the proposal as it stands sufficient language to protect those who in the past have planted corn for silage.

In other words, if a farmer has a history of planting 50 acres of silage each year, or 75 acres, under the amendment as I have presented it he could continue to plant corn for silage in a similar amount.

Madam President, the proposal made by the Senator from North Dakota would open the door wide and would permit anybody to plant corn for silage purposes and then to sell his dry corn and have Uncle Sam support it. It strikes me that we have provided in the bill sufficient language to protect the smaller farmer, which I understand to be the purpose of my good friend from North Dakota.

As I have stated, in the bill there is the 25-acre small farm exemption. If a farmer has been planting 25 acres or less of any grains in the past, he would be exempt from the program. Or, he could choose to go under the program if he desired to cut back the same percentage that others who would come under the program would cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

There is also in the bill a provision which would give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to permit the planting of corn and of other feed grains in deficit areas. Since there are such provisions as I have mentioned, I believe those whom the Senator from North Dakota is trying to protect would be amply protected.

There is still another provision whereby a farmer could plant all the oats he desired or all the rye he desired without penalties. I understand those are good feed grains and are grown in abundance in many areas.

Also, there would be no prohibition under my amendment to the planting of wheat, barley or oats for pasture, provided that the grain is grazed by the cattle while on pasture; that is, before maturity.

Madam President, the small farmers, as well as the beginning farmers, would be well protected.

There is another provision which would take care of new farmers. As Senators know, the law provides that a certain percentage of the national quota or acreage shall be set aside to take care of new farmers. There is also a certain percentage set aside on the county level to take care of new farmers.

The complaint which has been lodged by the Senator from North Dakota in relation to the effect the amendment I have offered would have against new farmers and also against those who produce cattle, I believe is not well founded. Those people will be well protected. As I stated yesterday, about 50 percent of the farms which plant grain will be affected. In other words, almost 50 percent of the farmers would come under the 25-acre exemption.

Mr. EASTLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it the meaning of the amendment that silage be exempted? Is that the meaning of the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield for some questions?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not quite hear the answer to the question asked by the Senator from Mississippi. Would corn grown for silage be counted in the feed grain base?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us presume that a farmer has planted 100 acres of corn and under his history has used 50 acres of the 100 acres for silage. That farmer has a history of 50 acres of silage. He could continue to plant the 50 acres of corn for silage without restriction and without cutting back under the program. However, the other 50 acres would be subject to the quota provisions of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If he wished to do so, would it be possible for a farmer who had 100 acres planted to corn, 50 of which was used for silage and 50 of which was harvested for grain, to put the whole 100 acres into silage corn?

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmer would be cut back only on 50 acres.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. He would be cut back on 50 acres?

Mr ELLENDER. Only on the 50 acres. In other words, any acreage which has been planted by the farmer in the past and used exclusively for silage would not be affected under the amendment I have offered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I had not found that in the amendment, but I am glad to have the Senator on record as stating it.

There is a further question which relates to the years to be used for the base period. On page 10, of the Ellender amendment, at the bottom, it is stated that the base period shall be the calendar years 1959 and 1960.

Mr. ELLENDER. 1959 and 1960, that is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For the purpose of determining acreage allotments for the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crops. Why did not the Senator include the crop year of 1961, and provide for the three most recent calendar years to be the base?

Mr. ELLENDER. The idea is to have the exact amount; 1961 would be added as the program goes along.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would be added, but the trouble is that in areas which have fluctuating crops, 1959, in some portions of the country, was a very unfortunate year; 1960 would hardly give a reasonable average; 1959, 1960, and 1961 would give a more truly average production.

The Senator's amendment would make it possible for a proclamation to cover 3 years and for an election to cover 3 years. It seems to me that the base period should be at least 3 years in order to get a more true average.

I should like to have the Senator consider, in line 20, page 10, adding "and 1961" and in line 24, changing the "two" to "three."

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I am informed that that would penalize quite a few farmers who went into the emergency program which is now on the statute books. They have cut back under the law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They have cut back, but the problem remains.

Mr. ELLENDER. We would have to write into the law something to take care of that situation. In my humble judgment it would complicate matters.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In many areas in which a drought occurs, farmers could be denied relief, for one drought year could be placed against a normal year. It would give a base that would be discriminatory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. EASTLAND. Madam President, I ask the Senator to yield so that I may ask the Senator from Vermont a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I am glad to yield 2 minutes to both Senators.

Mr. EASTLAND. Madam President, may I ask the Senator from Vermont a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to make a brief statement first and then, if there is time, I shall be glad to respond to the question.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry voted 11 to 4 to exempt silage, rye, and oats from the provisions of the compulsory feed grain bill. Silage crops receive no price supports and should not be subjected to the same penalties as crops which receive direct Government support.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that it has been stated time and time again on the floor of the Senate that grasses and pasture are not affected by the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that silage is nothing but a filler, a carrier, and a substitute for grass?

Mr. AIKEN. It is used for the same purpose. If the growing of silage were restricted, farmers would have to go out of business or raise grass that would yield 15 or more tons to an acre.

Mr. EASTLAND. We know that an animal cannot be produced with silage. It is nothing but a substitute for grass.

Mr. AIKEN. And a farmer cannot produce milk profitably and efficiently on silage alone.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I am in difficulty in the matter of time. I ask unanimous consent that I may raise a parliamentary inquiry without the time being charged to either side. I think there has been some confusion. My understanding now is that when the hour of 4:20 p.m. is reached, all discussion on all amendments to the feed grain provi-

sion of the bill automatically will come to an end, and though amendments may be offered, they may not be discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So at 4:20, all debate on all amendments to the Ellender amendment, or that section of the bill, come to an end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, may I first have a ruling on my unanimous-consent request? I am rationing time with a teaspoon. I wish to be sure about the ruling on the parliamentary inquiry. I wish unanimous consent to raise the inquiry without having the time charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am trying to have a parliamentary situation straightened out without having the time charged to me in my attempt to do so. I must recognize Senators who have perfecting amendments, if they are to have any time.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is about a minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will restate his request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely asked unanimous consent to raise a parliamentary inquiry without having the time necessary to make the inquiry charged against the time available on the Ellender amendment, so that we might straighten out the confusion with respect to other amendments that must be offered before 4:20 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from South Dakota indicated that he would like to hold up final agreement to a unanimous-consent request to reach a vote at 4:20 and limit debate on all amendments to the feed grain amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Wisconsin understands that the situation is still as follows:

If the Senator from South Dakota or any other Senator should object to such a unanimous-consent agreement because of the way the previous unanimous-consent agreement was written, was repeated in the RECORD and also appears on the front of the Calendar, it would still be possible for a Senator to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, and he would have 1 hour on his side, and 1 hour would be available for the other side. Is that statement correct?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not answered the inquiry of the Senator from Wisconsin. The Chair believes that, as originally stated, all debate on all amendments must be concluded by 4:20.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair. When I raised the question earlier in the day it was stated by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], that the language in the RECORD was clear. I conferred with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is one of the outstanding parliamentarians in the Senate. He said that on the basis of the printed RECORD, the unanimous-consent agreement clearly gave 2 hours to the amendments. The language read "or amendments thereto." If the Chair is to make the kind of ruling he has announced, I am obliged to appeal from the decision of the Chair, because I think it would be unfortunate if Senators could not rely upon the unanimous-consent agreements as printed on the calendar and on the blue cards that are distributed to Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator from Wisconsin finished his inquiry?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin has finished his inquiry. It is his understanding that the Senator from South Dakota has stated exactly what the majority leader agreed to, but the Presiding Officer has ruled otherwise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The ruling is that at 4:20 p.m. all debate on the Ellender amendment, and all amendments thereto, will come to an end.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. While I agree with the Senator from South Dakota as to the rightness of his position, the question need not cause grave concern, because the last paragraph of the unanimous-consent agreement specifically provides:

> The said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Which means 4 hours of available extra time would be allotted on any of those questions. I cannot conceive of any Senator wanting to utilize more time than that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, it is my understanding that if I desired to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida on the bill, which I would be glad to do, I could not do so after 4:20 and still give him an opportunity to discuss the Ellender amendment before it is voted upon.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to have an answer to my inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I gave the Senator time on the bill, he could not discuss the Ellender amendment because the vote would occur before that time. Debate on the amendment would be shut off.

Mr. EASTLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did not the previous occupant of the chair, at the request of the minority leader, rule that amendments to the Ellender amendment—specifically the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin and the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi—could be offered after the vote on the Ellender amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I think they could be offered if they were germane, but I thought they had to be offered before the vote on the Ellender amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; that would fly in the face of the ruling.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather that time is running.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have an amendment which I intended to offer, but after looking it over, I believe it should be offered only if the Ellender amendment is agreed to. Would I be excluded from offering the amendment after the Ellender amendment was agreed to?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The amendment could be offered. Two hours of debate, 1 hour on each side, would be allowed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But if the Ellender amendment were adopted, the question would arise as to whether it could be perfected. Many of the proposed amendments are perfecting amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to be sure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment should strike out any part of the Ellender amendment, the amendment could not be offered after the Ellender amendment had been adopted. My amendment would strike it out. Therefore my amendment must be offered before the Ellender amendment is voted upon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator would be unable to do so, so far as debate is concerned, after 4:20.

The Senator from South Dakota has raised a new point with respect to an appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can save a little time if the Senator will answer my further question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My amendment would add to the Ellender amendment if the Ellender amendment were adopted. May I offer it after 4:20 p.m.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator can get time to offer it; but who will give him time? The minority leader will have to give him time, but his problem is how to provide time for Senators who have amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean after 4:20.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment would be a perfecting amendment in the form of an addition to the Ellender amendment. I believe the Senator should have a ruling from the Chair now as to whether, after the vote on the Ellender amendment, he is still in court.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no purpose in presenting the amendment unless the Ellender amendment is agreed to. Then I want an oportunity to present my amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me state the question as unequivocally and simply as I can. Will any perfecting amendment which is germane and adds to the Ellender amendment be in order after the vote on the Ellender amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to make a unanimous consent request to the effect that the vote on the Ellender amendment and all amendments thereto be at 5 o'clock instead of 4:20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to amend that request to change the time to 4:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The question is whether or not, after 4:45 p.m. an amendment to make an addition to the Ellender amendment, if it should be adopted, would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it would not be in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would it not be in order as a new paragraph or a new section elsewhere in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment may be offered to any part of the farm bill not embraced in the feed grain amendment which is the pending Ellender amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the majority leader feel that the easy solution is to defeat the Ellender amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Vermont is asking the question of the wrong man. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wonder if the Senator from Montana would modify his unanimous-consent request to allow 10 minutes of debate on each side on any amendment that is offered to the Ellender amendment. Then we can start at 4:20. At least we will know what we are voting on at the time we are voting on the amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree. I make that a part of my request.

Mr. EASTLAND. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request is to extend the time to 4:45, with 10 minutes on each side on each amendment that is offered.

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair ask the Senator from Delaware what his request was?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My suggestion was that if debate is to be shut off at 4:20, we should allow 10 minutes to speak on each amendment to the Ellender amendment so we can vote first on the amendments, after a brief explanation of them, to be followed by a vote on the Ellender amendment. In that way we would know what we were voting on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I raise one question. There will be a demand for a yea-and-nay vote on one of these amendments. If debate is shut off at 4:45——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It will not be shut off. We would take whatever time was required.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to offer his amendment now? If so, I will yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would, under the unanimous-consent agreement just arrived at, or as proposed by the Senator from Delaware, if I could get 10 minutes to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One further inquiry. It is my understanding that the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion?

Mr. ELLENDER. I withhold it. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Young amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] designated "K." The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, do I not have time for debate on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for debate on this amendment has been concluded. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Aiken	Curtis	Mundt
Allott	Dirksen	Murphy
Beall	Dworshak	Pearson
Bennett	Eastland	Prouty
Boggs	Fong	Proxmire
Capehart	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Carlson	Holland	Scott
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Stennis
Church	Keating	Thurmond
Cooper	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—53

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bartlett	Hickey	Morse
Bible	Hill	Moss
Burdick	Humphrey	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan	Pastore
Cannon	Kefauver	Pell
Chavez	Kerr	Randolph
Clark	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Ellender	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Engle	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ervin	Mansfield	Symington
Fulbright	McCarthy	Talmadge
Gore	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Hart	McNamara	Yarborough
Hartke	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Miller	

NOT VOTING—11

Bush	Gruening	Russell
Butler	Johnston	Tower
Carroll	Kuchel	Wiley
Dodd	McGee	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the plans for the rest of the day. As I understand, there are still 25 amendments on the desk, and I thought the majority leader might like to advise the Senate how late the Senate may continue in session tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I think, first, I should ask the indulgence of Senators in bearing with the leadership in the prolongation of the rollcalls, because I understand the bells are not working, and I think we should give consideration to Senators caught in that predicament.

Relative to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I wish to say, after considering the question with him, it is anticipated that we may very well be in session until 7 or 8, or thereabouts, tonight. The purpose is to bring to a conclusion final passage of the bill perhaps late tomorrow night, and then take up the public works authorization bill. If we finish those two bills by Tuesday, it is the intention of the leadership to go over until the following Monday or Tuesday, with a pro forma meeting probably a week from tomorrow, with no votes to be considered.

This is not a carrot being held out, but it is a way of telling the Senate about the business before the Senate. If we can do it, fine; if we cannot, we shall have to consider other procedures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has an hour been set for convening tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; 10 o'clock in the morning. After completion of action on this bill will come the public works authorization bill. Sometime after we return, after Memorial Day, we will take up the Interior Department appropriation bill.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. During the colloquy earlier in the day, when we were raising questions about the unanimous-consent agreement, I appealed from the decision of the Chair, but did not press the appeal at that time, because a conversation with the distinguished majority leader indicated that he would ask for a modified request which would allow 10 minutes to a side on amendments. I told the Senator that in that event I would not press the appeal. I wish to have the RECORD show this, and to show, in effect, that I did withdraw the appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that hereafter we shall be extra careful in presenting unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I call up my amendment to the pending amendment numbered "5-22-62—F" and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE:

On page 13, beginning with the new sentence in line 17, strike out all down through line 4 on page 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever a referendum is conducted pursuant to the provisions of the first paragraph of this section for the purpose of determining whether farmers favor or oppose marketing quotas for feed grains, the Secretary shall at the same time conduct referendums to determine whether farmers favor or oppose marketing quotas for wheat and cotton. The eligibility requirements for voting shall be determined in the case of feed grains by the provisions of the first paragraph of this section, in the case of wheat by the provisions of part III of subtitle B of this title, and in the case of cotton by the provisions of part IV of subtitle B of this title.

"Whenever referendums for feed grains, wheat, and cotton are conducted at the same time as provided herein, any farmer eligible to vote in more than one such referendum shall only be permitted to vote in favor of marketing quotas for all commodities with respect to which he is eligible to vote or against marketing quotas for all commodities with respect to which he is eligible to vote.

"In determining the results of a referendum conducted under this section, the votes cast in favor of or against marketing quotas in the case of feed grains, wheat, and cotton, respectively, shall be counted separately.

"The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within thirty days after the date of such referendum, and if the Secretary determines that more than one-third of the farmers voting in any of the referendums conducted voted against marketing quotas for the commodity concerned, the Secretary shall proclaim that marketing quotas will not be in effect with respect to the crop or crops of that commodity with respect to which the referendum was applicable. If the Secretary determines that, in the case of the feed grain referendum, two-thirds or more of the farmers voting approve marketing quotas for a period of two or three marketing years, no referendum with respect to feed grains shall be held for the subsequent year or years of such period.

"If the Secretary determines that the date prescribed in the first paragraph of this section is too early or too late to conduct simultaneous referendums as provided herein, he may advance or delay the conducting of such referendums by publication of the change of date in the Federal Register."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, may we have order in the Chamber? The debate is under a limitation of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The debate is under a limitation of 10 minutes to each side. The Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Madam President, I am opposed to the Ellender feed grains amendment for a number of reasons. The principal reason is that all available evidence indicates that if the Ellender amendment is agreed to and if it goes into the law, in the referendum which would follow there would be a negative vote, and the program would not come into effect. Two-thirds of the farmers involved would not vote in favor of the program.

The reasons for this are many. They are not based on theory. They are based on some very careful surveys by professionals who universally agree that this would be the situation.

One of the reasons for this is that two-thirds of the farmers involved do not sell their feed. The farmers feed it on their farms. They do not have any direct incentive for voting themselves a reduction in production. If the program went into effect the farmers probably would

have to cut back their production of feed grains by 20 percent. If the farmers wished to maintain dairy production, the production of beef or of hogs, they would have to buy feed grains and they would have to buy them at higher prices. For this reason many farmers would vote "no."

There is another very important reason. With respect to the major money crops, what has happened in some areas of the country is that the farmers who have produced cotton, who have produced wheat, and who have produced other products of the kind with respect to which the farmers have supported marketing allotments—by very heavy votes, as the Senator from Louisiana has indicated—have then taken the acreage diverted out of cotton and out of wheat and have planted it to feed grains.

COTTON, WHEAT FARMERS HAVE DIVERTED TO FEED GRAINS

I made that point yesterday, and I was challenged by the chairman of the committee. Today I wish to point out that in Texas, Oklahoma, and California, for example, cotton and wheat acreage was reduced by 6.3 million acres between 1952 and 1960, and during those same years feed grain acreage increased by 4.4 million acres. It is very clear that there is a pattern of diverting acres to feed grains. This is a big factor in causing the present surplus. And it is another reason why the experts are convinced that there will be a negative vote on a mandatory feed grain program. What would happen is that the farmers would vote in favor of limiting cotton acreage, in favor of limiting wheat acreage and acreage of other commodities, but the farmers would then vote against limiting themselves in the production of feed grains on their diverted acres.

In the third place, Madam President, the fact is that many farmers do not recognize the connection between the prices they get for hogs and beef and the price of corn. Economists recognize it. Experts recognize it. But thousands of farmers do not recognize it, and some farm organizations do not. Because this opinion is so widely shared, it is all the more reason why farmers will vote "no," feeling that they will be limiting production but getting no return for it.

DAIRY FARMERS WILL VOTE "NO"

Finally, dairy farmers will have no reason to support the program. I challenged the chairman of the committee yesterday to give me a single reason, and he did not come up with any. Dairy farmers will have no reason to vote in favor of this program, because the dairy farmer will be in the position that he will get $3.11 per hundredweight for his milk. He will get 75 percent of parity, regardless. If he should vote in favor of the program, if the program is approved by the referendum, he would have to take a reduction in feed grain production. He would have to pay more for feed. He is now suffering from a very low support price, a support price which in my State at least drives farm income down below what is needed to maintain a bare minimum standard of living.

Virtually every expert agrees that if the referendum is voted down there will be chaos in farming, and a very bad situation in America. It will be the worst kind of situation possible.

That is not the opinion merely of liberals. The Farm Bureau Federation, which is the great conservative farm organization of America, agrees that the situation would be impossible if land were not taken out of production or if something were not done, if price supports are abandoned. We would have a situation in which the farmers would be able to produce as much as they wished to, with no controls at all; with from zero to 50 percent price supports. There would be vast overproduction of feed, and distress prices for beef and hogs, as well as a greater than ever dairy surplus.

This is the reason I have offered the amendment. I ask the chairman of the committee to consider it seriously.

AMENDMENT PROVIDES SIMULTANEOUS REFERENDUMS

What the amendment would provide is that with respect to feed grains, wheat and cotton, any time there is a feed grain referendum held, the cotton and wheat producers who also grow feed grains and also are eligible to vote would be required to vote simultaneously for controls on all crops or controls on none.

It seems to me that this would be only fair. This would make sense. This would provide a real opportunity and a real incentive to get the program into effect.

The chairman of the committee pointed out that some votes have been as high as 94 to 98 percent in favor of quota programs. I think there is no question that the farmers still would wish to have a limitation, but in all fairness to the Midwest producing areas of feed grains, if we are to permit the cotton farmers and the wheat farmers to have a program with higher prices then we ought to demand also that they support a marketing quota program for feed grains.

When the referendums were tallied they would be tallied separately. It seems to me this would not prejudice the cotton program or the wheat program, but it would give the feed grain program a far better chance of approval.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the vote taken by the farm journal, which recorded the votes of 64,560 farmers. The compulsory quotas were supported by 4 percent of the 64,560. Land retirement was supported by 43 percent; and 53 percent said to have the Government "clear out."

These figures offer great support to what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. Only 4 percent of the 64,560 expressed their support of compulsory quotas.

The argument made by the Senator from Wisconsin is emphasized by the fact that the compulsory reduction would apply to the farmer who is trying to grow enough products to feed his cattle.

One of the staff members told me a moment ago that 85 percent of the feed grains are not moved from the farm; or, if they are moved, are moved to the immediate vicinity and are not placed in the commercial market.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I agree that there is a great deal of sentiment on the farms for this proposal.

I think most of us are aware that if this is put into effect overnight, all of a sudden, and there is an end to the whole program for feed grains without any gradual provision, there would be chaos and an extremely serious situation. It would be a disaster not only for the feed grain farmers but also for the hog farmers, the beef farmers, and eventually the dairy farmers.

Madam President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I prefer to reserve the remainder of my time. I have only about 2 minutes remaining, and I would prefer to have the chairman of the committee use some of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I cannot as yet determine what is the purpose of my good friend from Wisconsin. It strikes me that each of these programs should stand on its own feet.

What would be gained by requiring the wheat farmer, the feed grain farmer, and the cotton farmer to vote the same for the three programs? I cannot understand it. The law as it now applies to the commodities mentioned, that is, wheat and cotton, have been on the statute books for some time. It strikes me that the voting on those programs should be separate. For the life of me, I cannot see what advantage would be gained by combining the three commodities in one vote.

The amendment to the mandatory feed grain program amendment provides for simultaneous referendums on feed grain, wheat and cotton marketing quotas, and would require any producer eligible to vote in more than one such referendum to vote the same way in each such referendum. Thus, a cotton farmer wishing to vote for cotton marketing quotas, would be required to vote affirmatively for feed grain quotas, if he were also eligible to vote in the feed grain referendum. The purpose of the amendment is to prevent producers from voting for cotton and wheat quotas and against feed grain quotas, and then diverting acreage from cotton or wheat to feed grains.

The amendment is similar to the tie-in sales that were so objectionable during the price control days. In order to get something he wants the producer will be required to take something he does not want. I believe that two-thirds of the voters in a feed grain quota referendum, if permitted a free choice, would approve quotas. But I do not believe that they should be forced to vote one way or another against their best judgment.

The amendment would introduce considerable administrative difficulties. The ballot is by law a secret ballot. But how can the Secretary determine that a pro-

ducer voting "yes" in the feed grain referendum has also voted "yes" in the cotton referendum and still protect the secrecy of the ballot?

July 24 is at present the latest date on which the wheat referendum may be held. The testimony before the committee was that the farmer should know whether there will be quotas or not much earlier than this in order to make his plans. The committee in the permanent wheat provisions of the bill made the latest date for the wheat referendum about June 13. It must be within 60 days of the quota proclamation, which must be made before April 15.

Cotton quotas need not be proclaimed until October 15 under existing law and the referendum need not be held until December 15.

Under the feed grain amendment I have proposed, the quota could be proclaimed as late as June 19 and the referendum could be held as late as 60 days later in October.

All these dates have been worked out carefully to give the Secretary adequate time to obtain as current information as possible and still give the farmer as much time as he needs to plan his production. The holding of simultaneous referendums would, of course, upset this balance.

I ask the Senate to reject the amendment.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In order to clarify the RECORD with reference to one or two points, first, the argument that 85 percent of feed grains are fed on the farm or used in the area nearby still does not tell the whole story about the situation relating to feed grains. How much feed grain is there in the Commodity Credit Corporation warehouse at the present time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am amused every time I hear that argument, because I wonder how in the world the large quantity of feed grain now on hand got into the Government's possession. We now have on hand $3 billion worth of feed grain.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How many bushels?

Mr. ELLENDER. We now have on hand 2.4 billion bushels of feed grain.

I cannot follow the argument that 85 percent of the grain is fed on the farm or on farms nearby.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There must be a big farm in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I quoted figures which were secured from members of the staff. They indicate that 85 percent of the feed grain products of the farm are used on the farm or in the immediate vicinity thereof, and are not fed into the commercial market. The members of the staff are the authors of the statement. I suggest that there be some reconciliation of opinions between those in control of the committee staff and members of the committee.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I suggest that the figure may be correct as to each year's annual consumption. Eighty-five percent of that amount is consumed by farms or on farms nearby. It would not apply to the enormous stockpile. But I believe the figures used by the Senator from Ohio are correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point I attempted to make is that those figures do not tell the whole story. The fact is that, despite the figure, there is still $3 billion worth of feed grains owned by the Government, and in any man's language, that is a great deal of feed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think it merely proves that for many years we have been playing the part of Don Quixote in Congress by trying through legislative fiat to cure something that has demonstrated its incurability.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On the question of supply and consumption, a copy of the Wall Street Journal dated May 22, 1962, was handed to me in which the following article appears:

> Corn glut held by Uncle Sam shrinks fast. The price-support pile of corn owned by the Government fell to 729 million bushels May 1, down 138 million bushels from a month earlier and far below the 1.4 billion held a year before.

Mr. ELLENDER. I stated that the carryover last year was 85 million tons. Now it is about 78 million tons.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that I have 3 minutes remaining. In view of the fact that the chairman will not accept my amendment and that it would have no chance, I shall not request a yea-and-nay vote. However, I wish to use the remainder of my available time to speak against the basic amendment, the Ellender amendment.

The main point, which I have not yet made, is that in effect the amendment would disenfranchise 1,100,000 small farmers. It would do so in the following manner: The amendment provides that if farmers grow 25 acres or less of feed grains, they have a choice. What a choice. They have a choice of voting in the referendum. If they vote in the referendum against limiting their production, they are subject to a limitation of their production. Then they must lose 20 percent or more of their production.

But if they do not vote in the referendum, they still have a limitation on the amount of feed grain they can produce. I am convinced that there are hundreds of thousands of farmers in this country who will deeply resent it when they are told by the Department of Agriculture that although they cannot vote without incurring a sharp economic loss, nevertheless they cannot produce one more acre—or even one more square foot—of feed grain.

That is wrong; and there will be deep resentment if the amendment is agreed to. I do not think Senators realize what the amendment would do. Its effect would be very serious. I would not like to go back to Wisconsin and explain to a dairy farmer that he will not receive any more money for his milk, but that he cannot grow another foot of corn for silage, or any kind of corn or sorghum. That is exactly the provision of the amendment. It seems to me that Senators should realize that, in effect, the amendment would disenfranchise 1,100,000 small farmers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The great difference between the current law and the bill is that under the corn law the farmer himself can either sign up or not sign up; and if quotas are voted under the bill, every farmer in effect has signed up.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. Furthermore, unless a farmer signs up, he cannot vote. If they vote, they must take a terrific cut, one that they cannot afford to take. It means that they cannot vote, and that they are in a position to be limited.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, is there any time remaining on the Ellender amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish me to yield?

Mr. COOPER. If there is any time left on the basic Ellender amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes remain on the Ellender amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I have some time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Kentucky permit the Senate to finish consideration of my amendment?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. How much time does the Senator from Kentucky desire?

Mr. COOPER. Three minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I sent to the desk an amendment to the Ellender amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Amend the Ellender amendment by striking out lines 8 through the word "Act" in line 15 on page 6 and insert "products thereof, less (if the stocks of feed grains owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation are determined by the Secretary to be excessive) an amount of feed grains determined by the Secretary to be a desirable reduction in such marketing year in such stocks, but not in excess of 10 percent of such stocks, to achieve the policy of the Act".

Mr. MILLER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I shall not now speak on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, but on the Ellender feed grain amendment. Earlier today I spoke briefly on the Ellender wheat amendment. I voted in favor of it. In the short time that I spoke, I tried to point out the reasons which led me to support the wheat amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, and the reasons which impel me to vote against the feed grain amendment.

I agree wholly with the argument of the Senator from Ohio and other Senators when they say that it is doubtful that everyone in this body has thought about the consequences of this amendment, and whether the people of the country have thought about the consequences which would follow if the feed grain amendment should be adopted. I point out that there are great differences between the wheat amendment and the feed grain amendment. Wheat has a long history of compulsory acreage allotments and marketing quotas for which farmers have annually voted. Yet, the existing wheat program cannot work, because by law reductions in wheat acreage cannot be made below 55 million acres. Further, wheat is the crop in greatest surplus, and in which the Government has the greatest investment.

In contrast, corn and other feed grains have never had this experience and history of compulsory controls. I believe that if the feed grain amendment is adopted, it will have these consequences:

Many farmers who now grow corn and sorghum and barley for use on their own farm as feed for their livestock and poultry will find themselves in the position where they cannot grow enough feed for the livestock and poultry enterprises best suited to their farms. Certainly, they would not be able to expand their production to meet the changing needs of livestock operations on their own farms. That is a very radical proposal to impose upon farmers who have always been able to produce for their own feeding needs.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has pointed out that there are rather large stocks of feed grain on hand. However, if we study the tables in the committee report we find that the surplus stocks of these feed grains are very small compared with the consumption in a year.

With respect to corn, it is about a half year's supply. It is just about enough for use in one-half year. For other feed grains the supply is less. To take the step proposed by the Ellender amendment, with no chance for farmers to consider fully its consequences, is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MILLER. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Furthermore, I believe the adoption of the amendment will lead eventually to controls being placed directly upon livestock. Some administration witnesses who came before our committee admitted that it could logically lead at some time to controls on livestock. I believe the Senate has gone far enough, and that Congress will have gone far enough if we meet the wheat problem. Wheat is the pressing farm problem.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, on the Democratic side, will not, by legislative fiat, say to farmers, "You cannot raise feed for your own use." It is in line with the thinking of some people in the Department of Agriculture. It is not in line with the thinking of the farmers of this country or the people of this country. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, how much time remains on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four and a half minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my amendment relates to page 6 of the Ellender amendment. It seeks to eliminate the provision in the Ellender amendment which would take into account imports of feed grains that cut down on the national allotment. Furthermore, it would modify the Ellender amendment by taking into account the reduction in stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, in such amount as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. Instead, if my amendment is adopted, it will altogether eliminate from consideration the imports of feed grains. I believe that is a practical and sensible and fair thing to do. We do not want to have imports of feed grains, if our situation is such that we must cut down on the amount of production of our own farmers.

Furthermore, it seems to me to be fair and practical to put a limitation on the amount the Secretary of Agriculture can take out of the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The Ellender amendment would give him unlimited discretion in that connection. Under my amendment he would be limited to taking out not in excess of 10 percent of the stock in any one year.

It seems to me that if we are to take into consideration the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, we ought to do it on a gradual basis, instead of giving discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture to take out more than 10 percent in any one year.

I shall be very happy to yield for questions. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the amendment with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I believe it is a fair amendment. I hope he will accept it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. Under my amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture would use the same yardstick as he uses for other basic commodities in determining what the domestic needs will be, what the export needs will be, and what will be needed for a sufficient carryover. Under my amendment, the Secretary could not go under 110 million tons of feed grains. He could go above that amount if he desired to do so. But the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is to prevent him from going deeper than 10 percent into the huge carryover we now have.

As I have pointed out, there are on hand today 2,400 million bushels of corn and other feed grains, in which the Government has invested about $3 billion. Under the Senator's amendment it may take forever to get rid of this surplus. There is no doubt that so huge a surplus dangling over the market has an adverse effect on prices. I should much prefer to leave it to the discretion of the Secretary to reduce this huge stock as soon as he can and go back to a carryover which I would consider to be normal.

SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION OF ORBITAL FLIGHT BY COMDR. SCOTT CARPENTER

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana yield me 1½ minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield a minute and a half to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the breathtaking and successful conclusion of Comdr. Scott Carpenter's orbital flight has thrilled all America and the free world. His success points up once again the great progress being made in our space program, and the magnificent teamwork of the more than 30,000 persons directly involved in the Mercury manned space flight project.

This flight has provided an important continuation of the flow of scientific information which is so vital to the ever-growing capabilities of man in space.

Commander Carpenter has further enhanced the superb traditions of skill, dedication, and faith which his predecessors in Project Mercury space flights have established.

The determination of the United States to explore and develop space for peaceful purposes once again has been exhibited openly to all people throughout the world.

To Commander Carpenter, to our great space agency and its distinguished leaders, Mr. Webb, Dr. Dryden, Dr. Seamans, and to the thousands of determined and inspired workers in science and industry who have made this additional scientific knowledge and progress possible, I join all America in saying heartiest congratulations for a job well done. [Applause.]

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Did I correctly understand the Senator to speak of a surplus of 3 billion bushels of feed grains?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; a surplus of $3 billion worth of feed grains.

Mr. MILLER. A $3 billion surplus of feed grains?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; feed grains now on hand.

Mr. MILLER. Feed grains?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that includes corn, sorghums, and oats. The Senator is correct. The figure is as of March 31, 1962.

Mr. MILLER. May I comment on that statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Iowa has a minute and a half of his own time remaining in which to do so.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me that a 10-percent reduction every year is a reasonable maximum. We are not trying to cut down the surplus overnight; in fact, we are not trying to eliminate it. I think it would be a mistake to eliminate all the surplus. The Senator well knows that there ought to be a strategic reserve of feed grains. I do not believe we should talk about eliminating all the surplus.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 1 minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the Senator from Minnesota 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the RECORD ought to show clearly that under any program of controls or allotments we do not conform strictly to what is called a supply-and-demand formula, because the supply, as interpreted by the proposal before us, includes normal use, the export factor, plus the international requirements, plus the normal carryover for safety at home. All this is included in our definition of supply.

I spoke on this subject last evening. I have an amendment, which will be more specifically set forth, to direct the Secretary along this line and to so define "supply" in the proposed legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "5-22-62—C," to the Ellender amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be identified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment is designated "5-22-62—C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be printed without reading.

The amendment to the amendment is as follows:

On page 12, line 11, strike out "SMALL FARM EXEMPTION" and insert in lieu thereof "EXEMPTIONS".

On page 12, line 12, insert "(1)" immediately after "SEC. 360f.".

On page 13, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary shall, upon application made pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, exempt producers from the requirement of paying any penalty under section 360h with respect to any farm for any crop of feed grains on the following conditions:

"(A) that none of such crop of feed grains is removed from such farm;

"(B) that such entire crop of feed grains is used for seed on such farm or fed on such farm to livestock (including poultry) owned by any such producer, or by a subsequent owner or operator of such farm; and

"(C) that such producers and their successors comply with all regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the purpose of determining compliance with the foregoing condition.

Failure to comply with any of the foregoing conditions shall cause the exemption to become immediately null and void unless such failure is due to circumstances beyond the control of such producers as determined by the Secretary. In the event an exemption becomes null and void the provisions of this part shall become applicable to the same extent as if such exemption had not been granted. No acreage planted to feed grains in excess of the farm acreage allotment for the crop covered by an exemption hereunder shall be considered in determining any subsequent feed grain acreage allotment or marketing quota for such farm. No price support shall be made available on any feed grains produced on any such farm in any crop year for which an exemption is requested under the authority of this paragraph."

On page 19, line 15, strike out the period after the word "section", insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or (III) the producers on such farm are exempted pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 360f."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the amendment simply provides that a man may grow on his own land, without price supports, whatever feed is necessary for consumption on his property. Suppose a man owns a herd of cattle. The way the bill now reads, he may not grow enough grain to feed his own cattle on his own property.

I submit that before Mr. Khrushchev takes over, we should get back to some of the fundamentals upon which this country was founded. A man owns his soil to derive the fruits thereof. Suppose he owns a farm and has invested thousands of dollars in tractors and other farm equipment with which to raise grain to feed his livestock. There cannot be any reason why he may not grow on his own property the necessary grain to feed his own livestock.

Several million workhorses and mules are on the farms of this country. Unless my amendment is adopted, there will be many instances in which farmers will not be able to grow the grain to feed their own livestock on their own property.

My amendment would not cost the Government a dime. It would not result in an addition to the surplus. Not a bushel of the grain would go into a Government warehouse. The amendment would merely permit the farmer to grow the feed necessary for consumption on his own farm, without price support. The amendment should be adopted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi takes on a fine moral tone; but if we move over into cotton, should the farmer be permitted to plant whatever amount of cotton he needs? Or should he be permitted to grow as much tobacco as he wishes, if he grows tobacco?

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I have been yielded time by the Senator from Louisiana. I was merely commenting.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Minnesota knows that cotton and tobacco are industrial commodities and are not consumed on the farm.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator wishes to limit his proposal to having the farmer raise all the corn he needs to feed his cattle and to feed himself on the farm, that is another question; but livestock is a commercial product and can be taken to the stockyards.

Mr. EASTLAND. A man who owns a herd of cattle should be permitted to grow on his farm the products necessary to feed the cattle.

Mr. McCARTHY. Should a man who raises cotton be permitted to raise all the cotton he can gin on his farm?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, if he owns a gin.

Mr. McCARTHY. If he owns a gin, he can gin the cotton and market it.

Mr. EASTLAND. The average cotton farmer grows 10 or 15 bales. A gin will gin several bales.

Mr. McCARTHY. If he gets a bigger gin, should he be given a bigger quota?

Mr. EASTLAND. He would have to own more land. He would have to be a rich man. He could not gin a large quantity of cotton if he had a small farm.

I am trying to help the small farmer who owns a herd of cattle to grow on his own land the grain necessary to feed the cattle. What does he own the land for?

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator from Mississippi want the quota to go with the gin?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, what does the farmer own the land for, or what does he own the tractors for, or what has he made that big investment

for? His purpose is to be able to feed his own livestock.

Mr. McCARTHY. He can raise on his farm all the feed he wants to raise to feed to all the livestock he will be able to eat, but not enough to feed to livestock to be sold commercially and put on the market.

Mr. EASTLAND. But that is his right, as an American citizen.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Following the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, I wish to say that two very important factors are involved. One is the freedom of the farmer and the individual; the other is the cost to the Government.

The administration's proposal is a long start toward depriving the American farmer of the right to operate his own business, and it will be definitely more costly than the program we now have, taking into consideration the fact that the Department of Agriculture has not been trying to administer the present program in a manner calculated to make it economical.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. First, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. EASTLAND. How much time remains under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 7 minutes remaining under his control, and the Senator from Louisiana has 8 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me, for a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that for years, by action of the Congress, there has been a 30-acre exemption as to the production of wheat on the farm, for use on the farm?

Mr. EASTLAND. It has been either 25 or 30 acres.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder why there is a difference and what the reason is for the distinction between the 30-acre exemption for wheat and the lesser exemption for feed grains.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is this difference: Most of the wheat is sold on the market and is used for commercial purposes. But I am saying that an American farmer should be able to grow on his own farm whatever amount of feed he needs for his own livestock, whether it be beef cattle, dairy cattle, horses, mules, or billygoats. As an American citizen, he has that inherent right.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield that minute to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and I find ourselves in disagreement on some issues; but I must say that on this issue I am completely in agreement with the Senator from Mississippi. I know the poultry farmers and the dairy farmers and other groups of farmers deeply resent being restricted as to the amount of wheat and feed they may grow on their own farms for their livestock. It has always seemed to me to be very dangerous to have such a provision in our law.

This is a good illustration of what our farm programs will lead to. This kind of control is frightening in the extreme. To limit what a man can grow and consume on his own land is the last word in regulated agriculture. It is the farmer in chains. What will it lead to next? Will the shopkeeper, the workingman, the clerks, and teachers be subject to controls like this?

Mr. President, this amendment goes to the very heart of this entire issue. I am happy to support the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi in this matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point already made—namely, that the pending proposal has far-reaching ramifications. I definitely concur in that statement.

I anticipate that before the year is over, many of us will receive complaints from farmers who will find that they have planted more than the law allows them to plant, even though they have done that for the purpose of feeding their own livestock and managing their own small farms—with the result that these farmers will be brought into court and will be charged with crime. Then the farmers will write to their Members of Congress, and will ask, "What has become of my liberties as a farmer? I own this small farm, and I have some hogs and some cattle and some billygoats, and I need the feed grains to keep this farm running. But the great and powerful sovereign Government of the United States has declared by law that in my humble efforts to run this farm, I shall not be permitted to grow the crops that are needed for this humble operation."

Mr. President, the far-reaching ramifications are beginning to manifest themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield 2 more minutes to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. If I have any time remaining, I am glad to yield it to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has 2 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield that time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Ohio has not yet heard of the Freeman-Cochrane axis, has he? I concur in everything the Senator from Ohio has said; but he has not yet heard of the Freeman-Cochrane axis, has he?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall not comment on that point.

I merely wish to state to the Senate that probably there is not one Senator who has not gone through his State on Decoration Day or the Fourth of July or Constitution Day, proclaiming the goodness which comes with the liberties provided by our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence. But, Mr. President, I ask this question of my colleagues: What is becoming of the liberties of the American farmers, when it is proposed to put this harness and this shackle upon them?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that throughout the rural communities, for many decades the American farmer has been taught day in and day out by the agricultural experts to grow what he needs on his farm—to grow what he needs in order to feed his livestock—his cattle, his work stock, and so forth—and that the only way he will be able to make ends meet is to live at home and produce his necessities there? Has not that been taught as being fundamental to our agriculture?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

On this floor I have heard arguments in favor of protecting the little farmers. But where is the protection for them in the pending measure? This measure contemplates, in effect, destroying the small farmers.

Aside from any other reason for voting against this measure, I shall vote against it because I subscribe to the perpetuation of the freedom and the liberty of the citizens of this country; and I hope all my colleagues who believe in that principle will give thought to it and will recognize the far-reaching impact of the pending proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time under the control of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have listened to the dramatic speech made by my good friend the Senator from Ohio. I am sure that he is opposed to the feed-grains bill. However, the difficulty is that he has failed to read the bill, for small farms up to 25 acres are exempted from this measure. If in the past the small farmers have planted 25 acres or less, those acres are not covered by this bill; and, in addition, the farmer is at liberty to plant all the oats he desires to plant, because oats are not covered by this bill, and neither is rye.

Mr. President, my purpose here is to provide that if corn farmers expect the Government to support the price of the corn they produce, then they must curtail production in line with our requirements. Or if they vote not to curtail

production, then price supports will be set at market price levels.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not yield now.

Mr. President, in the past 15 years the great difficulty has been that the corn grower has been exempt from all of these controls. The corn grower has been able to plant all he desired, with price supports. Even marketing quotas were removed from the corn producer. I say it is unfair to the taxpayers of the Nation to permit corn producers to grow all the corn, sorghum, and barley they wish, and let Uncle Sam carry the surplus. That is what it amounts to.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not yield at this time; I have only a short time.

We have gone far to exempt from my amendment the people the Senator from Ohio is crying about. I am for the small farmer as much as he is, or as much as any other Member of the Senate, and in the bill we have exempted those who produce on less than 25 acres.

In addition, we have said to the farmer, "If you planted corn for silage in the past, you have a history for it, and you can plant it without any penalties." We have done everything possible to assist the small farmer for whom my good friend from Ohio has been pleading.

I would be the last man on earth to do anything to injure farmers, but when a farmer plants 50 or 60 or 75 acres to corn and then lets Uncle Sam buy the corn from him and store it, that is where I want to draw the line.

As I pointed out before, controls have been in effect on all other basic crops. The program has worked well on cotton, rice, tobacco, and other basic commodities. But in those cases the farmers themselves voted for programs which gave the Secretary of Agriculture the right to curtail acreage so that production would be in keeping with our requirements.

We have also provided for the deficit areas. Under the provisions of the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture, wherever there is a deficit area of feed production, may exempt such areas.

So we have done all possible to assist small farmers.

I repeat, because it needs repeating, that up to March 31 we had $3 billion worth of feed grains on hand, which represents 2.4 billion bushels. I want to get rid of these surpluses. If this amendment is adopted, it will kill the corn provision now before the Senate, because it will mean that a farmer can grow any amount of feed he desires, or any crop he desires to grow on the land, provided it is fed on the farm. That, to my way of thinking, means the killing of this bill.

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

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

Mr. GORE. Two minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have not been able to enter into the debate, but this is a subject about which I have some knowledge. In my considered opinion, adoption of the amendment would nullify the effectiveness of the provision offered successfully by the senior Senator from Louisiana.

If we accepted the proposition that a producer can produce without limit so long as he feeds it on his own farm, I ask the senior Senator from Louisiana, whether, in his opinion, that would not be an open invitation for a corporate combination of corn land and the feed lots?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about it. It would really kill the bill.

Mr. GORE. It would kill the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator from Mississippi has said, it is the same thing as permitting a farmer to produce all the cotton he can gin on his farm. If a farmer can produce all the corn he can feed, there will be an open invitation for a corporate combination of corn land and the feed lots.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Tennessee would not misquote the Senator from Mississippi; would he?

Mr. GORE. If I misquoted the Senator, I did not mean to do so. I withdraw the statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Senators constantly talk about the feed-grain provision as if it represented a drastic cut. Supply is to be related to the needs, to the reserves, to the consumption requirements, and to the export requirements. Under the terms of the bill there is to be established a minimum of 110 million tons of feed grains. The Secretary can have no quotas or allotments below that. He could go higher. If there were a shortage, instead of reducing the acreage he could increase it.

A certain degree of flexibility has been provided. What has been provided is a program of "no free riders." That is what the Senator from Louisiana is talking about.

I think the point was well made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], that a provision which permits a farmer to feed all he can produce on the farm, regardless of his historic base, might well result in promoting one of the biggest combines of feeder lots, hog production, and corn production that one could ever hope to see, and might help to do away with the family farm. Senators should think about that for a moment.

Protections have been written for the small farm, for the deficit areas, and with respect to the adequacy of supplies.

I point out that in 1958 farmers produced 22.4 million tons of oats, which is a good feed, which has a feed equivalent to corn of about 60 to 65 percent. That 22.4 million tons is exempt. Farmers can produce 40 million tons of oats, and it will be exempt. It is good hog feed. It is good chicken feed. It is good turkey feed. It is good beef feed. Yes; and it is good horse feed, if there are any horses left.

In 1959 farmers produced only 107 million tons of corn, so the proposal is not one which should shock someone to death. What is really sought is to shock the Treasury. I say, as a friend of agriculture, that the time has arrived when the friends of agriculture had better make up their minds whether the public will become so discouraged and disgusted with the cost of the farm program that there will not be any program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are at that point now, Mr. President.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri may proceed.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have listened to this discussion with interest. The basic trouble with respect to the current farm programs in this country today is found in excessive inventories. Excessive inventories probably have killed more businesses than any other single factor. And they will ruin the entire farm program unless we face the problem now in the Senate.

In my opinion, the position of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is correct. The farmers of this country cannot have it both ways. If they believe in price supports—and I would hope they would and would get fair price supports—they should be willing to have their production controlled. That is what we are talking about.

I shall oppose the amendment, for the reasons I have stated, and vote for the Ellender amendment.

As a representative of a State where agriculture is still the No. 1 business, I want to pay tribute to the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for their many long hours of work on the Food and Agriculture Act, and especially to the able and experienced chairman of that committee, Senator ELLENDER.

I do not agree entirely with the committee majority; but their report explains the bill fairly and well. With the supplemental views presented, it gives us an excellent basis for appraising the current operations of the farm program as it has been operating; and also for deciding what the farm program should be.

I hope we will consider this act as a business matter because any agriculture problem can only be solved through the application of sound business principles.

American farmers are not lacking in independence and self-reliance. On the contrary, they are among the most independent and self-reliant people in the Nation. But at times it has been necessary for them to have support from their Government, support comparable to tariff protection for business and minimum wages for labor.

The number of farmers has been steadily decreasing. American agriculture, however, is still made up of some 3.7 million individual units, most of them family owned and operated.

It is hard for American farmers, scattered all over the country, and with diverse but closely related interests, to get together nationally to solve the problems of their industry. Hence they look to their Government for advice, and at times assistance, on the two major aspects—production and marketing.

New machinery and new chemicals, along with improved management, has increased our agricultural productivity to an extent once unimagined. As example, whereas in 1938 wheat yields per acre averaged 13.3 bushels, by 1960 yields averaged 26.2 bushels per acre.

The "Food and Agriculture" booklet published by the Department of Agriculture, reports the average yield of cotton has risen from 270 pounds per acre in 1950, to 438 pounds in 1961. A further increase to 500 pounds is expected by 1967.

Average yields for the four major feed grains have risen from less than a ton per harvested acre in 1950 to 1.32 tons in 1961. A further increase to about 1.5 tons is expected by 1967.

In 1980 this Nation will have a population of 245 million people, 60 million more than today. But our food and fiber needs will be met on 50 million less acres of cropland than are now in use.

Over the years price supports have prevented economic disaster for our farmers. But without truly effective production controls these price supports can only lead to unnecessary and expensive surpluses.

At the close of the 1951 marketing year, the feed grain carryover was 20.1 million tons. By 1961, however, this carryover had increased to 84.7 million tons.

The wheat situation is quite comparable. The carryover has been increased from 256 million bushels at the close of the 1951 marketing year to 1,412 million bushels at the close of the 1960 marketing year.

Following an increase in dairy price supports—without production control—at the same time there was a heavy drop in consumption, the surplus of dairy products multiplied to where, at the end of March, the CCC had some 280 million pounds of butter.

Nor is the price support reduction of last April expected to cut production; in fact, it may result in an increase, because milk farmers will try for maximum production in effort to meet costs.

This is the problem—large surpluses which must be handled, because, as of March 31, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned $4.5 billion of surplus farm products, and had loans on $2.9 billion more.

Let us also remember that the carrying charges for these surpluses now amount to over $1 billion a year.

Buying and storing farm commodities far beyond our needs is an expensive way of temporarily avoiding the issue; and makes any solution all the more difficult. Therefore, if we are to support prices, we must have production controls; acreage controls alone are simply not enough.

American farmers have a long and cherished tradition of independence. They do not relish being told how much they can produce, or on what terms. But the thinking man of agriculture knows that is the price which must be paid for any meaningful price support program.

Those who advocate price supports without adequate production controls are no friends of the farmer. Such a course can only increase the already staggering surpluses, which must be stored at additional cost to the Government.

Let us hope, therefore, that the Senate will vote the farmers the right to a realistic and honest choice.

Let us give the farmers of America an honest choice between an unsupported market on the one hand, and price supports with meaningful production controls on the other.

If the latter program is adopted, it is my considered opinion that not only the large farms but also the efficient family size farms, will be able to live and prosper in the American tradition.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been intrigued by the reference to 2.6 billion bushels of corn on hand, as if that were a terrible calamity. I understand that figure was as of the 1st of April.

Mr. President, we utilized corn at the rate of 3.8 billion bushels last year, or 320 million bushels per month. There are 5 months before the new corn crop will come in. By the 1st of October there will probably be a billion bushels of corn left on hand, which will represent a 3 months' supply.

I say to Senators, "For Heaven's sake, do not take chances with the security of this country by cutting our feed grain supply below a 3 months' supply or our wheat supply below a year's supply. It would be a terrible thing to reduce the food supply of this country below a safe level.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will need only 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 minute.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the statement that the amendment would promote corporate farming is a fantasy. The amendment would not do any such thing. It would give to every farmer in the United States, without cost to the Government of the United States, the right to grow feed for his own livestock on his own farm. Senators have been conjuring up ghosts.

My distinguished friend from Louisiana has criticized the corngrowers. Statements have been made about people living off the Treasury. Nothing like that is involved in the amendment, because no price support is involved. The feed grains will be grown for consumption without price supports.

Is it not in the very best tradition of our country that a man may be permitted to grow on his own land that which is necessary for consumption by his own livestock and by his own family?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me some time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am familiar with the provisions identified by the Senator from Louisiana concerning the discretionary power sought to be vested in the Secretary of Agriculture, to take such action as will conform to the solutions conceived for what are called deficit areas. I am familiar with that, but based upon what I have seen happen in the Government, I should like to get away from a reliance upon discretionary power of individuals and an abandonment of reliance upon law, immutable and clearly written.

Congress can continue to enact legislation abdicating the power of Congress and surrendering it to boards and departmental heads, but I am not willing to rest content with that type of government.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The statement has constantly been made that the U.S. Government will be picking up the check for price supports on feed grains. Under the proposed amendment how would it be possible for the U.S. Government to pick up any check?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall not answer that question directly. Since I have been in the Senate I have heard arguments made each year about the final solution of this problem. At the end of each year I have found that we were in worse condition than during the preceding year.

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the proposed amendment the cost to the Treasury would be nothing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We had a conservation reserve program. Thirty million acres were acquired under it at a cost of $11 per acre, in the form of annual payments.

Last year we passed a bill which was supposed to be the panacea. Under that bill it cost us $31 an acre to take land out of production. For $1 spent under the conservation reserve $3 was spent under the bill passed last year.

Something has been said about the farmers being allowed to plant oats to feed cattle. I have heard the argument made that cattle need some solid foods, and that the mere allocation of the right to feed them with oats does not answer the question of providing a well rounded diet, under which the farmer could strengthen and fatten his cattle, and

thus procure for himself the greatest return.

I hold the Senator from Louisiana in the highest of esteem. I know of his concern about the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I yield to no other Senator in the desire to lessen the tax burden on the people of this country. I contemplate fighting for that principle so long as I have any power. There are other aspects of our responsibility which are of equal importance, however.

I come back to the proposition that it is sought to put a harness and shackles upon the little farmer of my State.

I will not stand for it. I will not subscribe to it. I will vote against the amendment, and finally against the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to the so-called Ellender amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Aiken	Dirksen	Morton
Allott	Dworshak	Mundt
Anderson	Eastland	Murphy
Beall	Fong	Pearson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Boggs	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Capehart	Javits	Scott
Carlson	Keating	Smith, Maine
Case, N.J.	Kerr	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Thurmond
Cooper	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Miller	
Curtis	Monroney	

NAYS—45

Bartlett	Hickey	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Burdick	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pell
Cannon	Jordan	Randolph
Church	Kefauver	Robertson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Mass.
Ellender	Magnuson	Sparkman
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	McCarthy	Talmadge
Gore	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hartke	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Moss	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Bush	Fulbright	Long, La.
Butler	Goldwater	McGee
Carroll	Gruening	Russell
Chavez	Johnston	Tower
Dodd	Kuchel	Wiley

So Mr. EASTLAND'S amendment to the amendment of Mr. ELLENDER was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall vote against the Ellender feed grain amendment because it is a permanent, mandatory marking quota program which will necessarily adversely affect dairy, livestock, and poultry farmers and those who are purchasers or users of feed grains. I emphasize the word "permanent," for that is why I also voted against the Ellender wheat amendment. There is a more rational solution to the problem of farm surplus, and we should not close the door on it by freezing ourselves into permanent programs of this sort. Perhaps it would be equitable to ask these farmers who purchase feed grain to accept the obvious disadvantages to them under the Ellender feed grain amendment if we could point to equivalent or offsetting advantages for them, either as farmers, as consumers, or as taxpayers. But I cannot see any real prospect of advantage to dairy, livestock, and poultry farmers in the Ellender amendment. On the contrary, I see positive economic disadvantage to them as farmers, for their feed costs will be fixed at a high level, even as other costs of farm production continue to mount (an increase of more than $500 million in 1961), and yet, speaking particularly of dairy farmers, they are not offered the prospect of a penny more in the price of their product. As for benefit to these farmers, consumers, I have yet to hear any prediction that the price of milk or foodstuffs will be lowered as a result of this amendment. And, as for benefit to them as taxpayers, it is all well and good to speak of reducing surpluses and thereby storage costs, but I have yet to hear an actual estimate as to how much American taxpayers will realize in net savings by reason of a program which employs a compulsory program to reduce storage costs of certain feed grains on the one hand but increases other agricultural outlays on the other.

By opposing the Ellender amendment I do not wish to support by implication the present emergency feed grain program which was first enacted last year, for all its proponents claim for this emergency program is that it cut somewhat the costs of storage of some feed grains, while conceding that other storage costs have increased. In this connection, I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont and ranking Republican member of the Agriculture Committee [Mr. AIKEN], when he made the following comment:

> It has been said that had it not been for the program farmers would have produced 500 or 600 million bushels more feed grains. But those who made that statement forget that, according to a report showing the intention of farms to plant, issued by the Department of Agriculture in March 1961, even before the program was enacted, farmers had announced their intention to plant several million fewer acres of corn than they had planted the year before. So I do not think the argument holds water very well.

I do not think that program worked. Although we are providing for extending it for another year or two, it ought not to continue.

I predict, Mr. President, that before the end of 1962 we shall see sharp increases in the price of feed grains, and it will be the dairy farmer, and other purchasers of feed grains, who will pay that price. This is too much to ask of an already hard-hit segment of our agricultural economy.

HEALTH CARE PROPOSALS FOR THE AGING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, interest in the issue of health care for the aging has resulted in valuable legislative proposals being put before both bodies of

COMPARISON OF MAJOR HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PROPOSALS FOR THE AGING, 1962

KERR-MILLS PROGRAM (PUBLIC LAW 86-778)	ADMINISTRATION BILL (87TH CONG.), S. 909 (SENATOR ANDERSON AND OTHERS), H.R. 4222 (REPRESENTATIVE KING)	JAVITS BILL (S. 2664)
Coverage: Approximately 10 million persons over 65 might meet the eligibility requirements. The number actually affected will depend upon the number of States participating, and the eligibility standards formulated by such States. (S. Rept. 1856, 86th Cong.) [1]	(*As of January 1963, see effective dates below*) *Million* OASI eligibles ..... 14.4 Railroad Retirement eligibles ..... .6 Total 15.0	All persons 65 and over who meet the retirement qualifications [1] and who are not beneficiaries of medical care under old-age assistance or other Federal assistance medical programs.
How many benefit: Each State could formulate its own eligibility standards within the State plan, except that benefits must be provided for residents of the State who: (1) have attained age 65, and (2) are not recipients of old-age assistance, but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of the medical services listed below. Persons under age 65 or persons receiving old-age assistance could not be made eligible under the State plan. The State plan may not require an enrollment fee as a condition of eligibility or impose a lien on the property of a beneficiary during his life or that of his surviving spouse.	All persons would be eligible for medical benefits who— (1) are age 65 or over; and (2) are eligible to receive social security or railroad retirement benefits.	12.3 million (as of 1963) estimated out of total age population of 16 million (est.)
Benefits: The State plan for medical assistance for the aged may specify medical services of any scope and duration, provided that both institutional and noninstitutional services are included. The Federal Government would share in the expense of providing the following kinds of medical services: (1) inpatient hospital services; (2) skilled nursing home services; (3) outpatient hospital or clinic services; (4) physicians' services; (5) home health care services; (6) private duty nursing services;	Benefits would consist of payments to medical facilities for services rendered to eligible individuals. Such payments may be made for the following kinds of services: (1) inpatient care —90 days per benefit,[1] subject to a deductible of $10 per day for the first nine days, but not less than $20; plus, (2) skilled nursing home care after transfer from a hospital—120 days per benefit period plus an extra two days of nursing home care for each unused day of hospital care, total nursing home care for each benefit period not to exceed 180 days [2], plus,	Eligible individuals may choose one of three optional programs; (1) preventive, diagnostic and short-term illness benefits with specified services; (2) long-term illness benefits with specified services; (3) private insurance benefits, under which the cost of a private insurance plan, up to a maximum of $100 per year, is paid for. Benefits specified under the preventive short-term care plan; (1) 21 days of hospital care; (2) 63 days of nursing care less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (3) physicians serv-

[1] A benefit period commences with the first day a person receives hospital benefits and ends 90 days after he has ceased to be an inpatient in any hospital or nursing home.

[2] Thus, if an individual uses 60 days of hospital care, or less, in a benefit period, he will be entitled to 180 days of nursing-home care after leaving the hospital. If he uses 70 days of his hospital benefit he will have 160 days of nursing-home care. If he uses 80 days of the hospital benefit, he will have 140 days of nursing-home care.

[1] An individual would be "retired" if: (i) his income for Federal income tax purposes did not exceed $3,000, or $4,500 in combined income with his spouse, in his last taxable year; or (ii) he files a sworn statement that for taxable year in which he applies for health care insurance benefits, his income for Federal tax purposes will not exceed $3,000, or $4,500 for a married couple; or (iii) he had attained age 72.

This bill contains basically the same benefit, administrative and eligibility features as S. 937, which provides for general revenue financing. I introduced S. 937 on February 13, 1961, with Senators COOPER, SCOTT, AIKEN, FONG, COTTON, KEATING, KUCHEL, PROUTY, and SALTONSTALL as cosponsors.

Source: Senator JAVITS' office.

the Congress. The major and distinctive features of these bills have been set forth side by side in a concise, objective manner that has proved instructive and helpful to all who have been fortunate enough to have this table. This excellent document was prepared by Cordelia B. Markarius of the staff of the Republican policy committee, under the direction of Staff Director David S. Teeple, and offers a valuable guide through the major health care proposals before us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks this comparison table.

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

COMPARISON OF MAJOR HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PROPOSALS—Continued

BOW BILL (H.R. 10981)	LINDSAY BILL (11253)	BLUE SHIELD-BLUE CROSS SENIOR CITIZENS PROGRAM (Endorsed by the American Medical Association)
Everyone who reaches age 65 who wishes health insurance.	OASDI eligibles and over; also railroad retirees. 14.4 million OASDI beneficiaries and 0.6 million railroad retirees; also subject to State action and State eligibility standards, all those not covered by OASDI may be made eligible (about 2.9 million).	Blue Shield: All 17.9 million persons age 65 and over, their spouses, and any children under 19 years of age. Blue Cross: All 17.9 million persons age 65 and over and surviving dependents.
Medical care insurance under a choice of policies, the minimum benefits of which are described as plans 1 and 2.	Minimum of 15.0 million as of end of 1963; subject to State action and State eligibility standards, any portion or all of an additional 2.9 million could benefit, or for a total of 17.9 million of the entire aged population.	Same as above.
Bow plan 1 (Payment of all charges is made by the insurance carrier)	*Bow plan 2* (Subject to a deductible feature with not to exceed 25 percent coinsurance)[1]	*Benefits*
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	Hospital room and board equal to charges for semiprivate accommodations; other hospital charges including charges for surgical	I. OASDI eligibles have an option to choose between (1) protection under a "Government plan," with same benefit structure as the King-Anderson bills (S. 909 and H.R. 4222), and (2) the right to a monthly cash payment provided that the individual is covered by a private health insurance policy or voluntary prepayment plan which has an actuarial value at least equal to that of the Government plan. Any individual electing the private health benefits	Blue Shield: surgery either in a hospital or doctor's office; in-hospital visits up to 70 days per admission, up to 30 days of in-hospital doctor visits per year for tuberculosis and mental patients; anesthesia performed by physician who bills for services; nursing home care and one physician visit per week for 13 weeks for patients (other than tubercular or mental) who transfer from hospital to nursing home; diagnostic X-rays of accidental injuries taken in doc-

[1] Payments 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.

Source: Representative Bow's bill (H.R. 10981) and chart from Mr. Bow's office on page 4309, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 15, 1962.

COMPARISON OF MAJOR HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PROPOSALS—Continued

KERR-MILLS PROGRAM—Continued	ADMINISTRATION BILL—Continued	JAVITS BILL (S. 2664)—Continued
(7) physical therapy and related services; (8) dental services; (9) laboratory and X-ray services; (10) prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices; (11) diagnostic, screening, and preventive services; and, (12) any other medical care or remedial care recognized under State law.	(3) home health services—240 visits per calendar year; plus, (4) outpatient diagnostic services—no durational limit, but subject to a deductible of $20 per diagnostic study. Effective Dates Inpatient hospital services: October 1, 1962. Outpatient diagnostic services: October 1, 1962. Home health services: October 1, 1962. Nursing home services: July 1, 1963.	ice for 12 days; (4) first $100 of costs for ambulatory diagnostic, laboratory and X-ray services; and (5) 24 days of visiting nurse or other home health care services. Benefits specified per year under the catastrophic long-term or chronic illness plan—80 percent of the following costs, after payment of the first $125 of medical expenses: (1) 120 days of hospital care; (2) surgical service, drugs and appliances, provided in a hospital; (3) 360 days of nursing home services less any days of hospitalization at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (4) full home health care services. Private Insurance benefits—payment to insurance carrier of premiums on a renewable private health insurance policy of which an eligible individual is beneficiary, up to $100 per year.
Administration: Participating States would be reimbursed for part of their expenditures under federally approved State plans providing medical services to aged persons who are not recipients of old-age assistance, but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the cost of necessary medical services.	Would provide medical benefits through the social security (OASI) mechanism for persons 65 or over who are eligible to receive OASI benefits, or railroad retirement annuities.	By State under agreement with Secretary of HEW, or by the Secretary if he is unable to conclude an agreement: States to be reimbursed; they can augment benefits under same administration if they assume added costs.
Financing: Federal sharing in State expenses under plans for medical assistance for the aged would be determined according to an equalization formula based on State per capita income in relation to the national average and would run from 50 to 80 percent. There are no dollar limits beyond which no matching will apply. The States would receive in addition an amount equal to half of their administrative expenses under plans for medical assistance for the aged.	The cost in percent of the estimated level premium payroll ($5,000 wage base) would be 0.66 percent. This cost would be met in two ways: (1) The amount of annual wages and earnings subject to social security payroll taxes would be increased from $4,800 to $5,000, effective in 1962; and, (2) Social security and railroad retirement payroll taxes would be increased by 0.50 percent of taxable earnings, effective in 1963. (Increase equals 0.25 percent on employers, 0.25 percent on employees, and 0.375 percent on the self-employed.) These changes in the tax structure would derive revenue equal to 0.60 percent of the present estimated level premium payroll ($5,000 wage base).	Benefits would be paid from a Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund. (1) Payroll taxes of employees and employers are increased one-fourth of 1 percent of first $4,800 wages in 1963 each and one-eighth of 1 percent in 1972; for self-employed, three-eighths of 1 percent in 1963 and three-sixteenths of 1 percent in 1972. These increases derive the equivalent of 0.70 percent of payroll on a level premium (long run) basis. (2) For other retirees, by appropriation from general revenue.
Total cost first year: Estimated costs for the first year were as follows: [In millions of dollars] Federal ..... $60 State ..... 56 Total (S. Rept. 1856, 86th Cong.) .. [1] 116	The estimated total cost of providing medical benefits would be about $2 billion per year on a level premium (long run) basis. The cost for early years would be slightly over $1 billion.	$1,230 billion.

[1] As of January 1962, 25 States and 3 jurisdictions had established MAA programs as follows: Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virgin Islands, Washington, West Virginia, Alabama, California, Connecticut, Guam, Maine, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Press release, Mar. 28, 1962.

COMPARISON OF MAJOR HEALTH CARE INSURANCE PROPOSALS—Continued

BOW BILL (10981)—Continued		LINDSAY BILL (11253)—Continued	BLUE SHIELD-BLUE CROSS SENIOR CITIZENS PROGRAM—Continued
Bow plan 1—Con.	*Bow plan 2*—Con.	*Benefits*—Continued	
outpatient treatment up to $120 in any calendar year. Convalescent hospital room and board up to $6 per day, and up to $186 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital. No home health services or nurses' fees. Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum. Diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services when hospitalized as above. Drugs used in hospitals.	or emergency outpatient treatment. Convalescent hospital room and board up to $6 per day and up to $540 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital. No home health services. Up to $16 per day for registered nurse, and up to $480 in any 1 calendar year. Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum, and $5 per call for other than surgery or postoperative care. Diagnostic X-rays and other diagnostic and laboratory tests; X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope treatment. 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.	option would receive a monthly cash payment of $8 per month (to be increased if actuarial value of benefits under Government plan increases). He may choose any qualified private health insurance policy or private prepayment plan. He may assign his monthly cash payments to the carrier of his private health benefits plan. II. Individuals who are not covered by OASDI (including public assistance recipients) may be made eligible for the benefits of the Government plan if their States wish to "buy-in" to the Federal program for them. A particular State would specify the eligible class of persons (setting whatever eligibility standards it wishes). When an eligible person enters a hospital or nursing home he will be treated in the same way as an OASDI beneficiary. Each State would reimburse the Federal Health Insurance Trust Fund periodically for the aggregate amount paid out in respect of its non-OASDI beneficiaries. States would be aided in reimbursing the Trust Fund by Federal grants from general revenues. These grants would be paid under the same formula as in the Kerr-Mills law, except that the Federal percentage share of the grants would be 5% greater than under the Kerr-Mills formula.	tor's office or hospital out-patient department within 72 hours of accident, also diagnostic X-rays for hospital patients when ordered by attending physician, consistent with condition for which patient was hospitalized and performed by physician who bills for services; radiation therapy performed by physician; laboratory and pathological examinations done by attending physician. Blue Cross: 70 days of hospital care in rooms of 3 or more beds including room and board, general nursing service, drugs, dressings; emergency accident care within 72 hours in out-patient department for surgical procedures, X-ray and radiation therapy. Care in chronic and rehabilitation hospitals and skilled nursing homes and visting nurse service at home.
Secretary of Treasury.		(1) For Government plan: by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, making agreements with providers of services and utilizing State agencies to determine qualification of services. (2) For private health benefits option: State insurance commissioners determine qualification of private health benefits plan for the monthly cash payment, under agreements with the Secretary of HEW; the Secretary issues regulations prescribing standards for determining actuarial equivalence. State "buy-in": States determine eligibility; administration for the eligible class is same as for Government plan. All phases: Secretary consults with Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council, which includes at least four outstanding private health or prepayment plan experts.	Blue Shield and Blue Cross.
		Financing	
Through tax credits for individuals who pay their own premiums or are covered by insurance paid for by near relatives or former employers, and through issuance of "medical care insurance certificates" for all others.		For OASDI eligibles: Same as S. 909 and H.R. 4222, except that H.R. 11253 creates a separate health insurance trust fund rather than merging the two existing funds and the new health insurance programs. For non-OASDI beneficiaries made eligible under State "buy-in": A combination of Federal, State and local general revenues. Federal percentage share of the cost in any State same as under Kerr-Mills law plus 5 percent. Costs depend entirely on action taken by States.	Blue Shield: paid in full for single persons with an annual income of $2,500 or less, and for husband and wife whose combined income is under $4,000. Others above income limit, pay any costs above those allowed for particular services. Estimated cost for plan: single person $3.20 per month, husband and wife $6.10 per month. Blue Cross: paid for by individuals at an estimated cost of $10 to $12 per month.
Cost estimated to be comparable to other legislation, but difficult to predict because of lack (a) precise information on amount of deduction 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. Estimated first-year cost: $1.6 billion.		$1.1 billion for OASDI beneficiaries.	No estimate for either plan.

UNCERTAINTY IN THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, Senators have heard me say many times on this floor that no economy can withstand a constant beating the brains out of private enterprise.

Never was there a more appropriate time to repeat that statement than right now. Lessons of the past apparently mean little to persons in whose judgment, power, and attitudes rests the destiny of America.

The destiny of America depends on jobs which provide a good life for workingmen and their families—jobs which cannot exist or continue unless the places where they work make enough money to meet their payrolls, keep their plants modern to meet competition, and yield a profit sufficient to justify continued investments by the people who finance them. That is basic economics.

We cannot interfere with that basic process and have a sound, growing economy. In my opinion, that process is now being interfered with. Thus, we not only are not making the progress some foresaw, but there are economic signs that such interference may stall us in our tracks and throw us into stagnation or serious reverse.

When I say we must not beat the brains out of private enterprise, I mean either of the two basic ingredients of the private enterprise system—labor and/or business. When one is hurt, both are hurt, despite the fact that, for one reason or another, we appear to favor one against the other. If we destroy the confidence of one or the other, we hurt both.

It is this kind of basic economics, Mr. President, which the Wall Street Journal dealt with in an article which appeared May 24, 1962, about conditions in the city of Fort Wayne, Ind. The headline of the article reads "Uncertain City—Kennedy's Efforts To Reassure Business Show No Results in a Midwest Community."

Because the article tells the story so well, I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

UNCERTAIN CITY—KENNEDY'S EFFORTS TO REASSURE BUSINESS SHOW NO RESULTS IN A MIDWEST COMMUNITY

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

FORT WAYNE, IND.—There is some evidence in this city that President Kennedy has induced in the business community an attitude of uncertainty deeper than most people suspect. It runs so deep, in fact, that it's resisting current efforts of administration leaders to eliminate it.

The President has brought this about, according to businessmen here, through his strong-arm tactics in the steel affair, by showing less enthusiasm for restraining unions than for restraining management, and by pressing for legislative programs that hark back to the New Deal. But he has done it most of all by convincing Fort Wayne businessmen that he doesn't understand the workings of a free economy.

The resulting attitude is not one of personal hatred for the President such as existed in some quarters during the Franklin Roosevelt era. It is rather a feeling that Mr. Kennedy's fondness for flaunting Executive power and what is believed to be a demonstrated antibusiness bias, make it hazardous to do anything except sit tight.

Although it has been clear that Presidential actions in recent weeks have dampened the mood of business throughout the country, the extent of the uncertainty comes into sharp focus when one examines the attitudes of proprietors and managers in a representative industrial city—in this case Fort Wayne.

DIVERSE INDUSTRY

Fort Wayne is especially well suited to such an investigation; it is a growing, prosperous, progressive community that boasts a solid base of diversified industry. With a population of 161,776, Fort Wayne has an unemployment figure of 3.6 percent of the work force, well below the national average. Local plants include those of General Electric, B. F. Goodrich, International Harvester, International Telephone & Telegraph, Magnavox, Dana Corp., Phelps Dodge, Fruehauf Trailer, and various makers of auto parts, pumps, and precision instruments.

In early April of this year, more than 50 percent of Fort Wayne's major industries were engaged in or had just completed plant expansion programs. Until April, there was an atmosphere of great business confidence. Since April—the month Mr. Kennedy lowered the boom on United States Steel—the atmosphere has changed.

"If you want our company's reaction to Mr. Kennedy" says an executive with a national company here, "you'll have to check with our board of directors, but I'll tell you this. We planned a multimillion-dollar addition to this plant. Now all I know is it's been shelved. Maybe this was in reaction to the steel business and maybe it wasn't. I've been told that the company wants to wait till the dust settles. Anyhow, nothing's going to be done this year."

Russell M. Daane, executive vice president of the Fort Wayne National Bank, declares: "Businessmen here are certainly concerned. They still can't get over the President's methods in dealing with the steel companies. That smacked too much of the Gestapo, what with FBI's night visits to reporters' homes, Mr. Kennedy is apparently against all monopoly except the monopoly of Presidential power. Yes, Fort Wayne businessmen are very concerned."

Along with the uncertainty produced by the steel affair, there is a widespread belief among industrial leaders here that the President is playing politics at the expense of business. Why, it is asked, did Mr. Kennedy play down his interest in holding the wage line when he addressed the United Auto Workers in Atlantic City earlier this month? Why didn't he say that what happened to steel would happen to a union that refused to bow to the administration's wishes?

"Kennedy has been less than honest," claims one executive. "It's bad enough when he threatens both business and labor and throws a clinker in the whole free enterprise system, but when he pounds on business and then pussyfoots when it comes to unions, I think it's rotten."

Nor are Fort Wayne labor leaders entirely happy with the administration's growing intrusion into collective bargaining. "I think in general that there's good business ahead," says Howard Minier, president of the AFL-CIO Council for Fort Wayne and Allen County, "but I'm worried about the effect of a wage-price freeze on national growth. You need a little inflation to raise living standards and you're not going to get it by a policy of rigidity. Also, I don't think the Government should get involved in collective bargaining unless it's invited."

What one businessman here described as "just plain discouraging," is the President's current legislative program which features a variety of New Dealish measures that "cannot help but burden business further." The idea of withholding taxes on dividends and interest, for instance, is anathema here. "This bill alone would raise our costs 90 cents to $1 per account," says Fort Wayne National's Mr. Daane.

"The President's methods and programs dealing with business have caused great concern," comments Clyde E. Flowers, senior vice president of Lincoln National Bank. "Mr. Kennedy's behavior reflects the fact that he's had no experience in business. He doesn't understand business."

"I don't think business has to apologize for being business," declares a vice president of an electronics firm. "Mr. Kennedy doesn't realize that it's not through public works programs that the Nation can achieve sound economic growth. It is very frankly through providing a climate in which business can prosper that we will move ahead. All the President has to do to keep the lid on inflation is to balance the budget. But that would take more political courage than Mr. Kennedy is interested in displaying."

Earl S. Ward, executive vice president of the Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce, says that the anxiety of the business community in the wake of the steel affair is evident whenever businessmen gather. "I was in Washington for the chamber meeting that Kennedy addressed. In all my life I've never seen a public official get such a cold reception from businessmen. Around Fort Wayne the administration's attitude toward business is a leading topic. Nobody is sure just how far Kennedy will go in holding back business and nobody is anxious to find out. But I know of instances where planned expansions here have been postponed or canceled because of the uncertainty the President has created."

Another indication of how deep business resentment runs is the reaction to the administration's proposal to make the tax depreciation allowance more favorable. "That's like throwing a dog a bone after you've hit him on the head with a rock," declares a plant manager for a national company. "Of course we need whatever better tax break we can get but if Kennedy thinks he can restore confidence with another one of his gimmick's he's crazy. He gives you a lollypop with one hand while he keeps slamming you with the other. For Pete's sake don't use my name or we'll have FBI men all over the place and I'll get canned. That's probably an exaggeration, but who can be sure of anything anymore?"

ON THE OLD FRONTIER

Such apprehension is not a normal part of the character of Fort Wayne, a city with sturdy old-frontier origins and principles. It is situated at the juncture of the St. Marys, St. Joseph, and Maumee Rivers and its history goes back to the 17th century when the French established a trading post on the site.

The post changed hands several times as the French, Indians, and English battled over it, and the site was controlled by the Indians even after the American Revolution. President Washington sent out three expeditions to capture the post for the United States and the first two ended in a rout by the redmen. Finally Gen. "Mad" Anthony Wayne overwhelmed the Indians and built a wooden stockade known as Fort Wayne.

The community which grew up around the fort was incorporated in 1829. The city's population is 90 percent native-born white and largely of German extraction. Some 70 percent of the families own their own homes. Fort Wayne has spent $15 million on new schools on a pay-as-you-go basis in the last 5 years. Cultural activities include a philharmonic orchestra and a ballet company supported by public subscription.

"We're a pretty good city," says the chamber's Mr. Ward, "and ordinarily we'd have every reason to be optimistic."

A PROVED BREED OF WATCHDOGS IS AVAILABLE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an excellent column by Arthur Krock in today's New York Times, concerning the desirability of a joint congressional watchdog committee to supervise the Central Intelligence Agency.

A year ago, there was a general consensus that intelligence collection and covert operations should be separated. Yet, today, they remain under one and the same roof. And that roof, incidentally, is a pretty large one, since it covers an establishment containing 5,700 windows. I continue to hope in this connection, that hearings may soon be held on Senator MCCARTHY's Senate Joint Resolution 77, which seeks the creation of a committee along the lines so well and ably advanced by Mr. Krock.

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

A PROVED BREED OF WATCHDOGS IS AVAILABLE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—The recent crop of critical books and articles on covert operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, principally with respect to the U-2 flight, which was downed in Soviet Russia, and the invasion of Cuba, which was repulsed by Premier Castro, has nourished proposals for a congressional watchdog committee of the CIA. Its new Director, John A. McCone, who took office, after these events, has already told Congress he has no objection to the establishment of this committee, having worked very well with one when he was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Presumably, therefore, unless President Kennedy should object to a CIA watchdog group of Congress, and if the formula of its selection were also satisfactory to the President and to Director McCone, there would be no insurmountable administration obstacles if Congress chose to create this new special committee. And one formula of its selection that is being discussed seems well suited to the basic requirements of the two branches of the Federal Government involved.

Under this formula the House and the Senate would each supply a watchdog committee of nine members. The two would act separately in general and jointly when this was found desirable by both. The House group would be composed of the chairmen of the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Appropriations, the ranking majority members of these three and the ranking minority members. The Senate group would be formed of the chairmen of Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Appropriations, plus the ranking majority and ranking minority members. This, as in the case of the joint committee that watchdogs the AEC, would give control to the party majority in each branch, which currently is Democratic.

The product of this formula, in the present makeup of these committees, would be two groups of the highest caliber and seniority in Congress, with memberships of proved discretion and great influence. In the nature of the assignment, these legislators would be restrained from passing on secret information to the other members of the committees from which they were recruited. But when these parent committees were dealing with matters in which CIA activities were involved, they would have authoritative guidance now denied them. The beneficial effects of this on major legislation are obvious.

THE PERSONNEL

If the nine-member groups were chosen on the formula under discussion, only two members would encounter a problem of choice growing out of their present committee assignments. These two are Senators RUSSELL of Georgia and SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts. RUSSELL, being currently chairman of Armed Services and ranking majority member of Appropriations, would have a double eligibility of service on the CIA watchdog committee. So would SALTONSTALL, because he is the ranking minority member on both Appropriations and Armed Services.

The indicated solution would be for Senators BYRD, of Virginia, and STENNIS, of Mississippi, who rank after RUSSELL on Armed Services, to become its two majority members on the watchdog group. And SALTONSTALL's choice would be between his two ranking minority memberships, making room thereby for either Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, or Senator SMITH, of Maine.

The watchdog committees would then be composed of the following: (House) Chairman CANNON, Representatives MAHON and TABER, from Appropriations; Chairman VINSON, Representatives RIVERS and ARENDS, from Armed Services; and Chairman MORGAN, Representatives ZABLOCKI and CHIPERFIELD, from Foreign Affairs. (Senate) Chairman HAYDEN, Senator RUSSELL, and either Senator SALTONSTALL or YOUNG, from Appropriations; Senators BYRD, STENNIS, and either Senator SALTONSTALL or SMITH, from Armed Services; and Chairman FULBRIGHT, Senators SPARKMAN and WILEY, from Foreign Relations.

Either Senate combination, and the House group which encounters no similar problem of selection, would provide two CIA watchdog committees of exceptional quality. And the sense of "mission" that the creation of such committees imparts would be a shield against uniformed criticism that CIA greatly needs, and a filter of the information Congress should have in the public interest.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, but I am willing to withdraw it to save time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. MAGNUSON. My amendment proposes on page 27, line 9, after the period, to insert the following:

The term "feed grain" shall also include rye in areas designated by the Secretary.

For the purpose of the RECORD, I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question with regard to this situation. Farmers and producers in my area have suggested to me that the amendment be included in the bill because, they say, due to climatic conditions and the necessity for soil conservation in certain dryland wheat production areas, it has been necessary to plant rye in lieu of barley, in recent years. They suggest that unless the language in the proposed law is amended, producers who planted rye during the 1959 and 1960 base years will be denied a feed grain base, while their neighbor, who was able to plant barley, would have established a feed grain base in that program.

In my State there are many producers who, because of their desire to follow soil conservation practices, have been planting rye. Those farmers desire to participate in the feed grain program to the greatest extent possible; and they believe that unless the amendment is adopted they will be denied that privilege.

In other words, I suspect they can, if they have been planting rye when it has been necessary due to the conditions which existed in 1959 and 1960. They could not shift back and participate by planting barley. The situation poses an inequitable problem. Apparently because of the dryland areas, in some years rye has been a better crop.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment now before the Senate covers corn, barley, and grain sorghums; that is all. Rye is excluded, so farmers can plant all the rye they desire.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What they are getting at—and there was a conference on the subject—is that if they had planted rye during the 1959 and 1960 base years, and then desired to plant barley, so as to participate in the feed grain program, they would be denied the right to make that shift because they had been planting rye. But they planted rye instead of barley only because of the climatic and soil conditions.

I suppose that what they are contending is that they cannot shift from one grain to the other, because barley is included in the program and rye is not. They can continue to plant rye.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. That is why I say I do not quite understand the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They can continue to plant rye and qualify under the base period.

Mr. ELLENDER. But so far as the production of rye is concerned, there is no limitation; a farmer can plant all the rye he wishes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If they had been planting rye during the base period 1959 and 1960, as many farmers did, and wanted to get into the feed grain program and limit themselves to planting barley, they would have no base.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right if they did not plant barley, corn, or sorghum in the base period.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; but it was necessary for them to plant rye instead of barley due to climatic conditions in those particular years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Rye was considered to come under the feed grain base, was it not? Rye was considered to be a feed grain in the 1959 and 1960 period.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; rye is not included in my amendment. In the original administration bill it was included at the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a feed grain?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Might it not be, then, that the acreage which was planted in rye could be considered for the purpose of feed grain allotments, which are now included in the bill as grain sorghums? Rye acreage would have been included in the 1959–60 base.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the original administration proposal it could.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The rye farmers could come into the program. I think they want to get into the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They want to make certain that they are not excluded from the base of 1959–60. They had 50 acres of rye, which was considered as a feed grain under the discretionary authority of the Secretary. They want to make certain that the 50 acres are not denied them for purposes of corn, barley, and grain sorghums, which come under the feed grain category in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I feel certain the committee wants to handle this problem fairly, so I withdraw the amendment. I understand this proposal is covered in the House bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is included in the House bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It will not be in the Senate bill. This question can be taken up for consideration in conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On the basis that the Senator from Louisiana says that there is language in the House bill which includes rye, and that if it is kept out of the Senate bill, it will be possible to go to conference and arrive at an arrangement so that equity will be done in this particular instance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is a problem, since it is not possible under the act to produce rye on converted acres. I am certain the chairman will work on this problem in conference, so that there will not be a situation in which rye acres will be counted as a base and the farmer will be paid for taking his acres out of production, and then will switch around, because the act provides that rye may be grown on converted acres. I am sure the chairman will arrive at a proper adjustment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington withdraws his amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have at the desk amendments to the Ellender amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend the Ellender amendment as follows:

Strike the word "hardship" in line 23 on page 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "an average loss of 20 percent gross income".

Strike the word "unduly" in line 24 on page 24 and insert following the word "increase" the following: "by 25 percent".

Insert following the word "area" in line 1 on page 25 the following: "based on 1959–1960 operations".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa desire that his amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. President, first I yield half a minute to the Senator from New Jersey, and then I will yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent that their remarks follow the action on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I read the following language at the end of page 3 of the amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, and I shall then ask a question. Beginning on line 16, the language reads:

> The national public interest and general welfare require that the burdens on interstate and foreign commerce above described be removed by the exercise of Federal power. Feed grains which do not move in the form of feed grains outside of the State where they are produced are so closely and substantially related to feed grains which move in the form of feed grains outside of the State where they are produced, and have such a close and substantial relation to the volume and price of livestock and livestock products in interstate and foreign commerce, that it is necessary to regulate feed grains which do not move outside of the State where they are produced to the extent set forth in his act.

Does the distinguished chairman of the committee feel that by that declaration in the legislative findings it is made constitutional for the Federal Government to regulate and control feed grains which do not move outside the State and do not enter into interstate commerce directly? In other words, does the chairman believe that that kind of declaration in legislative findings makes grain which is wholly consumed, wholly used, and wholly handled within a State come under the commerce clause of the Constitution and makes such locally used and locally handled grain interstate commerce?

Mr. ELLENDER. This provision is in the existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself another minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that cattle, which eat feed wholly within the State, could then be moved into commerce.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But suppose the cattle are butchered locally. Suppose they are butchered on the farm and the meat used on the farm. Or suppose the cattle are butchered in a local shop or packing plant.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have been operating under the same language and getting along with it for quite awhile. It is merely a declaration of policy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a legislative finding. Moreover, in my State there has been some problem with respect to elevators which are locally owned and are not members of any chain. The operators have even wondered whether they should be under regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just now stated, the identical language was included in the 1938 act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The identical language?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; this is copied from the 1938 act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The 1938 act did not provide for control of feed grains from a mandatory point of view, however.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but it provided for supports, and it provided marketing quotas. But, unfortunately, they were never put into effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the farmer could sign up or could stay out, as he chose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, since quotas were never proclaimed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. However, in this case, if quotas are voted by two-thirds of the eligible farmers, the quotas will be applicable to all farms, regardless of whether the farmers have signed up.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say similar language applied not only to corn and feed grains but also to all the commodities covered by the 1938 act—which were five in number: Corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the problem arises because if such blanket coverage is voted by two-thirds of the farmers, all farmers will be subjected to the restrictions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my amendment has to do with the deficit-area provisions on page 24 of the Ellender amendment. Under that amendment it is provided that this law will not apply to deficit areas; and the application is to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows: First, that the application of the provisions of this act would result in hardship to producers. However, the bill does not establish any guidelines in connection with the Secretary's determination of what "hardship" means. It seems to me we ought to define "hardship" and ought to state what it means. It seems to me that Congress should lay down the necessary guidelines in that connection; and I believe that a fair test of "hardship" would be what my amendment proposes—namely, an average loss of 25 percent of gross income.

Then the Ellender amendment reads: "To producers in such area would unduly increase the price of feed," but there is no guideline as to what "unduly" means.

It seems to me it is for Congress, not for the Secretary of Agriculture, to determine that. So my amendment provides that a 25-percent increase in the price of feed grains would be "undue."

Finally, the Ellender amendment reads: "and would disrupt normal farming practices in such area."

But, again, no one knows what "normal farming practices" are. Therefore, my amendment would require that determination to be based on 1959–60 operations.

I believe my amendment is fair. It takes from the Secretary of Agriculture unlimited discretion.

Last evening we had a colloquy between the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself; and in that colloquy it seemed to be the feeling that some guidelines should be set forth, to cover this provision of the Ellender amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. When would the loss to which the Senator has referred—"an average loss of 25 percent of gross income"—occur? Would it be an anticipated loss?

Mr. MILLER. It could be anticipated. But how else could the Secretary of Agriculture determine what "hardship" would be?

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of this part of the amendment is to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to have the privilege of deciding, as to an area which he would describe, whether there was a deficit of feed grains. This provision would give him the right to deal with that, and of course that would be left to his discretion.

It is my belief that he could better determine that under the circumstances existing at the time, instead of our trying to tie him down by means of guidelines such as the ones the Senator from Iowa is now proposing.

How could the Secretary of Agriculture figure that out? It would certainly require a guess on his part, if he were instructed to determine whether the gross income of the farmer would be decreased by 25 percent.

Mr. MILLER. Let me suggest to the Senator, who is so much concerned about all the surpluses, that this part of his amendment opens up a gap as wide as a tunnel, for the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the purposes of the Senator's amendment. All I am trying to do is tie it down, so the purposes of his amendment cannot be defeated.

The Senator from Louisiana says the Secretary of Agriculture would make a guess, under the amendment I have submitted. But what kind of guess does the Senator from Louisiana think the word "hardship" would require the Secretary of Agriculture to make?

This amendment will define the word "hardship"; and I should think the Secretary of Agriculture would prefer to have a little guidance in that connection.

Furthermore, the provision in regard to the 25 percent provides some definition of the word "undue." When words such as "hardship" and "undue" are used, they are meaningless unless some provision for their definition is made.

I should like to have the Senator take my amendment to conference and see what can be done there. Perhaps the percentage set forth in the amendment is high; but certainly I believe some such guideline should be established.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, I would have no hesitation about taking the amendment to conference.

But I return to the proposition that the Secretary of Agriculture would have to peer into the future quite some distance, in order to find out whether the average loss of gross income would be 25 percent. I wonder how he could determine that. It would require a big guess.

Mr. MILLER. But the Secretary of Agriculture is dipping into the future all the time.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, I am willing to take the amendment to conference; and it may be that the conferees can draw up additional guidelines, in order to do what the Senator from Iowa seeks to have done.

Mr. MILLER. Then may I offer my amendment with the understanding that the Senator from Louisiana will not object to it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood that the Senator from Iowa had already offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer my last amendment, and ask that it be stated. I now send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend the Ellender amendment by striking out lines 11 through 25, on page 12; and by striking out lines 1 through 3, on page 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, these amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, none of these amendments have been printed; so it is rather difficult to keep up with them.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, let me address myself to my amendment.

First, I wish to apologize to the Senator from Louisiana for not having this amendment printed. However, I wish to point out that not until the Eastland amendment was rejected did I know whether this amendment should be offered.

My amendment simply removes from the bill the exemptions for the small farmers. I realize that a great deal of emotion can be attached to the small farms of 25 acres or less; but I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are approximately 300,000 or 400,000 of these small farms; and if the Senator from Louisiana is genuinely interested in reducing the surpluses, I suggest to him that the quota and the allotment should be applied across the board, because if an exemption is made of the 300,000 or 400,000 small farms, the cutback in production and the cutback in the surpluses which are sought by the Ellender amendment will not be attained.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MILLER. Of course.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wish to say that I commend my colleague for offering this amendment. It is thoroughly and utterly practical. It is the way to attain such reduction, if Senators want it attained.

The exemption contained in the Ellender amendment would go far toward defeating the very purpose the sponsors of the Ellender amendment claim they seek to attain.

If we wish to have a reduction made, let us eliminate the exemptions and let us have the requirements of the bill apply across the board to the entire field of agriculture. Let us see whether we want to reduce production in this country or whether we prefer to have the bill apply to a special area or to make possible a special discretionary operation by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Let us meet the issue head on. Let us meet the issue squarely. My colleague's amendment will do just that, and that is the issue in his amendment. He has an excellent amendment. It is in keeping with the announced purpose of many Senators in connection with this bill and amendment. I think it is a square issue. I congratulate him for offering the amendment. I shall certainly support it.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am, of course, against this amendment. We have tried to protect the small farmers to the best of our ability. The 25-acre provision means that the farmer must have a base up to 25 acres if he is to obtain an exemption. It does not work in the same manner as the wheat exemption worked, under which a 15-acre exemption was given to the farmer, whether he had a history or not. In order for a farmer to be able to obtain an exemption of as many as 25 acres, he will have to show that his base acreage was up to 25 acres. It cannot be in excess of that amount.

As I have argued for quite a while with my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, we are trying to protect the small farmer and trying to make it possible for him to grow at least as much feed on his farm, as he did in the past.

I do not agree to support the amendment. I ask the Senate to vote down the amendment.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator realize that, granted that a historical base must be shown under his amendment, we are talking about 250,000 or 300,000 small farms?

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator should be talking about almost 1 million

farms throughout the country. I pointed out yesterday that the number of farms throughout the country producing 25 acres or less of feed grains was 1,204,532, and not the 600,000 figure to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Senator how many of those are feed grain producers?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand they are grain producers on the basis of 25 acres or less.

Mr. MILLER. If the figure is over 1 million, instead of 250,000 the Senator from Iowa is even more reinforced in what he has said. I cannot understand how the Senator from Louisiana can express such concern over the glut and surpluses that we have and at the same time in his amendment provide for an avalanche of exemptions. One million small farms are proposed to be exempted from the acreage and market allocations.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am somewhat intrigued by the argument of the Senator from Iowa, because only a short time ago he was trying to exempt all farms in America that produced feed grains—big, little, or medium.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I want us to be consistent. Either we ought to exempt them all, as the Eastland amendment would have done, or we ought to exempt none, as the Miller amendment would provide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is simple logic, but not very convincing or sound. What the Senator from Louisiana is proposing is that every consideration be given to the very small producer and the small farmer by establishing a feed grain basis in the crop years 1959 and 1960.

What are the reasons for it? One of the reasons is administrative, because of the vast number of farms involved. Another is simple equity and social justice for the small farmer himself.

I suggest that the idea of saying that, if one is exempted, all ought to be exempted has very little relevancy in the application of any rule in any area of human activity. For example, we have provided that if a person does not make over $600 a year, he not have to pay an income tax. So what the Senator from Iowa is saying is that if a person not making over $600 a year is exempted from paying an income tax, all persons should be exempted.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. On that point, the Congress has said, as the Senator well knows, that everybody gets a $600 exemption. It is an across-the-board provision. I submit that is a perfect analogy for what we are trying to do. This is an across-the-board provision. If we do not make it that way, it will literally destroy the objective of the Senator from Louisiana. I think the Senator has made my case when he points out that there are 1 million small farms.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out that these exemptions merely give farmers the opportunity of planting grain, but they do not get price supports. They can plant grain, and I presume they will feed it on the farm, but under no conditions are such farmers to obtain price supports unless they are willing to cut their acreage in the same percentage that the larger farmers' acreage would be cut by the Secretary. Only in that case could such farmers get the protection that the larger farmers received who had to reduce production.

In other words, if the farmer has a base of 25 acres or less, he can plant as he has planted in the past, without price supports; but if he desires to get under the program, and if he wants to vote on the program, he can take the cut, enter into the program, and obtain price supports and payments, and vote on the program.

Mr. MILLER. That is a valid point, but the only difficulty is that it is not the whole story. The Senator well knows that those farmers are not interested in price supports on small acreage. As the Senator pointed out, most of it is fed. It does not make any difference where the feed grains are, whether they are in the bin, on the farm, or in the bellies of livestock. If they are in the total crop on hand, that is what counts, and it is the glut of the market that can result from exempting these 1 million farmers that will destroy the Ellender amendment.

I yield back my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Ellender amendment as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I want to yield some time on the bill. First, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. And then I wish to yield to one more Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I think the step that is being proposed in the amendment now being considered can well be, if it becomes law, the death blow to free American agriculture. It is a bill that places complete control over the agriculture economy of this country, over the latitude and freedom of the farmer, in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to his whimsical operations. Not only is it a bill with general control, but if the Senate accepts the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, so far as price, acreage allocations, marketing controls, and penalties are concerned, it is as full of discretionary authority.

The amendment is a complete control amendment. Make no mistake about it, it is the most rigid and far-reaching proposal to subject what has always been the great bastion of freedom in our American economy—agriculture—to controls, to dictation, and to stifling.

If the amendment goes onto the statute books, we shall find that though agriculture may have a certain amount of freedom, it will not be freedom as a matter of right, but freedom only to such a degree as the grace of the Secretary of Agriculture sees fit to grant. That is what will occur, and make no mistake about it.

What has been proposed? A bitter choice has been proposed. A shotgun has been placed at the head of the feed grain producers in this country, with the statement, "You will either take what we put on you, when we saddle full controls over all producers, by voting in favor of it by two-thirds; or, if you do not, we threaten you with economic disaster by destroying supports, by destroying the program, by dumping 10 million tons of feed grains on the market at approximately the support price."

The farmer is not to be given a choice, except the bitter choice between practical slavery or extinction. That is approximately the choice he would have under the amendment. He would not be given a choice as to whether to take the program which is proposed or to accept a substantial land retirement program. That provision could not be driven into the proposal with a mallet. The farmer would be given a choice as to whether he would support a voluntary substantial land retirement program, and be otherwise free to operate the farm, or the present proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In addition, the amendment, involving discretionary power and responsibility in the Department of Agriculture, would make it possible to go into every farm and onto every acre of every farm in the feed producing area, and would produce a new horde of Government employees in the Department of Agriculture, much like the locusts, which, it is said, will increase this year in Washington and on the eastern seaboard.

There will be a great new expansion of bureaucracy. Government agents will be in the feed lots, in the corn fields, in the bean fields, and in the sorghum fields of every farmer of America. Government agents will be looking over the shoulders of the farmers, to see what they plant, where they plant it, and how much they get for it, and to measure their land as never before. That is what will happen.

Then there will be penalties. If two-thirds of the farmers should vote for this program, under compulsion and under the threat of economic ruin if they do not take it, even though they do not really want it but have no real choice,

what will happen? Penalties will be assessed, if by inadvertence a farmer should exceed the allotment.

The penalties go even further, in what is quite an innovation. Anybody who purchases feed grains from anybody who has violated the allotment will also be stuck for the penalty under the penal provisions. Who will be able to buy from a farmer, unless he suffers the hazard that the farmer from whom he buys may have violated the provisions of the law or the regulations of the Secretary? If that farmer has violated them, the one who buys from him had better look out, because he can be assessed penalties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has again expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I have 1 more minute, please?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the amendment goes into effect I doubt that the free farmers of America will accept the program by a two-thirds vote. Secondly, if the farmers feel bludgeoned into accepting it, by compulsion, because the only other alternative is economic depression if it is enforced, it will be a sorry day for freedom, liberty, and opportunity of agriculture in this country.

I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont.

We have heard a great deal of talk about the tender feelings of Senators for the small farmer. I remember that the Senate voted down an amendment, by a vote of 45 to 40—three changed votes would have changed the result—which would have permitted the farmer to raise grains on his farm to operate the farm. This applied mostly to the small farmer. This Senate voted down that amendment.

Before I speak about the feed grains amendment I wish to invite attention to another remarkable act of tenderness toward the small farmers. The bill before the Senate would knock out a provision of law which has been in existence for a long time, granting a 30-acre exemption to wheat farmers under section 335(f) of the existing law. There is a complete exemption of 30 acres, under the following provision:

(1) This condition shall not apply to farms operated by and as a part of State or county institutions or religious eleemosynary institutions;

(2) That none of such crop of wheat is removed from such farm except to be processed for use as human food or livestock feed on such farm and none of such crop is sold or exchanged for goods or services.

There has not been a realization during the course of this debate that the 30-acre exemption is to be eliminated, but it is to be eliminated. I want the farmers to know that the Senate, if it votes for the measure before the Senate—and I hope it will not—will be voting to destroy a very precious right which poultry farmers all over the Nation have asked for and have received in earlier years, and have enjoyed for many years. This is the right to produce up to 30 acres of wheat for the purpose of feeding their poultry, their own people, and their children living on the farms.

That provision is to be eliminated from the law, under the terms of the bill.

Next I wish to speak of the feed grains provision. The chief vice in this provision is that it does not recognize the laws of nature in the feed grain business, under which all States do not have a surplus and all areas do not have a surplus.

To the contrary, many States and many areas which are substantial producers of livestock, of dairy products, of poultry, and the like, do not raise enough feed for their own use; yet those areas and States would be required, under the provisions of the bill before the Senate, to take the same cut which is provided against the heavy commercial areas.

I shall consider the deficit area provision in a moment, if I may. That is the only thing which might prevent such a result; and it will not prevent it. I shall discuss that point in a moment.

Mr. President, my own State is a very great deficit area. We produce tens of thousands of livestock each year, tens of thousands of hogs, poultry in immense quantities, and milk in vast quantities. We raise sizable quantities of grain, and we are trying to raise more, because we are the most remote State in the Union from the heavy producing areas of feed grains. Therefore, we have to pay more for feed grains than any other producers in any other State have to pay, except perhaps those in New England.

Mr. President, the facts are very clearly shown. I have the record of the Department of Agriculture, which shows that in my State production has been heavy. For example, in the 1961 crop, there were 9.6 million bushels of corn, of which only 150,000 was even put under loan—about 1½ percent. My belief is that none entered into the Government surplus.

The year before that the quantity was 8.9 million, with about 1½ percent placed under loan, or 139,000 bushels. Either none or an infinitesimally small amount went into Government surplus. We have been producing corn because we need it. We need it for our own livestock and our own needs. We would be discriminated against if we were prevented from producing it. Why? Because we are a long way from the fertile fields of Iowa, Illinois, and other places where feed grains are produced in large amounts. We would be required to pay higher transportation costs. Our dairy farmers, poultry farmers, livestock farmers, and hog farmers all have a definite stake in being allowed to raise that which they need and have been raising, and with which we have been building a great industry down in our State. Shall we be permitted to continue to build that industry? The Senate, if it adopts the feed grain amendment, would say "No." It would not permit the continuation of that effort to take care of our own needs and feed our own stock, without imposing on the Federal Government under any price-support program or in any other way.

Let us get back to the deficit area provision, which I promised to talk about. The deficit area provision in the amendment is nothing but a carrot on a stick, because it does not mean a thing in the world. It provides:

DEFICIT AREAS

SEC. 360k. Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, in any area (county, State, or region) in which the Secretary determines (1) that the application of the provisions of this Act would result in hardship to producers in such area, would unduly increase the price of feed grains in such area relative to other areas, and would disrupt normal farming practices in such area, and—

This is the real meat in the coconut—

(2) that the exception provided by this section would not impair the effective operation of this Act, he may provide in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe that no farm marketing quota (that is, production on the acreage allotment) for any crop of feed grains shall be applicable to any farm in such area, if the acreage of such crop of feed grains does not exceed the farm base acreage determined for the farm.

We all know perfectly well that when we consider all the States that are deficit areas, we have a clear showing that all the New England States are deficit areas. Many of the States along the seaboard are deficit areas. All the States of the Southeast are deficit areas. When we realize that such is the case, we know perfectly well that the Secretary, even if he were completely partial to the idea of exempting areas which were deficit areas, could never find that the exception provided for by the section would not impair the effective operation of the act, because it would impair it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I know that the Senator's time is limited. I should like to ask the Senator if he agrees that marketing quotas in feed grain areas have never worked and never will because of the nature of the operation—the raising of the feed and the feeding on the farm.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do agree. Some people see no difference between feed grains which are fed—85 percent of them—either on the farm where they are produced, or nearby, and do not enter into the commercial handling of grains, and, on the other hand, tobacco, cotton, or rice, which certainly are not consumed on the farm. It is idle to put them in the same category because they are not. Mr. President, when we talk that way, we have our tongues in our cheeks, because we know perfectly well that the feed grains are consumed, in the main, on the farms where they are produced or in the nearby areas.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator confirm the fact that the amendment, in effect, though it has been very slightly modified, was rejected by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry after the committee heard the evidence and the facts?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator refers to the entire feed grains provision.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The feed grains provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. The feed grain amendment was rejected. In my judgment the bill could not have been reported if the amendment had not been rejected. It was rejected because of the great difference between feed grains and other great crops, and because of the differences in various areas of the Nation in connection with feed grain production.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I preface my question with the statement that Ohio produces in feed grains about what it consumes. It is not a deficit production State from the standpoint of feed grains. If the Secretary of Agriculture should determine that he will grant special privileges, in his discretion, to the deficit States—and I am thinking of the New England States, Florida, and similar States—how could he ever come to the conclusion that the granting of such exemptions would not impair the efficiency of the general program?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield another 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Secretary could not possibly come to that conclusion. That is exactly the point which I am making. If Senators will turn to page 9 of the report of the committee, they will find a clear picture of what happens in deficit States. The first six States listed are the New England States, in each of which there is a deficit. Under the last voluntary program, they hardly accepted at all the opportunity to divert acres and take them out of production. Why? Because they needed every bushel they could produce. The highest diversion of the six States that did divert was only 4.1 percent of its farms. The lowest was New Hampshire, which did not divert acreage on any of its farms. The State of Vermont, which is well represented here by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], diverted acreage on 2.2 percent of its farms. In the State of Massachusetts 0.6 percent—less than 1 percent—of its farms showed any diversion. The State of Rhode Island showed 0.3 percent.

Mr. President, we can see what happens in any area in which there is a deficit. Farmers hold on dearly to the right to produce all they can. They did so even in the face of an offer of a large bonus for nonproduction which was made last year and is offered again this year.

Mr. President, in the case of the States in the Southeast, every one of them is well below the national average, which is 40.1 percent of the grain farmers in the Nation. That is, a little over 40 percent of them diverted part of their acres. Every State in the Southeast is well below that figure. The States which diverted heavily are the heavy producing States, as Senators can see from the list, such as 70 percent, 60 percent, and various other large percentages of diversion, as shown in the list. I shall not call the names of the States.

Mr. President, is it proper to take away the right to produce what the people in a State need? I say it is not. Any law based upon such a premise is found to fall because any such law must have the approval and support of the people who depend upon the production which is affected by the law, and must commend itself in such a way that it will live and serve.

I hope that the amendment will be rejected, because if the amendment had been retained, the bill would have been prevented from reaching the floor of the Senate, in my judgment. It should be rejected now. After long study, the committee felt that it was a wrong thing for us to do. That is the reason that we took the action that we did in the committee. I hope the Senate will reject the feed grain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we have no more speakers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the Ellender amendment, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FONG (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. 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.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HICKEY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. 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 Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay".

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Bartlett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Humphrey	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Kefauver	Robertson
Cannon	Kerr	Russell
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Dodd	Magnuson	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarthy	Symington
Engle	McNamara	Talmadge
Ervin	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Monroney	Yarborough
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Moss	
Hayden	Muskie	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Bennett	Case, N.J.
Allott	Boggs	Case, S. Dak.
Anderson	Capehart	Church
Beall	Carlson	Cooper

Cotton	Keating	Saltonstall
Curtis	McClellan	Scott
Dirksen	Miller	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Morton	Stennis
Eastland	Mundt	Thurmond
Hickenlooper	Murphy	Williams, Del.
Holland	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.
Hruska	Prouty	
Javits	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—17

Bush	Goldwater	Long, Mo.
Butler	Gruening	Long, La.
Carroll	Hickey	McGee
Chavez	Johnston	Tower
Fong	Kuchel	Wiley
Fulbright	Lausche	

So Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished minority leader without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader, in view of his announcement earlier today, whether the action just taken on the Ellender amendment will conclude the business for today, after the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has been set as the pending business for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. There will be no further votes tonight. Of course, any Senator who wishes to speak may do so. But at the first available opportunity, the leadership will move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, under the order previously entered, and I express the hope that the Senate will be able to conclude action on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "5-21-62—J," and ask that it be made the pending business. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be identified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment is designated "5-21-62—J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment will be dispensed with, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 66, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"SUBTITLE C—DAIRY INCOME IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

"Legislative finding

"SEC. 330. Milk is a basic source of the Nation's food supply. Dairy farming, which is carried on in every State of the Nation and is an important source of farm income, constitutes a vital segment of the agricultural and national economy. It is in the national interest that there be adequate and balanced supplies of milk. Surpluses of milk result in low prices to producers and impair their purchasing power; shortages result in unreasonably high prices to consumers and the loss of markets for producers. Recurring shortages and surpluses cause undesirable fluctuations in prices to producers and consumers, unstable farm income, and disorderly marketing practices. The general welfare requires that interstate and foreign commerce be protected from the harmful effects of imbalances in the supply of milk and dairy products. All marketings of milk and dairy products are either in the current of interstate and foreign commerce or directly affect such commerce. The intrastate marketing of milk and dairy products is in competition with the marketing of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce. Milk and dairy products which enter directly into the current of interstate and foreign commerce cannot be effectively regulated without regulating that part marketed within the State of production. The conditions affecting the production and marketing of milk and dairy products are such that, without Federal assistance, farmers individually or in cooperation cannot maintain a flow of an adequate and balanced supply of milk in interstate and foreign commerce at prices fair and reasonable to producers.

"General definitions

"SEC. 331. For the purposes of this subtitle—

"(a) The term 'interstate commerce and foreign commerce' includes the movement of milk and dairy products in commerce between any State or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof, or within the District of Columbia.

"(b) The term 'affect interstate and foreign commerce' means, among other things, to burden, obstruct, impede, or otherwise affect interstate and foreign commerce, the free and orderly flow thereof, or the production, storing, processing, marketing, or transportation of milk and dairy products for or in such commerce or after transportation therein.

"(c) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(d) The term 'milk' means bovine milk, including any classification, type, or grade thereof.

"(e) 'Producer' means any person who is engaged in the production of milk or butterfat for market.

"(f) The term 'person' means an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or any other business entity.

"(g) 'First processor' means (1) any person, other than a retail store or establishment serving food for consumption on the premises, who receives, purchases, or acquires milk or dairy products from a milk producer for disposition in any form to others, and (2) any producer who disposes of milk or dairy products directly to consumers, retail stores, and establishments serving food on the premises.

"SEC. 332. In order to afford producers the opportunity and the means by which they can (i) on a compensated basis voluntarily adjust their marketings of milk during the marketing years ending March 31, 1963 and 1964, more nearly to equal demand, thus increasing their net returns and reducing Government purchases under its price support program, and (ii) receive prices for such marketing years at rates determined pursuant to section 337 of this Act for milk marketed within their normal marketing levels but receive prices which have been adjusted, through surplus marketing fees, to reflect a lower level of price support for milk marketed in excess of their normal marketing levels, thus stabilizing dairy farm income for milk marketed within normal marketing levels while reducing costs to the Government in supporting the price of milk marketed in excess of normal marketing levels and discouraging overexpansion in the production and marketing of milk, the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, to carry out for the marketing years ending March 31, 1963 and 1964, a dairy income improvement program as set forth in the following sections of this subtitle.

"Surplus reduction payments

"SEC. 333. The Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized to make surplus reduction payments to producers in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, who agree to reduce, during any one or more quarterly marketing periods of the marketing years, ending March 31, 1963 and 1964, their marketings to a level not (i) less than 10 per centum, or (ii) more than the larger of 25 per centum, or seven thousand five hundred pounds of milk below their normal marketing levels established pursuant to section 334 of this Act for such quarterly marketing period or periods: *Provided,* That surplus reduction payments shall be made to a producer only with respect to the reduction in his marketings which are below the lower of (i) the producer's normal marketing level, or (ii) the level of marketings which the Secretary estimates would be marketed by the producer during the period covered by his agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation if he continued marketing at the rate of his marketing when he entered into the agreement, adjusted for seasonal variations: *And provided further,* That Commodity Credit Corporation shall, to the maximum extent practicable, limit such agreements so as not to effect reductions in excess of 10 per centum of the total normal marketing levels for the marketing year established for producers within any one dairy district. For this purpose, the Secretary shall divide the continental United States, excluding Alaska, into fifteen dairy districts each having therein approximately the same proportion of total milk production. Commodity Credit Corporation may utilize surplus marketing fees paid to it under this Act, together with any other funds available to it for the purpose of price support, for the making of surplus reduction payments pursuant to such agreements. Such payments (1) shall not exceed $2.80 per hundredweight of milk, basis 3.82 per centum butterfat content, or exceed such rates as the Secretary determines will effectuate voluntary reduction in marketings by producers, and (ii) shall be less than the cost of acquiring such milk in the form of dairy products had such milk been marketed. A producer who fails to reduce his marketings to the extent required by such agreement shall be entitled to the surplus reduction payment on the quantity by which he actually reduced his marketings, but the amount of such payments shall be reduced by an amount equal to 20 per centum of what would have been the payment on the quantity of milk which he failed to reduce. Agreements entered into hereunder may contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to effectuate the purposes of the dairy income improvement program.

"Normal marketing level

"SEC. 334. If producers by referendum approve of the institution of a program as provided in this subtitle, the Secretary shall establish a normal marketing level for the marketing years ending March 31, 1963 and 1964, for each producer in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, who on the effective date of this Act was engaged in the production of milk for market. Such normal marketing level shall be the number of pounds of milk, or the number of pounds of milk fat, or such units of dairy products as the Secretary may deem appropriate for the administration of this subtitle, which the producer or his predecessor disposed of in commercial channels during the marketing year 1961-1962: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall a normal marketing level be established for less than fifteen thousand pounds of milk. The Secretary shall make

such adjustments in a normal marketing level established hereunder as he deems necessary for abnormal conditions affecting production or marketing including but not limited to flood, drought, disease of herd, personal health, and the fact that the producer may have commenced production and marketing after April 1, 1961. A producer's normal marketing level for the marketing year shall be apportioned by the Secretary among quarterly marketing periods thereof in accordance with the producer's marketing pattern in 1961, subject to such adjustments as the Secretary determines necessary to enable the producer to carry out his herd management plans for the marketing year. The quantity thus apportioned to a quarterly marketing period shall be the producer's normal marketing level for such period.

"SEC. 335. The Secretary shall prescribe such conversion factors as he determines necessary for use in determining the quantity of milk marketed by producers who market their milk in the form of farm-separated cream, butterfat, or other dairy products.

"SEC. 336. The quantity of milk reduced by a producer pursuant to his agreement under this subtitle shall be considered as having been produced and marketed by him for the purpose of determining his production of marketing history under any farm program in which such history may become a factor. A producer may, to such extent and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, transfer his normal marketing level, or any part thereof, to any other producer or prospective new producer who agrees to utilize such base for the disposition in commercial channels of milk, butterfat, or dairy products, produced in the same State as that in which the transferor engaged in production, or any State adjacent thereto. A producer who moves from one area to another and there engages in the production and marketing of milk may take with him all or any portion of his normal marketing level. The Secretary may utilize funds available for purchase or loans on dairy products under the price support program to purchase and cancel bases at a price not exceeding the amount of surplus reduction payments which Commodity Credit Corporation would make for an equal reduction in marketings.

"Producer referendum and price support levels

"SEC. 337. Not later than February 1, 1963, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of producers who during the marketing year 1961–1962 marketed not less than fifteen thousand pounds of milk to determine whether producers approve the institution of a dairy income improvement program for the marketing years ending March 31, 1963 and 1964. Producers shall be deemed to approve such a program if the Secretary determines that two-thirds of the producers who voted in the referendum or that producers who voted in such referendum and who marketed not less than two-thirds of the total quantity of milk which was marketed during the marketing year ending March 31, 1962, by all producers who voted in such referendum approve the institution of a dairy income improvement program. If producers approve a dairy income improvement program, the level of price support during such marketing years for milk and the products of milk shall, notwithstanding any other provision of the law be at 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as of the beginning of the marketing year. If producers do not approve a dairy income improvement program, the level of price support for milk and the products of milk, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall be at a level not less than 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as of the beginning of the marketing year.

"SEC. 338. Whenever normal marketing levels are established under this Act, notwithstanding any provision of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), any order issued under section 8c thereof may in addition to the provisions in section 8c (5) and (7) contain provisions for an adjustment in the uniform price for producers receiving surplus reduction payments for marketings below their normal marketing level. Under such provisions the total payments to such producers under an order shall be equal to (1) the uniform price multiplied by their normal marketing level minus (2) the lowest class price under the order multiplied by the amount by which such producers have reduced marketings below their normal marketing level. In the computation of the uniform price there shall be included, at the lowest class price, the volume of milk upon which producers will be entitled to marketing adjustment payments. For the purposes of this section a producer's normal marketing level shall be apportioned on a monthly basis. In the case of a producer part of whose normal marketing level is based on marketings which were not subject to regulation under the order during the representative period the Secretary shall apportion such producer's normal marketing level in accordance with his deliveries of milk in such representative period and the reduction in deliveries from the amount apportioned to the marketing area shall be considered in the calculation of the uniform price and payment under such order. The incorporation of provisions in an order hereunder shall be subject to the same procedural requirements of the Act as other provisions under section 8c.

"Surplus marketing fees

"SEC. 339. (a) The marketing of milk in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, either in the form of whole milk or of a product of whole milk during any quarterly marketing period of the marketing years ending March 31, 1963 and 1964, by a producer in excess of his normal marketing level for such marketing period, or by a producer who has no normal marketing level if normal marketing levels are established pursuant to this subtitle, shall be subject to a surplus marketing fee at a rate equal to the rate of the surplus reduction payment for similar milk established pursuant to section 333 of this subtitle: *Provided, however,* That no marketing fee shall be due on any milk or product thereof marketed during a quarterly marketing period commencing before the effective date of this Act.

"(b) The surplus marketing fee shall be paid to the Commodity Credit Corporation by the first processor who acquires milk or milk products from a producer in excess of the producer's normal marketing level, but an amount equivalent to the surplus marketing fee shall be deducted from the price paid by the first processor to the producer: *Provided,* That in case any milk or milk product is marketed directly by the producer to any person outside the United States the surplus marketing fee shall be paid and remitted by the producer. For the purpose of this section, a first processor who is also a milk producer shall be deemed to have acquired that portion of his production which he markets in excess of his normal marketing level. Such surplus marketing fee shall become due and payable within fifteen days following the marketing period in which the first processor receives from any producer milk or dairy products in excess of his normal marketing level or at the end of such other period of time as the Secretary may prescribe. The first processor and the producer shall be jointly and severally liable for any default in the payment of the surplus marketing fee and for interest thereon at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date such fee becomes due until the date of payment thereof except that the producer shall not be liable for any such default if the amount of the fee was deducted by the first processor from the price paid to the producer.

"(c) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall refund to persons determined by the Secretary to be entitled thereto the amount of surplus marketing fees determined by the Secretary to have been erroneously paid to Commodity Credit Corporation.

"(d) In case any person who is entitled to a surplus reduction payment or a refund or surplus marketing fee dies, becomes incompetent, or disappears before receiving such payment or refund or is succeeded in law by another, the payment or refund shall, without regard to other provisions of law, be made as the Secretary may determine to be fair and reasonable in all circumstances. The basis for, the amount of, and the persons entitled to receive a surplus reduction payment or a refund of a surplus marketing fee from Commodity Credit Corporation, when determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and the amount of any surplus marketing fee established by the Secretary, shall be final and conclusive.

"Review and use of committees

"SEC. 340. The normal marketing level established for a producer shall, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, be made and kept freely available for public inspection in the county in which such producer resides and in the county or counties in which his dairy herd or herds are maintained. In establishing and apportioning marketing levels, the Secretary may utilize the services of local county and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and of agencies established to administer milk marketing orders issued under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. Notice of the normal marketing level shall be mailed to each producer as soon as practicable after its determination. Any producer who is dissatisfied with his normal marketing level may, within fifteen days after the date of mailing to him of the notice thereof, have such normal marketing level reviewed by a local review committee in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary. Such review committee shall be composed of three producers, appointed by the Secretary, from one or more of the counties in which the producer maintains his dairy herd or herds or counties adjacent thereto. Such committee shall not include any member of any other committee which determined the normal marketing level for such producer. Unless application for review is made within such period the original determination of the normal marketing level shall be final and conclusive.

"Miscellaneous

"SEC. 341. The provisions of section 364 (relating to review committee), section 365 (relating to the institution of proceedings), section 366 (relating to court review), and section 367 (relating to stay proceedings and exclusive jurisdiction) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1364–1367), shall be applicable to reviews and proceedings under this subtitle. The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 373 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to reports and records of processors and farmers shall be applicable to each first processor and to each producer, respectively, under this subtitle. The provisions of section 388 (relating to utilization of local agencies) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as

amended (7 U.S.C. 1388), shall be applicable in the administration of this subtitle. The several district courts of the United States are hereby vested with jurisdiction specifically to enforce the provisions of this subtitle. If and when the Secretary shall so request, it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys, under direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings to collect surplus marketing fees provided in this subtitle. The remedies and surplus marketing fees provided for herein shall be in addition to and not exclusive of any other remedy under law.

"SEC. 342. (a) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary for the enforcement and the effective administration of this subtitle.

"(b) Costs incurred in the carrying out of the provisions of this subtitle, except section 338 hereof, shall be borne by the Commodity Credit Corporation and shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, without losing my right to the floor.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has been indicated that a number of committees will seek permission to meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate. I am quite distressed to do so, but I feel, under the circumstances, that I must object to such requests, if action on the bill is to be concluded tomorrow. So I now must object to any request that committees may meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator from Illinois make an exception for the Committee on Government Operations, which is conducting hearings that have entailed the bringing of witnesses from a long distance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I will, because that committee meeting will involve no markup of any kind. I make an exception for the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPPOSITION TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEW "FORRESTAL" CARRIER AND B-70

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by me this morning before the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations in opposition to the proposed appropriation for a new conventionally powered *Forrestal*-class aircraft carrier.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, MAY 24

I am appearing before this committee at my own request primarily to urge that the proposed appropriation for a new conventionally powered *Forrestal*-class aircraft carrier not be approved.

The cost estimates for the carrier range from $340 to $280 million, depending on whether it is built in a private or Government shipyard. If past experience is any guide, the higher estimate will turn out to be accurate no matter where the ship is built.

Yet a third of a billion dollars is only a downpayment on an aircraft carrier. Testimony provided by the Navy to the House Appropriations Committee stated that the cost of one aircraft carrier with supply and refueling ships, antiaircraft armament, and airplanes is "in excess of $1 billion." The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, confirmed this estimate in response to my question on the Senate floor.

Almost as large as the U.S. Capitol—the length of three football fields—with a top speed of about 30 knots, confined to the surface of the ocean, with none of the advantages of hardened protection or underwater concealment, an aircraft carrier is an inviting target to enemy attack. It cannot squeeze through the Panama Canal.

A carrier can be knocked out of commission by even a nonnuclear attack. One conventional bomb or torpedo accurately placed could destroy its usefulness for military action.

Active research and development is in process on an antimissile missile to hit an object that could be as small as a typewriter 300 miles up moving at 17,000 miles an hour. Seen from that perspective, an aircraft carrier represents a frighteningly easy target.

The carrier requested in this appropriation won't be delivered in any event until late 1966. Further developments in weaponry make its vulnerability then all the more likely.

According to Navy testimony, the new *Forrestal* carrier will not increase the size of our attack carrier fleet, but will simply replace an *Essex*-class carrier which they describe as "obsolescent." I want to examine what that word means.

Is the *Essex* carrier obsolescent compared to Soviet or other potential enemy carriers? This cannot be the case, since no other nations are acquiring new carriers. The Soviet Union has none.

Fundamentally, the *Essex* carrier is obsolescent in concept: it is slow and unprotected in an age of high-speed missiles and massive nuclear and nonnuclear weapons.

This is genuine obsolescence, for which there is no cure except a gradual phasing out of carriers.

But simply building a brandnew carrier to be delivered in 1966, a little bit longer, a little bit faster, a little more advanced in equipment—and a lot more expensive—cannot cure this kind of obsolescence.

We already have 16 aircraft carriers in operation, plus a 17th new one due to be completed in 1965. These are the nuclear-powered *Enterprise*, seven conventionally powered *Forrestals*, three of the *Midway* class, and six of the *Essex* class. This represents a substantial investment in aircraft carrier capability.

Far from enlarging our attack carrier fleet, it is proposed to reduce it to 14. Several *Essex*-class carriers are to be retired.

Yet for the limited war situation in which aircraft carriers contribute to a show of strength, the *Essex* carriers provide impressive capability. It is such limited conflicts that provide the only possible justification for aircraft carriers. In the case of all-out war, neither the seasoned *Essex* nor the newest *Forrestal* would be much use.

With the exception of the *Enterprise* all our carriers including the proposed new one have a serious fuel problem. Extensive planning and coordination is required to supply them with fuel oil and aviation gas. Like the carriers themselves, these supply lines are highly vulnerable to nonnuclear enemy attack, even in limited war situations.

The Navy testified to the House Appropriations Subcommittee that aircraft carriers can play an especially important role in the western Pacific-southeast Asia area. Yet this is the area which obviously poses the most difficult supply and fuel problems.

In the 1959 debate in the Senate on acquiring the nuclear-powered carrier, several Senators, respected for their understanding of military affairs, stated that to acquire a conventional carrier would be to "buy obsolescence." I believe this argument had considerable force at that time, when it was stated in support of the nuclear carrier.

The statement is obviously more valid today. To buy a conventional aircraft carrier in an age of nuclear submarines, intercontinental rockets, supersonic airplanes, and sky-to-ground missiles, is to invest in obsolescence.

I fully recognize that this committee and the U.S. Congress are committed to make adequate provision for our national defense. Since the new aircraft carrier has been requested by the Navy and the Secretary of Defense, and included in the President's budget, a decision to disallow it will not be easy and must be based on hard, sober analysis.

But the decision to appropriate some $300 million and more for an aircraft carrier is ours. The final judgment and responsibility belong to Congress. To abdicate this responsibility by freely approving all Defense Department requests runs counter to the spirit of the Constitution and in practice can have most unfortunate consequences. It is we who must weigh and analyze and, finally, decide for ourselves what shall be done.

B-70 PROGRAM

Regarding the B-70 and its more recent cousin, the RS-70, I urge this subcommittee to accept the considered judgment of the Secretary of Defense, as endorsed by the President, and not provide additional funds above the budget request.

Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering at the Pentagon, testified before the House Appropriations Committee that funds already appropriated for the B-70 program are ample for continued development in the coming fiscal year. The Defense Department expects to spend the very considerable sum of $171 million, out of the extra $180 million appropriated by Congress last year above administration requests. In total more than $1 billion has been made available for development of the B-70.

This year's authorization provides for an additional $491 million. A few days ago General LeMay appeared before this subcommittee to support an appropriation of that amount. The House-passed bill provides $223 million plus an additional $53 million for development of radar equipment for the RS-70—a total of $276 million, which is $105 million above the administration's budget request.

It is my hope that the Senate will endorse the considered judgment of the Secretary of

Defense and Director of Research and Development, based on rock-solid logical and factual analysis, by not appropriating any additional funds for the B-70.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any time consumed on my amendment tonight be not charged to the time allotted to the amendment. My request is for tonight only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to offer as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and which has been made the pending business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, my amendment contains the provisions which are in the bill reported by the House Committee on Agriculture—although the bill has not been acted upon by the House itself—and also one additional provision; namely, that the Secretary of Agriculture be permitted to use the production payment method and to make supplemental payments to producers of milk for manufacturing who agree to reduce production, in addition to the surplus reduction payments made to such producers. I intend to offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and which has been made the pending business of the Senate.

VIEWS OF DR. EARL J. McGRATH, OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Dr. Earl J. McGrath of the Institute of Higher Education at Teachers College of Columbia University, in an address at the University of Pennsylvania last January 25, 1962, has expressed himself quite forcefully upon a number of points concerning higher education which deserve careful consideration.

As an educator, Dr. McGrath is rightly concerned with the concept of educational excellence. Although there may be many in the field to whom his comments will serve as an irritant, in my judgment his forceful presentation should serve to clarify the discussion by pinpointing the issues.

Mr. President, it is my belief that many Senators will find these comments by Dr. McGrath helpful as they come to consider the broad field of educational legislation in the months ahead.

Since the conferees of the Senate expect to enter into a conference with Members of the House on the education bill in the next few days—and it will be an important conference—and since I believe Dr. McGrath's views are pertinent to the subject, I ask unanimous consent that the Benjamin Franklin lecture at the University of Pennsylvania, to which I have alluded, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

I particularly hope that members of the conference committee on the higher education bill will read this excellent address by Dr. McGrath.

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

OBSERVATIONS ON THE MEANING OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

(Benjamin Franklin lecture given by Earl J. McGrath at the University of Pennsylvania on January 25, 1962)

Academic excellence is the motif on which many current discussions of American higher education are orchestrated. The contrapuntal embellishments in these compositions include such subthemes as more science and languages in the high schools, higher college admission requirements, enriched content in all fields, greater stress on theoretical instruction, more searching examinations, higher criteria for scholarship assistance, honors courses for superior students, and a host of other devices calculated to raise the quality of learning. To those who have observed the supermarket practices of some institutions of higher education, the catering to the importunities of the uninformed, and the limited accomplishments of students, these themes rightly have a harmonious sound.

The levels of achievement in our colleges and universities have been unjustifiably low. The same can be said of the lower schools. Many students have neither been stimulated nor required to work up to their full intellectual capacity. College teachers properly complain that entering students have not mastered such high school subjects as English, mathematics, history, or chemistry while instructors in the graduate schools often find similar deficiencies in the products of the colleges. Parents and employers swell the chorus of criticisms within the profession. We would all agree that efforts to raise the standards of academic performance deserve applause and support.

Under the circumstances it may appear boorish to dub a few discordant notes into the present popular theme of academic excellence, but that is what the circumstances require to stir us to a keener awareness of the significance and direction of present developments. Current discussions tend to be sharply focused on subject matter, students, buildings, and finance, and too indistinctly on basic social and educational philosophy. Too often they completely overlook two tenets of American higher education. The first is the revolutionary idea that all citizens in a democracy should have the opportunity to develop their abilities to the fullest, not only as a personal right, but as a social necessity. In applying this principle to higher education we differ from other nations which reserve the privileges of advanced learning to the social and the intellectual elite. The other equally uncommon doctrine holds that institutions of higher education have a responsibility to create and disseminate knowledge related to all aspects of modern man's multifaceted world. Hence, unlike other nations which limit instruction to the liberal arts and older professional disciplines, our colleges and universities offer a great variety of instruction and conduct research in agriculture, business administration, pharmacy, home economics, accounting, medical technology, food marketing, and dozens of other fields.

The first of these policies—equal opportunity for higher education—has opened the doors of colleges and universities to an ever-increasing percentage of American youth. In the the 18th and 19th centuries only a small minority enjoyed the advantages of an advanced education. As Brubacher observes, high fees, especially in the older institutions on the east coast, "tended increasingly to restrict such institutions to the well-to-do and to give them a fundamentally patrician character." [1] Even as late as 1900 only 4 percent, 1 in 25, of the young people of college age attended such an institution. But between 1900 and 1960 this percentage rose from 4 to 37.8.

Ronald B. Thompson, who in the early fifties so accurately predicted present college and university enrollments, has recently issued new projections indicating that if the percentage of the age group attending college remains constant, 1970 enrollments will rise to 5.4 million.[2] If the percentage rises, as is more likely, 6.8 million students will have to be accommodated. Even if these figures should shrink by several hundred thousand the task of assimilating the additional students will require our stoutest national effort.

A basic fact on which any realistic discussion of academic excellence in American higher education must rest is, therefore, the uncurbable determination of our people to open wider the doors of higher education. Accordingly, as far as our Nation is concerned, academic excellence cannot be defined in terms of the intellectual capacities of 10 or 15 percent of the population. In this connection it is instructive to observe that Western European countries are moving away from their earlier selective policies toward American practice.[3] In any event no useful social purpose will be served by envisaging a program of American higher education in terms of a narrowing of the abilities now represented in institutions of higher education as a whole because our citizens have irrevocably decided otherwise. Indeed, the evidence indicates that a wider range of abilities and interests will be represented in the future college-going population. The 37.8 percent of the age group now attending a college or university will rise during the next decade, perhaps as high as 50 percent. The newcomers will undoubtedly include many very superior students who do not now continue their education beyond high school, but there will also be a much larger number of only modest academic ability. Taxpayers and private benefactors will insist that institutions of higher education accommodate all these students with their highly varied abilities and interests.

[1] John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, "Higher Education in Transition," Harper & Bros., New York, 1958, p. 40.

[2] Ronald B. Thompson, "Enrollment Projections for Higher Education 1961–1978," Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, September 1961, p. 6.

[3] See Phi Delta Kappan, "Reform in Post Primary Education of Western Europe," November 1961, vol. XLIII, No. 2.

Faced with this situation one may well ask how the concepts of academic excellence and equal educational opportunity can be reconciled. One obvious device would be institutional differentiation of function. That is, an increasing number of institutions might serve only students of high scholastic achievement while a smaller number catered to the needs of the less able. On a small scale this arrangement has much to commend it.

Some sorting out of college and university students is inevitable. Already some institutions are accepting only students who stand in the upper 10 or 15 percent of their high school classes, and demanding more of those admitted. Other institutions have already begun to imitate their more prestigious sisters. Even State colleges and universities have begun to adopt policies which exclude those of average ability and flunk out a considerable percentage of those accepted. A few community colleges are adopting similar policies of exclusion. When the whole enterprise of higher education is considered, however, these practices raise a serious question of national policy: While the general public intends to extend the opportunity for higher education to a considerably larger percentage of young people, can the colleges and universities become more selective in their admission practices? In concrete terms this question becomes: If by 1970 institutions generally decide to limit admissions even to the upper third of high school graduates, where are the other hundreds of thousands of students to obtain a higher education?

The general public will doubtless take the view that the large majority of our over 2,000 colleges and universities should accept and educate these hundreds of thousands of youth who do not stand in the upper 15, or even 30, percent of their high school classes. This being so, most institutions will be acting more realistically if they conceive of academic excellence positively by considering how their educational practices can be improved to provide a better education for the upper 50 percent rather than negatively in terms of excluding those who cannot meet ever-rising scholastic standards. Institutions which take the positive view can convince the public of their quality by demonstrating that their students in the larger sense of individual and social worth compare favorably with the products of the so-called prestige institutions.

Even institutions which strive for excellence by selecting their students primarily on the basis of high test scores and by demanding superior performance in course work may not be making their fullest social contributions. One of the most perceptive analysts of the issues involved in academic excellence, Wilbur J. Bender, formerly dean of admissions of Harvard University, has recently questioned the validity of increasingly selective admissions policies. He asks: "Does Harvard want a student body selected solely on the basis of apparent relative academic promise, or are there other considerations, largely nonacademic, which should influence the selection."[4] Dean Bender then answers his own question in the following words:

"The single-factor selection policy might work if we knew better how to identify real, as distinguished from apparent, intellectual power and creativity at the secondary school level. At present we rely basically for our evaluation of academic ability on test scores and rank in class, but there are increasing doubts whether these two items measure anything except the probability of getting certain kinds of grades in college. The student who ranks first in his class may be genuinely brilliant. Or he may be a compulsive worker or the instrument of domineering parents' ambitions or a conformist or self-centered careerist who has shrewdly calculated his teachers' prejudices and expectations and discovered how to regurgitate efficiently what they want. The top high school student is often, frankly, a pretty dull and bloodless, or peculiar, fellow. The adolescent with wide-ranging curiosity and stubborn independence, with a vivid imagination and desire to explore fascinating bypaths, to follow his own interests, to contemplate, to read the unrequired books, the boy filled with sheer love of life and exuberance, may well seem to his teachers troublesome, undisciplined, a rebel, may not conform to their stereotype, and may not get the top grades and the highest rank in class. * * *

"There are many kinds of aspects of intelligence which are important (admitting that not all kinds are relevant to a college), and grade-getting and test-scoring intelligence is not necessarily the most important, even for purely intellectual pursuits. Judgment is important, and curiosity and independence and honesty and courage and sensitivity and generosity and vitality. Energy may well be the most important x factor in determining the future contribution of an individual. The 10 percent of extra energy is probably worth at least 150 points on the scholastic aptitude test score. And judgment may be worth 200."[5]

Regrettably, there is little definitive information concerning the complex of intellectual and nonintellectual factors other than test scores involved in academic achievement, to say nothing about the much more complicated variables in professional success and a worthy personal life. Certain it is, however, that test scores constitute only one component in the complex of factors which determine human accomplishment and worth. As George B. Smith of the University of Kansas has shown,[6] some students in the lower half of their high school classes make quite creditable and, in some instances, distinguished university records. Henry S. Coleman, director of admissions of Columbia College, questioning the predictive reliability of scores on tests set up by the college entrance examination board, and high school percentile ratings, has observed that they cannot measure the staying power of the student, the intensity of his desire to learn or the contribution he could make to American society. In support of this opinion he reports that "most of the 15 freshmen with the poorest midsemester grades scored well up on their entrance board examinations."

Another commentator on selective practices in institutions of higher education, Christopher Jencks, in discussing a "suitable" education for American youth observes that:

"In many cases 'suitable' is merely a euphemism for 'intellectual' or 'bright.' The advocates of such plans would emulate the Europeans by confining higher education to those who have already demonstrated their academic gifts. Yet research has repeatedly shown that great numbers—perhaps a majority—of the most talented young people show very little scholastic promise while still in high school. Hence if every American college accepted the definitions of suitability which govern admission to Yale, Caltech, or Bryn Mawr, a very substantial proportion of our country's intellectual manpower would go down the drain."[7]

Moreover, recent research on recipients of National Merit Scholarships shows that many do not possess unusual imagination or creativity. Conversely, some of the most successful practitioners of the various arts and sciences having IQ's of 120 or above did not stand in the upper levels of their high school, college, or professional school classes. These contrasts in scholastic ability and originality of mind suggest that even those who satisfy all the requirements for distinction may lack some of the essential qualities for creative intellectual endeavor, a quality of obvious value in all phases of contemporary life. The factors in achievement on which existing knowledge sheds little light doubtless account for the fact that many persons with modest academic records succeed in later praiseworthy endeavors. They also explain in part why thousands of graduates of the colleges and universities of limited national prestige each year go on to achieve real distinction either in advanced studies or in their chosen occupations.

The results of recent research brought together in the publication, "The American College," by Nevitt Sanford[8] suggests that as institutions raise their admission standards and revise their educational objectives and procedures, they ought to give more attention to the degree in which students of equal ability vary in attitudes, intellectual curiosity, interests, values, vocational goals, social conscience, and personality structure. Faculties ought to possess much more information than they do at present about how their own prospective students differ from others in these characteristics. They ought likewise to be aware of the significant research findings concerning the impact of various institutional characteristics outside as well as inside the classroom on intellectual development and personality structure.

As they consider raising academic standards in terms of grades on subject-matter tests, faculties ought to ask themselves the following questions the answers to which have great significance for the individual and for society. Is it educationally efficient and socially defensible to select students solely on the basis of scholastic ability and achievement? What is the desirable student "mix" in terms of ability, personality, and values? What are the relationships between various traits of personality and character, and academic success as conventionally determined? Do present institutional practices cultivate or inhibit critical, independent, and creative thinking? How do individual students with different social and family backgrounds fit into student populations with distinctive social, intellectual, and vocational characteristics? Those who seriously try to answer these questions in the light of available knowledge and the broad purposes of higher education will wonder whether institutions which visualize the achievement of academic excellence only in terms of raising present admission standards and requiring greater mastery of subject matter are discharging their full moral responsibility either to the individual student or to the Nation.

A reconsideration of the quality of higher education will also lead to questions concerning the validity of the present stress on intellectuality. Again one must admit that present practices permit too many students to acquire degrees without adequate knowledge of the subjects they have studied, the

[4] Wilbur J. Bender, "The Top-1-Percent Policy," Harvard Alumni Bulletin, Sept. 30, 1961, p. 21.

[5] Ibid., pp. 22–24.

[6] George B. Smith, "Who Would Be Eliminated?" Reprinted from "The Coming Crisis in the Selection of Students for College Entrance."

[7] Christopher Jencks, "The Next 30 Years in the Colleges," Harper's magazine, October 1961, p. 122.

[8] Nevitt Sanford, "The American College," John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1962.

intellectual procedures involved, or any persistent interest in things of the mind. In all these respects, more exacting demands can be made on students in all types of institutions. But higher education of quality ought to concern itself with something more than the acquisition of knowledge and intellectual competence. In evaluating our current efforts to improve higher education it is appropriate to recall Gibbon's crowning judgment on Constantine that "as he gradually advanced in the knowledge of truth, he proportionately declined in the practice of virtue."

The equating of academic excellence solely with intellectual accomplishment is a relatively recent feature in the evolution of Western education. Since the days of the Greeks, educational philosophers have stressed the cultivation of traits other than intellectual competence. Though knowledge and intellectual skill were central in the educational views of Plato and Aristotle, both considered these qualities as instrumental in producing the virtuous citizen in the good society. Prof. R. C. Lodge, a distinguished classical scholar, observes that in Plato's conception of the purposes of education:

"The citizen is not a man set apart from the general life of the community: to cultivate his talents in abstracto. His learning is not book learning: to be written down on paper, kept on shelves and passed around from hand to hand. His knowledge is not the science of the specialist, the technical expert who knows everything about some one thing and nothing about civic life in general. His wisdom is not the wisdom of the great scholar, a professor whose profundity in his own field is an object of admiration to the simple but who does not himself remember his own street address. The citizen's learning is a part of the citizen's life, as he learns by action each day to be more of a citizen. * * *

"The life of culture is always conceived as arising out of, and intimately related to the ordinary, biosocial life of humanity; and however abstract and remote the techniques of mathematics and dialetic may at times appear, when viewed from the outside they are essentially, for Plato, the intellectual skeleton of the arts which animate human life and make it more human, more alive."[9]

Plato's view of superior education clearly embraced much more than current conceptions. In his hierarchy of values he placed personal and civic worth above intellectual achievement. These views are restated by a distinguished contemporary British scholar who, in commenting on the present plight of civilization, argues that unless higher education today concerns itself with values its other accomplishments will be of little avail in preventing mankind's descent into savagery or annihilation. Sir Richard Livingstone believes that:

"Human progress depends on a double advance—increase in knowledge and the discovery of higher values. We concentrate mainly on the first, but the second is far more important. Increase of knowledge may lead to nothing but elaborate barbarism; as indeed our own age shows. The applied science and technology of which we are always demanding more will give us comfort and even luxury, but if we want a great civilization we must look elsewhere. The ultimate importance of any nation is estimated not by its conquests, commerce or comfort but by the values which it has brought into the world and the degree to which they are embodied in its life."[10]

---

[9] R. C. Lodge, "Plato's Theory of Education," Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1947, pp. 227, 232.

[10] R. W. Livingstone, "The Rainbow Bridge," Pall Mall Press, London, p. 131.

The proposal that higher education should concern itself with values implies neither that it neglect the cultivation of the processes of abstract reasoning or the transmission of knowledge. Nor does it suggest that the student should be subjected to a given interpretation of the universe, or a dogmatic view of the nature and destiny of man. On the contrary, enduring values ought to be nurtured through the teaching and the example of scholars capable of perceiving the meaning of their subjects in terms of the larger context of life, and through their personal influence on the values, the ideals, and the basic motivations of students. But Prof. Philip Jacob's report suggests that with notable exceptions institutions of higher education have little influence on the values of their charges.

Young people today search earnestly for meaning in their world and in their own lives. Behavioral aberrations, even among those of unusual intelligence and academic accomplishment, reflect their inability to organize their thoughts around and to pour their emotions into activities which they believe merit their commitment. Higher education will fail to discharge a primary responsibility if it considers personal values and social responsibility extraneous or antithetical to intellectual training.

Current proposals to raise the intellectual level in colleges and universities may result in more competent engineers, physicists, historians, medical technologists, businessmen, and social workers, though some thoughtful educational leaders doubt this outcome. But efforts to strengthen and improve higher education by raising standards of performance within traditional patterns can hardly be expected to meet the larger needs of our time.

The difficulty in enlarging the conception of academic excellence arises out of the lack of reliable measures of growth in qualities other than knowledge and a limited range of intellectual abilities. Hence, advancement up the ladder of achievement in the world of learning depends largely on performance relatively easy to appraise. An immense amount of research is required on the whole complex of faculties, traits, and motivations which make up various forms of human excellence. If only an infinitesimal portion of the funds now being spent on a projected excursion to the moon were available for the needed research, the concept of academic and human excellence could be clarified and the lot of mankind incalculably improved.

Thus far the discussion has been concerned with the extension of educational opportunity, the types of students to be served, and the broad objectives of higher education. No less important in any consideration of academic excellence is the character of the instruction offered. It was observed earlier that a second major distinguishing feature of American higher education is in great diversity. The unmatched range and variety of instruction are in part a consequence of the doctrine of equal opportunity for higher education, for education in a dynamic society of social equals must meet the varied needs, abilities, and aspirations of all of its citizens.

But diversity also reflects the American conviction that many varieties of education, general and vocational, are worthy of a place in the house of learning. Contemporary American higher education differs basically in this respect from that in other countries, and indeed from its ancestors on this continent. In the early days of the Republic the curriculum of the liberal arts colleges, patronized largely by the upper classes, reflected its British prototype designed to prepare your men for positions in the state, the church, and in managerial affairs. Though there were minor variations, the almost uniform course of study consisted of the classical languages, philosophy, religion, and mathematics. After the turn of the 19th century abortive efforts were made to disestablish the primacy of traditional studies. The conservative Yale Report of 1828 buttressed the position of the entrenched subjects and postponed any substantial change until after the Civil War.

Two forces then broke the stranglehold of conventional learning. The Morrill Act of 1862 gave concrete expression to the democratic idea that the sons and daughters of the farming and artisan classes, no less than their socially and economically better-favored contemporaries, should have the advantages of higher education. It also profoundly influenced the type of instruction all colleges and universities were to offer in the future. The Morrill Act established the view that the subjects of instruction needed to prepare these new students for their occupational and civic responsibilities were as meritorious as the older liberal arts and professional disciplines.

These extramural demands for an enriched and expanded curriculum were soon reinforced by the importunities of scholars who imported new subject matter from the German universities. The admission into the college curriculum of the living languages and literature, the burgeoning natural sciences, and the incipient social sciences soon undermined the view that there was only one road to intellectual competence and liberal learning. Moreover, the general acceptance of the principle of the equality of subject matter enabled more technical and professional subjects such as agriculture and engineering to accompany the newer liberal arts disciplines into the halls of academia. Later this motley company propagated their kind until single courses grew into departments and schools. Their increasingly diversified and specialized curriculums now include hundreds of different undergraduate programs.

This fragmentation and differentiation of the undergraduate curriculum was paralleled and indeed in part caused by the initiation and expansion of graduate work. The first genuine graduate education offered at Johns Hopkins University in the 1870's soon found favor elsewhere. By their very nature graduate programs reflected the specialized intellectual interests of their faculties. Still later the junior college and its younger sister institution, the community college, further diversified American higher education by providing a greater array of instruction than that available in the 4-year programs.

These multiform institutions and their even more variegated offerings confirm the fact that this country has adopted the policy that a growing, adaptive, democratic society must have an ever-changing, expanding, and heterogeneous system of higher education. Consequently, the liberal arts colleges offer hundreds of different courses in the older disciplines such as English, history, physics, and sociology; the undergraduate professional schools provide a comparable richness of vocationally related instruction such as accounting, ventilation engineering, drugstore management, and psychiatric nursing; the graduate schools furnish an infinite variety of theoretical and applied subject matter such as microbiology, urban sociology, and personnel management; and, the community colleges supply a limitless range of general as well as occupational instruction for the auto mechanic, dental hygienist, X-ray technician, legal secretary, heat treater, and hundreds of other technical and semiprofessional workers. There is hardly a phase of life—personal, civic, or vocational—for which a person wishing to increase his understanding and improve his competence cannot find instruction in some institution of higher education.

Those concerned with academic excellence often voice the opinion that this proliferation of instruction has adulterated higher education. The idea that new subject matter deserved a place in the traditional curriculum has undoubtedly facilitated the admission of some instruction of questionable substance and dubious intellectual quality, as, for example, courses in flycasting, the manufacture and distribution of mobile homes, and other equally bizarre subjects. Even liberal arts colleges offer instruction excessively concerned with methodological exercises, technical skills, and specialized and detailed fact. If such instruction serves a need in American society, agencies other than colleges and universities ought to provide it. A reassessment of the quality of all types of higher education is both appropriate and timely.

As such an appraisal is made, however, social advance requires that the old and accepted not be ipso facto considered good, and the new and unknown, worthless. In the past, obscurantism in the established disciplines barred from the commonwealth of learning almost every subject now considered legitimate. Even such reputable subjects as French and chemistry were once the victims of the derogation which some of their present devotees pour on more recent claimants for a place in the academic sun. An early Harvard committee, for example, concluded th.t even though French might have some practical value, it was not worthy of a place in the curriculum. The committee proposed, therefore, that parents who wished their sons to acquire a command of the language might pay a tutor privately for such instruction. When Charles W. Eliot came to the presidency of Harvard, his own subject, chemistry, had little standing among his associates there or elsewhere. Even as late as the turn of the century the following catalog statement illustrates the invidious disparagement of the sciences:

"In the opinion of the faculty this [the classical course which leads to the A.B. degree] is the course which is best fitted to give the most symmetrical development to the mind, and the broadest culture; and it is the one which they would earnestly advise every young man seeking an education to choose."

Our present, more inclusive conception of the purposes and content of higher education has been a boon to American society. In spite of some attendant evils it has produced a more informed citizenry and workers of specialized competence either totally missing in other lands or trained merely in the routines of narrow technical efficiency. The rapid growth and the successful operation of our enormously varied economic, governmental, professional, and cultural enterprises result largely from the diversification of higher education.

The individual has also been benefitted by the opportunity to choose from a variety of courses of study. New educational programs have attracted many high school graduates who would otherwise not have continued their formal schooling. Students of uncommon intellectual gifts and strong motivations who might have made indifferent or failing records in a traditional curriculum have excelled in others more akin to their interests.

All signs indicate that in the future American higher education should, and will, be more, rather than less, differentiated. The vocational index now lists over a thousand occupations requiring some type of education beyond the high school, and the number increases at the rate of about 10 a year. As emerging knowledge is organized in teachable materials, new educational programs will appear. Even in liberal arts colleges, vocational goals obviously influence the curricular interests of most students. The usual majors in the traditional disciplines, most of which are vocationally oriented toward a life of scholarship, are already being augmented by such others as those in Russian, Chinese, international affairs, Near East studies, church music, social work, and medical technology. Comparable proliferations in undergraduate professional schools produce degree programs in hospital pharmacy, food marketing, hotel management, labor relations, and landscape design. Graduate schools, responding to similar academic, social, and economic demands, are adding a great variety of specialized instruction. Northwestern University, for example, within recent weeks has inaugurated a new program in biomedical engineering, as the announcement said, to provide a new interdisciplinary specialty in which medical specialists and electrical engineers work together to improve the practice of medicine by using the latest electrical theory and electronic instruments.[11] In the future additional curricular innovations may confidently be expected in all branches and at all levels of our system of higher education as the work of scholars penetrates unexplored terrain and as an increasingly complex society demands new types of training.

Some evidence indicates that those who oppose these developments by equating only nonvocational, theoretical instruction with excellence have already had an adverse effect on professional education. Some spokesmen for professional education question whether the steady raising of admission standards and an increasing emphasis on theory and research are not producing graduates with little interest in the everyday activities of the very professions they originally contemplated entering. These educators acknowledge the need for an adequate theoretical grounding in engineering, business administration, medicine, theology, and the liberal arts disciplines pursued in preparation for teaching. But they consider building bridges, treating patients, ministering to the spiritual needs of parishioners, and instructing undergraduates to be occupations quite different from those concerned with the pursuit of scholarship.

Commenting on recent trends in engineering education, for example, Dean Merritt A. Williamson of the School of Engineering at Pennsylvania State University observes that students who originally intended to become engineers, under the influence of those interested in research and the theoretical developments in physics, chemistry, and mathematics, end up by preferring to pass their lives in the library or laboratory rather than in the factory or the field. In concluding his plea for the realistic training of engineering students for their future professional responsibilities, Dean Williamson says:

"I think we, the engineering educators, should be vitally concerned that we are not derelict in turning out students who are imaginative, but practical, and also sensitive to persons through whom engineering efforts come into reality. Let us not, with all the magic surrounding the words science, research, high-powered mathematical analysis and so on, shove into the background of our thinking the concepts that go along with application, utility, economy, and professionalism, for these latter are the essence of engineering design and there is nothing old-fashioned, outdated, or subintellectual about them. Much as we need the boys on cloud nine, no type of educational institution other than ours is ever going to produce the highly intelligent, highly devoted, highly cost conscious, truly professional person that society needs. We must not fail to meet this obligation by taking any easy ways out."[12]

Likewise, some churchmen take the view that the institutions established and supported by religious bodies to fill their pulpits with preachers produce instead theologians more interested in the esoteric learning of the scholar than in ministering to the needs of confused and troubled parishioners yearning for spiritual guidance and personal counsel. And many college presidents believe that the graduate schools, the necessary source of teachers of undergraduates, too often turn out men and women primarily interested in, and only prepared for, the activities of research and the reproduction of their own academic kind.

Recent proposals calculated to raise the quality of programs in schools of business administration exemplify the need to consider the abilities of prospective students and the requirements of industry and commerce. The authors observed that some schools attract students of only mediocre ability and narrow vocational interests, and offered much specialized subject matter in accounting, insurance, retailing, management, and finance. They suggested that many students of lesser ability not be admitted and that specialized instruction be eliminated or moved into the graduate schools. An unexpressed assumption underlying such proposals is that the graduates of schools of business generally are going to occupy executive positions. If the foregoing proposals are intended to apply to all schools of business, even a casual examination of the structure of American business enterprise reveals that they are unrealistic. Thousands of employees of college grade do not now and many never will occupy high-level managerial posts. They can, however, serve efficiently and happily in somewhat lower echelons of business and industry. To try to educate them to do otherwise may delude them and actually fit them less well for the positions they can obtain. Schools of business ought to differ in the students they serve as well as in the instruction they offer. The same can be said about liberal arts colleges and other professional schools.

In liberal education the concern for academic excellence has been as partial as in professional programs. Emphasis in the various disciplines has been placed on the early identification and intensive training of future scholars and changes in the college programs have revealed a reversion to the earlier lack of concern for the nonmajor student who seeks a general knowledge of the subject. The professors measure institution's excellence by the number of students their several departments send on to the graduate schools much more than by their contribution to the general education of the whole college population. Tangible evidence of this change in emphasis can be found at the University of Chicago, the University of Minnesota, Harvard, and Columbia to mention only the most prominent examples where the promising programs of general education have been emasculated by the specialists' interests. Whether the liberal arts colleges will now turn out more competent physicists, historians, and philosophers remains to be seen, but that the general education of the average student will be narrower and more fragmentized is obvious. Christopher Jencks describes the recent preoccupation of teachers in liberal arts colleges in the following terms:

"In practice, if not always in intention, undergraduate instruction at great universities like Harvard is primarily a device for training—or simply recruiting—academicians. If the freshman is to justify the

[11] "Biomedical at Northwestern," Journal of Engineering Education, January 1962, p. 228.

[12] Merritt A. Williamson, "Are We Educating Scientists or Engineers," Journal of Engineering Education, November 1961, p. 101.

money and energy expended on him, many faculty members assume that he must become an amateur chemist, economist, philosopher, or the like. If he is really talented, moreover, he is expected to go on to a Ph. D. and a research career. Professors often seem to judge their own undergraduate programs by the number of graduates who undertake doctorates." [13]

Hence the meaning of the term academic excellence as applied to liberal arts colleges deserves as critical a reexamination as in its use in professional education. If the primary purpose of these institutions is the identification and preliminary training of scholars and scientists that is one thing; if on the other hand these institutions as the name implies have the social responsibility of providing a broad, genuinely liberal, nontechnical education for the intelligent discharge of the comprehensive responsibilities of life outside of a profession, that is another. The present discriminatory selection of students, the narrowing of college objectives in practice if not in declaration, and the professionalization of the liberal arts curriculum all cause thoughtful observers to question the meaning of academic excellence.

A proper redirection of higher education can only occur as the concept of excellence is related to all the varied intellectual qualities, skills, personality traits, and the factual knowledge involved in vocational competence, civic responsibility, and personal effectiveness. It must be based on the assumption that American society will require colleges and universities as a whole to offer a broad range of instruction for students of greatly varying abilities and interests. It is proper that the courses of study in some of these institutions should be highly theoretical, related to the older academic disciplines and long established professions, and designed for students of unusual scholastic aptitude. But proposals which disregard the hard, bare fact that the enterprise of higher education must soon accommodate 6 million young Americans from all stations in life, with an infinity of abilities, and many equally worthy though different vocational goals, are unrealistic and not in the national interest. The conclusion an objective observer must draw from an analysis of many of the current proposals for improving the quality of American higher education is that they are inadequate in several fundamental respects.

As steps are taken to improve the quality of higher education, those devoted to the task ought to keep three considerations foremost in their minds. These matters can be most graphically expressed in the form of questions:

1. What kind of human being is a given educational program designed to produce? This query ought to be answered in comprehensive behavioral terms, which should of course include intellectual processes. In recent years faculties have not been unconcerned about the objectives of various types of higher education; indeed much time and effort have been spent devising such lists of goals. For two principal reasons, however, they have often been ineffective in altering educational policies or practices. Typically faculties have expressed these aims in such general and academic terms that they have little relationship to the actual behavior of human beings as, for example, the statement that a particular college program produces graduates acquainted with the origins and development of Western civilization. Little attempt is made to determine whether the students who have been the beneficiaries of such an educational experience have greater respect for the rights of their fellow citizens, endorse and practice freedom of expression, read and enjoy the pertinent literary classics, or participate even as an observer in any branch of the fine arts.

The other shortcoming in such declarations of purpose relates to the failure of the teacher to organize his subject and choose his methods so as to achieve the goals he and his colleagues have presumptively endorsed. It is no exaggeration to say that usually the approval of such a comprehensive statement of objectives leaves the content and the methodology of teaching in individual courses undisturbed. In practice, therefore, the revised goals constitute only a set of ideals which, except for those related to the acquisition of knowledge, do not govern the activities of the classroom. Hence insofar as his behavioral characteristics go, the student remains unaffected by the impressive catalog of concerns the faculty declares it has for his intellectual, social, and spiritual development.

2. The question, What is intellectualism? points up the second major consideration in the upgrading of higher education. Even among the academically sophisticated, the common conception of this human characteristic is unimaginatively narrow. Generally, intellectualism is equated with intellectual accomplishment, and the latter with test scores, grades in course, class standing, and memberships in honor societies. And in spite of broader coverage of intellectual qualities included in the more recently devised instruments of academic evaluation, they still excessively reward those with the capacity to recall specific knowledge and to solve problems by the mechanical application of accepted formulas. Too many examinations penalize the nonconformist, original, inventive student who can visualize a variety of solutions to a given problem, or who sees the impossibility of giving any clearcut answer to the questions as they are stated.

The greatest weakness in present evaluations of the outcomes of education relates to a trait not closely connected with the acquisition of knowledge. It is concerned with the degree to which instruction has, or has not, aroused and cultivated an abiding interest in things of the mind. Some of the so-called late bloomers, the students with mediocre or poor high school records, who were intellectually awakened by an interested and inspiring college teacher, dramatically highlight the need to appraise the outcomes of such teaching. But to what extent consuming intellectual interests customarily result from the experiences of the college years, we do not know. Indeed the reading and other leisure time activities of those who have had a higher education strongly suggest that whatever else they may have acquired in knowledge or skill, the habitual practice of intellectual self-enlargement has not been a residual effect of their academic experiences. Before we freeze out academic practices in patently indefensible forms, the whole concept of intellectualism requires detailed and critical exploration. After this has been done methods of evaluation should be devised to assess the complex of mental and emotional qualities whose discrete elements and intricate interrelationships create lasting intellectual vitality.

Though the factors involved cannot now be described with precision, prominent among them is a compulsive interest in ideas, in things of the mind, in all aspects of the world and of man. Other faculties and qualities which deserve analysis and assessment include: (1) The constant pursuit of new knowledge; (2) the capacity to perceive subtle relationships between seemingly unrelated facts or events; (3) an urge to play with ideas unrestrained by the tenebrific forces of pedantry and the intimidating pontifications of established authority; (4) the suspension of judgment in all situations in which one is not intellectually at home; (5) a reasonably wide acquaintance with basic theories, principles, and key ideas in the major branches of learning; and (6) the ability and the desire to read steadily and widely throughout life. A review of even this incomplete catalog of traits indicates that though no one can be an intellectual without possessing average intelligence and a body of reliable knowledge, learning and intelligence should not be confused with intellectualism. Perhaps the sine qua non in the mosaic of intellectualism is an interest in ideas and their consequences in the history, the present conditions, and the future welfare of mankind.

Most present plans for raising the standards of performance among college and university students give little consideration to these matters which are much more important in human excellence and the raising of the intellectual level of American life than test scores and the diligent pursuit of knowledge within prescribed precincts. If these more comprehensive criteria were employed in the evaluation of academic excellence many of those who hold degrees, even Ph. D.'s, would come far from breaking the intellectual 4-minute mile, and their trainers might even be moved to revise their methods. Many graduates of our colleges and universities even with demonstrable high technical competence in a limited field of knowledge could hardly qualify as intellectuals. Too frequently they read nothing except their professional journals, the newspaper, and the vade mecum of the dilettante, the weekly news magazine. They are indifferent to, and often bored with, discussions of contemporary problems with the solution of which the future of the race is indissolubly connected. In the teaching profession this misnamed intellectual is typically more concerned with the technical training of the few students who may be persuaded to become candidates for advance degrees than with the thousands of others who ought to acquire a modest knowledge of, but an absorbing and continuing interest in, the subject.

The proposal that the foregoing qualities, and others which research could disclose, ought to be considered in assessing either individual or institutional academic excellence does not imply any depreciation of measures of the accumulation of knowledge and the more common skills of reasoning. It does mean that current suggestions for the raising of educational standards exhibit an excessive and dangerously narrow concern with factors in achievement which may be of secondary importance in the scientific, cultural, social, political, and artistic development of our people.

3. The third question concerned with the raising of academic standards is related to the second. What reliable knowledge exists concerning the educational practices which do or do not produce given traits of mind, personality and character? Present discussions of academic excellence are insufficiently illuminated by the authentic findings of imaginative research with respect to the total institutional impact on the individual. Compared with the scientific knowledge which undergirds our space program, some current proposals for educational improvement rank with Leonardo da Vinci's understanding of aerodynamics. They exhibit misinformation, (even with respect to the few data which exist) snobbery, subjectivity, and a perilously impatient desire to do more efficiently what we have been doing in higher education even though that may have been faulty. A fanatic has been humorously defined as one who redoubles his efforts when he loses sight of his objective. To a degree this witticism describes our present efforts to achieve academic excellence.

What is required now is a clarification of the intellectual, personality, character, physical, spiritual and civic qualities we ex-

[13] Christopher Jencks, "The Next 30 Years in the Colleges," Harper's magazine, October 1961, p. 123.

pect various types of American institutions of higher education to produce. To be practically effective these efforts to define educational goals in terms of a broad conception of human excellence should be accompanied by a massive research program to determine which educational practices and general conditions of college and university life nurture various human qualities. Some very fruitful and suggestive investigations have recently been reported in "The American College." [14] But in terms of the area of unexplored ground, and the potential social consequences of our ignorance, the present program of research is niggardly. If a modest portion of the enormous sums now being spent on the projected exploration of the moon were diverted to the exploration of the factors involved in academic and human excellence we might move further into outer space more expeditiously. More importantly, by that time perhaps we could preserve and so enhance the lives of many American citizens and their contemporaries abroad that they might, under the circumstances, be satisfied to remain behind on this presently confused globe.

[14] Nevitt Sanford, "The American College," John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1962.

THE HONG KONG REFUGEE SITUATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution urging concerted action to help alleviate the tragic situation of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong.

In submitting this resolution, I am honored to be joined by my distinguished colleague, the deputy majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY], by my good friend, the very distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], by the very able junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and by the very distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. President, we have all been deeply moved by the press accounts of the mass influx of Chinese refugees into Hong Kong and by the heartrending stories about the many thousands of refugees who have been obliged to return to Red China because it is physically impossible for Hong Kong to provide accommodations and sustenance for refugees in such large numbers.

When the American press printed a photograph of a refugee girl sobbing her heart out because she was about to be returned, the American people responded overnight with thousands of offers of adoption. Our people want to help in this tragic situation. I am sure we shall be speaking for all of them if we now commit ourselves to a generous program of assistance to the Chinese refugees now fleeing from Communist rule, in consultation and cooperation with the British authorities.

This latest outpouring of refugees constitutes another dramatic demonstration of the bankruptcy of communism. The British administration in Hong Kong has already granted asylum to 1,500,000 refugees from Red China and, by and large, it has up until now pursued a generous and humane refugee policy. But without assistance from other countries and without serious possibility of resettlement in other countries, there is a physical limit to the number of refugees that can be absorbed by Hong Kong's tiny territory.

I saw something of the Chinese refugee problem when I was in Hong Kong a year ago. The British authorities have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on housing projects and schools, retraining and job creation projects for the refugees. They have built and built until there is pathetically little ground left for any housing projects even on the hillsides of Hong Kong. But even with all this, the refugees are crowded five and six in a single room.

Until recent weeks, the rate of influx has averaged about 100,000 refugees a year, or just over 8,000 per month. But 2 weeks ago, this river of human refugees grew into a flood, which poured into Hong Kong, by land and by sea, at a rate of 4,000 or 5,000 each day.

These refugees are giving up their homes and are fleeing from Communist rule, in part because they are hungry, in part because they are terrified at the prospect of even more severe famine, in part because they do not wish to live any longer under that regime of coercion and oppression and hunger.

Many of the refugees make their ways to Hong Kong under perilous conditions and without the consent of the Communist border authorities. But the evidence is that, for some strange reason, the Communists have eased up on their border controls, so that people who wish to leave for Hong Kong could do so. This morning's news indicates that the Communist authorities have reconsidered their position, and are now tightening up their controls at the Hong Kong frontier.

Apparently the Communists are now worried over the political implications of this mass outflow of refugees. And they have every reason to be worried, because nothing more clearly demonstrates the failure of the Communist regime and the scope of popular dissaffection inside Red China.

Meanwhile, the British authorities in Hong Kong have been confronted with the heartbreaking problem. Hong Kong cannot possibly accommodate an influx of more than 100,000 refugees a month. And, as the British authorities have pointed out, if they did accommodate them this month, next month there would be twice that number clamoring for admission. Under the circumstances, they have endeavored to strike a compromise, granting asylum to those who can clearly demonstrate that they have suffered political persecution or are in danger of suffering political persecution, but returning all those who cross the border with permits or who have fled from China for reasons that are considered primarily economic. Applying these criteria, the British administration has been returning under guard as many as 4,000 refugees per day, some of them caught in the frontier area, some of them rounded up from the hillsides and teeming refugee quarters of Hong Kong.

The trouble with this criterion is that it is virtually impossible to draw a sharp dividing line between those refugees who seek sanctuary for political reasons and those who flee for primarily economic reasons. The fact is, that every political refugee, whether in Europe or in the Far East, reaches the big decision to give up his home and his homeland because of a combination of reasons—political, economic, social, and others. However these reasons may be weighted in any individual case, it all boils down to the fact that people become refugees because they find life under communism intolerable.

Many of these so-called economic refugees have wept bitterly at the point of being returned. Others have offered physical resistance. Still others have jumped from moving trucks to escape from their British guards. And the refugees in Hong Kong, sympathizing with the plight of these newly arrived refugees are apparently doing everything in their power to protect them and to prevent their capture by the British police. Yesterday, for example, it was reported that refugee families shoved their children into the paths of trucks loaded with refugees being returned to mainland China.

I do not wish to criticize the British administration in Hong Kong, because I know how heavy the burden has been and how truly generous and humane their attitude has been until now. I feel constrained to say, however, that I have been worried by certain press items dealing with the matter of involuntary repatriation.

According to one report, a group of soldiers who had come over in their uniforms were returned to the Chinese Communist authorities. My own feeling is that, however lax the border officials were when these soldiers escaped, the soldiers will certainly be confronted with harsh punishment on their return.

According to another report, one of the refugees recently sent back had been in Hong Kong several years. When his wife and child crossed the frontier recently to join him, the entire family was rounded up and returned.

Perhaps such individual tragedies are unavoidable when so many thousands of people are involved and when the authorities in charge are so harried and exhausted.

Rather than complain from the sidelines about any failure on the part of the British authorities in Hong Kong, I believe that we in the United States must first recognize, in far more generous measure, our own responsibilities in the Chinese refugee problem.

The fact is that the problem of refugees from communism is the collective responsibility of the free world, and it should be recognized as such. And because of the great power and wealth of the United States in the free world community, this responsibility is preeminently our own.

I believe that we have done our share in coping with the postwar refugee situation in Europe, with the Hungarian refugee situation, and with the Arab refugee situation; but in the case of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, I feel we have permitted the British administration to carry an exceedingly heavy

burden with comparatively little American assistance. This is one of the reasons why they are obliged to take such stringent measures today.

In the programs of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and of the International Committee on European Migration, it has traditionally been estimated that a fair share for the United States stands at approximately one-third of the total cost of the operation. I should like to propose, Mr. President—and this is part of the purpose of my resolution—that we apply the same criterion to the refugee situation in Hong Kong. I should further like to propose that we take a series of measures, within the framework of existing legislation, designed to alleviate this tragic situation.

I believe the proposals contained in my resolution are realistic, that they represent a minimum rather than a maximum, that these proposals are within our means, and that they could, if implemented, give effective assistance to our British friends and help them to keep the doors to freedom as generously ajar as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 346) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas within the past several weeks scores of thousands of Chinese refugees from Communist China have been pouring into Hong Kong by land and by sea; and

Whereas the British Administration in Hong Kong, which has already granted asylum to 1,500,000 refugees from Red China, and which has heretofore pursued a generous and humane refugee policy, is now turning back large numbers of refugees because it finds it physically impossible to receive, accommodate, and arrange resettlement for the 5,000 refugees who are daily seeking asylum in Hong Kong; and

Whereas this mass outpouring of refugees constitutes another dramatic demonstration of the bankruptcy of the Chinese Communist regime; and

Whereas the problem of refugees from communism should ideally be treated as the collective responsibility of the free world; and

Whereas human, moral, and political considerations all demand that the free world apply the most liberal and generous criteria in granting asylum to all those who seek sanctuary from Communist terror and oppression: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the the sense of the Senate—

(1) That the administration, in consultation with the British authorities, should convene a conference of nations interested in the Chinese refugee problem, based on the concept that this problem should be treated as a collective responsibility of the free world;

(2) That the President use the powers conferred upon him by Public Law 86-648 to parole into this country 5,000 Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, giving preference to family reunion cases, to those who have already applied for admission to the United States, and to professionals, specialists, and skilled workers who can make a significant contribution to American society;

(3) That the question of resettling Chinese refugees in other countries of the free world be raised at the conference proposed in paragraph 1;

(4) That, in addition, the American delegation be instructed to raise the question at the forthcoming meeting of the OAS in the hope that each of the member States will agree to accept a small but significant quota of Chinese refugees;

(5) That to help the British in Hong Kong cope with the immediate pressure of this vast new refugee influx, the President should immediately make available to the British authorities in Hong Kong whatever quantity of American surplus food these authorities may consider necessary;

(6) That, in line with the one-third formula that has become customary in the financing of United Nations and international refugee projects, the United States should assume responsibility for one-third of the cost of the Chinese refugee program in Hong Kong, employing for this purpose the funds that have already been made available for appropriation, on a discretionary basis, under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

(7) That at the conference referred to in paragraph 1, the American delegation be instructed to explore the possibility of arranging for the resettlement of a portion of the Hong Kong refugees in some of the unpopulated islands of the Pacific Ocean, leasing these islands, if possible, on a long-term basis, to the Nationalist Chinese Government, so that the refugees resettled will retain Chinese nationality;

(8) That, following the precedent established at the time of the Hungarian refugee crisis, the administration should make available American military transports for the purpose of resettling refugees from Communist China in Taipei or in the Americas or on unpopulated Pacific islands;

(9) That, to support the mass resettlement program in Taiwan which the Chinese Nationalist Government has now proposed, the administration should substantially increase its surplus food program in Taiwan and should offer to meet half the cost of resettlement and rehabilitation, up to a maximum of $50 million, this money also to be taken from the funds that have already been made available for appropriation, on a discretionary basis, under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended;

(10) That for the implementation of this entire program, the administration should use, and if necessary expand, the existing facilities of the Far Eastern refugee program of the Department of State, in cooperation with the American voluntary agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield, I wish to commend him for his initiative and his leadership in connection with this matter. He was so kind and considerate as to invite a number of his colleagues to join him, if they desired to do so, in the submission of the resolution; and I consider it a privilege and an honor to be a cosponsor of the resolution of the Senator from Connecticut. I believe his proposal is very much needed; and I propose to do my part in seeing that what it calls for—which I believe is very much needed—is done.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield to me, let me say that I, too, wish to congratulate him for his initiative in submitting the resolution, which I have been very happy to join in sponsoring. In fact, the resolution pretty well carries out part of the suggestions the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I made last Tuesday——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it does.

Mr. MUNDT. Immediately upon the receipt of news from Taipei that the Nationalist Chinese Government was willing to accept many of the refugees from Hong Kong. But the resolution goes further, and calls for the establishment of a council or conference to deal with the refugee problem, in trying to work out an overall arrangement so that these refugees can receive equitable and humanitarian treatment.

The resolution also provides that the United States shall accept 5,000 of these refugees from Hong Kong. I am sure our country will be happy to open its arms to these unhappy refugees from Communist China. So far as my own State is concerned, I am sure it will be most happy to welcome its share of them. Our State has some distinguished Americans of Chinese ancestry; they are splendid citizens. So we would welcome additional members of this group.

The resolution emphasizes the point that we should expedite the action, in terms of arriving at all possible procedures designed to attain the end in view, so as to make food available not only to Hong Kong, but also to Taipei and to all other countries willing to participate in the program.

I am glad the Senator from Connecticut has had the resolution printed in the RECORD, because it seems to me the resolution should be acted on with expedition by the Senate.

This is not a complicated measure. The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate; and I hope that within the week the Senate will act affirmatively on the resolution.

It seems to me the resolution calls for a manifestation of good faith insofar as freedom-loving people around the world are concerned.

The resolution demonstrates our desire to cooperate with the British, who are confronted with this specific problem. All that we ask is cooperation by the British in not barring the door to freedom to these people, who are escaping from the dungeon of communism, and in not condemning the refugees who already have left Red China or those who may leave in the future to the certain death which would face them if they were returned to the mainland.

We ask the British to be patient until the purposes of the resolution can be implemented.

Mr. President, I have been intrigued by a headline appearing today in the Washington Post. The headline is followed by the byline of Robert H. Estabrook. I am not sure whether the item to which I refer is a news article or amounts to editorial comment. However, I am not particularly concerned as to which is the case.

The headline is: "British Reply to MUNDT: Put Up or Shut Up."

Mr. President, that is the kind of language which we in the West understand, and I do not resent its use. It is the kind of straightforward talk that should be used among English-speaking people.

So I submit that under the resolution of the Senator from Connecticut, those of us who are associated with him in the submission of the amendment and he, himself, propose to "put up"; we propose to provide this additional assistance and we propose to provide cooperation.

So in reply to the British officials who made the statement about my allegation that they were forcing the refugees to engage in suicidal attempts, by pushing them back into Red China, I submit to Colonial Secretary Reginald Maudling, whom I have never had an opportunity to meet, and to anyone else who joined in directing the statement to me, that we have now "put up"; and now it is up to the British to cooperate, or else to stand condemned before world opinion for a shocking disregard of the equities and the humanities involved.

We are willing to "put up." We ask the British to cooperate and to keep open the door to freedom, and not to condemn these refugees to certain death.

If the British will do that, I am sure that they and the Americans, working together, can accomplish a great deal in aiding these unfortunate escapees, who are running away from godless communism and are seeking freedom.

I hope that in the meantime the British officials will not countenance the return by force of a single refugee to the certain death awaiting such refugees if they are compelled to leave Hong Kong and return to the dungeon of Red China.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield to me, let me say that my colleague [Mr. MUNDT] has, with his customary clarity, expressed exceedingly well the situation.

It seems to me this is one challenge which the people of the free world need to meet head on. If people are forced either by political conditions or by economic conditions to flee Red China, I believe that the least we can do is try to find food for them and try to find for them a place where they can go.

Inasmuch as the Nationalist Chinese Government in Formosa has indicated its readiness to receive many of these refugees, I believe we should join in supplying the necessary food until the refugees can be located.

Certainly, that would be one of the best uses of the so-called food-for-peace program that has been proposed.

I am not insensible to the fact that it is possible, in any mass movement of people, to have an infiltration of Communists. I would assume, of course, that proper steps would be taken to screen the refugees, to be sure there were no agents or provocateurs among them. I think those in charge of a program like this should also take steps to guard against black marketing. I am not insensible to the fact that when large quantities of food or other products are made available, even though most persons involved may have honest motives, people can engage in black marketing in those goods.

With those two cautions, the need for protection against infiltration of Red agents and against the possibility of black marketing, I strongly urge that the food-for-peace program be utilized to give assistance to persons who are trying to get out of Red China. In fact, the desperation of their movement reflects the love they have for a different kind of system than the one under which they have been forced to live.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin yields to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for the submission of the resolution. I feel privileged in joining as one of the cosponsors. I think all of us have been somewhat concerned as to what our duty was toward the starving of China.

I have felt it would be inadvisable for us to send food to China for distribution in that country, because there was no means by which we could control its distribution. There was always the probability—indeed, almost the certainty—that the Chinese would use our food as a political weapon against us.

The migration from China, stimulated at least in part by mass hunger, puts a different aspect upon the problem. In the first place, as previous speakers have said, it is clear evidence of the breakdown not only of the Chinese system of agriculture, but the Chinese system of industry and the heartless way in which they have treated their people.

It also permits us to demonstrate our humanitarian desires by feeding a considerable number of these people, taking care of a considerable number of refugees, and doing so outside of the control of Communist China.

I think the program which the Senator from Connecticut has suggested is both humanitarian in its nature and very practical in its application, and I hope it may be speedily adopted by Great Britain and this country and put into effect.

The Senator from Connecticut has made a great contribution. We are very much in his debt.

Mr. DODD. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], both distinguished Senators from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT and Mr. CASE], and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for their support and their encouragement. I am confident this resolution will be favorably acted upon in the Senate. I am glad it has been suggested that we get to it as quickly as we can. I think it is an urgent matter and that we should proceed with it. I hope the leadership will help us do so.

OUTDOOR RECREATION FROM UNUSED FARM LANDS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the need of outdoor recreation and how it can be met, to a great extent, by developing facilities on our Nation's farm and ranch lands.

The crying demand for the out of doors is encountered wherever we go. Public recreational facilities in many areas are already overtaxed. Attendance at our National Parks has surpassed even the most liberal projections made a decade ago. Last year 102 million people visited our national forests, an increase of 340 percent in 10 years.

The pressures on these and other recreational facilities will continue to grow as our population grows and our people have more free time.

In seeking the out of doors, most people seek simple pleasures—they want to hike, drive, picnic, fish, and swim. Others want to hunt and camp, go boating and waterskiing. Sites on which to carry out these activities are limited. They will become more limited as our population increases.

This is a problem, and, indeed, a serious one. Fortunately, we have much privately-owned land that can be developed for recreational purposes. That land now lies in the farms, ranches, and woodlands that make up three-fourths of our land area—land that is presently producing more food and fiber than we can use at home and market abroad. Why not ease both situations somewhat by taking land out of the production of food and putting it to recreational uses?

This would accomplish far more than just a reduction in surplus crops. It would mean that recreational areas could be developed near our highly populated urban complexes where the need is the greatest. It would mean a new source of revenue for the farmer and more business in hard-pressed rural areas. It would create new job opportunities.

Converting farmland to recreation areas is not something new or untried. It has already met success in many areas where enterprising landowners or organizations have seen the need. It can be as simple as a farm pond stocked with fish and opened to the public on a fee basis, or as extensive as a small watershed project lake, encompassing several hundred acres, developed for use by thousands of people a year who desire to boat, fish, swim, and camp.

The trouble with these enterprises—successful as they are—is that they are too few in number. Outdoor recreation can be a major product of American farmland, but help is needed to accomplish the goal if we are to even come near filling the need.

HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I rise to speak in behalf of our Nation's senior citizens, whose problems have been the subject of much talk but little action. Specifically, I am concerned today with the problem of providing adequate health care for our aged.

That this problem does exist is no longer a matter for debate, even by opponents of the King-Anderson bill, for it is widely acknowledged that the health of our elderly is indeed a serious problem, deserving nationwide attention. The rise in hospital costs from an average of $9.39 per day in 1946 to $32.28 per day in 1960; the higher incidence of hospital use by the aged, which is about 2½ times that of the below-65 group; the longer periods of hospital care required by the

aged; the difficulty of obtaining adequate low-cost health insurance; all these factors, combined with the low incomes of those over 65, act to place our senior citizens in a very disadvantageous position, to say the very least. For the typical aged couple, attempting to live on an income of less than $2,500 per year, is simply not in the position to pay the large medical bills which threaten them more and more as they grow older. No, Mr. President, clearly the issue is no longer one of whether or not there is a problem, but the issue is one of what we are going to do about this situation.

In 1960, as Senators know, one attempt at the solution of this problem was made. I am, of course, referring to the Kerr-Mills legislation, which, it is asserted in some quarters, is providing the answer to the problem. Mr. President, I think that the facts show just the opposite—that the Kerr-Mills program is not doing the job. For instead of creating an orderly, systematic method of providing medical assistance to the aged, we have created a potpourri of programs; a race in which a few of the participants run the full length of the course, some of the participants cut the corners and end up running half the distance, and a majority of participants do not run at all. No wonder, then, that we have the situation confronting us today under the Kerr-Mills legislation, in which only 21 of the States, as of October 1961, were providing medical assistance programs, and in which during the month of January 1962, three States were making 92 percent of the payments made under the program. Clearly, such a program is not meeting the needs of the great majority of our senior citizens. Something else is needed.

It has often been charged by certain elements in our society that the King-Anderson bill is socialistic; that it will lead to exorbitant taxation and ever-increasing coverage. If I believed that such allegations were true, I would not have become one of the cosponsors of the bill. However, it is obvious that the King-Anderson measure is far from being socialized medicine. Hospitals are not to be nationalized; doctors are not to be paid by the Government; freedom of choice in regard to the selection of hospital or physician will not be impaired; and the doctor-patient relationship, which has been so important in our system of medicine, will not be endangered. In fact, the King-Anderson bill, unlike the Kerr-Mills law, does not even provide for payment of doctor's services, nor does it provide the extensive, expensive all-encompassing medical care which the States may provide under the open-end system of Kerr-Mills. On the contrary, the King-Anderson proposal is merely a means by which the elderly can meet the expenses of hospital and nursing-home care in a dignified manner, through their contributions to social security; contributions which will be at the most $17.60 per year for a worker making $5,200 per year or more. This is a small cost indeed for the knowledge that one's old age will not be spent undergoing humiliating means tests, doing without needed medical care, or being forced to sell possessions earned through many years of labor in order to meet the cost of medical bills.

But, my distinguished colleagues, you are well aware of these facts, and I am confident that when the crucial time comes—when we must decide whether or not we shall move to correct this situation—this august body will not hesitate in making the decision which will help our senior citizens enjoy the benefits of their years of labor, and allow them to enjoy in peace and security the rest earned by them through many years of toil.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I rise to call attention to the fact that today is a special day—a day which should not go unnoticed. Just 25 years ago on May 24, 1937, the Supreme Court of the United States declared that the social security system was constitutional.

This was a glorious day 25 years ago, for it meant that Americans had recognized the needs of her elderly citizens; that America was concerned about her aged; and that America was the humane country that the rest of the world believed her to be.

Our great Nation has vastly grown during the past quarter century when the greatest tribunal of a free society, the Supreme Court, handed down this history-making decision. We have seen our country in the throes of a devastating Second World War; we have seen her on the battlefields of Korea; and we have seen her cross the threshold of space, and now search for answers to greater mysteries in the heavens. During this quarter century when many American lives were lost in the field of battle, we still have seen our population grow and explode.

Today, every day, 1,000 people are added to ranks of the aged—that is, those 65 and over. We now have 17,500,000 men and women in the United States who are 65 and older. Five years from now, there will be 20 million, and by 1972, there will be 23 million.

This is a blessing—not a curse. And, thank God, our Congress and Senators of a quarter century ago had the foresight to establish a program which would allow our senior citizens to live in respect and dignity in their twilight years, when perhaps they no longer would be able to work, or when they might wish to step aside and make available a job for a young man so he could provide for his young family.

Thank God the Congress of 25 years ago realized the need to allay the fears of our aged who felt they no longer were wanted or needed.

Today, I regret to see that half of the persons over 65 living alone have less than $1,000 per year income and half the couples over 65 have less than $2,500 in income. From this fact is seems to me that these senior citizens are able to provide themselves with merely the bare necessities of life.

Two years before the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the social security system, opponents of the program said its establishment would turn us to socialism. Bugaboos were raised such as the one that we would all have to wear our social security numbers tattooed on us. They said then that social security was a cruel hoax.

The country was told social security would destroy life insurance and stop the growth of private pensions plans and annuities. Yet, for some reason, all of these have grown.

Old-age and survivors insurance benefits began in 1940. During the next 20 years the number of workers in private pension and deferred profit-sharing plans grew from 4 million to 22 million. The number of annuities in effect rose from 1½ million to 6 million. Life insurance grew from $115 billion to $586 billion. Life insurance per family grew from $2,700 to $10,200.

There is no mistake that the social security program has made Americans insurance and pension conscious. It has stimulated the growth of private and company pension programs and boomed the insurance business. It is a base upon which those who are able are encouraged to build.

Under social security, assistance has been given to the handicapped, the disabled, the blind. The Senate Finance Committee just recently held hearings on a bill to provide greater benefits for these people, and I am proud today to have just introduced four amendments to assist our blind citizens in this country.

Undoubtedly, because of social security the welfare costs have been reduced since our elderly are able to better provide for themselves under social security.

My colleagues, I am proud to be a member of the Democratic Party which had the foresight to institute our social security program, and, moreover, I am proud to be an American, for only in America are the social ills of a great and free society solved through the democratic process as democracy speaks with a loud and free voice.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under the order of Tuesday, May 22, 1962, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 25, 1962, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1962:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Oliver Seth, of New Mexico, to be U.S. circuit judge for the 10th circuit, vice Sam G. Bratton, retired.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United

States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Achilles Lacy Tynes, O18916, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. James Hedges Forsee, O18265, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Chester William Clark, O41908, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Abner Richardson, 3d, O29906, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Richard John Meyer, O19147, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Heber Lipscomb, O19371, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Allen Carver, O19122, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Lane, O19021, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Achilles Lacy Tynes, O18916, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. John Frederick Thorlin, O19067, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. David Parker Gibbs, O19189, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Roland Haddaway del Mar, O29917, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Allen Harris, O18976, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Harry Lester Hillyard, O19524, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Pelham Yarborough O20362, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Douglass Phillip Quandt, O20605, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Leon Rowny, O23744, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Edward Gee, O19251, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Billingslea, O20367, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Donald Gilbert Grothaus, O20221, U.S. Army.

Col. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, U.S. Army.

Col. John Daniel Hines, O38900, U.S. Army.

Col. William Leslie Calhoun, O42664, U.S. Army.

Col. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, U.S. Army.

Col. Lawrence Pierce Jacobs, O31556, U.S. Army.

Col. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Jr., O20816, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Allen Douglas Hulse, O21238, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Col. Frank Carter Norvell, O19471, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Hall Safford, O20244, U.S. Army.

Col. John David Torrey, Jr., O20217, U.S. Army.

Col. George Madison Jones, O19965, U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Nelson Sibley, O21277, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Bernard Markey, O38826, U.S. Army.

Col. John Gottfried Gramzow, O30735, U.S. Army.

Col. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Bradford Smith, O22113, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Steve Archie Chappuis, O20899, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Eads Graham Hardaway, O20855, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Joe Hodson, O43268, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. B J Leon Hirshorn, O51762, U.S. Army.

Col. Kenneth Irwin Curtis, O19790, U.S. Army.

Col. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Runyan Linvill, O40305, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Stanley Lauriston Harding, O32134, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.

Col. Frank Milton Izenour, O21263, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Gilbert Turner, O31414, U.S. Army.

Col. Gordon Talmage Kimbrell, O20851, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, U.S. Army.

Col. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Robert Meyer, O20762, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Kenneth McCormick, O31982, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Justin William Stoll, O30483, U.S. Army.

Col. Bernard Sanders Waterman, O19746, U.S. Army.

Col. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, U.S. Army.

Col. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Thomas Corley, O21325, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Clifton Dalrymple, O31509, U.S. Army.

Col. Raymond John Harvey, O20116, U.S. Army.

Col. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert Ludwig Schulz, O42115, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major

Cosby, Warren G., O65710.
Hackett, Edward J., O82019.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Aamodt, Ludvig J., O87000.
Abrahamson, James L., O87001.
Abramson, Lawrence, O91145.
Abrams, Harry C., O87002.
Acuff, Joseph D., O86980.
Adams, Charles M., 3d, O85812.
Adams, Hunter W., O85814.
Adams, James W. R., O87003.
Adams, Joseph F., 3d, O85815.
Adams, Melvin M., O85816.
Adams, William K., O85817.
Adamson, Henry K., 3d, O87004.
Addison, Charles S., O87991.
Adelmann, Walter J., O85818.
Adkins, Kenton L., O91735.
Agee, Damon W., Jr., O85819.
Ailles, Craig R., O85820.
Albertson, William D., O85821.
Allingham, Edger R., O89669.
Amidon, Bert C., O85830.
Anderson, Barrie W., O85831.
Anderson, Frederick D., O87005.
Anderson, Jay E., O85832.
Anderson, Morris D., O85834.
Anderson, Richard J., O85835.
Anderson, Thomas W., O90169.
Anderson, William J., O91150.
Angolia, John R., O85838.
Anslinger, Raymond W., O94985.
Arbogast, Alfred A., Jr., O85840.
Arflack, Kenneth B., O88325.
Argrett, James H., Jr., O85842.
Armistead, John W., O87996.
Arrisgado, Maurice M., O87468.
Aucoin, Alvin S., O85843.
Austin, Robert E., Jr., O88328.
Auyong, Stephen K. H., O85845.
Bagdonas, Edward, O87006.
Bair, Arthur H., Jr., O87007.
Baker, David G., O85848.
Baker, Dorsey L., O87008.
Baker, Larry A., O86989.
Baldwin, Alan W., O87009.

Baldwin, Ronald C., O87010.
Ballenger, Kenneth D., O88332.
Ballenger, Thomas H., O87011.
Banyas, Michael, O88002.
Bareiss, David A., O85849.
Barmore, Frederick E., Jr., O85851.
Barnett, John R., O85855.
Barnhart, David S., O94911.
Barr, Grady W., O86991.
Barratt, Richard H., O85856.
Barrett, Peter J., O85857.
Barrett, Richard J., O85858.
Barrington, David, O85860.
Barros, John J., O85861.
Barry, Robert M., O87012.
Barton, Charles D., O85864.
Bassett, Lowell R., O85865.
Batcheler, George E., O85866.
Bates, John H., Jr., O85867.
Baugh, Raymond C., O87014.
Beach, David R., O85871.
Beach, Dwight E., Jr., O87015.
Beal, William R., Jr., O86993.
Beale, Robert W., 3d, O87016.
Beard, Charles T., O89930.
Beard, Louin L., O87017.
Beasley, John D., 3d, O85873.
Beasley, Rodney S., O91249.
Bechthold, Wayne H., O87018.
Bechtler, Alfred N., O85876.
Becker, John B., O85877.
Beech, Gary D., O87019.
Behie, Edward H., O85878.
Behannon, Hollis P., O86994.
Bell, Arleigh T., Jr., O87020.
Bell, David A., O85880.
Bell, Randall W., O87021.
Benagh, William E., Jr., O87022.
Bennett, Richard C., O87023.
Bennett, Stuart N., O87024.
Benson, Frederick S., 3d, O85882.
Bentley, Robert G., O94272.
Benwitz, Richard A., O85883.
Berg, Dwayne P., O86996.
Bergeron, Gary P., O86997.
Berta, Thomas L., O85886.
Bertils, Bertel R., O87025.
Bertolett, Craig R., O87026.
Besson, Frank S., 3d, O87027.
Best, David M., O85888.
Bettencourt, Ronald G., O85889.
Beurket, Raymond T., Jr., O87028.
Bichler, Herman J., O91756.
Bickford, James E., O89815.
Bicknell, Hilton B., O85890.
Biddle, David L., O94987.
Birrane, John H., O85895.
Bisbey, Jay B., O85896.
Bishop, Edward L., O85897.
Bishop, John C., O85898.
Bizic, Peter, Jr., O88008.
Black, Joe D., O88009.
Blake, Billy N., O85900.
Blank, Richard A., Jr., O88012.
Blasco, Andrew P., O85901.
Blevins, Virgil E., O85903.
Boerschel, August P., O85905.
Boggs, Haymon H., 2d, O87029.
Boginis, James W., O82431.
Bohi, Robert Y., O91555.
Bohman, Jack E., O87030.
Bolick, Thomas G., O87031.
Bond, John A., O85908.
Borlund, Thomas V., Jr., O87032.
Boston, Louis J., O85913.
Boterf, Chester A., Jr., O85914.
Bowen, Guy P., O88579.
Bowers, Robert F., O87033.
Bowser, William H., O85916.
Boyd, James R., O85917.
Boyd, Thomas, 3d, O87034.
Boyle, Clarence E., O85918.
Boyle, Conrad L., O87035.
Boyle, Russell T., Jr., O87036.
Bradley, Bruce R., O87037.
Braithwaite, David A., O85921.
Branscome, Dexter A., 3d, O85922.
Brass, Ronald W., O87038.
Bray, Robert F., O90397.
Breeding, Joel W., O91770.
Breedlove, Joe J., O85925.
Breen, William W., O87039.
Breslin, Frederick C., O85927.
Bretsch, Kenneth P., O90454.
Breuel, Albert A., 3d, O87040.
Briggs, Harold L., Jr., O87041.
Brigham, Donald F., O85929.
Brokaw, Robert P., Jr., O91170.
Broocke, Nathan I., O87042.
Brooks, Joseph J., Jr., O85931.
Brooks, Lawrence E., O88593.
Brooks, Richard L., Sr., O94444.
Broome, Donald F., O88344.
Broome, John M., O91171.
Broullon, Anthony J., O85932.
Brown, Melvin H., O85937.
Brown, Patty E., O85938.
Brown, Roy E., O91559.
Brown, Walter T., Jr., O87043.
Brownfield, Boyd J., O85943.
Bruner, William M., O85945.
Bryer, John E., Jr., O87044.
Buchanan, William J., Jr., O85948.
Buckley, Benjamin C., Jr., O85949.
Buell, William C., 5th, O87045.
Buff, Max LaD., O87697.
Buffaloe, Laurence W., O85951.
Buford, Alfred E., O94446.
Burba, Edwin H., Jr., O87046.
Burchell, Larry E., O87047.
Bures, Raymond A., O85955.
Burke, Joseph M., O88346.
Burkholder, Robert D., O85957.
Burleson, Willard McK., Jr., O87048.
Burley, Earl B., O85958.
Burroughs, Robert H., O87049.
Burwell, James M., O87050.
Bush, William A., O87051.
Butt, Herbert H., Jr., O88021.
Byrd, Charles R., O85962.
Cacolice, John P., O88022.
Cagle, Charles H., O91175.
Cahoon, John L., O88348.
Callahan, Joel T., O85965.
Calvin, John H., O85967.
Camp, Junious W., Jr., O88023.
Campbell, Douglas N., O87052.
Campbell, James T., O91785.
Campbell, J. Frank, O87053.
Campbell, John R., Jr., O85968.
Campbell, Ronald E., O88024.
Campi, Francis V., O85969.
Canales, Fred, O88025.
Cannon, Richard M., O87054.
Carberry, James A., O88026.
Carlisle, Allen D., O85971.
Carlisle, Robert M., O85972.
Carlson, Carl E., O89800.
Carolan, James M., O88027.
Carr, Benny M., O87055.
Carrier, David R., O87056.
Carroll, Edward J., O85976.
Carroll, John F., O87057.
Carter, Arthur P., Jr., O85977.
Caruso, Louis, 3d, O87058.
Castell, William T., O87701.
Cassidy, Denis L., O88028.
Catineau, William J., O85982.
Chalmers, Paul A., Jr., O87059.
Chandler, FitzHugh H., Jr., O87060.
Chapman, Ruthven H., O88616.
Chappell, James E., O87061.
Cheatham, Fred C., O88030.
Chew, Frank S., O85984.
Childrey, Albert B., 3d, O85985.
Chittenden, Warde P., O85986.
Christy, William C., Jr., O87705.
Chutter, Robert W., Jr., O85503.
Cincotti, Joseph G., O87490.
Clagett, Larry W., O85988.
Clark, Jack T., O85991.
Clark, Richard L., O87062.
Clark, Thomas F., O85993.
Clarke, Samuel, Jr., O85995.
Clarke, William E., Jr., O87063.
Clement, Joe M., O85996.
Clifton, James A., O85997.
Clum, Keith E., O89829.
Coen, Donald C., O87064.
Cohan, John A., O87065.
Colby, Nathaniel F., O87066.
Cole, Samuel B., 2d, O86001.
Conlon, John F., O86007.
Connors, Francis X. K., O86008.
Conway, Rody M., O87067.
Cook, Grady W., O86010.
Cooley, Russell E., 3d, O86011.
Cooper, Russell E., O86012.
Cope, Robert C., Jr., O86013.
Corby, John F., O87068.
Coreth, Joseph H., O87069.
Corr, James C., O87070.
Cosby, Andrew D., O86015.
Cotton, Charles A., 3d, O88356.
Cotts, David G., O87071.
Coughlin Frank J., Jr., O86016.
Covington, Henry H., 3d, O87072.
Cowden, Ronald R., O87713.
Cox, John R., O87073.
Coyne, John F., Jr., O93379.
Crafton, Walter H., O94743.
Craig, Hal N., O86019.
Cramer, Parker D., O86020.
Cranford, George M., O86021.
Craven, Ronald E., O86022.
Crawford, Vernon L., O87716.
Crofoot, George W., O94921.
Cronin, Michael J., O87074.
Crow, John S., O86028.
Crowe, Donald F., O86027.
Cubine, Gerald W., O94922.
Cummings, Sean H., O87075.
Cunningham, Patrick J., O87718.
Curbow, Stanton L., O86031.
Curran, Martin D., O86033.
Curren, William F., 3d, O94284.
Curtis, Thomas A., O86035.
Cyr, Arthur R., Jr., O87076.
Dague, Paul B., O86038.
Dalhausser, Robert W., O86041.
Daly, William F., Jr., O87721.
Damato, Earl J., O89327.
Dannell, John T., 3d, O87077.
Darby, Charles D., O87078.
Dassonville, Curtis R., O88042.
Davis, Donald R., O87079.
Dawkins, Peter M., O87080.
Dawson, Lawrence S., O86048.
Day, George E., O87081.
Dayhuff, Charles H., 3d, O88648.
Dearman, Charles S., O89892.
Dearmin, Paul E., Jr., O87084.
DeAtkine, Norvell B., O87082.
DeFabio, Richard A., O86049.
DeFord, Dale D., O86050.
DeGrant, Robert L., O86051.
DeLauder, William B., O86052.
DelBuono, John A., O86053.
Delikat, Stanley J., O87085.
Dellinger, George C., O86054.
DeMartini, Frank J., Jr., O86055.
DeMont, Robert W., O87083.
Dendtler, Robert B., O89048.
DesGranges, Jacques F. G., O86059.
Devereaux, Alfred B., Jr., O87086.
Dewey, Lawrence R., Jr., O86060.
DeYoung, Thomas A., O86062.
Dick, James S., O87087.
Dickson, Carroll Z., O86063.
Diehl, Thomas E., O86064.
Dietrich, Regis P., Jr., O86065.
Diggins, Kevin J., O86066.
DiGregorio, Anthony J., O88367.
Dishman, Benjamin E., O87088.
Dix, James A., O86068.
Dolbier, Walter H., Jr., O86070.
Donnelly, Raymond E., Jr., O86076.
Dooly, Billy B., O86077.
Dorland, Gilbert N., 87089.
Dorris, Albert F., O87090.
Dorsey, James A., O87091.
Dorsey, James J., O91215.
Dorshow, Henry B., O87092.
Doss, Lorenzo M., O86078.
Doubrava, Roy G., O87733.
Dougherty, Harry M., O86080.
Doukas, James W., O94853.
Douthit, Robert A., O88371.
Downing, Peter S., O89367.
Doyle, Walter J., O84160.
Drosdeck, John S., Jr., O86086.
Duchin, Ronald A., O86088.
Dugas, Sidney P., O86090.
Duggan, Dennis M., O87093.

Dumas, George C., O86092.
Dumas, Jesse D., O86093.
Dunn, Ralph B., Jr., O91505.
Dunne, Rory W., O87505.
Dunnington, Warren H., O86098.
Durham, James M., O86100.
Dyer, Glenn H., O87095.
Eady, William D., O86102.
Eberhard, Edward J., O87096.
Eckelbarger, Donald E., O87097.
Edison, Robert G., O86104.
Edwards, Aubrey H., Jr., O86105.
Edwards, Donald E., O86106.
Edwards, J. C., Jr., O86107.
Eggleston, Carl B., O86109.
Eggleston, Howard C., O89924.
Eiche, Jon J., O86110.
Elias, Paul J., O87099.
Elliott, Thomas L., O88055.
Ellison, William E., O86113.
Emery, Bruce W., O86114.
Emmerson, Arthur, 7th, O87100.
Emond, Rene J., O88375.
Endicott, Willard E., O86116.
Engler, Jean H., O87101.
Enright, Joseph F., Jr., O87102.
Epstein, David G., O86121.
Erbe, Henry H., Jr., O86122.
Erdelbrock, Dale H., O88376.
Ericksen, Arthur R., O91223.
Ernharth, Ronald L., O87103.
Erwin, Lyal H., O86124.
Eskridge, Robert J., O86126.
Evans, Charles H., O88058.
Evans, Kenneth A., O88672.
Evans, Robert D., O87104.
Evans, William U., Jr., O86128.
Eward, Harry J., O86130.
Faber, Ben D., O87105.
Fager, Leland E., O88059.
Fahringer, Robert H., O86131.
Fannin, Clayton A., O87106.
Farley, John C., O86132.
Farrell, John H., O87107.
Felsher, Edwin H., Jr., O86133.
Ferguson, James C., Jr., O87108.
Fernandez, Robert A., O86134.
Fernandez, Victor M., O87109.
Ferraro, Albert A., Jr., O86136.
Fertig, Stephen W., O87110.
Fielder, Jimmie D., O87111.
Fields, Charles G., O86138.
Fields, William R., Jr., O86139.
Finch, Vernon D., O86140.
Fisher, Gordon L., O86143.
Fisher, Raymond W., O87112.
Fitchett, Donald J., O87113.
Fitzgerald, Joseph P., O88378.
Fitzgerald, William A., Jr., O87114.
Flanders, George W., O86145.
Fleming, Blaine T., O86146.
Fletcher. Michael J., O87115.
Fletcher, Thomas H., O87116.
Flitcraft, Stanley G., O86147.
Fogarty, Daniel C., O86149.
Fontana, Robert G., O86151.
Forbes, Richard E., O87117.
Fortney, Kenneth R., Jr., O87744.
Foster, James E., O86153.
Fowkes, Reginald B., O92190.
Fraase, William K., O86156.
Franklin, George G., Jr., O88064.
Franklin, Robert L., O86157.
Franks, Frederick M., Jr., O87118.
Franz, Jay C., O87119.
Freeland, James T., Jr., O87120.
Freiler, John J., Jr., O86159.
Frem, Harvey J., O86160.
Frey, Evan C., O86161.
Frey, Robert S., O87121.
Friauf, Gerald F., O86162.
Fried, David E., O87122.
Friedel, George C., O87123.
Friesz, Leonard L., O86163.
Frischkorn, George K., O86164.
Fuller, Dwight H., O87124.
Furman, Daniel R., O95024.
Gabel, Michael A., O87125.
Gailey, William, O87126.
Gaines, Roger Q., O87127.
Gallagher, Robert J., O86168.
Galon, Ezequiel, Jr., O86169.
Gantt, John R., O86170.
Garcia, Amador, O88070.
Garcia, William J., Jr., O87128.
Garrett, Robert, 2d, O86171.
Garvin, Jerry M., O86172.
Gayler, James M., O86174.
Gegner, William R., O86176.
Gehler, Donald C., O86177.
Genova, Anthony T., O86178.
George, Alfred W., O87130.
Gercz, Francis G., Jr., O87131.
Gerhardt, Igor D., O87132.
Gessner, Charles J. B., O86180.
Gettle, Kenneth L., O86181.
Getz, Charles E., O87133.
Getz, Dwaine E., O86182.
Gibbs, James A., 2d, O87134.
Gibbs, Philip E., O87135.
Gilbert, John C., O89213.
Gilbertson, Clarence L., O87751.
Gillette, Michael J., O87136.
Gilligan, Thomas W., O87137.
Girard, John E., O86188.
Giraudo, Robert A., O86189.
Gleason, James E., O86190.
Glenn, Robert W., O86191.
Glidden, Richard C., O87755.
Godwin, Bobby J., O94929.
Goff, DeWayne B., O94300.
Gomez, Vincent C., O92350.
Goodall, Ralph E., Jr., O88077.
Goodpasture, Albert V., 3d, O87138.
Goodwyne, Charles O., O86192.
Gorham, Frederick A., 4th O87759.
Goring, Richard H., O86193.
Gorman, Patrick H., O86194.
Goyette, William J., O86195.
Graham, Duane I., O91254.
Graham, Michael L., O88706.
Grant, Alexander M., O87139.
Graven, Marion F., 3d, O87140.
Gray, David T., O87141.
Grayson, Eugene H., Jr., O86198.
Greco, John D., O86199.
Green, Frank D., Jr., O91257.
Greenawalt, Jeryl C., O87142.
Greene, Larry M., O87143.
Greenwood, Everett O., O86201.
Greeson, James H., O87676.
Greife, John L., O94930.
Grenier, Alfred F., O86203.
Griffin, Arthur R., O87144.
Griffith, Jerry R., O94858.
Grooms, Jimmy R., O86205.
Groth, Carl H., Jr., O87145.
Grout, Harold P., O86206.
Gruschow, Donald C., O87146.
Guild, William B., O87147.
Gumpf, John A., O93043.
Gunn, Lloyd R., Jr., O87700.
Gunerman, Howard E., O86209.
Gurr, John W., O87148.
Gustafson, Carl S., O92370.
Guthrie, John S., Jr., O87149.
Guttadauro, Angelo, O91259.
Guy, Warren J., Jr., O86210.
Haas, George C., O86211.
Hagerty, Harve J., O86212.
Hagerty, Paul P., O95029.
Hahn, James S., O87151.
Halbert, Edward, O87162.
Hall, Frank P., Jr., O86213.
Hall, James, O86214.
Hall, James R., Jr., O92378.
Halus, Michael B., O88387.
Hamil, Richard C., O86217.
Hammons, James O., O87773.
Hanson, Wayne A., O88088.
Hanzel, Richard D., O87776.
Hardy, James M., O86223.
Hardy, Teddy J., Sr., O92199.
Harkins, John F., O87153.
Harle, Richard T., O87154.
Harmon, Donald G., O86224.
Harmon, Wilburn H., O85761.
Harnly, Richard W., O87155.
Harper, James R., O86225.
Harrell, John R., O87156.
Harris, Arnold F., O86227.
Harris, Bobby R., O86228.
Harris, Douglas R., O94757.
Harris, Wiley V., Jr., O87157.
Harrison, George F., O87158.
Harrison, George R., O88089.
Hartley, Bobby J., O92201.
Haselton, Hunter G., O86232.
Hatley, Gerald W., O88390.
Hawes, Velpeau E., O86233.
Hawkins, Cyril A., Jr., O88727.
Hawkins, Lawrence R., O94464.
Hawley, Rexford K., O88391.
Hayes, Charles W., O87159.
Hays, Robert O., O86239.
Heath, Guy H., Jr., O87160.
Heberle, Charles J., O86240.
Hegerich, Robert L., O86243.
Heibel, Robert J., O85764.
Heim, Craig G., O92392.
Hendel, Robert C., O95035.
Hepler, Leslie J., O86249.
Herman, Gene L., O86251.
Herms, Alfred M., O94305.
Herrera, Frank E., O87161.
Herrington, James R., O87787.
Heach, Russell J., O86252.
Hess, Ronald H., O92405.
Hesse, John L., O89505.
Hewitt, Russell A., O87162.
Hightower, Louis V., 3d, O87163.
Hill, Jimmy C., O87164.
Hill, Ridings L., O86258.
Hill, William V., Jr., O86260.
Hilliard, Maurice G., O87165.
Hilmes, Jerome B., O87166.
Hinterleiter, David O., O86264.
Hintze, Richard A., O86265.
Hixson, Peter C., O95040.
Hobbs, Dale G., O92406.
Hodges, Harvey D., O90073.
Hodges, Philip G., O86268.
Hoffman, Jason G., O86269.
Hogan, David C., O86270.
Hogan, Jerry H., O86271.
Holder, Kenneth A., O86272.
Holder, Richard T., O95042.
Holman, Robert E., Jr., O87167.
Hooker, George A., O92068.
Horne, Douglas S., O86279.
Horton, William R., O86281.
Hosman, Henry R., O91874.
Hotchkiss, Richard M., O87168.
Houle, John L., O88105.
Houltry, Allyn C., O87169.
Houston, Samuel B., O86282.
Howard, Freeman I., O87170.
Howard, James D., O86283.
Howe, Robert B., Jr., O87171.
Howe, Robert D., O86284.
Huggin, Benjamin A., O86286.
Humbert, David W., O86290.
Humes, Walter W., O86292.
Humphrey, Richard A., O88399.
Humphries, John P., O86294.
Huntingdon, John P., O87172.
Huntley, John H., O88400.
Hurley, John S., O87173.
Hurst, Joseph W., Jr., O87174.
Hurteau, Joseph C., O87799.
Huskinson, William M., Jr., O86296.
Hutchison, Joseph B., O88401.
Hutton, Cuthbert P., O87175.
Hyde, John B., O87176.
Ilg, Robert J., O86299.
Imes, Allan B., O92419.
Imler, Estan F., Jr., O87177.
Inglett, Robert A., O86301.
Ingram, Donald D., O87178.
Inman, Terence B., O86302.
Innes, Douglas D., O86303.
Irons, Richard L., O86305.
Irvin, Lee P., O86306.
Irvine, Michael M., Jr., O93436.
Isaacson, Roy W., O94867.
Isacco, Michael D., O87179.
Ivey, Donald J., O86309.
Ivey, Herman V., O87180.
Ivey, William L., O86310.
Jaffe, Stephen G., O89789.
James, James D., O86312.
Janutolo, Dandalo M., O93046.
Jary, Roland S., O86315.
Jayroe, Glenn L., O94594.
Jefferson, Harvey P., O86317.

Jenkin, William E., O86318.
Jenkins, Joe E., O86320.
Jervell, Broder L., Jr., O87181.
Jett, Carl O., Jr., O86324.
Joh, John A., 3d, O87182.
Johns, Donald L., O91885.
Johnson, Bruce C., O87183.
Johnson, Charles C., O86325.
Johnson, Charles E., O87184.
Johnson, Darel S., O87185.
Johnson, Dean B., O86326.
Johnson, Donald O., O86327.
Johnson, Edward O., Jr., O86328.
Johnson, George P., O87186.
Johnson, John P., 3d, O87187.
Johnson, Richard B., O87188.
Johnson, Robert D., O91889.
Johnston, James D., O94596.
Jolly, Robert D., O86332.
Jones, Alva R., Jr., O86333.
Jones, Edward J., O88404.
Jones, Gary W., O86336.
Jones, John G., O86337.
Jones, Manley W., Jr., O87809.
Jones, Roland A., O86339.
Jones, Ronnie L., O89346.
Jones, William S., O86340.
Jordan, Josef C., Jr., O86342.
Jordan, Raymond G., O88405.
Jordan, Richard K., O87189.
Joyce, John H., O86343.
Joyce, Kenneth H., O87190.
Junier, Edward J., O86344.
Jurkowich, George J., O86345.
Kadlec, Gregory J., O87191.
Kaler, William R., O95051.
Kalpagian, Gregory, O87192.
Kampf, Joel, O87193.
Kanarowski, Stanley M., Jr., O87194.
Kapp, Kirby S., O87195.
Karl, Edward V., O86348.
Karp, John C., Jr., O86349.
Katsarsky, Leonard G., O87196.
Kaufman, Paul D., O88407.
Kawano, Kenneth I., O86350.
Keefe, Paul F., O87197.
Keefe, William A., 4th, O91294.
Kell, Wallace A., O86351.
Kellenberger, William E., O86352.
Kelley, Wilbourne A., 3d, O87198.
Kelly, Patrick J., O86354.
Kendall, Donald S., O87199.
Kennedy, James E., Jr., O87200.
Kennedy, Thomas J., Jr., O86357.
Keogh, Peter K., O87201.
Kenyon, James F., Jr., O95054.
Kerns, John A., O86358.
Keszler, Lawrence W., O90157.
Key, Gilbert N., O86359.
Kidd, Paul D., O86361.
Killheffer, Peter H., O86364.
Kim, Galvin D. S., O86365.
Kimber, Harold W., O86366.
Kimura, Michael M., O86367.
King, Eugene S., O88115.
King, Thomas R., Jr., O86368.
Kinney, Linford N., O88411.
Kirby, Ernest R., O86369.
Kircher, Alfred H., Jr., O92445.
Kissinger, George D., O87203.
Kittelberger, Kenneth F., O86373.
Kleb, George R., O87204.
Kleese, Gene D., O86375.
Klein, Stephen, O87205.
Knoop, Paul R., O85590.
Knowles, Bernard A., O87206.
Kocienda, Richard V., O87207.
Kodama, Lester T., O86381.
Koehl, Jacob O., O94097.
Kohn, Noel T., O88412.
Koisch, John J., O87208.
Kolin, Raymond A., O86383.
Koon, Carl B., O86384.
Kosiba, Leo M., O88413.
Kramer, Leo A., Jr., O86388.
Krausse, Stanley D., O92211.
Krawciw, Nicholas S. H., O87209.
Kress, Carl F., O88117.
Krulcik, James R., O87210.
Kubo, Arthur S., O87211.
Kuschner, Andrew K., O87212.
Kushner, John R., O86394.
LaFrance, Richard B., O86397.
Lagana, John J., Jr., O86398.
Lai, Leonard S. Y., O86400.
Lamarque, Ruben A., Jr., O86401.
Lambert, Harold E., O91624.
Lamont, John R., O94602.
Langford, Ollie L., O87213.
Lapins, Juris, O87541.
Larsen, Henry S., Jr., O87214.
Larson, Christian M., O94480.
Lasala, Robert J., O89086.
Laughlin, Edward N., O87215.
Lawlor, James, O86405.
Lawrence, Ashton C., Jr., O87216.
LeClere, Dick T., O87217.
Lehman, Robert A., O86412.
Lehrfeld, William R., O87218.
Leo, Thomas W., Jr., O87219.
Letchworth, Robert, O87220.
Lewis, Cleophus C., O88125.
Lewis, David A., O87221.
Lewis, Larry M., O88126.
Liberatore, Samuel N., O94873.
Lid, Dennis W., O86417.
Lidy, Albert M., O87223.
Lilliquist, William E., O86418.
Limmer, Ralph D., O86419.
Linden, Albert H., Jr., O86420.
Long, Anthony, O86422.
Long, Gary D., O36423.
Losa, Gene A., O86426.
Losey, Roy E., Jr., O87224.
Love, James E., O86429.
Lovelace, George E., O95065.
Lovell, James A., O86431.
Ludlam, Donald M., O87225.
Luedtke, David A., O87226.
Luther, William A., Jr., O87227.
Lutz, Charles M., O87228.
Lymn, Harry C., O87229.
Lynch, Claude E., O87230.
Lytle, Charles E., O37231.
Lyttle, Harry D., Jr., O86435.
MacArthur, Douglas E., O86436.
MacWillie, Donald MacG., Jr., O86440.
Mackoff, Roger L., O86439.
Madden, James W., O87232.
Madden, William L., O86441.
Madigan, Eugene F., O87233.
Madigan, John E., O86442.
Magee, Michael C., O86443.
Magill, John A., O86445.
Maglin, Richard R., O87234.
Magnussen, Mark H., O87235.
Maguire, John P., O88425.
Maher, Edward J., O86447.
Malek, Frederic V., O87236.
Malo, Armand E., O93461.
Manderson, Ivor C., O86449.
Manderville, Bernard P., Jr., O86450.
Manely, James E., O92219.
Mangum, Charles G., O87552.
Mangum, Robert A., O89546.
Mann, Marion E., Jr., O86452.
Mansfield, Clayton J., Jr., O87237.
Manzo, Fred V., O87238.
Mapes, Pierson G., O86453.
Marano, John C., O86454.
Marecek, George, O94615.
Markham, Don, O87239.
Markham, John F., O87845.
Marley, Ronald W., O86457.
Maroscher, Albert G., O86459.
Marsh, Byron D., O87240.
Marshall, Jerry V., O86460.
Marshall, William K., O87241.
Marti, John H., O94616.
Martin, Lewis R., O87242.
Martin, Richard H., O86462.
Martinelli, Aldo R., O86463.
Martinson, Juri, O86464.
Masel, Walter S., O86466.
Mason, Donald R., O86468.
Massey, James L., Jr., O87243.
Mast, Phillip K., O86470.
Mathis, Douglas, O86475.
Matteo, Thomas F., Jr., O86476.
Matthes, Donald T., O87244.
Matthias, Harold L., O88438.
Matthis, Earl N., O91697.
Matzeder, Clarence J., O86477.
Maughan, Richard R., O86478.
Mauro, Donald J., O86479.
Maxwell, Michael W., O86481.
Mayers, John J., Jr., O87245.
Mays, James L., O86483.
McAlpin, George R., Jr., O86484.
McCahan, Marlin E., O87246.
McCaig, Tom H., O94771.
McCartt, William G., O86485.
McCormick, William R., O94486.
McClurg, Donald W., O87247.
McConnell, Gerald B., O92222.
McConville, Frederick J., O87248.
McCoy, Jerald W., O87249.
McCracken, Henry E., Jr., O87250.
McCullough, Overton H., O86488.
McCullough, William G., Jr., O86489.
McDonald, Robert A., O87251.
McEvoy, Edward B., O91926.
McFadden, John H., O86494.
McFadden, Phillip L., O86495.
McKay, James M., Jr., O86497.
McKinney, David L., O87253.
McKisson, Raymond C., O87851.
McKnight, James G., O88148.
McLaughlin, Godwin P., O87254.
McLaughlin, Edward J., O86500.
McLeod, Norman F., O87852.
McLeod, Roy G., O86501.
McMorrow, Thomas F., O87255.
McNeil, Charles B., O88828.
McNerney, John C., O87256.
McPeek, Richard B., O87257.
McPhaul, Malcolm G., O88150.
McQuaid, Ronald J., O94321.
McSweeney, Albert S., Jr., O87258.
Medaris, John B., Jr., O87259.
Medley, Ted, O86508.
Melnik, Walter, Jr., O86510.
Meloy, John N., O87260.
Melton, Thomas L., O86511.
Mentor, John L., O86513.
Mercadante, Richard T., O86514.
Mercer, Clifford W., O87261.
Merchant, Don L., O86515.
Merchant, James L., O86516.
Merski, Norman R., O86517.
Metcalf, Ronald C., O86518.
Meyer, Richard J., Jr., O87262.
Meyrick, Joseph S., O86520.
Mikelonis, Eugene C., O87263.
Mikytuck, Robert, Jr., O86523.
Miller, Carl J., O86525.
Miller, James H., O87264.
Miller, Joseph, Jr., O87854.
Miller, Ronald A., O86528.
Miller, Terry M., O88153.
Miller, Thomas H., O86529.
Miller, Thomas H., O94946.
Millick, Charles A., O87265.
Mills, Gary L., O86530.
Mills, Jerry C., O87266.
Milton, John F., O87267.
Miner, Russell M., Jr., O87268.
Miner, William H., O88838.
Minnich, Lawrence E., O87269.
Mitchell, Charles C., O86532.
Mitchell, John R., O86533.
Moeller, Lawrence B., O86534.
Moellering, John H., O87270.
Monroe, DeWitt T., Jr., O87271.
Montagne, Ernest R., Jr., O88447.
Montgomery, David B., O86535.
Montgomery, Horace, O86536.
Moody, John W., Jr., O88157.
Mooney, Thomas R., O87272.
Moore, Claude P., O86537.
Moore, Emmett, O88158.
Moore, John E., Jr., O94116.
Moore, John W., O86540.
Moore, Riley R., 2d, O87273.
Moorehead, John H., O86541.
Moorhead, Thomas L., O87274.
Morales, Michael, O87275.
Moraski, Leon K., O87276.
Morefield, Alvin J., O87277.
Moreland, Harry W., O86544.
Morgan, Harold D., O87858.
Moriarty, Joseph T., O87278.
Moritz, Thomas W., O86547.
Morrissey, Dennis J., Jr., O87279.

Moses, Johnny M., O86553.
Mosher, Robert L., O86556.
Moss, Marvin F., O87280.
Motley, James B., O86557.
Moulton, William E., Jr., O87860.
Mountel, William E., O86558.
Mueller, Harold B., O86560.
Mullen, Cassius J., O87281.
Mullen, William J., 3d, O87282.
Mullman, Raymond P., O86561.
Munz, Thomas C., O82783.
Murray, William B., O88453.
Murry, William V., O87284.
Myers, Marvin O., O86565.
Nally, Michael J., O88455.
Nash, Charles J., Jr., O86566.
Nash, John M., O87285.
Neal, John O., Jr., O87286.
Nelson, Carl W., O86570.
Netzloff, Edwin A., O87287.
Newberry, Milton S., O87288.
Newman, Glen E., O87289.
Nichols, William W., Jr., O86575.
Nickerson, John M., O93065.
Noack, Richard R., O88462.
Noga, Gerald W., O87290.
Nolen, James T., O86578.
Nordgren, Alfred E., Jr., O87291.
Norman, Kenneth G., O87292.
Novogratz, Robert M., O87293.
Nugent, Richard O., O86580.
Nunn, Lee R., Jr., O87294.
Oakes, William E., O86581.
O'Brien, James J., O87295.
O'Brien, John A., O87296.
O'Connor, Hugh T., O87297.
O'Connor, John P., O86586.
O'Connor, Patrick M., O95076.
Offutt, Edward W., O86587.
Ogden, Gregory T., O86588.
O'Hara, Thomas C., O92106.
O'Keefe, Edward T., Jr., O86590.
Oldham, Theodore H., O86591.
Oliver, Eugene L., Jr., O87301.
Oliver, Homer D., O86592.
Olson, Kenneth R., O86594.
O'Meara, Andrew P., Jr., O87298.
O'Meara, William J., O87299.
O'Neill, Kevin J., O87300.
Oppenlander, Robert W., O86596.
Orndorff, John F., O87302.
Orr, John B., O86597.
Orr, Paul F., O86598.
Orth, Richard C., Jr., O86599.
Ott, John S., O86600.
Owens, Augustus L., O86602.
Palmer, Laurence J., O87303.
Palsha, Robert J., O86603.
Pangman, James K., O86604.
Panko, John, Jr., O87304.
Pappas, Constantine P., O86607.
Paquette, Roger K., O87305.
Pare, Clermont P., O86608.
Paris, John M., O86609.
Parker, Robert W., O86611.
Parker, Wendell G., O82866.
Parkhurst, Henry A., O90369.
Parolini, George W., O87306.
Parr, Gary K., O94329.
Paschall, Jim R., O87307.
Passarella, Patrick F., O87308.
Pastella, Donald R., O87874.
Patterson, Joseph M., O95079.
Patterson, Robert J., O94881.
Pattison, John A., O86614.
Patton, Joseph D., Jr., O88468.
Payne, Herbert M., Jr., O86618.
Pearce, Carl A., O86622.
Pearson, John E., Jr., O94949.
Peffenbach, Richard R., O87309.
Pendarvis, Donald R., O90378.
Perry, Lloyd M., O86624.
Perry, William R., O94632.
Peterson, Roger W., O87583.
Petric, John A., O86627.
Peyton, John H., O86628.
Pfann, Bruce W., O86629.
Phillips, Alan B., O87310.
Phillips, Joseph A., O87311.
Piatak, John R., O95081.
Pierce, Harlan L., O86633.
Pietrowicz, Stephen R., O86637.
Pihl, Donald S., O86638.
Pike, Gerald D., O86639.
Pike, James C., O86640.
Pike, Thurston E., O86641.
Pingry, Thomas E., O86643.
Pipia, John F., O86644.
Pishon, Nicholas E., O86645.
Pistole, Robert G., O86646.
Pistone, Ronald A., O87312.
Pitts, Walter E., Jr., O94333.
Plassmeyer, Martin L., O87313.
Plummer, Thomas F., Jr., O87314.
Poe, Thurel J., Jr., O86652.
Pokorny, Anthony G., Jr., O87315.
Pollock, William C., Jr., O87316.
Polzello, Carmine R., O88178.
Pool, Russell F., O88474.
Poole, Buddy J., O86657.
Poole, William J., O87317.
Pope, John L., O87887.
Porter, Bruce A., O87318.
Porter, Norman A., O89575.
Posey, Dudley M., O86659.
Post, Richard B., O88475.
Powell, Jamo C., O94636.
Powers, James S., O86662.
Preetorius, Charles D., O88476.
Prisk, Courtney E., O87319.
Proe, John D., O86664.
Quimby, Robert W., O88479.
Quinn, Roger A., O87320.
Race, Gary L., O88481.
Raffaele, Eugene J., O86666.
Rafferty, Joseph V., O86667.
Ramsey, Raymond R., Jr., O87321.
Ranalli, Robert J., O87322.
Ranch, Lewis C., O87323.
Ranney, Thomas A., O94335.
Rapaport, Benjamin, O86668.
Rask, Richard H., O87893.
Rasmussen, Robert B., O86669.
Ratcliffe, John P., O86670.
Ravan, Jack E., O87324.
Ray, Harry D., Jr., O86671.
Ray, James F., O87325.
Recher, Ronald R., O87326.
Redding, Frank J., 3d, O87327.
Reinhard, Donald R., O87328.
Renalds, Hugh H., O87329.
Reuter, Neil G., O86674.
Rewerts, David G., O86675.
Reynolds, Buddy L., O86676.
Reynolds, Sonny D., O88305.
Rhein, Reginald W., Jr., O87330.
Rhoads, Milton D., O86677.
Rhynsburger, Robert B., O86679.
Rice, Bert L., O88187.
Rice, Howard P., Jr., O91499.
Richard, Virgil A., O86680.
Richards, Arthur E., 3d, O86681.
Richards, Donald R., O88484.
Riley, Frank J., O89350.
Riordan, Robert W., Jr., O87331.
Rizzi, Robert D., O87332.
Roberts, Forrest E., Jr., O86687.
Roberts, James E., Jr., O86688.
Roberts, Joel E. L., O86689.
Roberts, Richard O., O87333.
Roberts, Thomas DuV., 2d, O87334.
Robertson, James A., O94127.
Robertson, Wyman D., O86691.
Robinson, Charles D., O88901.
Robinson, Edward C., O87335.
Rochester, James V., O90431.
Roesler, Gilbert E., O87336.
Rogers, David H., O87337.
Rogers, James H., O90185.
Rogers, Richard E., O87338.
Romboski, Lawrence D., O86699.
Rose, Claude H., Jr., O86702.
Rose, John B., O84261.
Rosner, Norman H., O87339.
Ross, Lawrence C., O87340.
Roth, Robert W., O87341.
Rothblum, Richard A., O87342.
Rounseville, Richard G., O86706.
Rourke, John M., O87343.
Roush, David L., O87344.
Rowe, James C., O87345.
Rowe, William G., O87346.
Rowland, Jerry D., O95093.
Roy, Daniel S., O94338.
Rushton, Pierce A., Jr., O87347.
Russell, Thomas B., O87348.
Ruth, John H., Jr., O87349.
Ryan, Robert H., O87350.
Rydberg, Carl R., O88908.
Sabia, Donald M., O86711.
Sadler, Richard C., O86713.
Salomon, Leon E., O91678.
Salter, Ronald H., O87351.
Salvatore, Frank M., Jr., O87352.
Samilton, Lawrence B., Jr., O87907.
Sanaker, John M., O92538.
Sandfort, Phillip L., O86718.
Santer, Richard A., O88195.
Santos, Melecio Z., Jr., O87353.
Satterwhite, James J., O87355.
Savas, Ronald D., O86721.
Scarangella, Frank H., O88196.
Schaubach, George E., Jr., O86723.
Schepps, Winston M., O87356.
Schiano, Lou's J., O86725.
Schlapak, Benjamin R., O86726.
Schlemmer, Roger B., O87357.
Schley, Robert L., O86727.
Schlievert, James W., O86728.
Schmacker, Bruce E., O87358.
Schmid, Karl F., O86729.
Schmidt, Jackie E., O88197.
Schmidt, Peter B., O87359.
Schneebeck, Gene A., O86731.
Schnick, Ronald L., O87361.
Schonblom, James E., O86733.
Schor, Stephen H., O86734.
Schow, Robert A., Jr., O87362.
Schroeder, Louis J., O87364.
Schumaker, Theodore A., O86735.
Schuster, Jon N., O86736.
Schutz, Ronald C., O86737.
Schwartz, Daniel, O86738.
Schwartz, William L., O87365.
Scott, Ernest K., O88198.
Scott, Walter S., O86739.
Scott, Warden M., O88491.
Scott, William A., O86740.
Seaver, James R., O86741.
Sefton, Douglas W., O87366.
Seitz, John A., 3d, O86743.
Sellers, Robert P., O88199.
Servis, Hubert T., O87367.
Seybold, Thomas K., O87368.
Shain, Robert G., O87369.
Shalikashvili, John M. D., O92121.
Sharkey, William P., O86750.
Shaw, David L., O87612.
Shaw, Gene C., O88200.
Shaw, Terrence L., O86752.
Shea, Joseph M., O87371.
Sheaffer, Phillip G., O87372.
Sheedy, Louis W., O86753.
Sheehan, John P., Jr., O87373.
Shelton, Ronald T., O87374.
Shepard, Phillip G., O86754.
Shephard, David A. C., O86755.
Shilling, Jack C., O87913.
Shine, Joseph P., O88930.
Shock, John P., Jr., O87375.
Shouse, Delbert F., O86758.
Shroyer, Phillip M., O86759.
Siciliano, Arthur J., O87377.
Sillers, Bruce D., O86762.
Silva, Warren R., O86763.
Simon, Benjamin J., O88205.
Simpson, Donald T., O87378.
Simpson, Felix D., O94342.
Simpson, John D., O87379.
Simpson, Le Oren, O86765.
Simroe, Theodore W., Jr., O87380.
Sisson, Brooks H., O87381.
Skamser, Harold P., Jr., O86769.
Skinkle, LeRoy W., O86771.
Skowronek, Richard P., O87382.
Slayton, Emmett, Jr., O86774.
Slifer, Richard D., O86775.
Smart, Donald L., O87383.
Smith, Charles E., O86778.
Smith, Gary N., O93079.
Smith, Glenn A., 2d, O86780.
Smith, Jack C., Jr., O87384.
Smith, James E., O86782.
Smith, Jarvis E., O86783.

Smith, John R., O91575.
Smith, Paul R., O95103.
Smith, Richard A., O94500.
Smith, Warren S., O87385.
Socks, Hugh J., Jr., O87386.
Soland, Donald J., O86789.
Soli, Thomas R., O87387.
Solliday, Charles W., O94963.
Soriano, Felician P., O86791.
Sorini, Laurence F., Jr., O86792.
Southworth, James V., O91625.
Souvenir, Melvyn L., O86793.
Sovine, Leroy K., O86794.
Spanjers, Leonard J., O87920.
Spann, Juan W., O94893.
Sparks, Ralph A., O86795.
Spears, James W., O86797.
Speck, Gerald E., O87921.
Speer, Richard L., O87922.
Sper, Paul N., O87388.
Spera, Francis P., O86799.
Spillane, Robert B., O95106.
Springer, Anthony T., O87927.
Springfield, Bruce W., O86802.
Sroka, Richard M., O86803.
Stadler, Gerald P., O87389.
Stanley, Frederick J., O87627.
Stansell, Ernest L., Jr., O86805.
Starr, Frank C., O86808.
Stauch, Edward G., O87390.
Stebbins, Allen F., O86810.
Stebbins, Ronald S., O86811.
Steele, James H., Jr., O87932.
Steinberg, Sherwin L., O87391.
Stephens, Donald L., O94649.
Stevens, Eulin L., O86814.
Stewart, Randall J., O86816.
Stiepock, Robert C., O86818.
Stiles, Howard J., O87392.
Storey, Arthur L., Jr., O88502.
Street, Russell K., O87394.
Streeter, William F., O86823.
Strickland, Darwin T., Jr., O86824.
Stroh, George C., O86825.
Stromberg, Peter L., O87395.
Strother, James O., O86826.
Struble, Lawrence A., Jr., O87396.
Stuart, Robert L., O86827.
Stults, Claude L., Jr., O86828.
Sullenberger, Louis E., Jr., O87397.
Sullenger, Lawrence W., O86831.
Sullivan, Joseph H., O87398.
Summers, William E., O86833.
Sumner, John H., O86834.
Sundt, Richard S., O87399.
Svendsen, Don F., O87400.
Sweeney, Robert F., O86837.
Sweet, Wayne A., O88213.
Swindells, John E., O86838.
Symons, John W., O82149.
Szustak, Frank G., O86842.
Tarbet, Kenneth D., O91526.
Taylor, James E., O86845.
Taylor, James R., O87941.
Taylor, Robert P., O87942.
Taylor, Vernon K., O94351.
Temple, William E., O87401.
Tennant, Charles E., O87402.
Terhune, Robert B., O88506.
Terry, Norman D., O86849.
Terseck, Richard J., O86850.
Thomas, Bobby F., O91706.
Thomas, James E., O84143.
Thomas, Marvin L., Jr., O87403.
Thomas, Phillip J., O86853.
Thompson, Benjamin W., Jr., O88507.
Thompson, James P., Jr., O86856.
Thompson, Paul F., 2d, O86857.
Thompson, Vernon D., O86858.
Thorstad, Ronald C., O86859.
Thudium, Christian C., Jr., O87404.
Thurin, John P., O92025.
Tillar, Donaldson P., Jr., O87405.
Todaro, Joseph E., O87406.
Tomiczek, Paul W., Jr., O87407.
Tompson, John C., O86864.
Toothaker, Thomas R., O86866.
Toskey, William M., O87408.
Tozier, Robert E., O87644.
Train, William F., 3d, O87409.
Traver, Donald J., O87952.
Tritaik, Wayne A., O86871.
Tritz, James W., O87410.
Tucker, John DeF., O86873.
Tully, Walter B., Jr., O87411.
Tulp, David P., O87412.
Tuma, Jimmy W., O86876.
Turley, Jesse D., 3d, O87877.
Turner, Robert A., O87413.
Tweddale, C. Thomas, O89392.
Tyler, Erven S., O87414.
Uhler, Robert G., O86880.
Ulrich, Joe D., O86881.
Vaglia, James E., O88511.
Vanek, David V., O86886.
VanHorne, Marvin L., O86887.
VanLoben Sels, James W., O87415.
VanZee, James L., O88988.
Vargosko, Michael A., O88219.
Vaughn, Emmet P., Jr., O86890.
Veidt, John H., Jr., O87416.
Vender, Roger D., O86891.
Venzke, Gene A., O86892.
Vermette, Robert E., O94901.
Versace, Humbert R., O87417.
Vinci, Joseph F., O86894.
Vines, Charles A., Jr., O86895.
Volponi, Anthony A., O88221.
Wacloff, Robert L., O86898.
Wait, William M., O86900.
Walczak, Sylvester, Jr., O86901.
Walker, James M., O87962.
Wall, William J., Jr., O86904.
Wallace, Malcolm K. R., O86905.
Waller, Calvin A. H., O86906.
Walls, Richard B., O86907.
Walsh, Daniel P., O86908.
Walsh, James E., Jr., O87418.
Walter, Dennis I., O87419.
Walters, Harry N., O87420.
Walters, James P., O87421.
Wands, Donald R., O87422.
Ward, Jerido, O88518.
Ware, Roger B., O87423.
Warren, Warren J., O78424.
Watkins, Wayne C., O87657.
Weand, David M., Jr., O88519.
Weatherly, Emory D., Jr., O88998.
Weaver, Carl A., Jr., O87425.
Weaver, Charles R., O87965.
Webb, Earl E., O92606.
Webb, James M., Jr., O86913.
Webb, Jesse H., Jr., O86914.
Webb, Waldo R., O86915.
Weber, Bowman H., O89001.
Weber, Ralph P., O87426.
Weber, William R., O87427.
Webster, Carl S., O87428.
Webster, Dan M., Jr., O87429.
Weekley, Robert M., O87430.
Weeks, Joseph P., O86916.
Weeks, William J., Jr., O86917.
Weening, Otto, O86918.
Weisenseel, Gerald E., O87431.
Weisler, Julian E., 2d, O87432.
Welch, Richard D., Jr., O87433.
Wells, James L., O86922.
Wells, Theodore D., O87434.
Welsh, Gary P., O86924.
Werbel, Stephen K., O87435.
Wesneski, Carl A., O89005.
Westgard, William C., O86927.
Wharton, William T., O88525.
Wheeler, David R., O87436.
Wheeler, Joseph W., Jr., O87437.
Wheeler, Robert A., O87438.
Wheeler, Roger, J., Jr., O86928.
White, Donald R., O91720.
White, Thomas H., O87439.
Whiteside, Jerry E., O86930.
Whitley, Henry G., Jr., O86931.
Whitworth, David C., O86933.
Whorton, Billy L., O92608.
Widder, David J. W., O86934.
Wilder, William B., Sr., O86936.
Wiley, Larry N., O87440.
Wilkerson, Edwin A., O86937.
Wilkins, Robert E., O86938.
Willey, Frank G., Jr., O87668.
Williams, Cary E., O89011.
Williams, David K., O92046.
Williams, Donald B., O87441.
Williams, Joe E., O87442.
Williams, John S., O88229.
Williamson, Alan R., O86940.
Williamson, John D., O87973.
Willis, Jerry T., O88231.
Wilmoth, Frederick L., O87443.
Wilson, John S., O87444.
Wilson, Loren D., Jr., O86944.
Wilson, Martin L., O86945.
Windham, Carter LeR., O87670.
Winebarger, Marion C., O86947.
Winford, Billy G., O86948.
Winn, David S., Jr., O86949.
Winter, Maurice G., O86950.
Wolf, Wilbur E., Jr., O86951.
Womack, Willard A., O86954.
Woodhouse, Donald L., O86955.
Woods, Lawrence D., O92051.
Wooldridge, Marshall, O87445.
Workman, Willard M., Jr., O86958.
Worthington, Wayne L., O87980.
Wosicki, Walter J., O87446.
Wray, Duane P., O94664.
Wright, William W., O87447.
Wrigley, John B., O86961.
Yateman, Sidney H., O87448.
Yates, Cecil E., Jr., O86962.
Yates, Richard P., O86963.
Yeats, Philip L., O87449.
Yeatts, Frederick L., O87985.
Yelverton, Rush S., O87450.
Yeosock, John J., O86964.
Yersky, Ronald E., O86965.
Yon, Frank E., O86967.
Young, Thomas O., O87451.
Young, Troy R., O87672.
Zachary, James L., O92149.
Zagalak, Stanley J., O87452.
Zajac, Stephen G., O86974.
Zaldo, William T., 3d, O87453.
Zierdt, William H., 3d, O87454.
Zoller, Harvey F., O88237.
Zukowski, Albin T., O87675.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Ball, Elizabeth C., L600.
Burbank, Arlene G., L597.
McCord, Patricia A., L595.
Slater, Suzanne, L603.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Belcher, David R., O85879.
Black, Baxter F., 3d, O89321.
Braddock, Thomas E., O89185.
Brown, Thomas J., O89770.
Carnahan, Robert P., O94279.
Cohen, Meyer W., O87710.
Cygan, Herbert E., O84971.
DeLos-Santos, Carlos, Jr., O91574.
Danhouser, David C., O88251.
Derrickson, William B., O93035.
Dupuy, Lloyd C., O86099.
Ellingson, Mayo K., O89474.
Elsarelli, Leon E., O95015.
Field, Richard W., O86137
Frate, Joseph A., O89331.
Greenhalgh, Donald L., O95026.
Hale, Arnold W., O91594.
Hansen, Louis J., O86221.
Harris, Jon N., O86229.
Hatfield, William K., O94759.
Heitzman, Lawrence J., O94760.
Henry, John D., O91602.
Higgs, Richard H., O86256.
Hill, Walter B., O89507.
Hill, William R., O86259.
Howell, Lawrence C., Sr., O94469.
Huff, William H., 3d, O94935.
Jackson, Thomas C., O86311.
Jessen, Gary C., O89228.
Kane, Charles F., Jr., O93048.
Kennan, James S., O86356.
Kielman, Roger W., O86362.
LaValley, John W., O94481.
Mallory, Lloyd M., O88426.
McCurley, Robert L., O89359.
Merritt, Thomas E., O89258.
Miller, Roger C., O90306.
Morgan, Robert E., O89362.
Moseley, Robert R., O91946.
Norton, George T., O94120.
Paul, C. Peter, O87875.
Payne, John C., O86619.

Peacock, James L., O95080.
Pedersen, Edward R., O90377.
Penick, Norman D., O91973.
Pittman, Thurman M., O86648.
Plaatsman, James P., O89370.
Pollock, Archie D., Jr., O86655.
Reuter, LeRoy H., O91498.
Sandleback, Eugene J., O95095.
Schlaak, James R., O88915.
Scott, Gordon W., O87609.
Sides, John P., Jr., O87915.
Simpson, Calbrieth L., Jr., O86764.
Sisler, Gary L., O86767.
Sobocinski, Philip Z., O94962.
Solomon, Richard C., O89385.
Thompson, George E., O90547.
Travis, Edward E., O92138.
Trumbla, Thomas E., O92028.
Tucker, Tracy W., O86874.
Webb, Byron D., Jr., O91414.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Gosling, Bernadine J., N3042.
Vineys, Eugenia A., N3062.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Cron, Lucius N., O18411.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3292, and 3294:

To be lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Picciotti, Romulus A. (Signal Corps), O79951.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Feagin, John A., Jr. (Artillery), O72048.
Lenio, Paul T. (Infantry), O72123.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Guthrey, William L. (Artillery), O78327.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

McCoy, John P. (Medical Service Corps), O84323.

To be first lieutenant

Hopkins, Richard L. (Medical Service Corps), O88743.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be captains

Benton, Arthur L., O1120620.
Brown, John P., O1885499.
McDonald, John F., Jr., O4006740.
Parker, Velma F., O2269151.
Stewart, Richard K., O4009589.
Wereszynski, Henry J., O4005282.

To be first lieutenants

Crider, Terence A., O4071284.
Crosby, Theodore F., Jr., O5301954.
Hackett, Gerald R., O5203771.
Hale, Charles A., O4058786.
Hazen, William C., O5001163.
Janosko, Eugene S., O5702852.
Johnston, Robert L., O5405142.
Keel, Frank W., O4049494.
Pelot, Lynwood M., Jr., O5405159.
Pollock, Robert T., O5202164.
Smith, William G., O5002395.
Thompson, David E., O4058063.
Walling, James B., Jr., O4085089.
Williams, Russell L., O5307295.

To be second lieutenants

Blondell, John V., O5209443.
Brooks, Milton D., O5312251.
Cooper, Kenneth D., O5704927.
Dekeyrel, Burdette L., O5312365.
Halford, John R., O5402673.
Jones, Dean C., O5408157.
McIlhaney, Richard G., O5404342.
Mulvihill, William M., O5209566.
Musmanno, Francis J., Jr., O5006774.
Naumann, Walter E., O5307631.
Schwartz, Michael P., O5005112.
White, Jerry A., O5210360.
Wilson, John F., Jr., O5311296.
Zebarth, Roger L., O5509739.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Brady, John M., O4015041.
Deegan, Alan E., O2296065.
Kau, Leong Y., O5518126.
Paul, Charles L., O5202606.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Bannister, Gary L., O2298008.
Blair, Lawrence, O5206199.
Bump, Robert G., O1938619.
Evans, William N.
Greenfield, Robert T., Jr., O2290164.
Jensen, Owen C., O2297987.
Lackey, Dixon A., Jr., O5301408.
Levy, Michael, O4053391.
Marsh, Frank G., O996737.
Mehlhop, Fred H., O5206575.
Stubbs, Joe C., Jr., O2305799.
Swearingen, Robert L., O5312931.
Winkler, William P., Jr.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Heath, Charles V., O1882457.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Parker, Royce C., O5301283.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Lucas, Mary E., M2298014.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Currigan, Mary B., N5407053.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Bohanan, Jack R., O2305075.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Allen, Bohn D., O2300721.
Bean, Stuart K., O4045300.
Brainard, William C., O2305102.
Cocke, Joseph G., Jr., O5300716.
Conte, Robert R., O5202014.
Felger, Charles E., O2305082.
Harris, Martin E., O2305186.
Helmus, Wilbur F., Jr.
Hughes, Robert P., Jr., O5201966.
Jensen, Walter L., Jr., O2300351.
Jones, Charles B., Jr., O2305065.
Ladner, Calvin N., O4084256.
Lawrence, Donald J., O2300691.
Martin, Jerry R., O5702271.
McLean, Robert B., O5201236.
Painter, Milford R., Jr., O2305010.
Pitkethly, David T., O5301317.
Quarantillo, Edward P., Jr., O5203623.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Clark, William H. H., O2300957.
Hagberg, Mylo M., O2305370.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Hodges, Mae E., L2295641.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Angiolelli, Ralph, O5002741.
Collyer, William M., O2306231.
Galietta, Enrico M.
Gustat, Mathew P., III, O5214772.
Herber, William E., Jr., O2298771.
Kendall, Marius W., O5705277.
Lassiter, Charles S., O5307931.
Lerro, Richard M., O5213835.
Marine, Wayne E., O5509094.
McCollum, John P., Jr.
Rosenbleeth, Milton H.
Savage, Linnaeus B., O2305773.
Sommer, Eugene C., O2307776.
Sorber, Charles A., O2305804.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Albright, Barbara L., L2302242.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Arends, Robert C.
Dyball, David C.
Gillespie, Richard L., Jr.
Gilliam, Frank H., Jr.
Hacker, Helmut F.
Klemperer, Walter M.
Land, Mickey L.
Steele, John M.
Tauscher, Gary L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adams, William E.
Amundson, Roger E.
Askins, William M., O5707116
Ator, Richard D.
Bachman, William H.
Ball, Elwyn J., 2d
Bean, Roger K.
Beim, Alexander
Bible, Paul A.
Bila, Ronald V.
Bombel, George A.
Brothers, Dale R.
Castle, Eugene H., Jr.
Caynon, Jackie L., Jr.
Charrin, Jack R.
Clement, Samuel A., Jr.
Clinchard, Adam G.
Cummings, Walter B.
Darcy, Edward J., III
Dingwall, Bennett T., III
Docter, Kenneth G.
Dodge, Francis N.
Dodge, Steven B.
Erber, Peter J.
Fischer, John A.
Fosbrook, Geoffrey A., Jr.
Geeck, Philip F.
Giese, Paul A.
Gordon, Charles L.
Gursky, Robert S.
Hartsel, James E.
Hawes, Samuel D.
Herdrich, Richard C.
Higgins, Dennis R.
Hightower, Edward G.
Huntley, Donald P., Jr.
Hurst, Lawrence
Jankowski, Walter J.
Jellett, James M.
Kuhl, Herbert D.
Kurka, George J.
Lowrance, Jerry M.
McCassey, Everett S.
Meyers, Frederick F., Jr.
Miller, Robert A.
Moore, Donald W.
Moore, Marvi D.
Murdock, Don H.
Nelson, Peter G.
Noel, Harlan M.
Norell, Stephan G.
Paul, LeRoy W.
Perry, Ronald J.
Prusinovski, Louis H.
Quick, Errol A.
Ratford, Ray L.
Redner, Daniel B.
Rodgers, Joseph A.
Rohn, Gordon F.
Rowell, John O., Jr.
Ryall, William F.
Salter, Douglas N.
Scamahorn, William E.
Schumaker, Robert F.
Shegog, James H.
Shepard. John D.
Shulman, Carl D.
Skinner, Brian K.
Smith, James A.
Smith, William L.
Stancil, Brian M.
Struthers, Allen B.
Swanson, Lawrence E.
Thomas, Steven A.
Turner, Nathaniel P., III
Wadham, Thomas A.
Walgren, William E.
Wallace, Jim B.
Williams, Jerome S.
Williams, Larry D.
Wills, Edward L.
Wormsbaker, Virgil T.
Youngblade, Walter

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1962, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:

Acklin, James M., III
Adams, Keith E.
Ailinger, Lawrence G.
Alcala, Raoul H.
Alt, Jeffrey C.
Amon, Lawrence R.
Anderson, Charles C., Jr.
Andress, James G.
Andrews, Robert P.
Andrews, Roger C.
Armstrong, Chalmers H., III
Armstrong, David A.
Arnold, Steven L.
Babb, Donald N.

Bachelor, Larry D.
Bailey, Ellis M.
Baltes, Paul A., Jr.
Barry, Richard A.
Bartelme, Michael J.
Batt, Howard C.
Baughman, Harold D.
Bauman, Robert D.
Baxter, Gene E.
Benchoff, Dennis L.
Bergeron, Donald N.
Bergman, Todd L.
Bernitt, Charles F.
Biddison, Alan M.
Bilafer, Martin F.
Blumhardt, Glen A.
Blundell, James D.
Blynn, David M.
Bode, John T.
Bondshu, Arthur F.
Boozer, Wilburn L.
Borrello, Ronald A.
Bothwell, Frederick C., III
Boyd, Harry R., Jr.
Boyle, James F.
Brewer, Thomas C.
Brogi, Robert P.
Broom, Thad A., Jr.
Broshous, Charles R., Jr.
Brown, Athur S.
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Gary L.
Brown, Harold L., Jr.
Brown, Morris E., Jr.
Brown, Roger A.
Brown, Walter R.
Browning, Philip Y., Jr.
Bryde, Walter J., Jr.
Buck, Thomas E.
Burke, Paul W.
Burns, Donald A.
Burns, Philip J.,
Burns, William C., Jr.
Burr, Ralph R., Jr.
Buttolph, Dan D.
Butzer, Charles B.
Byers, John W.
Byrd, William A.
Cacioppe, Richard C.
Calhoun, William R., Jr.
Campbell, John H.
Canary, Patrick L.
Carlson, Richard I.
Carnes, George P.
Carr, Sammie T.
Carroll, Robert C.
Carter, Benjamin F., Jr.
Casp, Michael A.
Caufield, Frank J.
Cauthen, William A., Jr.
Chadbourne, Glenn A.
Chafetz, Donald A.
Chandler, Charles R.
Chegar, Richard D.
Chisholm, Ronald J.
Chladek, Richard M.
Christopher, William G.
Chrobak, Walter J.
Clark, Daniel D.
Clark, Winston B., Jr.
Cobb, Tyrus R., Jr.
Cole, Roy W., III
Comello, Jerome J.
Comer, Frederick E., Jr.
Cooper, Robert S.
Cooper, Walter A.
Costain, Phillip A.
Cowles, James H.
Coyne, Robert C.
Crabtree, Michael A.
Crane, Lawrence R.
Cross, William M.
Crow, Rufus C., Jr.
Crowell, Arthur N.
Culp, Robert S., Jr.
Culp, Thomas D.
Culver, Thomas R.
Curren, Grindley C.
Currin, James M.
Dargle, John W.
Darrah, John W., III
Darrell, Charles C.
Daugherty, William F.
Davis, Thomas R.
DeAmico, Anthony R.
DeJardin, Alan R.
DeSapri, Donald A.
DeVore, John E.
DeVries, Robert K.
DeVries, Russell, Jr.
Dean, Kenneth L., Jr.
Degenhardt, Jacob R., Jr.
Denison, Dan L.
Denton, Donald A.
Dickinson, Robert C.
Dieal, William J., Jr.
Dilley, John H., Jr.
Dobbins, Paul J.
Dodd, James W.
Dolson, Kenneth R.
Dominy, Charles E.
Doten, Frederick S.
Douglas, Robert E.
Downing, Wayne A.
Duncan, George R.
Dunmyer, James W.
Dupuy, Trevor N., Jr.
Dworsak, William F.
Dwyer, Edward J., Jr.
Easterbrook, John E.
Eccleston, Thomas F.
Ellis, James R.
Ellis, Robert L.
Evans, John G.
Evans, William A.
Faley, Thomas E., Jr.
Fee, John E.
Feldman, David A.
Ferguson, John P., Jr.
Finlayson, John D.
Finn, Bertram P.
Fintel, Arthur T.
Fiore, Francis A. N.
Fishburne, Elliott G., III
Fisher, Charles L., Jr.
Flint, Dennis D.
Florence, John P.
Foss, Ardeen R.
Fox, Ralph M.
Francis, David P.
Franck, John L.
Franke, Roger W.
Franks, Clifton R.
Fraser, Harry L.
Froeschle, Joel D.
Fuellhart, Robert H., Jr.
Galanti, Philip J., Jr.
Garrett, Robert P.
Gartrell, Barry L.
Garvey Richard E., Jr.
Garvin, David E.
Gavan, William H.
Geiss, Charles G.
Gilligan, Richard M., Jr.
Girardi, Alfred F.
Gleason, James M.
Godshall, Michael L.
Godwin, John T.
Goldberg, Bertram
Goode, Robert H., Jr.
Gorden, Fred A.
Grahn, Norman D.
Gramzow, Richard H.
Grebe, Michael W.
Green, Roger W., Jr.
Greenwalt, Robert D.
Griffith, Thurston A., Jr.
Grimshaw, John M.
Gross, Joseph E., III
Guarino, Joseph L.
Gunderman, George L.
Habblett, John S.
Hagerty, Harry E., Jr.
Hameister, Herbert H.
Hamilton, Edward A., Jr.
Handy, George W.
Hansen, Kraig U.
Hard, Donald W.
Harkins, David V.
Harrington, James S.
Harris, Harold E.
Harrison, Willard E., Jr.
Hartman, Allison R., Jr.
Havercroft, Roger V.
Heigl, James J., Jr.
Heldman, James R.
Helmuth, Richard E., Jr.
Henderson, Leonard C.
Henderson, Ronald R.
Hendren, Ed W.
Henn, Karl M.
Herre, Thomas A.
Herring, Kenneth D.
Hertel, Herbert C., Jr.
Hickey, John J., Jr.
Higinbotham, Lewis
Hillyard, Frederick J.
Hilton, Roger T.
Holcomb, Cornelius C., Jr.
Holderness, Stephen W., Jr.
Holeman, Robert E.
Hoos, William A., Jr.
Horoschak, Peter P.
Howard, Malcolm J.
Hueman, Thomas P.
Hufschmid, Robert G.
Hughes, William M., Jr.
Hurst, Nicholas R.
Hyde, Clinton O., Jr.
Irwin, Richard W.
Ishoy, Kenneth V.
Ivy, Charles H.
James, Richard A.
Johnson, Cal D.
Johnson, Joe S., Jr.
Johnson, Marshall B.
Johnsson, Erik G., Jr.
Jones, David M.
Jones, John W., Jr.
Jones, Paul M.
Jordan, Robert W.
Kambrod, Matthew R.
Kamm, Ervin F., Jr.
Karrer, Donald
Kays, James L.
Kelly, John J.
Kelly, Patrick O.
Kendall, John F.
Kent, Richard S.
Keuker, Christopher H.
Kieffer, Joseph S., III
Kilmartin, Thomas J., III
Kimsey, James V.
Kinard, William H., III
King, John H.
King, Peter G.
Kirby, John J., 3d
Kirkegaard, Paul J.
Kirschenbauer, George W.
Kling, Thomas R.
Kobayashi, Roy S.
Kohler, Johann R. W.
Kosco, William G.
Krause, James E.
Krause, Robert G.
Kriesel, Melvin E., Jr.
Krukowski, Edward E.
LaRoque, Fred R., Jr.
Lair, Don L.
Landry, John R.
Lane, Ronald L.
Lape, Jerry V.
Larsen, Arnold L., Jr.
Lawson, Anthony B.
Learish, Dean L.
Lee, Roger C.
Lembo, Richard A.
Lilley, Robert J., Jr.
Lindsey, James L.
LoPresto, Raymond J.
Logan, David W.
Loupe, Sylvain M.
Lovgren, Arthur A.
Lurker, Ralph L.
Lynch, Albert F., Jr.
Lynn, Jon V.
Madden, Richard G.
Maidt, Honald N., Jr.
Malley, James H. M.
Martin, Bernard M.
Martin, James R.
Mayo, Richard E.
McCarthy, Jefferson B.
McCarthy, Terrance C.
McCrorey, James K.
McDonnell, Roger N.
McDonough, James M., Jr.
McDowall, Raymond G., Jr.
McElhose, Alan F.
McEnany, Brian R.
McGarry, Thomas W.
McGurk, Robert S.
McKay, James F., Jr.
McKeithan, Clifford M.
McKinley, Brian V.
McLaughlin, David R.
McMahan, Thomas E., Jr.
McNamara, Paul D. D.
McQuillen, James F.
McRae, Wilton D.
Meade, William C., III
Meehan, John F., III
Meeth, Harry, III
Mengel, Larry L.
Mennie, Thomas L.
Menning, Walter R.
Merriam, Charles S., II
Meyer, Samuel S., III
Middaugh, Thomas R.
Miller, Allen Z.
Miller, Frank D., Jr.
Miller, William L., Jr.
Minson, David C.
Moore, David W.
Moore, Michael
Moore, Thomas J.
Mooring, Laurence G.
Morgan, Douglas W.
Morin, Carl R., Jr.
Mount, Jimmy D.
Mumford, John B.
Mundt, David L.
Munsch, Robert C.
Murphy, Paul T.
Murphy, Vincent E.
Murray, Charles A.
Murray, Thomas E., II
Nahlen, Charles L.
Nau, John F., Jr.
Needs, Larry R.
Nelson, Phillip E.
Neumann, David C.
Nieuwboer, Harry W.
Noake, David A.
Norwood, Marvin P.
Novotny, John L.
Nunnelee, Joseph D., II
Nydegger, Neil K.
O'Brien, Michael T.
O'Neal, John W.
Oldfield, Peter J.
Ord, Robert L., III
Ostenberg, Thomas F.
Pakula, Kenneth R.
Pardi, Livio F.
Parker, Wayne B.
Parmenter, Larry W.
Parsons, Bruce B.
Pattarozzi, Anthony A., Jr.
Paxton, Gary L.
Pearson, Thomas D., Jr.
Pendergraft, Joe E.
Pendleton, Raymond A.
Perdew, Eldon L.
Peterson, James C.
Petrolino, Joseph A., Jr.
Petty, William D.
Pfeifer, Bill P.
Phillips, David J.
Phillips, Robert L.
Pons, Philip E., Jr.
Porter, John D., Jr.
Porter, Joseph G., Jr.
Poulsen, Waldemar P.
Price, Donald A.
Prince, Howard T., II
Pryor, Ralph W.
Reach, William T.
Reavill, Jackson C.
Redmond, James L.
Redmond, Robert A.
Reeves, Stacy E., 3d
Regan, John S.
Reich, Russell O., Jr.
Reid, Robert L.
Reimer, Dennis J.
Remener, Lawrence J.
Remington, Will M.
Renaghan, Kevin G.
Richardson, Lawrence C.
Ricks, Robert E., Jr.
Rigby, Joe W.
Riggs, David K.
Rintz, Robert E.
Rishel, Waide N., Jr.
Robb, Allan D.
Robbins, Christopher R.
Rohrbacher, Richard
Rose, Jerry D.
Rosenberg, Michael J.
Ross, William L., Jr.
Rowe, Dorsey E.
Rucker, Jack L.
Rumph, Robert R.
Rushatz, Alfred S.
Ryan, James C.
Sarran, George C.
Sayers, Ronny J.
Sazama, Francis J., Jr.
Scarsella, Alan N.
Scharpf, Francis R.
Scheewe, Lawrence R.
Schein, George, II
Scherr, William A., III
Schmidt, James K.
Schmidt, John L., Jr.
Schmidt, Marlin E.
Schmidt, Rodney J.
Schott, Paul D.
Seay, Jerry J.
Selby, John R.
Shaw, Charles L.
Sheaffer, Frederick E.
Sherard, Stewart, Jr.
Sholly, David J.
Shope, Walter R.
Shuey, Robert D.
Shutes, Stanford W., Jr.
Siedzick, Peter
Sikorski, Robert J., Jr.
Simcox, Thomas A.
Simoneaux, Joseph A.
Skarupa, Ronald A.
Sklar, Richard R., II
Skown, Bernard
Slater, Duane L.
Sloan, John N.
Smith, Dale F.
Smith, Larry D.
Smith, William F.
Snider, Don M.
Snover, Raife E.
Snow, Wayne A.
Spangler, David R.
Spencer, James J.
Sperman, Stephen D.
Spivey, Christopher B.
Spradling, Eldon H.
Sprague, Harold E., II
Sprouse, Derek G.
Spurlock, James E.
Stanley, Warner D., III
Starbird, Edward A.
Steele, Samuel L.
Steinke, Richard R.
Stephenson, Dan T.
Stephenson, Richard C.
Stewart, Donald E.
Stewart, Phillip R.
Stong, Todd D.
Storat, Richard E.
Street, Donald R.
Strohmeyer, James A.
Stroup, Theordore G., Jr.
Sweeney, Denne A.
Sweet, George B., III
Swick, Charles D.
Symanski, David E.
Szwarckop, Joseph D.
Szymczak, Robert W.
Tarbet, Robert M., Jr.
Taylor, John L.
Taylor, Leonard C.
Taylor, Walter D., Jr.
Teed, Dan G.
Telenko, George J., Jr.
Thomas, Billie N.
Thomas, Robert B.
Thompson, Stanley E.
Tindale, Alan C.
Tinnemeyer, Charles W.
Tomlinson, Gene B.
Treadwell, David O.
Tumelson, Ronald A.
Tumlin, Ronald W.
Tumpane, James R.
Tysver, Gerald A.
Ulmer, John M.
Urna, Henry D.
Voss, Donald J.
Vranish, John M.
Waggoner, Ivan L.
Wagner, John H., II
Wagner, Steventon
Walker, John B.
Walker, Thomas E., II
Wallace, Kenneth M.
Wallace, Roy V., Jr.
Ward, Windsor E.
Warner, Stephen D.
Wasaff, Samuel K., Jr.
Waters, Lawrence E.
Webb, Arthur M.
Webb, Ernest L.
Weinfurter, Robert J.
Weiss, James W.
Welper, Francis E., Jr.
Wertz, Paul F.
West, Steven G.
Westfall, Francis D., Jr.
White, William D., Jr.
Whitehead, William C., Jr.
Whitmore, Stanley E., Jr.
Wilcox, John G.

Wilhelm, Alfred D., Jr.
Wilkerson, Benjamin R., Jr.
Williamson, Donald L.
Willis, Wayne D.
Windom, David L.
Winkler, John C.
Withers, Geoffrey D.
Witzel, Ronald W.
Woeber, Donald H.
Wong, Robert Y.
Worthington, Henry W.
Worthington, James M., Jr.
Wuerpel, Charles L.
Wylie, Richard W.
Zabik, Robert D.
Zenker, Ernest G.
Zinn, Ronald L.
Zmuida, Paul T.

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1962, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provision of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 and 3287:

Bird, William J.
Dewey, Victor O.
Gezelman, Allen D.
Harper, Robert E.
Hunsicker, John E., III
Lane, Joseph H.
McDonald, Robert L.
Racouillat, Richard N.
Rice, Richard B.
Roze, Uldis R.
Trapnell, Philip B. S.
Tremaine, Myron D.

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1962, United States Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 and 3287:

Keyes, August L.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Persecution of Jews in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the New York Times on May 15, 1962, Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, of New York, clearly points out that the mere existence of a law prohibiting discrimination against a minority group is useless unless a Government actively promotes and protects individual rights. He rightly points out the disgraceful treatment the Soviet Union has given to its Jewish citizens and he urges the free interchange of information and personnel from the world and Soviet Jewish communities.

His letter and his suggestion deserve the consideration of the House:

SOVIET JEWS' PERSECUTION—INTERCHANGE OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS TO REFUTE CHARGES SUGGESTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

On May 9 the Times published a letter from Mikhail Strogovich, a Moscow law professor, which attempted to refute the charge that the Soviet Union was persecuting Jews. The reed on which the professor rests his argument is the Soviet Constitution and Soviet law.

While it may be true that Soviet law prohibits religious persecution, it is a well-known fact that any law is only as good as those who administer it. History has taught that the mere existence of a constitution and laws—no matter how fair on their face—does not prevent the establishment of a ruthless dictatorship.

As a Congressman who is deeply concerned with discrimination against all minorities, I have received evidence of widespread discrimination in the Soviet Union. The evidence shows discrimination against Jews in employment, in schools, in the Russian press and during the recently reported trials. In addition, there seems to be a deliberate effort on the part of the Soviet Government to eradicate Jewish customs and cultural institutions.

Reports of such persecution have been widely publicized in the United States. Instead of pious pronouncements and citations of dead-letter law, it would be far more convincing if the Soviet Government would allow contact between the worldwide Jewish community and Jews in the Soviet Union.

Both the United States and the U.S.S.R. have exchanged programs of musicians, singers, ballet dancers, scientists and others. Both countries would benefit if religious leaders were included in the exchange program. If the well-documented reports of religious persecution can be refuted, then why does not the Soviet Union allow, indeed encourage, a free interchange of personnel and information with her Jewish religious community?

WILLIAM FITTS RYAN,
Member of Congress,
20th District, New York.

Nationwide Press Reaction to New Jersey Doctors' Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to quote from the reaction to the threat of 44 doctors at Point Pleasant, N.J., Hospital early this month to refuse to care for patients under President Kennedy's plan for health care through social security which has resulted in a nationwide wave of shock and dismay among other physicians, public officials, the press and the public.

National reaction variously termed the threat "shocking," "incredible," and "political blackmail."

The 44 New Jersey doctors, according to Dr. J. Bruce Henriksen, leader of the group, signed a resolution that stated flatly:

We the undersigned * * * do refuse to participate in the care of patients under the provisions of the King-Anderson bill or similar legislation.

Dr. Caldwell Esselstyn, chairman of the Physicians Committee for Health Care Through Social Security, said in behalf of the committee that it was "incredible that a group of physicians would deny a sick person the right to pay his hospital bills by contributing to social security a little every month during his working years so he wouldn't have to accept charity in his old age."

New Jersey's Governor Hughes condemned the doctors' boycott threat, terming it a political device at variance with the vows of the Hippocratic oath.

It is a source of great regret to me—

He said—

that such a proposal originated in New Jersey.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff accused the New Jersey doctors' group of "trying to blackmail the Congress and the American people" and charged:

They are violating the Hippocratic oath which they took before they began the practice of medicine.

He pointed out that—

It should be absolutely no concern to a physician where a patient gets the money with which to pay his hospital costs.

Secretary of Labor Goldberg called the action of the New Jersey doctors a "disgrace to the country."

Following is a sampling of editorial opinion across the Nation:

New York Times:

The threat of a group of New Jersey physicians to boycott patients seeking care under the administration's proposed program of medical care for the aged is an attempt at political blackmail degrading to their profession * * *. Certainly physicians have a right to publicize their objections to any social security approach to the financing of medical care * * *. The one thing they do not have a right to do is to threaten to make the sick the victims of their political dissent by depriving them of lifeguarding services.

New York World Telegram and Sun:

Such a boycott of the sick would amount to a medical atrocity.

New York Herald Tribune:

New Jersey's rebellious doctors have not added to their stature by their revolt, nor have they enhanced the dignity of the medical profession's opposition to the King-Anderson bill * * *. King-Anderson, after all, would not pay doctors' fees; it would only pay a part of the patient's hospital bill * * *.

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

We are sorry to see medicare for the aged reduced to the absurdities rampant in New Jersey. The doctors should repel adherents by their own silliness.

St. Petersburg, Fla., Times:

One of the most shocking—and certainly the least tenable—positions any doctors' group has taken against social security medicare is that which has stirred up so much controversy in Point Pleasant, N.J.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

Incredible is a mild word.

Milwaukee Journal:

Such a readiness to violate their professional oath because they don't like the kind of health insurance a patient carries is shocking.

Denver Post:

The American Medical Association * * * should say that such tactics presently constitute blackmail and potentially represent

an attempt by a special interest group to dictate national policy to the American people.

San Francisco Chronicle:

It has been suggested that the new Jersey movement is a trial balloon, sent up by organized medicine to frighten the public away from support of the King-Anderson bill. If so, it will doubtless accomplish half its purpose before being shot down in flames. It will frighten the public—not against the medicare program, but against that segment of the medical profession that would prescribe so violent and desperate an antidote.

Arizona Elks Club Convention Speech by the Honorable John J. Rhodes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Elks Convention met in Mesa, Ariz., on May 11, 1962 at my home lodge. I was honored by being designated to give the memorial address.

The speech follows:

ARIZONA ELKS CONVENTION SPEECH, MESA, ARIZ., MAY 11, 1962

Once again, at the hour of 11, we meet to honor the memory of those brethren who have passed from our midst into the great beyond. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. Under the fatherhood of God, they were flesh of our flesh. Under the brotherhood of our order, they are of our hearts and of our spirits. They lived as we lived, and have passed beyond the great curtain, which will be drawn for us all, one day.

With their departure, we feel a great sense of loss. Although there are many hands to take up the torch they relinquished, the sum total of our accomplishments will be lessened, and the particular quality each of them brought to our order will be absent. To say that they will be missed is to understate the case.

But Elkdom always seals off its wounds, closes the circle, and proceeds in pursuit of its great objectives. Our departed brethren would have us do nothing less. To these objectives they gave a lifetime of devotion. We honor them most completely when we rededicate our own lives to the furtherance of the great purposes and aims for which our order ever strives.

On our altar is the flag of our country. All of our members have taken an oath of allegiance, not once but many times, to that flag, and to the Republic for which it stands. Today that flag and that Republic are beset by forces from within and without which would destroy them, because they stand as bastions against the domination over the minds and bodies of men which those forces seek. To them man is subservient to the state, and the desires—even the lives—of individuals are as nothing when compared to the needs of the monolith they have created and dubbed, "the state."

Whence came this "state"? In the Bible, temporal power is recognized, but it is always implicit in this recognition that such power does not run counter to the fatherhood of God. Our Creator has bestowed upon us the power to govern ourselves. We may delegate this power to governments of our own choosing, but the ultimate power to govern always resides in us as a gift of our Creator.

But those who would destroy us do not believe in a Supreme Being. They believe that there was nothing before this life, and that there is nothing after it. Their ideology is based completely on materialism. Since the existence of man is both the alpha and the omega, his lifespan should be made as useful as possible, and they are just the people to determine how he is to be used. Originally, the Communist theorist was preoccupied with bettering the life of man, and this is still preached by the Communist propagandist. But the Communist elite has long since recognized that they need not believe their own propaganda—that communism was and is a vehicle by which they and their heirs would ride to temporal power.

They found early in the struggle that their domination of the people required the creation of a fiction to which homage could be paid. Therefore, out of limbo, they created "the state." From the state flowed all power, and to the state was owed one's allegiance, obedience, and even one's life.

To the Communist mind, the state is a substitute for God. Their minds have never delved the mysteries of the origin of the power of the state. They accept its presence without questioning its genesis. How could a materialistic atheist do otherwise?

As a contrast, our Republic was founded by us to protect the rights of the individual and of our society. But we did not give the Republic all power—we delegated only specific powers, reserving the rest.

We can make further delegations of power, if we desire to do so. Our forefathers wisely made it difficult to amend our Constitution, but it can be amended. But we must be ever vigilant in guarding the powers we have reserved against summary usurpation or gradual dilution. May I say again—and emphasize—it is our faith and our conviction that these powers were given us by our Creator. The recipients of such a gift should ever guard it in a manner worthy of the great Giver.

We have delegated to our Republic the power to defend our land from attack from without. In exercise of this power, we have builded mighty Armies, Navies, and an Air Force second to none. We are on the threshold of being able to leave this earth on a vehicle built by us and travel to the moon and the distant stars. We are able to unleash the basic power of our universe in the shape of mushroom clouds and with destructive force which defies imagination. In the task of deterring attack from without, our Republic has been true to its trust. Only a maniac or an imbecile would accept the losses which would be his if he were to attack us in a general war.

Yet the foe we face is a subtle foe, who attacks in many ways. He not only plays on our weaknesses, but like the practitioner of judo, he turns our greatest strength against us. He uses our fears for his own advantage. He is an artist at decoy and masquerade, and continually tries to attract our attention in one sector while he pursues his subversive purposes in another.

Our sense of charity toward all is one of our greatest strengths. Yet by chicanery and the stimulation of poor judgment in our Government, he has caused us to give gifts which strengthen those who would destroy us. Forbearance is one of our virtues, but he has exploited this phase of our character by moving one of his minions into power 90 miles from our shores.

He makes feints in Berlin, and attacks in South Vietnam. He talks peace in Geneva, and makes war in Laos. He talks about banning nuclear tests, and prepares to test. He makes treaties with one hand and breaks them with another.

On the domestic scene, he uses the desire we all have for the well being of our fellow American to tempt us to embark on social experiments before our economy can afford them. His obvious hope is to use our own charitable virtue as a lever to make us ruin our own economy. Thus he would fulfill the prophecy of Lenin that we would fall "like an overripe plum" into their laps.

Against such a powerful and resourceful enemy, how can we best carry on the work that our departed brethren have "thus far so nobly advanced"? The answer does not lie in reacting to their every action. The answer certainly does not lie in fostering suspicions and doubts between loyal Americans. The forces of negativism may deter the expansion of overt communism, but something positive is needed to utterly defeat communism in all its facets.

That positive force is found in rededication to the conviction that each man is a child of God, and is therefore a brother of every other man.

As men who are recipients of the great gift of self-government from our Creator, we have delegated some of our powers to a Republic, but we have reserved all other powers. One of the powers we have reserved is the power to perform acts of brotherhood for our fellow men in our individual capacities. May we always keep this power and guard it jealously, allowing the Republic to do only those things which we cannot do ourselves.

In rededicating ourselves to these principles, let us also remember that the free enterprise system of economy is the best system yet devised by man, and will continue to be as long as it is operated by persons who are conscious of their responsibilities to their fellow men and to society. Let us remember that overregulation by government, overindulgence by government, and competition by government are equally destructive of free enterprise, and that the role of government should be to protect individuals and the society against predators—we will have them as long as humans are human. Let us also remember that the natural habitat of man—that climate in which he prospers mentally, spiritually, and physically—is a society in which he is free—free to get as big as he is big enough to get as long as he does not hurt society—or free to fall flat on his face, if fortune and his abilities so decree.

We will continue to be helpful to our fellow men, at home and abroad, but only in a manner they can understand, and which will aid, not deter, their moral and physical development. But we will also remember that the greatest asset of the free world is the free American economy—the free American society. If these fail, the lights go out all over the world. If they succeed, then all these good things we desire for our fellowman will, in God's good time, be theirs, inevitably.

If we here so rededicate ourselves, then our brethren who have passed from among us will not have lived and worked in vain, and we shall have been true to their memory, and to our order and its great principles.

First District of Arizona Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD the tabu-

lated results of the questionnaire which was mailed to my constituents on March 30. Of the approximately 25,000 which were sent out, 5,664 were completed, representing about a 22.5-percent return. Those who replied live in the First District of Arizona, Maricopa County, which includes the Metropolitan Phoenix area:

	Percentage results		
	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Do you believe that the United States should purchase $100,000,000 worth of United Nations bonds?	11.5	81.8	6.7
2. Is another summit conference between the President and Khrushchev advisable at this time?	5.1	86.8	8.1
3. Do you favor additional Federal aid to education?	20.6	76.3	3.1
If your answer is "Yes", should it be for—			
a. School construction?	44.6		
b. Teachers' salaries?	18.8		
c. Student grants?	36.6		
4. Is the House Committee on Un-American Activities performing a useful function?	70.3	8.7	21.0
5. Are you in favor of military aid to countries which are friendly, but who do not have the economy to maintain an adequate defense force?	73.6	15.3	11.1
6. Should antitrust laws apply to organized labor?	88.4	5.0	6.6
7. Do you favor the Congress delegating authority to the President to adjust income taxes?	7.7	88.9	3.4
8. In general, do you favor the U.N.'s Congo operation?	13.0	72.2	14.8
9. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations?	5.9	89.4	4.7
10. Should the United States have halted the erection of a wall between East and West Berlin, even at a risk of an armed conflict?	65.6	20.0	14.4
11. Do you favor a program of Federal medical aid to the aged?	32.4	60.4	7.2
If we have such a program, should it be financed by—			
a. An increase in social security taxes (the social security trust fund is generally agreed to be inadequate to meet future demands on it)?	37.4		
b. A matching grant program with the States?	62.6		
12. Would you be in favor of establishing a special labor court to settle labor disputes which pose a threat to the Nation's security?	62.3	21.6	16.1
13. Do you favor the Peace Corps program?	32.3	45.9	21.8
14. An Indonesian attack on Dutch New Guinea poses a threat to Australia's safety. Should the United States come to the aid of the Dutch and Australia if such an attack occurs?	71.5	12.0	16.5
15. Should the Federal budget be balanced, even though certain Federal services may have to be curtailed?	85.9	8.1	6.0
16. Should Communist pilots (primarily from Yugoslavia) be permitted to train in the United States?	4.7	90.2	5.1
17. Do you favor giving the President authority to reduce tariffs below present levels?	18.1	72.1	9.8
18. Is it possible for the free world to exist side by side with Communist nations?	16.7	74.7	8.6
If your answer is "No," which general policy, if any, should we pursue to insure victory over communism:			
a. "Hard"—resist all types of Communist advances, including military ones?	75.0		
b. Seek gains by negotiation and concentrate primarily on an economic cold war?	12.6		
c. Encourage reforms within the Communist system in the hope that it will eventually be modified?	12.4		
19. Should we continue economic aid to—			
a. So-called national Communist countries (i.e., Poland)?	6.6	87.8	5.6
b. Neutral countries? (such as India)	21.7	65.5	12.8
c. Friendly nations?	75.3	16.9	7.8
20. Do you believe that the civil liberties of all people regardless of race, creed, or color, should be protected?	96.0	2.3	1.7
If "Yes," should vote-counting frauds which deprive white people of their rights (i.e., recently in Chicago and St. Louis) be considered a violation of civil liberties?	94.4	2.1	3.5
21. Should States have more voice in the public land disposal policies of the Federal Government?	84.7	6.9	8.4
22. Is a free southeast Asia (which includes Laos and Vietnam) important to the security of the Western World?	76.9	6.8	16.3
If so, should we pursue a policy which—			
a. Backs only pro-Western governments?	82.7		
b. Seeks to create a neutral buffer between East and West?	17.3		
23. Should the voting age be lowered to 18?	21.7	72.4	5.9
24. Do you feel that the United States must overthrow the Castro regime?	86.7	8.2	5.1
If your answer is "Yes," would you advocate—			
a. The use of any means to topple that government?	55.9		
b. A policy limited to severe trade embargoes?	27.5		
c. Action only in conjunction with other OAS nations?	16.6		
25. Are you in favor of United States-Russian space cooperation?	19.2	70.6	10.2
26. Is an adequate international inspection system necessary for safe disarmament?	90.5	5.7	3.8
27. Do you feel that the chance that other Castro-type revolutions can be prevented by the Alliance for Progress (with its emphasis on aid to Latin American countries willing to undergo internal reform) justifies the expenditure of massive funds in that area?	26.2	50.6	23.2
28. Do you think that the Kennedy administration consistently takes the best possible course of action to insure our triumph over communism?	10.2	78.7	11.1
29. In general, do you consider yourself a political—			
"Liberal"?	5.6		
"Conservative"?	71.1		
"Or neither"?	23.3		

The National Lottery of Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Haiti.

Haiti, as we all know, is a tiny and poverty-ridden republic in the Caribbean. Revenue sources are few and the Haitian Government is thus well aware of the fiscal merit of a national lottery.

In 1961, the gross receipts of the national lottery of Haiti came to over $2¼ million. The net income to the Government was over $660,000 which were utilized for social assistance and scholarships.

The Government of Haiti has wisely realized that a national lottery can be an effective means with which to advance the social welfare of its people.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we here in the United States could benefit from the use of lottery money on behalf of similar goals. A national lottery in the United States could raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which could be used to cut our personal income taxes and reduce our big and ever-growing national debt.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not profit from the example of our foreign neighbors?

Curtis Bok

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and our country as a whole suffered an immense loss this week in the death of Curtis Bok—an extraordinary citizen, who did his work in a modest manner, without the benefit of fanfare.

I first observed the work of Curtis Bok when he became an assistant district attorney in Philadelphia. He was a fair prosecutor in an office where the rights of the accused could be overlooked. His next public position of orphans court judge in Philadelphia County also showed his great interest in principles and not picayune items. Although he served but a short time, he contributed much to the high regard in which the Philadelphia Orphans Court is held.

I had the opportunity to practice before Judge Bok when he became presiding judge of the court of common pleas No. 6. He was one of the greatest judges I have observed in my 32 years as a member of the Philadelphia bar. His opinions were lucid and frequently of literary vintage. His ability to see behind the presentation of facts and arguments was uncanny. I recall that in his courtroom hung a tapestry with the motto, "Eyes and ears are poor witnesses when the soul is barbarous." For over

20 years he served on the common pleas bench with his colleagues, Judges Flood and Leventhal, and created a feeling for litigants and lawyers that his tribunal was the most eminent in fairness and in justice.

It was my privilege to have had numerous talks with Judge Bok in his chambers. Later I campaigned with him when he was a candidate for the supreme court. I can report that he never indicated any change in his fair, modest, and considerate attitude at any time, under any circumstances.

Justice Bok was a model for legal behavior, manly behavior, courageous behavior. He was a rare example of modesty, fairness, and industry in the face of wealth, learning, and high office.

We have lost an unusual man, but we have learned much from his conduct and the way in which he lived.

Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Advance magazine, a journal primarily concerned with Republican political thought, has published a symposium on medical care for the aged including articles by Dr. Arthur Larson, Roswell B. Perkins, and myself. Dr. Larson's article has appeared in the RECORD, and I include with my remarks my contribution to this Republican symposium.

The article follows:

THE ALTERNATIVE: FREE, VOLUNTARY, PRIVATE

(By Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio)

Several million elderly Americans need assistance with the problems of medical care for the aged, and I believe it should be provided by the Federal Government, on a voluntary basis, through the medium of the private enterprise insurance industry of the United States. I have introduced legislation (H.R. 10981) to accomplish this purpose through a system of outright Government assistance to those least able to bear the expenses of illness, and tax credit incentives for those who can underwrite all or part of the cost.

The problem, it seems to me, is a transient one and should not be the basis for the establishment of a new Federal agency and a permanent Federal bureaucracy as is proposed in other legislation. Men and women who are 65 or over now, or will reach that age in the next few years, have had an unusual experience. Many of them were impoverished during the years when they should have enjoyed their greatest earning power. When they returned to work during and after the war, high taxes and inflation made it difficult, if not impossible, for many of them to make proper preparations for retirement and old age. In my opinion, this problem will become less serious in the next decade when those who retire will have had the benefit of many years of prosperity, as well as the recently developed pension and annuity programs.

In any discussion of the health problems of the aged, consideration must be given to the rapid development of health insurance in recent years. Both private companies and nonprofit carriers have been developing insurance protection designed for the special needs of the aged, and several hundred such policies are now available. Fifty-three percent of the 17 million Americans aged 65 or over now have some health insurance protection. The carriers have had experience with the problem, hospitals and physicians are cooperative, and citizens have expressed their confidence in this method of underwriting the costs of illness.

I believe a tax incentive to encourage elderly people who wish to have insurance protection should be the foundation of any Federal Government health program. The 17 million who are over 65 can be divided into four general catego ies. There are those relatively well-to-do who are self-insured, or are able to buy the kind of health protection they desire. There is a great middle group, perhaps 7 or 8 million individuals, who have sufficient income to live comfortably, if modestly, but are not able to meet the cost of prolonged or major illness. And there are several million with inadequate resources who are now dependent upon relatives or public assistance. Tax incentives will assist the majority in the first two groups if they wish to obtain health insurance. Tax incentives will encourage relatives and former employers to provide health protection for a great many others. The remainder must have outright Federal assistance.

The basic requirement of my plan is that every citizen who wishes to participate must file a Federal income tax return.

If the return indicates that the individual has no Federal income tax liability, I would have the Treasury Department issue him a "Medical Care Insurance Certificate" which he could present to the insurance carrier of his choice as payment of premiums upon a health insurance plan. The certificate would be redeemed from the carrier, by the Treasury, for cash equal to the cost of the premiums, up to $125.

If the income tax return of an individual indicates that his Federal income tax liability is in excess of $125 and that he has paid the premiums on a qualified health insurance plan, my bill provides a tax credit equal to the cost of the premiums, up to $125. To avoid misunderstanding, let me point out that a tax credit is a sum subtracted from the tax an individual owes the Government. It is not a tax deduction. All medical expenses of taxpayers over 65 are deductible in computing tax liability.

For those who fall between these groups, my bill proposes a combination of tax credit and outright assistance. For example a man whose tax is $50 would receive credit in that amount, together with a medical care insurance certificate, with a maximum value of $75. He could use the $50 he has saved from taxes and his certificate to buy the same basic coverage available to the others.

In each case, a married couple would receive a $250 credit or certificate, or combination of the two.

The bill also provides incentives for relatives to take care of those who cannot afford health insurance. The same $125 credit would be given any relative who buys protection for an elderly member of his family, whether or not the elderly member is his dependent.

There is a growing trend in the United States toward providing health insurance coverage for retired employees. My bill encourages this trend by providing the employer the tax credit that is available to a relative.

On the advice of insurance experts, I decided upon a credit or certificate valued at $125 because this is the amount that is required to purchase a health insurance plan sufficiently comprehensive to cover the major medical expenses of elderly people.

The bill establishes minimum coverages of two kinds. Plan A is first dollar coverage, which means that the insured individual can receive its benefits even if he is penniless. He is not required to contribute to the cost of the care covered by the bill. Plan A includes 90 days hospitalization, ancillary charges in connection with surgery or emergency outpatient treatment, convalescent care, and surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum.

Plan B is a more comprehensive protection designed for the individual who is able to contribute something to the costs of illness. The individual would be required to pay 25 percent of the costs of hospitalization, ancillary charges, surgeon's fees, physician's calls in home or office, registered nursing services, and other related expenses. Plan B also requires the individual pay the first $100 of medical expenses in a calendar year.

Insurance experts advise me that any carrier can offer policies including these basic requirements for about $125 per year, regardless of the previous medical history of the individual, and on a guaranteed renewable basis. There will be little, if any, profit to the carrier at this price. However, opening so large a market to a competitive industry assures that benefits superior to the minimums in the bill will be offered elderly people if my legislation becomes law.

I believe this is a proposal that can lift the issue of medical care for the aged out of the stalemate in which it has been for many months. It should be a program upon which all can agree.

I believe it is superior to the King-Anderson bill in that it is voluntary, it covers everyone rather than only those who are social security or railroad retirement annuitants, and it places the burden upon the entire society rather than upon those workers who are paying social security taxes. Many people object to the compulsory nature of King-Anderson.

My bill provides benefits superior to those provided in the King-Anderson bill, particularly in that it does not require a $90 payment by the patient for the first 9 days of hospitalization, and it offers surgical services not available in the social security approach.

Most important, my bill eliminates the controversy surrounding socialized medicine. Critics of King-Anderson are justified in raising the issue of socialized medicine. King-Anderson requires elaborate Federal regulation of hospitals, which entails regulation of the people who serve in hospitals, including resident physicians and interns. Further, Mr. Aime J. Forand has made it clear that the King-Anderson bill is only a foot in the door. Admitting that the benefits are limited and inadequate, he assures his supporters that the benefits will be increased and broadened in succeeding sessions of Congress if this small beginning can be enacted into law. Thus, the Forand proposal means the establishment within the social security system of a giant new Federal health program. Once established, it will grow and flourish.

I am convinced that the standards of medical care in the United States will decline under Federal supervision of this nature, and future advances will be inhibited.

Many argue that the Kerr-Mills Act is the solution to the problem of medical care for the aged. It is not the solution in my State, because Ohio, along with more than a dozen others, has refused to implement the Kerr-Mills Act. Furthermore, Kerr-Mills cares for only the indigent aged and does nothing to help the large middle group of elderly Americans whom I have mentioned—the men and women of modest means whose resources can be wiped out by a major illness.

The basic cost of my proposal, if everyone over 65 were to take advantage of it, would be $2.1 billion. This amount would

be offset, however, by various savings inherent in the program. For example, 1,400,000 people over 65 deducted $926 million in medical expenses in their 1959 returns, the last year for which figures are available. We may assume that these deductions were reflected in tax savings of about $200 million. This amount may be considered an offset against the apparent cost of my bill. No statistics are available concerning the number of persons over 65 who are listed as dependents by other taxpayers, nor the amount of medical deductions taken for such dependents, but we may safely assume that the tax savings in this category are at least comparable. In addition, to the extent that my proposal will pay for medical care now paid by Kerr-Mills or other State welfare programs, there will be a saving to Federal, State, and local governments. Considering these factors, I believe the actual cost of my program will be about $1.5 billion. Estimates of the cost of the King-Anderson program range from $1.1 billion first-year cost, the figure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to $3 or $4 billion, the estimates of insurance company actuaries.

My proposal, in summation, is a voluntary medical care program for all aged Americans, using the facilities of an existing Government agency and of existing free enterprise insurance organizations, protecting completely the self-respect and independence of each citizen, and placing the burden of solving a national problem upon all the tax sources of the Federal Government.

I hope sincerely that this proposal will be accepted as a constructive alternate, offered by a Member of the minority who recognizes the existence of a problem and is not satisfied with the solutions proposed by Members of the majority. It is a sound program which merits the consideration of all who are interested in making progress in this field. Introduction of identical measures by 30 of my colleagues indicates that it does have appeal.

Memorandum on the Launching of the Nuclear Submarine U.S.S. John Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to visit the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. last Monday when the nuclear submarine U.S.S. *John Marshall* was commissioned. It was a great occasion, highlighted by a fine address by Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, who sponsored the U.S.S. *John Marshall* when it was launched last summer on July 15, 1961. As was fitting, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Earl Warren, was present for the commissioning. He, too, had the privilege of witnessing the launching of the *John Marshall*. As usual Chief Justice Warren delivered a fine address, appropriate to the occasion putting into commission a ship named after one of his great predecessors.

I have asked the Navy to furnish me a memorandum on this subject that I make part of these remarks so that my colleagues may enjoy them.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. MILLER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

On May 21, 1962, the U.S. Navy accepted the U.S.S. *John Marshall* (SSBN-611) from the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., at which time the *John Marshall* was placed in commission and accepted by Vice Adm. Wallace M. Beakley, USN, Deputy Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, as a unit of the Atlantic Fleet. Vice Admiral Beakley made the official acceptance for the U.S. Navy, followed by a few words from Mr. William E. Blewett, Jr., president of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. Comdr. R. W. Stecher, USN, Blue Commanding Officer, assumed command and Comdr. R. D. Donavan, USN, Gold Commanding Officer, also spoke. Both Blue and Gold crews were present and will alternate in manning the ship on its patrols.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Rear Adm. I. J. Galantin, USN, Director of Special Projects of the Bureau of Naval Weapons (and now responsible for the Polaris program) also were introduced. Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, who sponsored the *John Marshall* when launched last summer on July 15, 1961, made the following remarks:

"This last week an eminent historian was discussing the character of one of the country's greatest legal minds. He described him as having learned his law in Virginia and of having a most stern, intense, inflexible nature with a deeply serious and intellectual personality. I thought he was speaking of the Attorney General. He was, in fact, discussing our hero, John Marshall.

"As you know, John Marshall's rigid adherence to what he believed was right and just contributed tremendously to the constitutional government we now enjoy. President John Adams said, after appointing him to the Supreme Court: 'My gift of John Marshall to the United States was the proudest act of my life.'

"I know that in the very old naval tradition the grace and good fortune of the sponsor are supposed to be imbued in the ship. In this case though, for all our sakes, I hope tradition reverses itself and that the courage of John Marshall and the loyalty, bravery, and excellence of the fine men serving in the U.S.S. *John Marshall* be infused in her sponsor.

"It is my prayerful hope that the missiles locked within her may never be released. Instead of the weapons of war, the combined goodness and strength of all her men will radiate outside her hull for all the world to see and admire.

"Good luck and Godspeed."

The Honorable Paul B. Fay, Jr., Under Secretary of the Navy, introduced the principal speaker of the day, Chief Justice Earl Warren, whose remarks follow:

"This occasion, upon which we commission this fine ship the *John Marshall*, causes us to focus a reflective eye upon the pages of our national history and, as we do, we cannot but be struck by the emergence of great figures to meet the occasion at every critical juncture.

"Justice Story, in speaking of his longtime friend and associate, said:

"'Chief Justice Marshall was the growth of a century. Providence grants such men to the human family only on great occasions to accomplish its own end. Such men are found only when our need is the greatest.'

"And, as we reflect, we are also struck by the frequency with which Virginia has produced other great men and women to occupy leading roles in the unfolding and development of American civilization. It is not too much to say that the founding, expansion, and independence of our country largely finds its sources in the history of Virginia.

"The first permanent English settlement in America was made at Jamestown in 1607 and only 12 years later, in 1619, the first legislative body in the colony met at Jamestown, almost 200 years before the adoption of the American Constitution—making the Virginia General Assembly the oldest lawmaking body in the Western Hemisphere. Then, in 1634, the Syms Free School opened at Hampton, and the Eaton Free School began 15 years later. These were the first free schools in what is now the United States, and as early as 1646 the Virginia General Assembly provided funds for public education.

"Even our country's geographical expansion can be traced to the time in 1778, during the Revolutionary War, when a Virginia army, led by George Rogers Clark, won for the United States the Northwest Territory from which several large States were later carved.

"The vast region between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains was purchased through the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson.

"Merriweather Lewis and William Clark explored the great Northwest leading to its settlement. Stephen F. Austin led American settlers into Texas; San Houston won independence for Texas from Mexico, and John Tyler laid the groundwork for the admission of Texas into the Union. The victories of Generals Zachary Taylor and Winfield Scott in the Mexican War resulted in the addition of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and parts of Colorado.

"All of these men were Virginians.

"American independence itself was greatly the work of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, George Mason, James Madison, John Marshall, and James Monroe, all of whom were among a brilliant group of Virginians who devoted their lives and their fortunes to their fledgling nation. Four of the first five Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe—were Virginians, and other Presidents were William Henry Harrison, John Tyler, Zachary Taylor, and Woodrow Wilson.

"During the formative stage of our Government, some of the world's finest writings in politics and government were composed by Virginians. Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence; George Mason authored the Virginia Declaration of Rights, a model for the first 10 amendments of the Constitution of the United States; and James Madison was called the father of the Constitution because of the great part he played in writing it and in securing its adoption.

"These were the men, immortal in U.S. history, with whom John Marshall lived, worked, and served in colonial United States. Whether they agreed in politics or not, they all had great minds, were passionately devoted to their own political philosophy, and each sharpened the minds of the others either through friendly acquaintance or political debate. Marshall was the beneficiary of these associations as much as any American of those days, and the inspiration saw him through service as a soldier in the War for Independence, as a Congressman, a diplomat of outstanding ability, and Secretary of State.

"But, his own reputation most firmly rests on his service as Chief Justice of the United States. It was in this office that his character, wisdom, and his great insight into the requirements of free government were established as a shining example for all future members of his profession.

"He served at a time when the truth about the nature of the Union and the purposes that joined the widely separated States into one Republic—about the Constitution and the application of its principles to the problems of the times—was obscured by sectionalism and selfish interests and narrow loyalties. Through a generation, he expounded these matters and formulated decisions of such clarity and vigor that he is now recognized as the foremost leader in

developing and maintaining the unity and stability of the United States. Thus, he made of the Constitution a vital, dynamic, and a lasting charter for free and orderly living in our country.

"Today as we commission this fine ship, our minds are necessarily upon a responsibility that is global, rather than primarily national. Even so, I believe that John Marshall's life and his works have for us a profound significance as we chart our position among the nations of the world and as we determine the course of our national conduct.

"In the world we live in today, there exist two great philosophies of man and of government—ideologies which disagree violently on the proper relationship between the individual and the state and in which there is a constant struggle for the minds and hearts of men. We and other free countries are endeavoring to demonstrate that freedom and dignity for all constitute the only sound basis for world peace. We are ranged, on the one side, with those who seek attainment of human goals through a government of laws administered by men—rooted in moral law, reflecting a religious faith that man is created in the image of God and that the energy of the free individual is the most dynamic force in human affairs.

"On the other side, there are those who are committed to the belief that human goals are most satisfactorily met by a government of men who rule by edict. Their edicts are grounded in an ideology that rejects man as a spiritual being, and establishes the all-powerful state as the prime source of advancement and progress.

"The case of the competing ideologies is on trial before the bar of world opinion. Each claims that it seeks, above all else, an enduring peace and each strives to identify itself with the best interests of mankind. But the final judgment on both sides—and it may be years in coming—will depend as much on the pace of human progress evident within their borders as on peaceful relations with foreign countries.

"In this period of history, when the eyes of a critical world are constantly upon everyone, the power of example is far more colorful than that of precept.

"If the world is made to see that the provisions of our Constitution guaranteeing human rights are living things, enjoyed by all Americans, it will do much to turn the tide in our favor and, therefore, toward peace. This is what Jefferson had in mind when, in the Declaration of Independence, he wrote 'of a decent respect to the opinions of mankind.' Both of these great Americans recognized that there cannot be a stagnant peace. Change is the law of life, and unless there is peaceful change there is bound to be violent change.

"John Marshall's experience and sufferings as a Revolutionary soldier led him to equate peace with strength. He knew that peace could exist only by a people prepared and willing to fight for its preservation. 'The United States will only arm to defend their own rights,' he said. 'Neither their policy nor their interests permit them to arm in order to compel a surrender of the rights of others.'

"John Marshall's view of military preparedness—represented today by the commissioning of this submarine—was simple and direct: He envisioned the United States as a great and, with respect to her self-defense, a powerful nation. He believed her able to maintain her independence and, in terms that admonish us even today, believed that she must deserve to lose her independence 'if she permitted it to be wrested from her.'

"It is fitting, therefore, that the *John Marshall* should join the other vessels of the ballistic missile fleet named for Virginians—the *George Washington*, the *Patrick Henry*, the *Robert E. Lee*, the *Thomas Jefferson*, the *James Monroe*, and the *James Madison*—and lend further meaning to our determination not only to insure our own independence, but to obtain in the long sweep of history freedom and justice for all men."

That fleet and this ship are evidence of our intention to accomplish that mission. Both represent the will of the American people to enable freedom to grow and prosper wherever on this globe it is cultivated. They will pursue this cause in the tradition of the American Navy—in the spirit of John Paul Jones and his Bon Homme Richard—the spirit that has made our Navy our national protector from that day to this, and that so recently in the Coral Sea, in the Solomons and at Leyte restored the freedom of the seas to the people of the world. Their cruising range will be to the farthermost shores of the oceans. Their power will extend to the remotest regions of the earth. The crest of this one, a trident held securely in the strong arm of justice, will be a symbol of freedom to people everywhere. It will give meaning to the ancient words that were so dear to the heart of John Marshall, "veritas vincit—truth conquers."

Very respectfully,

J. B. HILDRETH,
Captain, USN Naval Aide.

How To Keep American Products Competitive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Secretary Dillon before the White House Conference on National Economic Issues which was made on May 22.

The subject of Secretary Dillon's speech is how to keep American products competitive in the world markets.

The Secretary's address merits the careful consideration of every Member of Congress. It is one of the best presentations that I have seen in regard to the administration's program to promote American business and commerce and to make it possible for us to increase our export market.

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

HOW TO KEEP AMERICAN PRODUCTS COMPETITIVE

Ladies and gentlemen, this subject of how to keep American products competitive in world markets is to me the single most important subject, the most important task in our whole balance-of-payments problem, and therefore is probably of more interest to me and the Treasury than anything else you are discussing here today. It is an all-encompassing subject.

I have just returned myself from 3 days in Rome at a conference that was organized by the American Bankers Association, called the Annual Monetary Conference, at which some 50 American bankers met with an equivalent number of their European counterparts, and which included the heads of the Central Banks of England, of Holland, of Germany, of Italy, of Switzerland, and the Deputy Head of the Bank of France. We had a pretty thorough discussion of all our international monetary problems and the balance of payments was high on the agenda.

A clear result came out of this conference, a clear consensus, at least among the European members, and that is that the item they were most concerned about, that they watched most carefully, was the course of prices in the United States, and as long as the United States could maintain basic price stability, they do not feel there is any very real problem and they have basic confidence in the United States.

I think that the general results of this conference were very helpful, because I think that the American people were, if anything, a little surprised at the confidence reflected by the European bankers. This was actually the same sort of reaction which I had found last September at the International Monetary Fund meeting in Vienna, and which had been considerably misunderstood.

Their point was that they watch prices, which is their real problem in Europe, and has been, and they didn't care too much, and they made this clear, about the details of our budget or our fiscal results, as long as they did not have an effect on our prices.

The fact that our wholesale prices today are lower than they were a year ago is to them the essential element, rather than the fact that we happen to have had a rather substantial budget deficit this year, which because it occurred in a time of slack, did not have an effect on prices.

They did have some worry about what they characterized—I'm now using European terms—as the excessive American flow of investment capital to Europe that is going on at the present time. But they did not have any very clear ideas as to what should be done about it, and many of them hoped that somehow it would abate before the situation became truly serious.

Now, to the subject of our meeting—how to be competitive. The answer is very simple. All you have to do is keep your prices steady or, if possible, lower them, and in doing this we will be competitive. Actually, over the past year, our price levels have been more steady and in some cases lower than the general level of European prices. They have had rapid wage increases which over the years have been absorbed in increased productivity, but beginning last year this began to catch up with them. Profit margins were narrowed and prices began to go up a little. And they went up faster than they did here, so it's very clear that our competitive position in the Common Market is somewhat better now than it was a year ago.

How to do this, of course, is the problem. A great many things are necessary, and I would like just to list a few of them.

First and foremost, I think if we are going to remain competitive over a long period of time, we have to attain and maintain reasonably full employment and operate our industrial plants at reasonably full capacity.

Another way of saying this is that we have to achieve a faster rate of economic growth. This will, of course, lead to higher profits, it will lead to lower costs, and naturally, in addition, it is vitally important here at home, since it will soak up a great deal of the excess unemployment which we now have, and have had for much too long. This is a fundamental objective of the administration, and is basic to our competitive position. And I think one of the reasons that the continental European economies have done so well and have been so competitive over the past years has been the fact that

they have continuously operated pretty close to capacity.

Now, to achieve and maintain capacity operation, one thing we must do is to avoid recessions. We have had periods of time over the past decade when we have operated at a very satisfactory rate, but we have had three or four recessions which, while much milder than they have been in the past, were sharper than those which have taken place in Europe. We do not feel that we have reached perfection in handling these yet. Although we have made great improvements, we think we can still do better. Therefore, an overall program to combat recession has been submitted, and we feel it should be enacted.

First is a permanent unemployment compensation bill, which is only simple justice, but also is obviously necessary because each time we have had a recession we have had to adopt a temporary bill to handle the situation. It would be much better if we had a proper law on our books permanently.

Second is authority, when recession strikes, to initiate prompt temporary and limited tax cuts. I have heard some discussion of this and some opposition to giving the authority to make these tax cuts to the President. I might say that that is not the essential point. The essential point is how to handle a recession and how to achieve a system whereby a temporary and limited tax cut could be used at the right time and for the right period. I think there is quite a measure of feeling, and even agreement, that this is probably the most effective and powerful weapon against a recession. The question is how to invoke it; what are the mechanics. Personally, I haven't found any way of doing it effectively other than giving the authority to the President under rules carefully laid down by the Congress. But if the Congress or anyone else can devise some other system, certainly the way it is put into effect we do not feel is essential. That part of the program which says it should be done by Presidential authority is not considered an essential element by the President.

The third element is temporary public works. This bill would under certain conditions, be used to expedite certain types of public works that can be started almost instantly and can be completed in less than a year. We have had poor experience with these public works increases in the past, because it has taken a long time to get them under way, and money has generally flowed out after the recession was over. But if we have advance authority, and it is narrowly limited to these types of things that can get under way quickly, we think it would be helpful.

All these things together should serve to minimize or, hopefully, work toward the elimination of recessions, as we have known them. I think nothing could give a greater boost than to that productivity and faster growth.

The next element in being competitive is to have efficient production. That means that we must have the most effective use both of our labor resources and of our capital resources. Mere full employment, which is important, is not enough. An example of that is the example of the last decade in Great Britain where they have had full employment, but where it is generally recognized that they do not, or have not yet, operated their labor in the most efficient manner, and they have not operated their plants in the most effective manner. So therefore, they have not been as competitive as they would like to be.

Full employment, certainly, does facilitate any adjustments that might be necessary to increase and to reach maximum labor efficiency. That is one of the reasons we put it first, because it is a concomitant of many of the other things that we wish. Also, it is necessary to have greater efficiency of capital, and this means more investment continuously in modern equipment to keep our plants more efficient and more completely modernized. We have lagged in this area in the last decade, and it seems, certainly, the European countries have put in generally about twice as much proportionately of their gross national product in modernization and new plant and equipment as we have, and have also grown much faster. There does seem to be a correlation in this area. More investment, certainly, does create jobs, it creates demand, and it helps to speed growth.

We are working in this area in the only two ways we know how. We are preparing—it will be ready some time at the end of June, or July at the latest—a complete revision of our administrative rulings on depreciation. This will shorten depreciable lives, will make much simpler the problem of management in figuring out schedules of replacement, and will make their relations with the Revenue Service much simpler. But this can only do part of the job. It can't meet the competition which is provided today by other industrial countries, all of which have special incentives in their tax codes for investment in machinery and equipment. And this, I may say, for whatever it is worth, is one of the few really clear-cut differences between the European system and our own system. We often look at Europeans and wonder why they have done better, why they are doing better in growth today than we are in the United States. It is, I am sure, a very complex matter, and many things are interrelated. But one of the few things that stand out as a clear-cut difference across the board is this fact of special incentives for investment which are present throughout Europe.

Now, we have suggested the investment credit as the best and the cheapest method of accomplishing this. It is used already, or a similar thing, the investment allowance, in a number of European countries, and it has been used there successfully. We hope that it is enacted. If it is, the combination of it and the depreciation revision will give us a position comparable to our European friends.

Next on our program is the overall tax reform, which we have talked about, which should be ready for consideration next year. This will involve an overall revision of the income rate structure and will be designed to speed growth and to increase consumer demand. And I think that actually the investment credit is the first step in this overall program and should be looked on as a part of this overall program, and not looked on just as one thing that is being done all by itself for growth in the tax field, because that is not true. What will follow next year will be equally important, and many will feel that it is more important, much more important.

Now, all of these things are of no avail unless we continue to avoid inflation and continue to avoid price increases. This means we must avoid price increases that come from cost push or pressures. Here wage rates, naturally, are highly important, and I think it is important that the general increases in wage rates that we have in coming years, right at this period, should come out and must come out of increases in labor productivity. In this area the guidelines that were furnished by the Council of Economic Advisers, I think, have been a great step forward. They certainly are highly commended in Europe, and are one of the chief reasons for which European economists who look at this country do have relative confidence in our policies, because we seem to be doing as good or better a job right now than they are doing in this general area.

But productivity also applies to capital, and any increases there in productivity of capital should also lead to improved profits. We recognize that profits are essential to our system. Our system has often been called the profit system. That is what it is. But in present circumstances it certainly is clearly better to have any needed increases in profit come from higher operating rates and come from more efficient operations, rather than from across the board price increases. We should use the greatest care about price increases, and, of course, there was a section in the Council of Economic Advisors' report adjacent to the guidelines on wage rates, which dealt with this question of price increases. It is perhaps a somewhat more complex problem, but I think it is one that we also have to watch, because you can't have your restraint all on one side. The restraint has to be across the board.

With all of these measures, I think we will be in pretty good shape. We do need, then, certain specific additional measures to get into the market so our prices can help us and so we can sell. Here is where, of course, the trade bill comes in, to see that the tariffs are not too high to vitiate our attempts to keep our prices down. Here is where the export insurance comes in, which we have created over the past year, and which, on the latest reports that we have, should lead to sales of exports by the United States in the neighborhood of four or five hundred million dollars this year, that would not have been paid without this insurance program.

Now, the total of the insurance program will be much larger than that over the course of the year, but some of those exports probably would have been made anyway. Here is where the expanded efforts of State and Commerce on distributing export information come in.

With all of these things being done, I do think we can have a rounded program which will keep our exports competitive, and also keep us competitive here on the home market to imports. I keep emphasizing the words "keep us competitive" because I think in many areas we already are competitive and we shouldn't lose sight of that. It is important to make the best of that and to keep the relatively good position that we have, with about a $3 billion surplus in our commercial exports.

Thank you.

Chicago Society Observes 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the Chicago Society of the Polish National Alliance observed its 50th anniversary. Almost 1,000 members and well-wishers of this splendid organization attended a banquet in the main ballroom of the Conrad Hilton Hotel to observe this anniversary.

The Chicago society is the largest organization of Polish-American businessmen and members of the various professions in the United States. During this

impressive ceremony, the great contributions that this organization has made toward the development of Chicago during the past 50 years were eloquently reviewed by several speakers. It is indeed an imposing record of service not only to Chicago, but to the Nation as a whole.

It gives me great pleasure today to call to the attention of my colleagues the memorable speech delivered by U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, who was the principal speaker at this impressive banquet.

Senator MUSKIE's remarks follow:

FIFTY YEARS' PERSPECTIVE

(Address by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, at 50th anniversary banquet of Chicago Society of the Polish National Alliance, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., Saturday, May 19, 1962)

To my way of thinking, there is nothing more symbolic of America than a celebration like this one tonight.

Here we are, looking backward to rekindle the culture and traditions of our special heritage from the land of our fathers overseas while at the same time contributing to a hopeful and productive future as Americans.

Politicians—and I count myself as one—are always quick to point out this wonderful paradox: that nowhere else on earth is it quite so easy for immigrants and their descendants to nurture deep emotional ties with their ancient homeland and still be at home in the country they adopted and which adopted them.

It is well to remember from time to time what our fellow citizens sometimes forget: that no small part of America's vitality and strength is rooted in the blood and sinew of men and women who had the vigor and the courage to reject oppression and inhumanity by tearing themselves away from a soil they deeply loved for the freedom and opportunity of an alien shore—an act of individual faith repeated thousands of times in the flowering of America.

From the time of Kosciusko and Pulaski until the present day, Poland has given its share of bravery, wisdom, muscle, culture, and genius to the United States, and, above all, that passion for freedom which, more than any other aspiration, unites us with the American dream.

The Poles, I think, also are adept at integrating themselves with American folkways while still retaining their capacity for fierce allegiance.

No less a person than the great Paderewski, who himself retained a lifelong love affair with America, had a favorite story which illustrates this fact:

"There was a big Polish traffic cop in New York," he would recall, "who halted a car that went through a stoplight. As he approached the driver, he saw to his embarrassment that it was a certain eminent Catholic bishop. 'O, I beg your Reverence's pardon,' said the officer. 'I just stopped your car to warn you that the cop at the next corner is a terrible black Protestant.' "

Perhaps this is not exactly the kind of service which for 50 crowded years has motivated the members of the Chicago Society Group of the Polish National Alliance as it worked to fulfill its ideals and objectives. But laughter and humor are also an important part of our Polish heritage.

Sometimes, as we regard the unknowable future, it may seem that we have precious little to laugh about. Yet it is impossible on an anniversary like this merely to look backwards.

You and your leaders, like Dr. Gorny and Mr. Peska, and Judge Adesko, can take honest pride, of course, in enumerating the achievements of the society during the past half century. You should laud the unselfish devotion of all those who have contributed so much to your charitable endeavors, to your patriotic and educational enterprises, to your monuments of which your beautiful clubhouse is certainly one, and to your impact on the social and cultural fabric of the great city of Chicago.

Even so, gathered here tonight on this golden anniversary of progress and achievement, none of us—neither you nor I—can escape the new challenge of tomorrow. For as Shakespeare tells us, what is past is prologue.

I see that inscription on the front of the National Archives in Washington every day as I drive down Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol. And, in preparing for this occasion, it stimulated me to consider how much of the future we might reasonably foretell out of the prologue of the past half century.

To begin with—I want you to know that I have done my homework.

Thanks to the Library of Congress and its microfilmed collection of old newspapers I can share with you some of the headlined concerns that occupied our national thoughts 50 years ago when the Chicago society was born.

In May 1912, Russia was in the headlines. Her massive effort to grow cotton in central Asia had failed. The Russians, said the New York Times, will have to depend, as before, on American produce for its cotton needs.

In May 1912, Japan was also making news. The U.S. Senate was alarmed over reports that Japan sought a coaling station on the west coast of Mexico to service its warships—a clear challenge to the Monroe Doctrine.

In May 1912, Cuba was very much in the news. Our treaty of reciprocity had expired—and the Cubans, especially the cigar-making industry—were nervous about our willingness to renegotiate the trade pact.

In May 1912, the infant Republic of China was already in trouble as robber-soldiers in the Canton area defied the Central Government amidst rumors of a plot to establish a new dynasty.

In May 1912, the British ordered 60 new flying machines and promised to raise the total to 100 as soon as their army and navy could train enough pilots.

In May 1912, even Berlin was making headlines. The kaiser's son had just bought a new American automobile thus heightening German panic over the invasion of American-made cars. Demands for a protective tariff were heard. Said one American car maker with considerable satisfaction: "Our prices are unbeatable in the fatherland."

In May 1912, Poland, too, was in the headlines. Its patriots were emerging everywhere to harrass the uneasy oppressors of Prussia, Russia, and Austria, anticipating fulfillment of Paderewski's heroic prophecy that "The hour of our freedom is about to strike."

I suspect, however, that none of these nuggets of news beguiled the ladies of Chicago more than an advertisement for something described only as "suffragette corsets."

Obviously, the catalog of news in any given month is likely to provide only a pale hint of the great ebb and flow of events and historic decisions.

As always, people were preoccupied with immediate episodes and urgent drama: The sinking of the *Titanic* * * * Scott's conquest of the South Pole * * * Teddy Roosevelt's Bull Moose bolt from the Republican Party.

There were tensions and portents, of course, mostly ignored and mostly misunderstood.

Before the year had ended, the Balkans would erupt into murderous war against Turkey and the crumbling Ottoman Empire. Yet in viewing this conflict there were very few in 1912 who could foresee the sequel of worldwide war only 2 years hence. Paderewski was one of the few when he predicted that "Within 5 years from the dust of this tortured soil will rise the Polish Phoenix."

At home, too, domestic tensions betrayed their presence.

The American Socialist Party, led by Eugene Debs, would win nearly 6 percent of the total vote in the 1912 presidential elections—the highest percentage ever achieved by the Socialists in this country—the John Birch Society to the contrary notwithstanding.

Yet many who would equate what they saw in the kaleidoscope of 1912 with what they see in the TV tube of 1962 have been tempted to conclude that by contrast with our contemporary turbulence the world of 50 years ago was a far more peaceful and stable era—a time frozen in historical tranquillity, like a fly in amber.

I submit this deduction is an illusion.

For just below its seemingly passive surface the world of 1912 bubbled with a ferment of all the accumulated evils of history.

There was social injustice, economic misery, political oppression, and human exploitation all over the globe. Poland was only one of many areas where a faceless and almost voiceless humanity yearned for something better than hunger, poverty, and hopeless servitude.

But 50 years ago many Americans were still insensitive as a people to such aspirations—partly out of limitations on their ability to communicate and travel, partly out of isolation, and partly because we still cherished so much scientific and historical error.

We didn't know it 50 years ago, but all these explosive ingredients were coming to a boil at the very point in time when human intelligence stood poised to crash through the barriers of myth and ignorance into the greatest flowering of technology the world has ever known.

Today, everything is exploding: population, knowledge, communications, resources, cities, space itself.

These are the forces of change which were unrecognized a half century ago. These are the forces which we have to understand and master today if we are to survive and flourish.

Abraham Lincoln put our modern dilemma into words a hundred years ago when he said: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do and how to do it."

Let us ask ourselves then where we are in 1962.

First, we live on a tiny planet inhabited by 100 other sovereign nations whose problems, through the sophistication of modern communication, land in our living rooms every hour on the hour.

We live on a planet that grows ever more crowded, where the rate of population growth has actually doubled since 1945. From the historical 1 percent a year, it has jumped to 2 percent annually—a rate increase which, even if it remains fixed at that level from here on, will still double our present world population of 3 billion souls and not in 50 years but in the next three decades alone.

In Africa and Asia, where the growth rate varies from 2 to 4 percent, such growth must inevitably wipe out any conceivable investment or foreign aid without regard to its effect on living standards, illiteracy and hunger.

We also live in a world of competition and challenge where the confrontation be-

tween communism and the West throws a dark shadow over all effort to achieve a coherent world order.

We live in a world of paradox where the threat of total annihilation and the solution of all our ancient ills may be found in the same scientific revolution.

We live in a world where the European trading empires of 50 years ago have been succeeded by a doctrine of self-determination first enunciated by Woodrow Wilson—a world where 900 million people have achieved independence from colonial rule in the past 20 years alone.

If we have learned anything from the past 50 years, we should have learned that there is as yet nothing orderly or predictable about the assorted convulsions of the present, where old hostilities, old systems and old myths are all dying at differing rates, where population pressures, racial hatreds and the impulses of new technology mingle in strange surges that respond to no one solution.

Yet there are fundamental directions—fundamental decisions we must make. Otherwise we may wind up fighting symptoms rather than causes in our struggle for a working world order.

I share with the British economist, Barbara Ward, a conviction that the three basic areas of major challenge are: (1) international order, (2) the developing world, and (3) the use of our abundance.

We are tending to answer the challenge of international order with an organized international society through a world mechanism which, as the League of Nations we rejected, and which as the United Nations we now heavily endow.

We are tending to answer the challenge of the developing world through special programs of aid and assistance which seem to have bought us more trouble than friendship.

We are tending to answer the challenge of our abundance through sustained programs of economic growth.

Yet in each of these three directions we move uneasily and with distrust, inhibited by attitudes inherited from an unscientific past and by instintive fears of relinquished sovereignty, of deviations from our old methods of trade and of the menace of big government.

Will we continue, despite all our misgivings, to accept these challenges as the deep historical pressures of change and upheaval they are or will we try to retreat disastrously into the smugness of a past that is dead and gone forever?

Let us dare to look ahead 50 years—to the world of 2012.

Speculation on the shape of the future has its hazards, of course, but it is neither idle nor futile. It may seem incredible, for example, but away back in 1835, Alexis de Tocqueville, the shrewd French observer who wrote the monumental study of "Democracy in America," wrote in these words: "There are at the present time two great nations in the world which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front among the nations, and the world learned of their existence and their greatness at almost the same time * * * their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

De Tocqueville could not know that Marxian communism would be a controlling factor in the formation of the 20th century Russian State, but on the basis of population, geography, and economic resources, he could forecast the importance of that vast land to the east of Europe as well as that of the United States.

De Tocqueville's prediction also suggests that political systems may reflect, but do not necessarily determine, the relative power of states.

We must bear this in mind as we ask ourselves what our world will be like in 2012.

What will our headlines say? What will our international TV news reports reflect?

Perhaps we may find a meaningful portent of the future in these imaginary items from the press reports of May 19, 2012, A.D.:

"Congress refuses to increase membership in the House of Representatives—Votes to maintain 435-seat limit despite population gains."

The United States will be a more crowded place in 50 years. Instead of a population of 185 million, we will have a population of 400 million. This will strain not only our capabilities to house, feed, employ, and educate ourselves; it will also strain the institutions of representative democracy.

"United Nations Commission on Moon Colony at impasse. Soviets and Chinese in bitter debate over space allocations."

Even more explosive gains in world population may be expected, especially in those areas which are now struggling to enter the industrial and technological age. We may find human mobility extending to interplanetary travel. New power alinements and rivalries will produce conflicts strange to our midcentury eyes.

"Chicago protests Canadian delay in okaying additional water pipelines from Hudson Bay. Mayor warns Lake Michigan will soon be an empty desert unless flow from north is increased by 10 billion gallons a day."

The emergence of great and continuous urban belts with literally millions of people will put strains on our most precious resources undreamed of even in our own time. The complications of such mundane matters as water, sewage, food supplies, and transportation will approach mass chaos without the most careful long-range planning and cooperative international enterprise.

"Karkovsky seeks U.S. aid in satellite crisis. Russian Premier asks help on control of potential Indonesian missile bases."

Nations which today are struggling for a place in the sun may become potential threats to international peace through the acquisition of new weapons and advance technologies. Fifty years ago, Russia was in the throes of the industrial revolution. Today she rivals the advanced Western nations in technical and scientific capability. We cannot be complacent about the capacity of backward nations to catch up to us in important areas.

"Pirovsky denounces Russian speech curbs—new conservatives demand United States clamp down on college debates. Free speech issue top college issue in Russia and United States."

The rivalries between the totalitarian countries and the parliamentary democracies will not end, but each will be subject to strains peculiar to their own histories and conditions.

And finally:

"Japan curbs textile imports. Alleges Atlantic Economic Community disrupts market."

As a famous statesman once said, the more things change, the more they really are the same.

Our position in the world and our relationships to the rest of the world, are the product of many forces. They affect our economic health. They affect our security. They affect our attitudes toward other people and other lands. They affect the attitudes of others toward us.

The events and trends of the past half century have demonstrated to us that we cannot isolate ourselves from their impact; that our future is inevitably entangled with them; and that our own self-interest requires that we undertake to exert our influence upon them.

The forces generated by population growth; the forces generated by the tremendous acceleration of science and technology; the forces generated by an aggressive Communist conspiracy; the forces generated by underprivileged hundreds of millions who have learned to dream of a better life which promises escape from hunger, disease, and poverty; the forces generated by the emerging nationalism of colonial peoples; all of these are of such magnitude, that we can ignore them only at our peril. They will not pass us by because we will it. The oceans will not shield us from them. Great as are our resources, there is no application or combination of them which can render us immune to the destructive effects of such forces running wild.

We cannot escape the responsibility, in our own self-interest, for controlling them, for minimizing their destructive potential, for diverting them to constructive goals; and we cannot discharge this responsibility alone or unaided.

Being a part of the world, we have no choice but to influence it. Our influence can be positive or negative. It cannot be neutral. The means for exerting this influence is our foreign policy.

There are no easy policy answers to the wide variety and diversity of perplexing questions which are tossed up by the ebb and flow of the forces to which I have referred.

It is relatively easy to say that we will stand firm before Communist aggression. It is more difficult to apply such a general policy to the specific problem of distant, almost unreachable Laos.

It is relatively easy to say that we will not retreat from the objective of German reunification. It is more difficult to conceive of circumstances we might be able to create which would persuade the Soviet Union to endorse such an objective.

It is relatively easy to say that we endorse the principle of self-determination for the colonial peoples of the world. It is more difficult to determine how it should apply in such complex situations as the Congo, where the native population was not prepared for sudden nationhood.

Difficult as it is to apply general policy, our relationship to other people will not rest on a firm and stable base unless it rests upon some fundamental beliefs and principles. We may have to compromise them in specific situations. We may have to postpone their implementation in specific countries. We may have to do business with leaders and governments whose philosophy is inconsistent with our own. Our decision in each such case should be based upon our judgment as to whether the specific expediency is more consistent with our long-term goal than other possible alternatives, rather than whether or not it is consistent with perfection.

Our long-term goals are easy to agree upon: The survival and growth of our country; the survival of freedom here at home and its expansion abroad; peace.

History should have taught us that we can never be sure that we are moving toward them so long as conditions anywhere in the world restrict human beings in need from moving toward basic decency and dignity.

The hungry will seek food.

The land poor will seek space.

The underprivileged will seek opportunity.

The poor will envy the rich; and the rich will fear the poor.

The greedy will be grasping, the starving will be desperate, the ambitious will be ruthless.

It is elemental needs and these elemental passions which create the great pressures for change. No one really knows what the world will be like 50 years from now. But no one who is at all sensitive to what has happened in the last 50 years can doubt that tomorrow's boundaries, tomorrow's alliances, the orientation of tomorrow's economic and military and political power, yes, the very existence of a tomorrow for making, depends upon how well the world learns to mobilize and apply its resources to the hopes and the needs of its billions of individual human beings. Whether they live in freedom or in slavery, whether they are literate or illiterate, whether they are white or black they hold in their minds and hearts and souls the power to shape the world of 50 years from now—the power generated by their dreams and their drives.

These restless urgings can be permitted to drift into destructive channels leading to chaos, explosive antagonism, and continuing and increasing violence.

Or, they can be directed into constructive channels leading to broader understanding, increasing tolerance, expanding freedom, and peace.

Which course will the world take? Can we influence it? Must we try? What is your answer? Your answer will be our foreign policy.

National Lottery Legislation: A $10 Billion Myth and a National Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on May 17 I addressed the House and exposed the failure of the sponsors of the national lottery bill to raise revenue to request a hearing and reports from the appropriate agencies. I documented my charge by a letter to me from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means which stated flatly that no request for hearings had been made on H.R. 2007; and that, if a request were made at this late date, because of the heavy schedule no hearings or consideration could be had this year.

Subsequent speeches during special orders on May 22 reaffirmed my charge of the failure to request hearings.

A reading of the provisions of H.R. 2007, one of the lottery bills to raise revenue and reduce taxes, indicates that consideration of the bill would be fruitless and would explode the exaggerated estimate of revenue to be derived. The sponsor of the bill H.R. 2007, the Representative from the 25th District of New York, Mr. FINO, has on many occasions in speeches to the House overestimated revenues to be derived and on innumerable occasions asserted that $10 billion could be raised if Congress would not be so stubborn and so hypocritical and would adopt his measure, H.R. 2007. A reading of this measure and a reading of the present State statutes compel one conclusion, and that is: that, instead of $10 billion being raised, not even one thin dime could or would be collected under the provisions of the lottery bill proposed.

On page 3, line 9, of H.R. 2007, there is found the following language:

No ticket of participation shall be sold in any State, or in a political subdivision of a State, where such sale is illegal.

Research by me and by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress discloses that lottery is illegal and outlawed in every State of the Union and in the District of Columbia. The only possible exception is Nevada where gambling is permitted, but lottery is not mentioned. Thus under the terms of the bill introduced by the gentleman from the 25th District of New York no lottery ticket could be bought or sold in any one of the States of the United States. Where then in the United States could the national lottery operate? Nowhere. Where could the exaggerated revenue of $10 billion be obtained in the United States? Nowhere. Where then is the source of funds to reduce the national debt as proposed by the national lottery sponsors? Nowhere.

I submit the references to the constitutions and the statutes of the States of the Union which declare lotteries to be illegal in the United States:

Alabama: article IV, section 65; Code of Alabama, 1940, 14; section 275.

Alaska: Alaska Comp. Law, 1949, sections 65:13-1 to 65:13-6.

Arizona: Arizona Revised Statutes, 1956, section 13-436.

Arkansas: article 19, section 14; Arkansas Statute, 1947, section 41-2025.

California: article IV, section 26; West's Annotated California Code, 1956; Pen., sections 319-326.

Colorado: article XVIII, section 2; Colorado Revised Statutes 1953.

Connecticut: General Statutes 1949 Revised, section 8667.

Delaware: article 2, section 17; Delaware Code Annotated 1953, 11; section 661.

District of Columbia: Title 22, section 1501; District of Columbia Code.

Florida: article 3, section 23; Florida Statute 1955, section 849.09.

Georgia: article 1, paragraph IV; Code of Georgia Annotated 1948, section 2-204.

Hawaii: Section 288.2, page 1525, volume 2, chapter 288; Revised Laws of Hawaii.

Idaho: Article 3, section 20; Idaho Code, 1948, section 18-4902.

Illinois: Article 4, section 27; Smith-Hurd, Illinois Annotated Statutes, 38; section 406.

Indiana: Article 15, section 8; Burns Indiana Statutes Annotated 1956, section 10-2302.

Iowa: Article 3, section 28; Iowa Code Annotated, 1950, section 726.8.

Kansas: Article 15, section 3; General Statutes of Kansas, 1949, section 21-1501.

Kentucky: Section 226; Baldwin's Revised Statutes Annotated, 1955, section 436.360.

Louisiana: Article 19, section 8; West's Louisiana Statutes Annotated, 1952, section 33.401 and 4.7.

Maine: Maine Revised Statutes, 1954, C. 139, section 18.

Maryland: Article 3, section 36; Annotated Code of Maryland, 1951, article 27, section 423.

Massachusetts: Annotated Laws of Massachusetts, 1956, C. 271, section 7.

Michigan: Article 5, section 44; Michigan Statutes Annotated. 1954, section 28.604.

Minnesota: Article 4, section 31; Minnesota Statutes Annotated, 1947, section 614.01.

Mississippi: Section 98; Mississippi Code 1942 Annotated, 1957 edition, section 2270.

Missouri: Article 3, section 39; Vernon's Annotated Missouri Statutes, 1953, section 563.374.

Montana: Article XIX, section 2; Revised Code Montana, 1947, sections 94-3001 to 94-3011.

Nebraska: Article III, section 24; Revised Statutes Nebraska, 1943, sections 16-226, 14-102, 15-258, 17-120.

Nevada: Article IV, section 24; Nevada Revised Statutes, 1957, section 462.020.

New Hampshire: New Hampshire Revised Statutes Annotated, 1955, section 577.1.

New Jersey: Article 4, section 7; New Jersey Statutes Annotated, 1953, section 2A:121-1.

New Mexico: New Mexico Statutes, 1953, section 40-22-13.

New York: Article I, section 9; McKinney's Con. Laws of New York Annotated, 1944 Pen. section 1371.

North Carolina General Statutes, 1953, section 14-290.

North Dakota: North Dakota Revised Code, 1943, section 53-0401.

Ohio: article XV, section 6; Page's Ohio Revised Code Annotated, 1954, section 2915.10.

Oklahoma: Oklahoma Statutes Annotated, 1937, 21; section 1052.

Oregon: article XV, section 4; Oregon Revised Statutes, 1955, section 167,405.

Pennsylvania: Purdon's Pennsylvania Statutes Annotated, 18; section 4612.

Rhode Island: article IV, section 2; General Laws, 1948, 612; section 1.

South Carolina: article 17, section 7; Code of Laws, 1952, section 16-501.

South Dakota: South Dakota Laws of 1939, section 24.0201.

Tennessee: article 11, section 5; Tennessee Code Annotated, 1955, section 29-2017.

Texas: article 3, section 47; Vernon's Texas Penal Code, 1952, section 654.

Utah: article VI, section 28; Utah Code Annotated, 1953, section 76-27-10.

Vermont: Vermont Statutes Revised, 1947, section 8545.

Virginia: article IV, section 60; Code of Virginia, 1950, section 18-301.

Washington: article 2, section 24; Revised Code, section 9.59.010.

West Virginia: article 6. section 36; West Virginia Code of 1955, section 6104.

Wisconsin: article 4, section 24; Wisconsin Statutes, 1949, section 348.01.

Wyoming: Wyoming Comp. Statutes Annotated, 1945, section 9-815.

For almost 10 years lottery bills have been introduced by the present sponsors. Numerous speeches costing the taxpayers much money have been made and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about a lottery bill asking Congress to adopt this legislation. Perusal and study of the lottery measures disclose that the provisions of H.R. 2007, the Fino lottery bill, negates the purpose of the proposal and that no funds could legally be raised. For 10 years a mountain has labored mightily and it has brought forth not even a mouse.