for a pension under existing laws. These 631,000 new pensioners must be earning a minimum of $3,000 a year already and the bill gets, not just a portion of $102.37, but $1,200 a month. The $102.37 would get, but the entire $102.37 a month.

So, from among the 631,000 proposed new pensioners, the very minimum case would be someone who now has $3,001 a year in income. This veteran of World War I would receive an extra $1,200 a year from H.R. 3745, bringing his income up to $4,201 a year, not counting what he may be receiving from social security, from his union pension fund, from his company’s pension fund, from railroad retirement or from whatever other pension income he may be getting. I might add that $4,201, or the minimum income accruing to each new pensioner embraced by this absurd bill, is more than $4,200 a year higher than the income level of 84 percent of the male population of 65 years of age or older.

And, if this bill were passed, who would be paying for it? The taxpayer, of course. Where do the taxes come from? Eighty-one and nine-tenths percent of all income taxes come from individuals and almost half of all the people in the United States paying income taxes reported an adjusted gross income of less than $4,000.

If we were to approve of H.R. 3745 we would find ourselves in a morally indefensible position. And, frankly, the position would be politically indefensible as well. We would have to explain to our constituents why we voted for legislation which would force half the taxpayers of the United States to contribute to the support of those who are already making more money than they are.

Of course, I have been talking about minimum income allowable under H.R. 3745. The maximum income allowable under the bill would be $3,600 for a World War I veteran with dependents. The extra $1,200 a year would boost this man’s income to $4,800 a year, plus whatever pensions and annuities he might be receiving from any source whatsoever.

We will routinely have cases where the veteran has $5,000 to $6,000 and gets $1,200 a year in pensions. As we all know, this income could be considerable. It is not rare in these days to find our senior citizens getting pensions or annuities from two or more sources. No matter what the size of these pensions, these people would still be eligible for the extra handout.

Let me cite an example close to home. Under certain circumstances, a Member of this House would receive, under our own pension plan, an annuity which the average citizen would consider not only adequate, but handsome. But if such a retired Member were also a veteran of World War I, even if he had only 3 months’ service, he could collect this $102.37 a month pension, just as long as he managed to keep his income from fees, rentals, dividends and other sources under $3,000 a year. If this was a problem, he could shift some of it to his wife. I suggest that this is not the purpose for which any other pension plan conceived by the mind of man was ever intended.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, this startling fact about H.R. 3745. Under its provision, all World War I veterans, younger than 65 and who are receiving less than $3,000 a year in wages, and now on the pension rolls would receive very little help. All those receiving more than $3,000, but less than $4,000, would receive the entire $102.37 extra a month and, of course, would not be required to count social security or other retirement payments. Under this weird reasoning, the less you are receiving now, the less you will get; the more you are receiving now, the more you will get. In other words—‘‘them that has, gets.’’

The Veterans’ Administration estimates that in fiscal year 1963 the present pension program will cost the taxpayers $1,783,681,000, of which 78 percent or $1,386,489,000 will go to World War I veterans, their widows and children. If H.R. 3745 were enacted, almost $1 billion additional would be imposed on our pension bill.

The Internal Revenue statistics for the tax year 1959—the latest figures available for this purpose—show that there were approximately 21½ million individual returns filed showing a gross income of less than $3,000. The revenue from this group amounted to $1,665,759,000. This is $116 million less than will be forced to operate on a program we already have and it is $1 billion, 18 million less than it would take to pay for the pension program we would have if H.R. 3745 were passed and enacted into law.

H.R. 3745 is grossly unfair and discriminatory as between veterans. I think there are none who would deny that the service-connected veteran and surviving widow and children of service-connected veterans deserve first consideration. If a veteran is totally and permanently disabled from a service-connected cause he only receives $2,700 a year. If he is 50 percent disabled, he receives $100 a month. A widow who lost a husband in the war gets about $87 a month. An orphan, who lost both his father and in the war and subsequently lost a mother gets $70 a month. Two dependent parents living together, who lost a son in the war, get $75 a month if their combined income is not over $2,400 a year. Yet, we are being told that the present income limit of $3,000 for the married, non-service-connected veterans, who served 90 days, is too low and that we must raise these income limits.

We have been trying since early last year to get a modest service-connected increase bill through the Congress. This bill would cost less than $100 million, yet we have not been able to get it through. Now an effort is being made to get a $1 billion non-service-connected pension bill passed which would give better treatment to the 90-day, non-service-connected soldier than the seriously disabled service-connected veteran receives. Mr. Speaker, this is grossly unfair and I do not see how this Congress could ever accept such a proposal, regardless of the amount of political pressure that is applied.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2164. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the First World Conference on National Parks, and for other purposes.

S. 3203. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3755. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act of 1913, and for other purposes.

H.R. 941. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; and
ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 866. An act to provide greater protection against the interception and dissemination of messages of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes; S. 1834. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 866), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes;

S. 3003. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia;

S. 3266. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "an act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1929, as amended (2 U.S.C. 158), to authorize the deposits to the Library of Congress and to raise the statutory limitation provided for in that section;

S. 3350. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to make advances on U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury;

S. 3350. An act to amend the act of August 14, 1954, relating to the District of Columbia hospital center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act;

H. R. 2444. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2444. An act to amend section 303(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 by increasing per diem rates and to provide reimbursement under certain circumstances for actual expenses incurred in travel;

H. R. 1045. An act to provide for the conveyance of 39 acres of Minnesota Chippewa tribal land on the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation to the State of Minnesota; S. 1106. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands on the Eastern Cherokee Reservation in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina;


HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 8728. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9411. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; and


LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to a total of 100 minutes.

Mr. Humphrey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The President pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. Pearson. Mr. President, the Bar Association of the State of Kansas at its recent annual meeting at Topeka, Kan., urged that an act to amend and extend monetary limitations upon the jurisdiction of the district courts in civil actions against the United States, be reported to the Senate as follows:

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

WHEREAS 28 U.S.C. 1346(a) (3) (popularly known as the Tucker Act) limits the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in contract actions against the United States to claims of $10,000 and less, notwithstanding other grants of unlimited jurisdiction to such courts in tort or in contract actions against the United States; and

WHEREAS this jurisdictional limitation is burdensome to lawyers and litigants in that it requires larger claims to be tried in the Court of Claims in Washington, D.C., rather than in the forum of the claimant's residence or in the forum where the contract may have been executed; and

WHEREAS a specialized tribunal has not been found to be necessary or desirable to determine Government Liability in noncontract actions or in contract actions involving claims of $3,000 or less; and

WHEREAS recent enlargements in the Federal judiciary should permit these claims to be tried expeditiously in district courts if claimants could elect to bring them in such courts rather than in the Court of Claims:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

Resolved by the Bar Association of the State of Kansas at its annual meeting at Topeka, Kan., on May 19, 11, 1962,

1. That the executive council memorialize the Congress of the United States to remove monetary limitations upon the jurisdiction of the district courts in civil actions against the United States; and

2. That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators Frank Carlson and James B. Pearson; Representatives William Avery, Floyd Breeding, Robert Dale, Robert Ellsworth, Walter F. George, and Garner Shriver; Attorney General Robert Kennedy; and to the Honorable Alfred F. Murrah, chief judge, 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Passed unanimously by the general assembly of the Bar Association of the State of Kansas in its annual meeting on May 14, 1962, at Topeka, Kan.

HARRY O. JANICK, President.

JOHN W. SHAW, Executive Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

S. 1106. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California (Rept. No. 1630).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:


BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3474. A bill for the relief of Cathie Lee Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for Mr. STENNIS):

S. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution proposing and submitting to the Congress of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to H.R. 12154, which is the sugar bill, or act, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

These amendments will not both be adopted, since they appear at the same point in the bill. They are different means of achieving my purpose in offering the amendments, which is to protect the American consumer in the matter of the price of sugar.

I ask that the amendments to the bill be printed and lie upon the desk, notwithstanding the fact that the bill itself will be reported to the Senate only tonight.
Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], chairman of the Committee of Public Works, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated April 17, 1962, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of Public Works, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of programs vital to the welfare of the country. I wish to call particular attention to the statement made in the New York Times, which appears today in the New York Times.

I wish to call particular attention to the statement made in the New York Times, which appears today in the New York Times. This does not mean that the Canadian crisis does not have its lessons for us. But there is no need to panic and cut back on programs vital to growth. Foreign confidence must be maintained; but this is best done by demonstrating that the American economy is competitive and increased efficiency depends on expansion. Our problem is not a question of living beyond our means but of insuring that we utilize all the resources in men and machinery that are now lying idle.

Mr. President, I am particularly struck with the cogency and pertinence of the conclusions of the costs because we have among us a few nervous individuals who feel that the sole solution to the economic problems before the country is to cut back upon programs which, in my opinion, are vital to the welfare of the country.

I agree with the thought expressed in the concluding sentence, that:

Our problem is not a question of living beyond our means but of insuring that we utilize all the resources in men and machinery.

And materials, facilities, and resources that are now lying idle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1962]

The Canadian Lesson

Canada's financial crisis is being pictured as an omen of what the United States faces if we do not get our own house in order. The weakness of the Canadian dollar does not mean that the Canadian crisis does not have its lessons for us.

Mr. President, I am particularly struck with the cogency and pertinence of the conclusions of the costs because we have among us a few nervous individuals who feel that the sole solution to the economic problems before the country is to cut back on programs which, in my opinion, are vital to the welfare of the country.

I agree with the thought expressed in the concluding sentence, that:

Our problem is not a question of living beyond our means but of insuring that we utilize all the resources in men and machinery.

And materials, facilities, and resources that are now lying idle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1962]

The Canadian Lesson

Canada's financial crisis is being pictured as an omen of what the United States faces if we do not get our own house in order. The weakness of the Canadian dollar does not mean that the Canadian crisis does not have its lessons for us.
Rostow, counselor of the State Department and Chairman of its important Policy Planning Council, was called before an appropriate committee to explain, as its reported author, a highly controversial foreign policy document which has been making the rounds at top levels within the administration, and here on the Senate floor. This 28-page document, long, reportedly, and it is titled "Basic National Security Policy," as an outline of the administration's grand strategy for the next set of foreign affairs for the coming years.

The Senate from Illinois has eloquently spoken here of Mr. Rostow's assumptions that the Soviet Union's policies are mellowing, and are even on the verge of becoming honorable, and asserts there is little or no intelligence support for the theories advanced in this new policy document, prepared for President Kennedy and the National Security Council. The Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater) has similarly spoken, terming the theme of this foreign policy statement as one of the most amazing thesis is this: That both the United States and Russia are losing power and that an area of overlapping interests is developing between them.

"Mr. Rostow sees no victory by the United States in any conflict, only a victory by the Russian people over the United States, per capita and soft capitalism over communism. In fact, Mr. Rostow is a man of little hope and the last person in my opinion who should have been chosen for the all-important task of directing the continuing review of our foreign policy.

"The basic philosophy of successful conflict is always to pursue a winning course through death, and to always change the losing game. Every high school coach, every big league manager knows this. But apparently our State Department planners do not."

ANSWER IS OBVIOUS

"If Mr. Rostow's assumption, that the Soviet Union is softening is correct, then what caused it to mellow? To me the answer is that we are living in an era in which we have ever gotten anywhere with the Soviet Union; the only times it has ever mellowed—has been when the United States was tough. Logic would say that Mr. Rostow is recommending a course entirely diametric to American interests.

"How does Mr. Rostow explain the recent Russian breaking of the moratorium on nuclear testing, its recent announcement that it will test a 150-megaton bomb in retaliation for our resumption of testing?"

"Does the presence of our Armed Forces in Thailand or Vietnam indicate the Communists are mellowing? I think the Senate is entitled to know."

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 21, 1962]

ROSTOW POLICY PLAN RIDDLED BY GOLDSWATER—SHRIEK WITH GREAT DANGER, SENATOR (By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 20—Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, told the Senate today that the United States would be launched on a new, hazardous and futile course if future foreign policy is based on the assumption that Soviet policy is mellowing.

"This assumption, reported as the theme of a foreign policy guide prepared for President Kennedy by Walt W. Rostow, Chairman of the State Department Policy Planning Council, is fraught with great danger, Goldwater said.

He joined Senator Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, and the minority leader, in demanding that Rostow be questioned by a Senate committee "at the earliest possible time."

"I have talked to a number of the Administration's foreign policy experts, and it is my opinion that a number of them do not know what is best for them, the country," he remarked. "It is part and parcel with the idea that American people must be brainwashed into changing their views for their own good.

"The American people may not have the same level of 'sophistication' that the New Frontier insists upon but they do know that the most important thing for them is that the Communists cannot be trusted. They know that apassment in the present world crisis is of one piece with a policy of surrender."
Goldwater placed in the record materials prepared on April 21, 1957 about Mr. Rostow, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for International Study, which he is dean of the Law School at Yale University, who has been mentioned as a potential nominee for a Supreme Court appointment.

[From the Dallas Morning News, June 20, 1962]

Ms. Rostow to the Stand

Ever since somebody—we think it was Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina—first charged that the State Department is really a no-win situation for various congressional committees and individual Members of Congress have been trying to improve it. Mr. Rostow, along with the President, has been a chief architect of that policy, and now he wants to be called to the stand to testify.

Most of these attempts have met with limited success.

Now Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, has suggested that Walt W. Rostow be called to the stand to testify that Congress call Rostow to the stand to see if he has refused to release the document—even though the Supreme Court has said that the Communists are mellowing and will not use force to take over any other part of the world. (Rostow must have had more than just a change in the administration's foreign policy, he should be able to do something useful.)

In yesterday's editorial, the News reported the following, information.

The reason for Senator Dirksen's proposal that Congress call Rostow to the stand is that he is the respondent for the Chicago Tribune, has provided a detailed analysis of the proposals that have come to the Senate, and has drawn most of the following information.

In addition to recommendations that we recognize Red China and East Germany, pull out our troops from Korea, and give the President power to move our forces anywhere in the world, there are also recommendations that we should be more cooperative.

In no event should we ever encourage or support the Communists in the satellite nations. If we come to an agreement with the Soviet Union, we might advance a program which does not require negotiations.

Our treatment of Soviet satellite nations should be gentle—we should refrain from criticizing them, continue to give them aid, open up trade channels with them and encourage our Western European allies to be more cooperative.

The Court has ruled that those pupils who wish to do so may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each school day, according to Justice Potter Stewart, because I think he puts the whole question in the proper perspective. I wish the majority of the Court had heeded his opinion on this issue.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. President, the decision of the Supreme Court yesterday respecting the matter of prayers in the public schools of New York has many distressing aspects, and I find myself very unhappy about that majority decision.

The minority opinion, expressed by Justice Potter Stewart, was printed in full in the New York Times this morning, and I ask unanimous consent that it may appear following my remarks this morning in the body of the Record.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. President, Justice Stewart points out the many implications in which prayer is required by Federal law. Every Senator, when he takes his oath of office, pledges himself to fulfill his duties with the help of Almighty God. The same is true in the House of Representatives. A few years ago—I think in 1954—in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, we inserted the words "under God." I think this decision of the Supreme Court is most unfortunate and divisive and quite unnecessary, and I hope that those who are interested in this subject will heed the opinion of Justice Stewart, because I think he puts the whole question in the proper perspective.

I wish the majority of the Court had heeded his opinion on this issue.

Disent);rning opinion by Justice Stewart

A local school board in New York has provided that those pupils who wish to do so may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each school day, according to Justice Potter Stewart, because I think he puts the whole question in the proper perspective.
simple prayer, the New York authorities have established "an official religion."

With all respect, I think the Court has missed the essential constitutional principles. I cannot see how an "official religion" is established by letting those who want to say a prayer at the start of the day do so. The question is not whether the wishes of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the freedom to pray. It is, rather, in the spiritual heritage of our Nation.

The Court's historical review of the quarrels over the Book of Common Prayer in England or any parallel case on the issue before us in this case. England had then and has now an established church. Equally undeniable is the fact that the Federal Governments are without official church in our own States. For we deal here not with the establishment of a state church, which would, of course, be constitutionally impermissible, but with whether schoolchildren who want to begin their day by joining in prayer must be prohibited from doing so. Moreover, I think that the Court's task in this as in all areas of separation of Church and State, is not relativistic by the uncritical invocation of metaphors like the "wall of separation," a phrase drawn from the First Amendment. What is relevant to the issue here is not the history of an established church in 16th century England or in 18th century America, but the history of the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our Government.

PRAYERS IN GOVERNMENT

At the opening of each day's session of this Court we stand, while one of our officials recites a portion of the Bible. Since the days of John Marshall our Crier has said, "God save the United States and this honorable Court." Both the Senate and the House of Representatives have their daily sessions with prayer. Each of our Presidents, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has, upon assuming his office asked the protection, and help of God.

The Court today says that the State and Federal Governments are without constitutional power to prescribe any particular form of words to be recited by any group of the American people on any subject touching our Government. The Star-Spangled Banner," made our national anthem by act of Congress in 1931, contains the words: "Blest with victory and Peace, may the Heav'n rescued land Praise the pow'r that hath made and preserved us a nation. Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just, and this be our motto 'In God is our trust.'"

In 1864 Congress added a phrase to the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag so that it now contains the words "one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all." In 1952 Congress enacted legislation calling upon the President each year to proclaim a national day of prayer. Since 1864 we have "in God is our trust" have been impressed on our coins.

Countless similar examples could be listed, but there is no need to belabor the obvious. It was all summed up by this Court just 19 years ago in a single sentence: "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." Spevak v. Cleveland, 343 U.S. 306, 313.

I do not believe that this Court, or the Congress, or any other authority has by the policies and practices I have mentioned established an "official religion" in violation of the Constitution. What the State of New York has done so in this case. What each has done has been to recognize and to follow the deeply entrenched and highly cherished spiritual traditions of our Nation—tradi tions which come down to us from those who almost 200 years ago avowed their "firm reliance on the protection of divine providence" when they proclaimed the Freedom and independence of this brave new world. I dissent.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST IMPORTS OF U.S. PRODUCTS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, as we prepare to consider trade policy legislation, there is one item I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Under trade agreements, restrictions extend in the past, we have gained certain tariff reductions from other countries in return for concessions we have made. However, one fact has been that devices other than tariffs and duties have been used by many foreign nations to discriminate against imported products.

I have done a brief research job—and a hastily one, I am afraid—but it points out some of the mechanisms used which are known by different names. For instance, permits are still used in Great Britain, which must be granted by the government before any foreign products can be imported. While there is no specific duty or tariff imposed, the necessity of securing a permit, for instance, effectively prohibits U.S. coal from being sold in that country.

I ask unanimous consent that a short analysis I have had prepared be printed in the Record following my remarks.

Analysis ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

DEVICES, OTHER THAN TARIFFS AND DUTIES CURRENTLY USED BY FOREIGN NATIONS TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST IMPORTED PRODUCTS

There is a tendency to assume that the negotiation of trade agreements between nations deals largely, or principally, with the tariff duties as levied thereon. However, one fact has been that imported goods are subject to other discriminatory devices than their counterparts in most European countries to provide longer wear and more trouble-free operation.

Annual road tax: A device, such as used in Italy, where vehicles are taxed annually on the engine hp. The disadvantage to U.S. vehicles, with their large engines, is compounded by the fact that this tax is constant and does not diminish with the age of the car.

Sales tax: A device, such as used in Portugal, where taxes are levied on the basic retail price of the import, separate and distinct from duties charged on the import.

Import tax: A device, such as used in Greece, where a levy is made upon the c.i.f. (cost, insurance, and freight) value of the imported product. Following our remarks.

Luxury tax: A device, such as used in Greece, where a tax is imposed on the c.i.f. value of certain foreign imports.

Primage tax: A device, such as used in Australia, where additional taxes are levied against certain types of products. This device is usually not imposed to imports from other Commonwealth nations.

Turnover equalization tax: A device, such as used in the Federal Republic of Germany, where a tax separate and apart from duties and tariffs is imposed on the duty paid value of the selected imports.

Customs stamp tax: A device, such as used in France, where a tax is imposed on the total of all customs charges.

Compensatory import tax: A device, such as used in Italy, where a tax on the duty and additional tax paid is levied against selected imports.

Fiscal tax: A device, such as used in Spain, where a tax on the duty and additional tax paid value of selected foreign imports.

Value added tax: A device, such as used in France, where a tax is imposed on the value added from duties and tariffs, is levied upon the importation of certain selected items such as small motors and compressors.

Fiscal levy: A device, such as used in Switzerland, where a tax separate and apart from duties and tariffs, is levied upon the duty paid value of selected imports.

Stamp tax: A device, such as used in Switzerland, where a tax is imposed upon all charges against sales companies. This tax, which appears on the Swiss customs receipt.

Tariff quota: Under a tariff quota, imports of a commodity under a certain size are permitted to enter a country at a special low rate of duty but any imports in excess of that amount are subject to a higher rate of duty.

Circulatory restrictions: Devices, such as used in Denmark, Sweden, and Great Britain, which effectively restrict and prohibit imports of selected items such as dairy and certain products.

Bilateral quota: A bilateral quota is established by the United States and another country, or between the importing country and export groups with the supplier country. A common result is a rationalization of
the export market and the channeling of abnormal quota profits to special groups. Anti-trust rates. A device such as used in Italy, where low-interest loans are available to farmers who purchase domestic equipment but where higher interest rates are charged if foreign equipment is purchased.

Mixing quota: Numerous countries have in effect regulations which require producers to utilize domestic raw materials, up to a certain proportion, in the production of a finished product. Sometimes referred to as "linked-usages" regulations, have a quid pro quo effect in that they serve to limit imports to some relatively fixed ratio of particular domestic production.

Remission restrictions: A device, such as used in Afghanistan, where although an exchange license is not required, permission nevertheless must be obtained to remit foreign currency to exporters abroad.

Cartels: A device, such as used in Belgium, which may have as an effect the direct restraint of imports. For example, two cartels, the "Comité Générale labelled" and "Burjana," currently control a good deal of the refining, industry, and commerce of Belgium and, therefore, a large portion of the trade between these industries and the rest of the world. The Belgian Government actively supports and encourages such cartels.

Unilateral quota: A device by which a country undertakes to fix an absolute limit upon the quantity of a commodity eligible for export or import. A country may also stipulate that any quota may be formulated either in global terms or on an allocated basis. Under the global quota, imports are admitted from any country or countries up to the full amount of the quota. Under an allocated quota the quantity of imports allowable is apportioned among various supplier countries.

TRADING SYSTEM FOR HANDLING GRAIN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, with a major share of our attention directed to the problem of agriculture and farm surpluses, we often lose sight of the very vital "service of trade" for this part of our economy by the grain markets.

For 85 years the Kansas City Board of Trade has made an important contribution to the handling of the vast complex trading system developed to handle grain.

The Kansas City Star of June 10, 1962, paid a fine tribute to this excellent organization. It also summarized some of the board's current concern with matters before the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**HARVEST IN A RUSH, BUT SALES TAKE TIME**

The wheat harvest season is here. Combines are rolling across yellow fields of ripened grain. Trucks speed from field to local elevator. By the railroad, the grain moves swiftly to the nearest storage bins at the terminal markets.

On the farm, this is the climacteric season of the year. Obviously the completely mechanized modern farm is still unable to eliminate the days of bundle wagons and steam thresher. The big dinners for thrasher crews are only memories of the days gone by. Literally, figuratively, the harvested grain returns to growers, hundreds of millions of dollars.

Less apparent to the public than the harvest is the complex trading system that has been devised to handle the grain. Although it is sold today or tomorrow, or put under Government loan, the wheat currently being harvested is not expected to be in the market for another week or even next. It will be utilized throughout the year or it may even be 2 or 3 years before it is ground into flour.

The Kansas City board of trade in Kansas City and at other major grain markets, groups of men will be standing in the trading pit, futures markets, signaling their bids or acceptances. Their eyes will be on a huge blackboard where prices of all the mill's wheat are posted, accepted, or rejected. Changes seem to come by the minute. In Kansas City another 40 or 50 men on the same exchange floor will be putting their hands through samples of grain in wood trays on tables. They are buyers or sellers. More men will be walking hurriedly to their offices. Messengers arrive and leave with important papers. Telephone ring and tele­types click.

The board of trade is a busy place. The casual visitor may look on the activity in complete perplexity.

As a matter of fact, there is a direct correlation between the harvest rush on the farms today and the activity on the grain exchange floor. At the Kansas City board of trade, for example, the business (at the board of trade) handles the grain, gives it a value (price) and stores it. Business, represented here primarily because there is no better place for comparing the grain, makes it available to the man who pays a price and accepts the risk. They will have it ready for delivery to consumers when they want it or where they want it. It may be in Kansas City, it may be in any place in the world.

It is a marketing system that has been developed specifically by this country. Many changes have come in recent years through Government farm programs with supports which are the major factor in stabilizing wheat prices. But price still has not been the only change in response to market demands and the private trade has not been eliminated. It never should be.

The grain trade is under no direct attack from the Government, yet constant vigilance is required to maintain its free-enterprise status.

Even in the new farm bill which is now before Congress, a Senate amendment cautions the Secretary of Agriculture not to circumvent the channels of private trade. This amendment is a reaffirmation of directions already given the Secretary, the report suggests that Congress sees a need for protecting private trade against Government intervention, even though none is contemplated.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who introduced the amendment, spoke of it as a reminder to the Department of Agriculture. The amendment as adopted by the Senate reads: "Sec. 403. Nothing contained herein shall be construed as authorizing sales of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned commodities, including loans to the payment-in-kind certificates, other than in accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. Congress hereby reconfirms its longstanding policy of favoring the use by governmental agencies of the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce, and directs the Secretary of Agriculture and the CCC to the maximum extent practicable to authorize and procure procedures designed to minimize the acquisition of stocks by the CCC to encourage orderly marketing through private competitive trade channels, both cooperative and non-cooperative, and to ob­tain financial participation and the marketplace remit from producers and for the Commodity Credit Corporation."

A second amendment introduced by Senator HUMPHREY instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to report to the "Congress" that the Secretary should use the facilities of farmer cooperatives when feasible.

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, said: "Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be considered reported to the Senate."

The amendment, the Chairman, was ordered to be printed in the Record.

In speaking of this amendment, Senator HUMPHREY said: "I think the amendment or the proposed amendment will be quite consistent with what we believe this country is trying to do to stabilize agriculture, namely, the belief that when it is possible it is much better to utilize the resources of the private sector than to utilize the full machinery of the Government..."

There are unavoidable expenses and responsibilities involved in the stabilization of storage and delivery of the grain. These expenses must be met. The responsibilities can be met by either the private trade or the Government.

When statements are heard that it is costing the Government a million dollars a day just to store surplus grain, we should realize that these storage charges would accrue whether the grain was in Government or private hands. They become a part of the final cost of the product. Of course, the big surpluses add to the total storage costs.

Back in the 1920's, before Congress ever had a farm program, the normal storage charge in elevators was 12 cents a bushel. On a Sanders, 15 cents a bushel. Thus the tremendous storage costs today are the result of volume, not of any change in the cost of storage charges.

Storage, of course, is only one part of the grain business. Ironically, although a large share of the payments for storage of huge grain surpluses has gone to the grain industry, the grain trade in general has opposed the farm programs. Even though Government storages have been so successful that the grain people would prefer to go back to a completely free market. But few on the trading floor of the Kansas City Exchange would live long enough to see it happen.

Nevertheless, they argue that the Government program is responsible for the high wheat surpluses which continue farmers, the trade, and Government alike.

An important part of grain trading is the futures market. It is complicated and often misunderstood, yet because of its importance it can be done swiftly and economically on standards that are accepted anywhere in the world.

In handling wheat over long periods, risk is a major factor. There are risks which include the natural hazards of weather, pestilence, drought, floods, and product deterioration, but the major and overshadowing risk is price risk. The futures market provides a means of shifting this risk-to whom it may be more willing to shoulder it, hoping, of course, to make a profit.

Boards of trade provide facilities for members to trade in futures. Explanations of futures trading reveal that the actual "commodity" bought or sold on a futures market is a contract. This contract is a promise to deliver or accept delivery of a specified quality of grain at a specified time and place. The grain doesn't actually change hands until the contract becomes due.

An example of the use of the futures market is the taking fromrescia of flour mills, a practice that might be likened to insurance. A mill which has contracted to deliver flour in September, for instance, buys a corresponding amount of wheat on the futures market to protect itself against a price change until the flour is delivered. On the other hand, as it fills his order, the miller will sell futures in the market, which, after all, is a market for futures, in order to hedge against a drop in the price of the grain.

The wheat futures market, pertain­ings to the futures market by acting as a mechanism for fulfillment of promises to deliver or receive products at a specified time in the future. Such a system is a necessary part of maintaining a commodity that has been harvested in a matter of weeks, yet consumed throughout the year. Futures also have the very im-
DISTORTION OF THE CONSTITUTION BY THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 8 minutes. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for some years now the members of the Supreme Court have persisted in reading alien and revolutionary interpretations into our Federal Constitution of the United States. Through interpretations which cannot be sustained by either the language of the Constitution or the intent of its framers, they have sought, in effect, to change our form of government.

But never in the wildest of their excesses, Mr. President, have they gone as far as they did on yesterday when—in a gross display of all-powerful executive authority to act on the subject.

Mr. President, the first amendment is so clear that any fourth grade student can understand it. It says simply that: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

Congress has made no such law. No Member of Congress has proposed such a law. And, in the absence of such a law, the Supreme Court is without authority to act on the subject.

If, Mr. President, a true interpretation of the spirit of the Constitution would hold that the Supreme Court, not the State of New York, has violated it. That is true because the President of yesterday’s ruling was to prohibit the free exercise of religion by the schoolchildren of the State of New York.

The renowned and respected minister, Dr. Billy Graham, put the matter in its proper perspective with his observation that the Constitution of the United States guarantees freedom of religion—not freedom from religion.

No historical fact is more clearly established than that this country was settled by men and women of great faith who were seeking a home where they and their posterity might worship God in freedom. Every President of the United States from Washington to Kennedy has sworn before God to uphold the Constitution and laws made under it.

The psalmist of old declared that “Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.” The Junior Senator from Georgia believes with all his heart, Mr. President, that the overwhelming majority of the American people will agree that man of God was a greater authority on the subject than six politically motivated members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I warmly commend my distinguished colleague from Georgia in the sentiments he has expressed. I fully concur in the condemnation he has made of the decision. Later today I plan to discuss it at some length, because it is a subject in which I have been interested over a number of years.

Mr. President, our colleague has pointed out that the first amendment relates to an act of Congress. Is that not true?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In this case, no act of Congress was involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 1 more minute to the junior Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure my colleague remembers that James Madison was a very religious man. He did not wish to take religion out of Government, but he wished to keep the Government out of religion. He wished to put into the first amendment a prohibition against State laws to establish religions. He could not get that adopted, so the States can go far beyond the Supreme Court in our national anthem. Our “Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag” has been amended to include the phrase, “one nation under God.” All branches of the armed services have chaplains of all faiths whose salaries are paid by tax funds. Congress has enacted legislation calling on the President to proclaim a National Day of Prayer each year.

Mr. President, I submit the Supreme Court of the United States on yesterday violated every tenet of American law and every principle of the spirituality of man. It has dealt a blow to the faith of every believer. In a Supreme Court, which has given aid and comfort to the disciples of atheism by whatever name they may call themselves.

Mr. President, it is the earnest hope of the junior Senator from Georgia that this unconscionable edict will prove to be the event which arouses the American people to demand action by their elected representatives for the preservation and protection for all for the ever-broadening judicial encroachments which are destroying freedom and constitutional government in this country.
did. New York only authorized a brief prayer. Is that not correct?
Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct.
Mr. ROBERTSON. It is correct that the decision yesterday related to a State law, and a brief prayer only was involved. As my distinguished friend said, the Supreme Court has again, by judicial fiat sought to amend our Constitution.
Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is eminently correct. I commend him for his views, and I agree wholeheartedly with it.
Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Georgia may have an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is so ordered.
Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has it occurred to the distinguished Senator that on the gallery floor of the Capitol, within a stone's throw of where we stand in this Chamber today, there is a chapel furnished by public funds, where a Member of this body or any other person can go to indulge in prayer, to energize his faith, and to find his Maker in his own way?
Mr. TALMADGE. The junior Senator from Georgia is aware of that fact. I compliment and commend the distinguished minority leader for pointing it out during this colloquy.
Mr. TALMADGE. The attention of the distinguished minority leader to the fact that under­neath the clock on the wall of this very Chamber is engraved "In God We Trust." I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Virginia for their valuable comments in this discussion.

RECORD OF SERVICE OF PHILIP COOMBS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Philip Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, has resigned. He has given our country good and faithful service. I have known Mr. Coombs for many years and consider him an extremely able and dedicated person. He brought new life and vitality into the Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs and made a significant contribution to the life of our country by building educational and cultural affairs into a more vital and effective component of U.S. foreign relations.

A careful study of Secretary Coombs' record will reveal the broad scope and the wide range of activities of the educational and cultural affairs program. Mr. Coombs is to be congratulated for his leadership role, but it is the imagination, in developing and improving the program.

In late April, Mr. Coombs addressed the Annual Conference of the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers. I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of his address printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF INITIAL REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE PHILIP H. COOMBS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS, AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN STUDENT ADVISERS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 35.

Dr. Neal. Our next speaker has probably been responsible more than any one individual for the recent concern of the Federal Government with foreign students. The framers of the famous Ten Points familiar to NAFSA, he has also brought into international educational exchanges vigor, imagination and, above all, close liaison with the association and the institutional spokesmen among its members.

I present to you now with great pleasure the Honorable Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. [Applause.]

Secretary Coombs. Thank you, Joe Neal. I think I should address you as friends and stockholders rather than as a new audience. This year we have to omit the box lunch. [Laughter.]

When I attended the very good reception last night given to our friends who attended the Senate hearing, I had the patience to listen to my remarks on earlier occasions—all the way from New York to San Francisco and even as far away as Australia. I am delighted that we could all be together here today. I am delighted that this was the toughest challenge I have had since coming to Washington. Most of you here have heard a speech by now and I must try to give you a new one.

I would like to give you a kind of stockholders' report. I hope you see in broad perspective what you and other voluntary organizations in the academic community have been accomplishing and what the Government can do to help.

I will try also to suggest some of the things that remain to be done next year and thereafter.

I think it can be said in summary—and you people could present much of the evidence—that in the past, we have been having a kind of discussion about the student who was called home from Italy to direct a large exporting enterprise doing a $50 million a year business in grains, contracts and other matters. The Bureau has a full­time top manager.

Clearly, if the new Assistant Secretary was to perform effectively his other duties, which were brought under the Secretary's jurisdiction, he could not also give full time to managing the day­to­day operations of the Bureau. He therefore established a new Assistant Secretary for Foreign Students.”

The Assistant Secretary of State is much smaller than the Bureau. It has 9 officers and 6 secretaries; the Bureau has over 300 persons. Attached to the Assistant Secretary's office is the USAID Advisory Commission on Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The office has four principal responsibilities. First, to provide general policy direction and supervision to the Department's own Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Second, to provide leadership and policy guidance to all Federal agencies engaged in international educational exchanges and cultural activities in order to encourage a greater coordination of their efforts and to stimulate a strengthening of these efforts.

There are, incidentally, seven federal agencies that receive direct appropriations for one kind of activity or another in this field. And beyond that, there are well over a dozen additional Federal agencies that cooperate or do contract work in this field. A second responsibility is to develop U.S. official positions and to maintain relationships with international and regional organizations with respect to educational and cultural matters. At the moment this means primarily UNESCO, the OAS in Latin America, and the newly created Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), covering the Atlantic Community.

The fourth assignment which, over the long run, is probably the most important, is to develop a broader and deeper basis for close cooperation and complementary action between the Government and Federal educational and cultural organizations and institutions around the United States.

END OF TRANSCRIPT

Carrying through these four assignments effectively requires the development of a very complex pattern of working relationships. We have spent a good deal of time this year
laying out these lines of communication and cooperation, first, within the Federal Government itself, second, with the international organizations, and third, with the American academic community, voluntary organizations, foundations, and the like. It required many meetings, hundreds of speeches, and thousands of broadcasts, to get these lines of cooperation established.

If you will pardon some personal references here since it is the only way I know to give the stockholders a full report. In addition to these events, I have personally clocked over 75,000 miles of international travel and conferences, or more than 18 a month, in the past year or so. This involved representing our Government at 5 international conferences and visiting 12 of our overseas missions ranging from Ethiopia, Greece, Thailand, Lebanon, Egypt, Peru, the United Kingdom, Spain, France, Uruguay, India, Chile to Japan. So, if nothing else, I have seen the world this year. [Laughter.]

It involved working with literally dozens of American Government organizations, agencies, and so on, perhaps foolishly, some 30 speeches at conferences and meetings. We have contributed magazine articles, letters, and have given a dozen TV and radio broadcasts. In short, we have been trying to develop national, and international, cooperation in the community with some common concepts and common goals, cooperating across private and governmental lines and across international boundaries. I remember an incident a few months ago when a new secretary whom I had not yet met was visiting our reception counter. When she finally asked which man was Mr. Coombs, another girl replied, "He is the man who always comes through with the suit-case." [Laughter.]

What a terrible reputation to have.

3. MAIN POLICY OBJECTIVES

But the year was spent in more than just talking and traveling. We evolved some central policy themes, central objectives, that would guide our efforts and provide a framework within which, spending the proceeds and the opportunities could be handled. Six principal objectives emerged.

The first, and central policy objective was to place these international educational and cultural activities into the mainstream of American foreign relations. In the past they have all too often been regarded as fringe benefits to American foreign relations, good things in their own right, but lacking a pattern to direct and importantly with the serious business of foreign policy. We have endeavored, with much help from others, to give these activities a more important role in foreign affairs.

Now, this took more than just talking about it. It required a series of steps. The first was to de-emphasize within the Government's own exchange programs the country emphasis on categories, on quotas, on target procedures, and to get much more attention focused on the practical objectives of particular students and the needs and priorities of the countries. It means relatively less to the student and the country to give the student a course in the Soviet Union, it means much more to the student and the country to give the student a course in Burma, a chance to go to Burma, a chance to get there, under the new grants, a chance to be educated in Burma. It is an example of how the emphasis of the past and the emphasis of the present can be in harmony with the philosophy of the new AID program, with its emphasis on country planning.

It means also strengthening the liaison between the people operating the exchange programs and those engaged in broader analysis of country situations, such as the desk officers and the regional officers in the State Department, the officials in the AID countries, and similarly the AID officials. Both in Washington and the field, it means achieving better linkages and joint planning between the exchange activities and other related activities of USIA and AID, and similarly the National Science Foundation and other Federal agencies, as well as private foundations that operate overseas.

Well, this, then, was the first broad policy theme and objective: to put educational and cultural affairs into the mainstream of U.S. foreign relations.

The second objective was to improve the quality and the effectiveness of these exchange activities, from expanding the quantity. It is always more dramatic to expand the quantity of something, such as enrollments, but it is sometimes more important to elevate the quality. But how to do this?

Well, one example is an effort in which you people are directly involved, namely, this 10-30 program for improving the quality of the experience of foreign students. We will continue to do it.

In the leader and specialist program, where several hundred foreign leaders and specialists are brought here each year, there are many of you, personally and through your organizations, involved. It is now evident that we need to do directly and importantly with the serious business of foreign policy. I have endeavored, with much help from others, to give these activities a more important role in foreign affairs.

Now, this took more than just talking about it. It required a series of steps. The first was to de-emphasize within the Government's own exchange programs the country emphasis on categories, on quotas, on target procedures, and to get much more attention focused on the practical objectives of particular students and the needs and priorities of the countries. It means relative...
resources, in balance with its physical resources, much investment in physical resources will go down the drain because there will be no people to utilize them or to manage them intelligently.

Thus, our office has sought to work with many nations which are already investing in educational development in the form of national expenditures in a developing country are not simply consumption expenditures, not simply social overhead, but are investment that has a double dividend. In the economic sense of the term. Preliminary research done by eminent economists such as Prof. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago strongly suggests that in our own national history the yield on investment in human resources through education has been substantially higher than the yield on investment in factories and other physical facilities. Of all nations we should be convinced of the importance of investment in human resource development in the development plan between human resources, in balance with its physical resources, in Europe and in Asia. Of all nations we should be convinced of the importance of investment in human resource development in the development plan between human resources, in balance with its physical resources, in Europe and in Asia.
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sights have been held high and the quality of the people appointed to these important posts.

Another major item on the agenda, which I won't go into in detail, is of course again this matter of American students. I think there is a term which is quite appropriate for the effect of foreign students on the map than anything else. To hear the talk, you would think that half, or over half of the foreign students were from Africa. Only 3.7 percent, in the latest count, are from there. In fact, we recently had only yesterday some preliminary figures from IIE's "open doors" census, which indicate that in the current year, and I think there has been an overall increase over the previous year of something like 40 percent in the number of students from Africa, including north Africa, studying in the United States.

The third topic was the whole matter of educational development in Africa. This includes a large task force of eminent private and government leaders to help new African nations develop their educational systems. We have to look at how these two interact. The task force has worked closely with private foundations, with the AID program, with the American University in Africa, and has cooperated with other agencies involved. We have cooperated with educational services, with MIT to develop new methods of teaching English and learning for Africa. This has been a most exciting enterprise.

A fourth and quite different topic has to do with the teaching of English abroad as a second language. We got into this primarily because there were five separate federal agencies engaged in this business, which may sound silly but actually there is a very good reason, and that is that the teaching of English has to be five. But, being five, it is important that they follow the same road map and have some reasonable division of labor.

In this field also the British are very active and are anxious to harmonize their efforts with ours, because the rapidly rising worldwide demand to learn English is fast outstripping the combined capacity of the United States, the United Kingdom and other English speaking countries to meet that demand. This suggests that in this field also there needs to be technological innovation, because the highest input requirements for teaching English are embedded manpower which is in very scarce supply. We have been working closely with the Center for Applied Linguistics of the British government, and have been trying to devise a new technology of instruction in English.

I have mentioned also the fifth item, the U.S.-sponsored schools abroad. This has involved us in much detailed work with other agencies, especially AID.

A sixth item has involved working with the international organizations to help strengthen their role in education and culture, and to help get their programs properly meshed so that they would neither conflict or run off fruitlessly in separate directions. Here we have worked especially with UNESCO, the OECD, and the OAS.

A seventh important topic has been the role of the Alliance for Education, for which I have just mentioned. Here again we established a task force of expert people outside the government. We sent a group to the Panama Canal Zone; we went to Punta del Este, in the American delegation, and achieved with the help of our colleagues of the other American delegations a comprehensive resolution at Punta del Este on educational and cultural and scientific development. It was that resolution that gave the ground work and the thrust for the recent conference at Santiago, where the ministers of education and other experts throughout Latin America came to grips with how to translate that general resolution into concrete action and progress.

The eighth topic, to which I have alluded to already, is the stimulation of new technological, fresh imaginative approaches in education, when we have worked again closely with UNESCO. Here again, for example, in the Purdue international conference on educational television we have worked with UNESCO. We have worked with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and with various private groups on this subject. I believe that over the next 10 to 20 years television will signal a new reality of student subjects in the whole field of international education.

A ninth related topic was the whole matter of mass media for education and for cultural development. One side of this problem is that the products of American mass media—films and television programs—are rapidly spreading around the world and having an enormous educational impact, even though they were intended to be entertaining.

Some of you have heard me tell the story of a true fact which recently a BBC reporter interviewed a while back by a BBC reporter who was looking into the impact of television on education in South America and in some well-developed areas, and the villager said, "When are you people going to get automobiles like we have?"

And the average person on the street in Japan can tell you he doesn't have to come to the United States to get the same culture. He knows all about us now. He has seen our movies and our television programs. Sometimes like 40 percent of television time in Tokyo is canned American entertainment programs. Now, of course, it is fine for entertainment, but it seems to me that we need to work hard to get a greater educational impact and a greater quality, cultural programs of a good quality into international circulation—to show a different part of American life, and sometimes a more significant and loftier side. So we have done what we could to encourage a further flow.

One other item which I have mentioned already has been the integration of the State Department's exchanges with the work of the Office of Education to help develop greater competence among Americans in world affairs and to help strengthen American cultural exchanges and the like for Latin America. We have worked hard to get the AID program and the American University to help in this. Progress has been steady, but as we have heard, it can be done. It needs to be further spelled out, and we need to strengthen further the consultation among these agencies that is required for better coordination.

Another big topic has been the whole matter of books. We feel that the Alliance for Progress, for example, should have as one of its major ingredients a strong effort to develop a large flow of low-cost books, textbooks, and the like for Latin America. This will do much to encourage a great engagement of minds, and the personal and intellectual ties between the United States and the rest of the Western World. Progress has been made, and further progress will be made in this effort.

Another topic that has been putting greater emphasis on young people in all of the exchanges, and more emphasis on women leaders. These emphases will be reflected in the coming year's program. We spent considerable time, of course, developing the 1963 plans for the Bureau and for my own office. And these are reflected in the budget that is now before the Congress.

One of the more esoteric problems which I inherited quite unwittingly was the preservation of the Nubian monuments. And some of our recent efforts have been put to work brought to the United States from the U.A.R., for the first time anywhere, of some of the precious relics from the temple of King Tut. And I very much hope you will remember him as King Tut. This collection is now touring the United States and the rest of the Western World, and the rest of the Western World. Progress has been made, and further progress will be made in this effort.

One of the more esoteric problems which I inherited quite unwittingly was the preservation of the Nubian monuments. And some of our recent efforts have been put to work brought to the United States from the U.A.R., for the first time anywhere, of some of the precious relics from the temple of King Tut. And I very much hope you will remember him as King Tut. This collection is now touring the United States and the rest of the Western World, and the rest of the Western World. Progress has been made, and further progress will be made in this effort.

We have even gotten into the whole question of the role of education in immigration programs, of the Department of Defense, which brings over each year a substantial number of young people to serve in the military. It has been our objective to try to help broaden the character of their social experience and their intellectual opportunities while they are in the United States.
Mr. Humphrey. The Senator from Minnesota will have the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, some time ago I read an article in the local press which indicated that a very important facility and operation of the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, was being opened up in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, which was the Crisis Center, being abandoned.

The Crisis Center was established during the Eisenhower administration in order to facilitate and expedite information and reporting in the State Department. At the time of its establishment, the Crisis Center received considerable favorable comment and justly so.

My concern over the alleged abandonment of this project led me to write a letter to the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Affairs, Mr. Fred Dutton. I have received a reply from him, and I have the impression that both of the communications referred to were printed at this point in the Record.
There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be recorded, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1962.
The Honorable Fred Dutton, Assistant Secretary, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Fred: I wish to call to your attention a clipping that has been on my desk for several months.

1. Have you been assigned to the Crisis Center? I have understood for some time that the oldline State Department officers have fought this idea, primarily on the grounds that it cuts across traditional lines and apparently violates some of the traditional concepts of an organizational chart.

As I recall, this Crisis Center was established because of the need for prompt action and response in the State Department. The long delay in getting action through the normal channels of any big Government department has necessitated some form of ad hoc organization to give attention to urgent matters. I know that the Crisis Center was established because through it there is a way for this huge Government of ours to respond quickly and intelligently to developments which were taking place so rapidly and unexpectedly that it was impossible for the regular bureaus and agencies of Government to cope with them.

In any case, you have given me a report on the Crisis Center, what its status, how many persons are assigned, what is their rank, what are these officers' duties, and are they paid for it? I am keenly interested in this matter, and I believe that this letter should be brought to the attention of the Secretary.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MAY 8, 1962.
The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, U.S. Senate.

DEAR Senator Humphrey: I have reviewed your letter of April 30 with Mr. William Brubeck, Executive Secretary of the Department, who is now responsible for the direction of the Operations organization.

As you know, the Operations Center was set up a year ago as an experiment in order to influence the Secretary of State in his implementation of the policy to meet critical situations. As the Center evolved over the ensuing months, it became increasingly apparent that the Secretary of State in effect was responsible for a complex of assignments which had to be given to a concrete, stand-alone organization. The extent overlapped those of the Executive Secretariat, which is the instrument of the Secretary for operational management of the Department. A decision was consequently made to place the Operations Center directly under the Secretary so that its activities could be more effectively coordinated with the other elements of the Secretariat. This was done in mid-January 1962 and formalized in the attached departmental circular of March 7.

A meaningful round-the-clock watch is now being maintained in the Operations Center as the central command post for rapid communication and coordination of urgent matters in the Department. This watch is manned by five teams of officers, each ranging in grade from FSO-3 to FSO-S. Each watch is responsible during its tour of duty for monitoring telegrams from abroad and communicating fast alerts to the Secretary and to appropriate other officers of the Department at any time of day or night. In addition, the watch maintains liaison with the various State Department bureaus and offices in the White House, Defense Department, and intelligence community in order to coordinate and direct the flow of information and to keep the Department apprised of critical, quickly developing situations. The watch also maintains secure and rapid telephonic contact with certain of our principal posts abroad and, through these contacts, is able to keep senior officers informed. The watch staffs, supplemented by the services of three desk officers on a rotating basis, prepare and circulate to the key officials and other elements of the executive branch reports of the operations developing.

The foregoing activities are under the general direction of the Secretariat of the Department and specific direction of a senior officer who has been designated as Acting Director and has been with the Operations organization since its inception.

As of today, there are 19 officers directly assigned to the Operations Center to carry out these assignments. The operations part of the Center is also backstopping potential from the entire “tail” of the Executive Secretariat.

The Secretary will be most interested in your views on this matter and it will be shown to him immediately upon his return from his present trip abroad.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY—REORGANIZATION

1. Direction of the Operations Center has been assigned to Lucius D. Battle, the Executive Secretary's aide-de-camp. In addition to functions previously performed, the Executive Secretary is responsible for the Operations Center and for service and support to task forces and similar working groups.

2. In connection with these assignments, the Office of the Executive Secretary is reorganized as follows:

2.1. Under the Executive Secretary, the Operations Section has been created to provide a 24-hour, 7-day week global watch and will perform related briefing and alter functions for the top secret compartment, for task force officers, and for bureaus, as appropriate. For this purpose, the former Reports Section of the S/S-RO has been assigned the new functions of screening and distributing incoming and outgoing traffic for the Secretary and other departments, and for preparation of the top secret, summary, and other reports.

2.2. Permanent deputies of the representatives of other agencies, formerly detailed to Headquarters, Operations Center, are attached directly to the Office of the Executive Secretary (S/S), Office of the Secretary of State.

2.3. The Operations Section of the Reports and Operations Staff (formerly S/S-RO) is redesignated Secretariat Staff, S/S-8. Under the Secretary, the Executive Secretary will continue to perform the previous functions of S/S-RO (other than reports functions discussed above); and to maintain and support of work presented to and actions directed by the Secretary, the Under Secretary, the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, and the Deputy Secretary for Political Affairs. The provision of secretariat support for these officers at international conferences, for high-level visits and other major meetings, etc.

2.4. The follow-up responsibilities formerly divided among the S/S-RO have been assigned to a single S/S-8 Follow-up Section, under the direction of the Chief, S/S-8.

2.5. S/S-9 will provide the service of a Secretariat officer to task forces and similar working groups. Certain existing task forces will be given additional support as required.

I wish to commend the Secretary of State and his Department on the reorganization and express my thanks for the prompt attention to my inquiry.

(At this point Mr. Metcalfe assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE PEACE CORPS CELEBRATES AN ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noted with pleasure an editorial and article which appeared in the New York Times of June 25 noting that today is the first anniversary of the start of training for the first Peace Corps recruits. Although the year has not been a painless one—every new organization has its growing pains and periods of trial—the worst fears of those skeptics who opposed the program remain unfounded and the best hopes of its supporters are well on their way to fulfillment.

In fact, the Peace Corps has shown a surprising ability to add enthusiasm and hostility into more or less fervent enthusiasm. The reason is plain to see. Beatniks and “youthful idealists” have been made very welcome. At the present time there are 973 volunteers in 16 countries, and over 1,300 recruits are now in training. In the countries where Corps men and women are now stationed, they have been warmly received and have done admirable work in helping the people of these countries to build toward the future. Frequently unorthodox in their methods, the Peace Corps volunteers have never lost sight of their purpose: to help the people among whom they are serving. In teaching, nursing, agriculture, construction, and other areas, they have made vital contributions to the development of the human and material resources latent in the countries to which they are sent.

As the Times editorial states about the program:

The training at home has been rigorous; in the field the young people have been expected to live as do their native counterparts, and, in a real sense, to remain the host country and not Washington that decided what shall be done where; and hard work rather than glamour has been the order of the session.

May the Peace Corps have a healthy and prosperous future.
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Peter Braestrup, entitled "Peace Corps Thrives in First Year Abroad," in the edition for June 24, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article and the accompanying photographs were printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS THRIVES IN FIRST YEAR ABROAD—NATIONS ASK MORE AS 1,000TH RECRUIT HEADS HOME

(By Peter Braestrup)

WASHINGTON, June 24—The Peace Corps expects to send overseas this week its 1,000th newly trained volunteer.

There are no special plans to celebrate the occasion. The event is regarded as merely another sign that "the push is on" this summer, as one Corps official said. "We're moving from a penny-ante operation into big business," he commented.

Sargent Shriver, director, predicted that the current total of more than 2,000 volunteers in training or overseas would grow this year to 10,000. The Corps plans to meet the mounting requests from the aided countries. The new volunteers will include retired people as well as recent college graduates.

Already, in its first year in the field, the Corps has had teams of American men and women teaching school in the Philippines, surveying roads in Tanganyika, working in clinics in Malaya, and showing farmers how to raise grass on the West Indies Island of St. Lucia.

Almost every week this summer and fall, new applicants will head overseas, usually for more language training in the "host country" before they go to work with local people.

A sign tacked on the door of Mr. Shriver's office says: "There is no place on this club for goofs." The Corps Director is pushing his staff hard to keep recruiting, selection, and training of volunteers on schedule.

Plans must be coordinated with the "host" countries (who request and assign the volunteers), the Agency for International Development, and such pressure groups as the National Council of Catholic Women who do the basic training under contract.

This coordination is seldom painless. Each organization and each foreign country has its own notions of how the Peace Corps should be treated.

But so far the buildup has got off to a good start.

Most of the increase will come between now and Labor Day, as the recruiters pour into American universities for training. Mr. Shriver expects to have 10,000 volunteers by the fall of 1963.

There will be midwives in Bolivia, tractor operators (replacing Czech technicians) in Tunisia, agricultural extension workers in Chile, fisheries experts in West Africa, and thousands of college graduates of all ages teaching school in a dozen lands.

"We may be a year late, but those who have thus far received volunteers," Mr. Shriver said, "have asked us to double, triple, and even quadruple the number of people that we could afford to send overseas.

In short, the Peace Corps, despite dark fears expressed by congressional critics a year ago, has become a success.

The organization was authorized by President Kennedy's Executive order March 1, 1961, on a "temporary pilot basis" as a branch of the State Department. It became a permanent Corps last summer. Mr. Shriver's mission is to supply volunteers to the work of development nations, catch up in education, agriculture, health, and other fields. The first of the 2-year volunteers began training June 26, 1961.

"The payoff is performance overseas," William F. Haddad, an associate director and "inspection general" of the Corps, said.

CONGRESS AUTHORIZES EXPANSION OF CORPS

The organization has had a year's hard-won experience with a $30 million program, which currently involves 975 volunteers overseas in 16 countries and 1,476 more in training.

It is on this basis of the experience that President Kennedy and Mr. Shriver won congressional authorization—for expansion of the Corps to a $63,750,000 level in the year starting July 1.

The Appropriations Committee has not yet to put in the actual funds, and no monetary action is expected until late in the congressional session.

From interviews here, and from special reports by correspondents of the New York Times, emerges the picture of the Corps performance overseas since the first two groups of volunteers arrived in Tanganyika and Colombia last fall.

The first point that becomes clear is that two problems forecast last year by critics have not existed.

These were: That the Corps would become a haven for "beatniks" and "fussy-minded idealists," and that prospects of living and the realities of life in the bush, and that Communist agents would score easy victories in ideological debate with naive volunteers.

On the contrary, the volunteer who emingles with the picture emerges of a "beatnik" if he is an idealist, he is a tough-minded one.

The Corps screening system has resulted in an 18 per cent dropout rate among the men and women who actually started training.

The training includes language and cultural instruction to help workers on American college campuses ranging from Utah State to New York University. Many of the volunteers also go through a tough jungle camp in Puerto Rico. Their average age is 24 years, but seven persons older than 60 have also made the grade.

The Peace Corps volunteers come from every state in the Union, and from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam.

So far, according to Mr. Shriver, Washington has received 26,807 applications for duty. About 20,000 of these applicants have taken entrance exams. Of these, 4,000 have started training or overseas and 1,379 more in 16 countries and 1,379 more in training.

There has been a lack of drama in the Corps, unlike its predecessor, the "temporary pilot basis" which was done "on the fly." The Corps would be" a "haven for "beatniks" and "fussy-minded idealists," Mr. Shriver said. "We're on the basis of this experience that President Kennedy and Mr. Shriver won congressional authorization—for expansion of the Corps to a $63,750,000 level in the year starting July 1.

The Appropriations Committee has not yet to put in the actual funds, and no monetary action is expected until late in the congressional session.

From interviews here, and from special reports by correspondents of the New York Times, emerges the picture of the Corps performance overseas since the first two groups of volunteers arrived in Tanganyika and Colombia last fall.

The first point that becomes clear is that two problems forecast last year by critics have not existed.

These were: That the Corps would become a haven for "beatniks" and "fussy-minded idealists," and that prospects of living and the realities of life in the bush, and that Communist agents would score easy victories in ideological debate with naive volunteers.

On the contrary, the volunteer who emerges from the picture emerges of a "beatnik" if he is an idealist, he is a tough-minded one.

The Corps screening system has resulted in an 18 per cent dropout rate among the men and women who actually started training.

The training includes language and cultural instruction to help workers on American college campuses ranging from Utah State to New York University. Many of the volunteers also go through a tough jungle camp in Puerto Rico. Their average age is 24 years, but seven persons older than 60 have also made the grade.

The Peace Corps volunteers come from every state in the Union, and from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam.

So far, according to Mr. Shriver, Washington has received 26,807 applications for duty. About 20,000 of these applicants have taken entrance exams. Of these, 4,000 have started training or overseas and 1,379 more in 16 countries and 1,379 more in training.

There has been a lack of drama in the Corps, unlike its predecessor, the "temporary pilot basis" which was done "on the fly." The Corps would be a "haven for "beatniks" and "fussy-minded idealists," Mr. Shriver said. "We're on the basis of this experience that President Kennedy and Mr. Shriver won congressional authorization—for expansion of the Corps to a $63,750,000 level in the year starting July 1.

The Appropriations Committee has not yet to put in the actual funds, and no monetary action is expected until late in the congressional session.

From interviews here, and from special reports by correspondents of the New York Times, emerges the picture of the Corps performance overseas since the first two groups of volunteers arrived in Tanganyika and Colombia last fall.

The first point that becomes clear is that two problems forecast last year by critics have not existed.

These were: That the Corps would become a haven for "beatniks" and "fussy-minded idealists," and that prospects of living and the realities of life in the bush, and that Communist agents would score easy victories in ideological debate with naive volunteers.

On the contrary, the volunteer who emerges from the picture emerges of a "beatnik" if he is an idealist, he is a tough-minded one.

The Corps screening system has resulted in an 18 per cent dropout rate among the men and women who actually started training.

The training includes language and cultural instruction to help workers on American college campuses ranging from Utah State to New York University. Many of the volunteers also go through a tough jungle camp in Puerto Rico. Their average age is 24 years, but seven persons older than 60 have also made the grade.

The Peace Corps volunteers come from every state in the Union, and from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam.

So far, according to Mr. Shriver, Washington has received 26,807 applications for duty. About 20,000 of these applicants have taken entrance exams. Of these, 4,000 have started training or overseas and are scheduled to start. Two hundred and sixty-seven have been dropped from training for various reasons.

SEVENTY-FIVE DOLLARS A MONTH RANKED FOR EACH VOLUNTEER

Most of the volunteers have had at least a year in college.

They are reimbursed for living expenses at a rate that is intended to make them live like their local counterparts, for example, teachers or farm extension agents. This rate varies from $18 a month in the Philippines to $80 in Tanganyika and $160 in Colombia.

In addition, each volunteer gets $75 a month, banked for him by the Corps, which is paid him after his 2-year tour. In every case, the Corps man works where the host country wants to put him.

Dr. George Guthrie, a Pennsylvania State University psychologist, commented as follows on a training group bound for teaching in the Philippines:

"The majority of these people were in the upper half of their class at college. But there wasn't a Phi Beta Kappa among them. Many of their schools had no chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. They aren't Ivy Leaguers or beatniks. Most are farm boys and girls, small school kids. Most of them are from middle class families. More easily than some, they can afford to make the sacrifice."

This portrait does not ring true for every overseas group. The 35 surveyors, engineers, and medical personnel working in Tanganyika, for example, are far more of a professional type than the Philippine group.

As the Peace Corps' first year comes to an end, I am not afraid to get their hands dirty. Most volunteers here are farmers and look it.
As one official said: 'Their heart is really in the Indian rural area.'

The weakness of the volunteers' labor varies widely from country to country. In India, the tiny Peace Corps contingent is struggling to get itself understood in a land where the biggest problem is the Health Ministry: staffing rural clinics in the "ulu," Malaya's backwoods. The 36 Peace Corps men and women in the territory have made a dent in several vital areas, including volunteer work in a 2,650-patient leper colony.

In Colombia, 36 American surveyors, geologists, and engineers are not only creating good will, but, alongside local helpers, are doing a job that a local official described as absolutely vital. They are working on surveying the country, and developing farms, fields, and electric lines. They are also helping farmers to sell their produce at good prices.

The volunteers dismissed the old British notion that Africans would not work. On safari, when their African helper sat down, saying he could not go on, Thomas Katus, of Mccfston, S. Dak., and Jurry Parsons, of Albany, N.Y., sat down too. "OK," they told their friend. "It's your country, so why shouldn't we bother." This got the team going again.

Prime Minister Rashid Kawans, of Tanganyika, told the team that for 20 years he had been working to get farmers to farm the multitudes; in other words, services are relatively cheap or even free. In many cases, the volunteers serve where local teachers do not go.

Another major effort has been in agriculture.

In Brazil, 43 volunteers drove jeeps into the field last month to work with the Brazilian Association for Rural Credit & Assistance on farm assistance and home economics through the local version of the 4-H Clubs. The Peace Corps in Brazil is dovetailing its work, particularly in the country's poorer areas, with the work of the International Development, which finances the $2 million project of the rural aid association.

In Colombia, the Peace Corps has attempted one of its more ambitious assignments—training called "community development." Although the 62 men volunteers who arrived in Colombia last September have built roads and schools, set up health stations and paddled up first-aid cases, their basic function has been to work with Colombian representatives to get mountain villagers to help themselves despite poverty, illiteracy, and the paternalism of the landlords. The task has not been an easy one.

FIRST LINKS SUCCESS WITH ECONOMIC FREEDOM

In Santander, Colombia, a volunteer told a village priest:

"We want to solve these problems without giving orders. We want to motivate people to work. Maybe we'll build a health center or prepare a highway. We want to tell them 'we need a school,' and they'll shout and argue and laugh and finally build a school."

But the priest replied quietly: "You will achieve that when you have economic freedom."

In Chiriqua, in the Colombian department of Boyaca, a hard-working Peace Corps team was pulled out 3 months ago to avoid its getting into a local dispute over the work and relations with belligerent landowners, who discouraged peasants from attending community meetings.

Nevertheless, 44 Peace Corps volunteers have made do. One volunteer, Davis Grubb of Westport, Conn., took a bus into Bogota, called on the police chief, who backed him up with a bulldozer, which his village used to build an 8-mile road to market.

Another volunteer, David Downing of Los Gatos, Calif., has been doing the dirty work of moving muck along a 14-mile dirt road from the village of Gatos to Bogota, the capital.

The villagers are enthusiastic, if every harassed Colombian official is not. The volunteers, sometimes in their annoyances, are besieged with offers of coffee, liquor, or sweets.

As far as the morale of the volunteers is high. But some of them get depressed. "Maybe frustration is built within the boys themselves," said Leon Lane, deputy representative for CARE, Inc. (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere), which is handling the project for the Corps in Colombia. "They have a lot of baggage back home to go too fast too soon."

A job like this isn't going to be completed for years and years," he continued.

In Peru, where Peace Corps team at the University of Notre Dame in Lima has been working since December with the local university to set up a medical education program, they were scattered in ones and twos for 1,000 miles in the Chilean interior.

Their work is more formalized and more specialized than that of the Colombian team. They work as carpenters, social workers, in rural husbandry, as dental assistants, home economists, and economic advisers. "These Peace Corps volunteers are striving for a better understanding between people," the Chilean newspaper La Estrella said.

More volunteers are on the way to Chile. But, as in the case of Colombia, the impact of the Americans is muted by the vastness of the problems they have tackled.

Despite such frustrations, both Latin American officials and the Peace Corps see their development as a way to make good use of young Americans with or without academic training and to discover special needs in the developing world. All parts of the volunteers in Colombia and Chile are being picked for work in Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Cyprus, British North Borneo, and Sarawak.

Besides the occasional frustrations, the Peace Corps volunteers are successful. One of the most severe was the lack of proper language instruction—a fault that has been corrected.

For example, the first group of 128 volunteers sent to the Philippines last fall spent weeks learning Tagalog, the national language. Then they were assigned to non-Tagalog-speaking areas. Roughly the same mistake was made in training the 28 volunteers sent to West Pakistan, where the state languages, along with English, are Sindhi, Punjabi, and Fustan. The 26 men and 2 women who arrived in Fustan just could not master Punjabi in 10 weeks at Ohio State University.

SOME OF THE PROJECTS POORELY DEFINED AT START

A second problem has been projects that were either poorly handled or badly defined. For example, the 128 volunteers sent to the Philippines last fall spent weeks learning Tagalog, the national language. Then they were assigned to non-Tagalog-speaking areas. Roughly the same mistake was made in training the 28 volunteers sent to West Pakistan, where the state languages, along with English, are Sindhi, Punjabi, and Fustan. The 26 men and 2 women who arrived in Fustan just could not master Punjabi in 10 weeks at Ohio State University.

Some of the Projects Poorly Defined at Start

In Santander, Colombia, a volunteer told a village priest:

"We want to solve these problems without giving orders. We want to motivate people to work. Maybe we'll build a health center or prepare a highway. We want to tell them 'we need a school,' and they'll shout and argue and laugh and finally build a school."

But the priest replied quietly: "You will achieve that when you have economic freedom."

In Chiriqua, in the Colombian department of Boyaca, a hard-working Peace Corps team was pulled out 3 months ago to avoid its getting into a local dispute over the work and relations with belligerent landowners, who discouraged peasants from attending community meetings.

Nevertheless, 44 Peace Corps volunteers have made do. One volunteer, Davis Grubb of Westport, Conn., took a bus into Bogota, called on the police chief, who backed him up with a bulldozer, which his village used to build an 8-mile road to market.

Another volunteer, David Downing of Los Gatos, Calif., has been doing the dirty work of moving muck along a 14-mile dirt road from the village of Gatos to Bogota, the capital.

The villagers are enthusiastic, if every harassed Colombian official is not. The volunteers, sometimes in their annoyances, are besieged with offers of coffee, liquor, or sweets.

As far as the morale of the volunteers is high. But some of them get depressed. "Maybe frustration is built within the boys themselves," said Leon Lane, deputy representative for CARE, Inc. (Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere), which is handling the project for the Corps in Colombia. "They have a lot of baggage back home to go too fast too soon."

A job like this isn't going to be completed for years and years," he continued.

In Peru, where Peace Corps team at the University of Notre Dame in Lima has been working since December with the local university to set up a medical education program, they were scattered in ones and twos for 1,000 miles in the Chilean interior.

Their work is more formalized and more specialized than that of the Colombian team. They work as carpenters, social workers, in rural husbandry, as dental assistants, home economists, and economic advisers. "These Peace Corps volunteers are striving for a better understanding between people," the Chilean newspaper La Estrella said.

More volunteers are on the way to Chile. But, as in the case of Colombia, the impact of the Americas is muted by the vastness of the problems they have tackled.

Despite such frustrations, both Latin American officials and the Peace Corps see their development as a way to make good use of young Americans with or without academic training and to discover special needs in the developing world. All parts of the volunteers in Colombia and Chile are being picked for work in Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Cyprus, British North Borneo, and Sarawak.

Besides the occasional frustrations, the Peace Corps volunteers are successful. One of the most severe was the lack of proper language instruction—a fault that has been corrected.

For example, the first group of 128 volunteers sent to the Philippines last fall spent weeks learning Tagalog, the national language. Then they were assigned to non-Tagalog-speaking areas. Roughly the same mistake was made in training the 28 volunteers sent to West Pakistan, where the state languages, along with English, are Sindhi, Punjabi, and Fustan. The 26 men and 2 women who arrived in Fustan just could not master Punjabi in 10 weeks at Ohio State University.

SOME OF THE PROJECTS POORELY DEFINED AT START

A second problem has been projects that were either poorly handled or badly defined. For example, the 128 volunteers sent to the Philippines last fall spent weeks learning Tagalog, the national language. Then they were assigned to non-Tagalog-speaking areas. Roughly the same mistake was made in training the 28 volunteers sent to West Pakistan, where the state languages, along with English, are Sindhi, Punjabi, and Fustan. The 26 men and 2 women who arrived in Fustan just could not master Punjabi in 10 weeks at Ohio State University.
number of volunteers on duty or assigned, the projects and training centers:

PROJECTS UNDERWAY

Venezuela, 41; 4-H, 4-H Foundation.
Nigeria, 40; secondary education, Harvard.
Nigeria, 45; secondary education, University of California at Los Angeles.
Nigeria, 24; university education, Michigan State.

University of Pennsylvania and the projects and training centers: Columbia, 37; secondary education, extension, education, Iowa State.
Tanganyika, 35; road surveying, mapping, Texas Western.
Colombia, 58; rural development, Rutgers.
Colombia, 44; rural development, Arizona State.
Chile, 45; rural development, Notre Dame.

The training at home has been rigorous; in the field the young people have been expected to live as do their native counterparts, often on a fairly Spartan regime; it is the host country and not Washington that decides what shall be done where; and in hard work, few things have been key expression. Applicants were carefully screened, with the result that only a few wanted to come prematurely, or had to be asked to do so.

Last year the Peace Corps made out with $90 million. The training amount has been authorized, though not yet appropriated. The larger amount would cover the gap as is the one of a better way of making friends, spreading democratic ideas and helping people. Some day the Ngainias, the East Indians or the Colombians may recognize that they are the people that can to turn over control of the domestic farm to their own young people to work with us on projects they can handle better than we can. Why not?

MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, some of the Nation's most powerful farm interests have launched a massive and deliberate campaign of half-truths and distorted facts aimed at arousing the entire farming community against one of the most important and needed migratory bills now before the Congress.

The facts suggest that behind this attack are a small number of growers who are the major users of Mexican farm labor supplied through the bracero program under Public Law 78. These growers rely upon the secret services in a few farm associations used pay lobbyists in Washington to campaign against S. 1129, a legislative measure to provide farmers a reliable, qualified domestic labor supply and make fuller employable power for qualified American farmworkers. Worth reiterating, how­ever, is that fact that not all farm asso­ciations or recruitment centers of the 1,000-odd Peace Corps recruits abroad by the fall of 1963. Some of these facts are set forth in a news report in the Times today.

The training at home has been rigorous; in the field the young people have been expected to live as do their native counterparts, often on a fairly Spartan regime; it is the host country and not Washington that decides what shall be done where; and in hard work, few things have been key expression. Applicants were carefully screened, with the result that only a few wanted to come prematurely, or had to be asked to do so.

Last year the Peace Corps made out with $90 million. The training amount has been authorized, though not yet appropriated. The larger amount would cover the gap as is the one of a better way of making friends, spreading democratic ideas and helping people. Some day the Ngainias, the East Indians or the Colombians may recognize that they are the people that can to turn over control of the domestic farm to their own young people to work with us on projects they can handle better than we can. Why not?

Niger, 8; teaching, Howard University.
Senegal, 6; teaching, Howard University.
Togo, 20; education, University of Maryland.

THE PEACE CORPS’ FIRST YEAR

A year ago tomorrow the first of the 2- year recruits for the Peace Corps began their training. Some critics of this plan for a kind of AREF feared that young, romantic idealists with weak characters, unfounded illusions and beards might be attracted. But a survey of the 1,000 Peace Corps volunteers who will be trained volunteer will soon go overseas. Performance reports are good enough to justify Director Shriver’s claim that about 10,000 Peace Corps recruits abroad by the fall of 1963. Some of these facts are set forth in a news report in the Times today.

The training at home has been rigorous; in the field the young people have been expected to live as do their native counterparts, often on a fairly Spartan regime; it is the host country and not Washington that decides what shall be done where; and in hard work, few things have been key expression. Applicants were carefully screened, with the result that only a few wanted to come prematurely, or had to be asked to do so.

Last year the Peace Corps made out with $90 million. The training amount has been authorized, though not yet appropriated. The larger amount would cover the gap as is the one of a better way of making friends, spreading democratic ideas and helping people. Some day the Ngainias, the East Indians or the Colombians may recognize that they are the people that can to turn over control of the domestic farm to their own young people to work with us on projects they can handle better than we can. Why not?

Niger, 8; teaching, Howard University.
Senegal, 6; teaching, Howard University.
Togo, 20; education, University of Maryland.

You are aware of the danger to agriculture posed by S. 1129, the proposal in Congress by Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey, to double the local and the domestic farm labor force to the U.S. Department of Labor.

The enclosed material has been prepared for your use.

To be most effective, this material should be localized so as to make it more attractive to the various news media in your area. As a consequence, we would suggest the following:

Do not simply reproduce and mail this material to your local news outlets. Instead (a), wherever possible, substitute the name of a local association and individual for the name of the national users committee and its spokesman; (b) have some well-known individual in your organization who is familiar with the issue hand-carry your revised release and suggested editorial material to your local news media. Have him present to the entire community, and, therefore, of significant news interest; and (c) if you have additional material which you would like to include, distribute the material you give to your local news media, file, see to it that prominent members of your organization personally present your localized story to their service clubs, church groups, influential representatives of allied industries, and your elected State and Federal representatives.

Fear resulting from such distortions and techniques is as unnecessary as it is avoidable—especially when the fear is manufactured by those holding themselves out as having the only antidote to allay these fears. In short, I am charging these few paid Washington lobbyists with being self-proclaimed protectors and then generating fear that the farmworkers to enter themselves as the bastions against an imagined enemy-Congress.

AN UNPARALLELED GRANT OF POWER TO GOLDBERG

A FALSE CHARGE

Another document spuriously charges that S. 1129 grants the Secretary of Labor an “unparalleled grant of broad discretionary power” and cites sections 204(b), 205(2) and 206(a) as proof. Examination of this so-called proof, however, shows it to be without merit in that these sections of S. 1129 have parallel provisions in existing law, or implementary regulations and agreements.

Section 204(b) is an unparalleled grant of power.

Fact: This section of S. 1129 is similar to section 503 of Public Law 78—1951—and regulation 602.10 of the Wagner-Peyser Act—1933—both of which provide that foreign workers will not be available to farmers who have not made reasonable efforts to obtain domestic farmworkers.

Fiction: Section 205(2) is an unparalleled grant of power.

Fact: This section of S. 1129 is similar to regulation 602(9) of Wagner-Peyser which conditions the Interstate recruitment of American farmworkers upon as-
similar employment service provisions, to call him a "czar" only when he administers S. 1129 is a pristine example of doublethink.

Key to the anomalous position taken by those attacking S. 1129 lies in the fact that these associations do not truly represent the farm community as claimed. Acquiescent to economic benefits gained through the bracero program, a few growers seek to retain this advantage at the expense of the small farmer.

Serious disadvantages from an economic viewpoint is the small farmer who is not equipped to utilize Mexican farmworkers supplied under the bracero program. He must rely upon his own efforts and ingenuity to attract qualified reliable farmworkers to harvest his crops. Too often, however, enough farmworkers cannot be obtained when needed or they may not be qualified or reliable. Mean­while, the large commercial farming operations participating in the bracero program are sufficiently staffed by a number of reliable farmworkers. These workers, carefully selected and transported under a highly efficient program, will arrive when needed and will be qualified and reliable.

The large bracero user, moreover, receives an additional economic advantage over the nonbracero user. Federal funds, raised through taxes, are used to pay part of the cost of bringing the bracero program. In this connection, it is noteworthy that the farmers in Texas and California alone utilize 15 percent of the annual importation of braceros.

Also victimized by the assault on S. 1129 are the long-suffering domestic farmworker and his family. The loss of an adequate, well-functioning, and voluntary farm employment service envisioned under S. 1129 would perpetuate the existing barriers against matching farmworkers to farm jobs. To leave such employment service in the hands of a czar is irrational and imposes an unnecessary burden upon the farmer and the citizen farmworker alike.

Moreover, the importation of hundreds of thousands of Mexican farmworkers puts them in direct job competition with our already underemployed rural citizen farmworkers. Originally the bracero program was enacted as a stop-gap measure. Over the years, however, it has become the major source of seasonal farmworkers. It is now time for the American public, farmer, and non-farmer alike, to modify the bracero program so that it is used to supplement— but not supplant—the American farm labor force.

SECTION ENTAILS SELF-DECEPTION

The growers seeking to discredit and abort the possibility of a stable, productive domestic farm labor force are furthering themselves. The extension of the bracero program in Congress in 1961 was accomplished only by great pressure. Furthermore, when President Kennedy signed the 2-year extension, he said:

The adverse effect of the Mexican farm labor program * * * on the wage and employment conditions of domestic workers is clear and cumulative in its impact. We do not condone it. Therefore, I sign this bill with the understanding that the labor offices of the Labor Work Force * * * use the authority vested in me under the law * * * make the determination as essential for the protection of the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers.

Given the uncertain future of the bracero program, it is absurd for the large bracero user to block the passage of S. 1129. To accomplish this end is tantamount to destroying one of the most useful and needed pieces of legislation ever designed to provide farmers, large and small, with a source of reliable, seasonal farmworkers.

A MODEST PROPOSAL TO REASONABLE MEN

Once it is clear that the assault on S. 1129 is being undertaken only for the benefit of a small number of large bracero users, and on an accurate appraisal, not even in the best interests of these growers themselves, rational farmers will benefit from the proposed voluntary employment service envisioned in S. 1129. I therefore urge all members of Congress to examine S. 1129 and the benefits it will provide. This is a modest proposal to reasonable men.

To assist the farming community in this regard, I have prepared a fact sheet which will provide an accurate analysis and explanation of S. 1129. I hope the farming community will make use of this fact sheet; I also hope those representatives of the farm community will present it with a view toward assisting the farmer, the migrant farm family, and the national interest. Once this is underway, and concepts of the wrong-headed slogans and mythology are replaced by rational discussion, I will welcome ideas for making the employment services provided under S. 1129 as effective and helpful as possible to farmers and farmworkers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the fact sheet to which I referred, containing the true purposes of S. 1129, together with a description of the bill, be printed in the Record at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FACT SHEET ON S. 1129, TO AMEND THE ACT OF JUNE 6, 1933, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF LABOR TO PROVIDE IMPROVED PROGRAMS OF RECRUITMENT, TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The statements in this fact sheet are based on the version of the bill, S. 1129, on which hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on February 8 and 9, 1962, and on consultation with the U.S. Department of Labor concerning the prospective operation of the program.

1. What is the purpose of S. 1129? S. 1129 is designed to remedy inadequacies that exist in the present farm labor situation caused by the weakness of the employer and farmworkers. Many farmers cannot now obtain adequate numbers of farmworkers. Too many farmers cannot rely on the workers (1) to arrive when they are needed, (2) to have the appropriate qualifications, and (3) to stay on the job until its completion.

For these farmers, S. 1129 is intended to make the job of the farm labor force. S. 1129 will also make fuller employment possible for qualified farmworkers and,
by providing workers placed under the program with certain minimum assurances, will increase the number of qualified, reliable workers available to farmers. Should a worker hired under S. 1129 fall, without good cause, to fulfill his employment contract, the farmer will be supplied with a replacement worker. If the farmer does not desire a replacement, a proportional part of his original fee will be refunded. If the farmer, after use of replacement workers, and refund provisions in the bill, it will be the Government, not the grower, that bears the responsibility to provide a payment to the worker for time spent through a worker's leaving the job before the end of the agreed-upon period of employment.

1. What are the obligations of a farmer to a worker he obtains under S. 1129?

2. How will S. 1129 affect the present farm placement system?

3. How will the farmer be assured of getting only qualified, willing, and able workers under S. 1129?

4. Where will the workers supplied under the S. 1129 program be placed?

5. Under the authority given in S. 1129 for positive recruitment, it will be possible for the employment service to tap new sources of agricultural labor in addition to making referrals of workers who, through crew leaders, have entered into a contractual relationship with placement offices. Seasonal farm employment away from home would be profitable for many farmworkers and small family farmers who now lack year-round work. Recent surveys, made in rural Mississippi and Arkansas, strongly indicate that this will be an important source of qualified workers for the S. 1129 program. Another source will be American Indians, among whom there is excessive unemployment although they are now skills in training programs such as the Area Redevelopment Administration program in Hamonton, N.J., which recently graduated 260 in the past year. In addition, those unable to maintain employment will be placed in new occupations. In addition to making farmworkers available from new sources, S. 1129 will increase the total number of available man-hours through full employment of workers already in the migratory stream. Many present migrants, reluctant to travel until they know that work is available, now frequently delay their departures so long that they do not arrive in harvest areas until the peak needs has passed. Other migrants now seek work without guidance, or travel unneccessarily long distances to gain employment. By assuring transportation to the work and back to the home base, and by making possible the use of information on the locations of men and jobs, S. 1129 will promote the full utilization of workers such as these.

6. Will S. 1129 provide for the unionization of farmworkers?

7. How will a farmer go about hiring workers under the S. 1129 program?

Orders for workers under S. 1129, like orders under present placement procedures, will be placed through the local office of the employment service. Workers will be brought into the area under S. 1129 only if sufficient qualified workers who are permanent residents of the area are unavailable.

8. How will workers be furnished without any unreasonable delays?

The transportation of workers by the Employment Service through interstate clearance, the employer's housing, and his responsibilities under the agreement will determine the length of time required. Claims may have to be made before a need for foreign workers can be determined. The use of this procedure would have to be made in rural Mississippi and other areas. In cases of labor shortage in the West, the use of this procedure would be considered one of the reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers that must be made before foreign workers can be certified. The availability of the S. 1129 procedure will not, however, increase the total number of foreign workers that can be employed. It will be the employer's obligation under the agreement to reemploy the same workers in the employment service to tap new sources of labor. Where growers have housing facilities only for bachelors, the S. 1129 program, to affect the farm for foreign workers, will in general have to provide bachelor domestics. No expensive modifications of accommodations will be required. If the S. 1129 program can provide suitable housing, the number of foreign workers may be reduced where on- or off-farm family housing is already furnished with a view to reducing the burden on the farm operator. A reduction in the size of a grower's labor force, for example, may mean that his bachelor housing, with slight modifications, could accommodate a labor force including families.

9. Will workers placed in jobs under S. 1129 have to meet minimum standards?

Supposed is now required with respect to housing for workers referred by the U.S. Employment Service through interstate clearance, the employer's housing for workers referred under S. 1129 will have to meet minimum standards. Where there are effective State housing regulations, however, additional requirements will not be imposed. The employer's other obligations will be: to pay the worker as much as local workers are paid for similar work; to require him to perform the work required of him with proper application, care, and diligence; to pay the worker as much as local workers are paid for similar work; to require him to perform the work required of him with proper application, care, and diligence; to pay the worker as much as local workers are paid for similar work; to present any work for which he is responsible, and to present a written statement of his personal, family, and health insurance coverage.

10. What will be the relationship between S. 1129 and present programs for the temporary importation of farm labor?

With the enactment of S. 1129, farmers will have a new procedure for recruitment of domestic workers. In appropriate circumstances, the use of this procedure would be considered one of the reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers that must be made before foreign workers can be certified. The availability of the S. 1129 procedure will not, however, increase the total number of foreign workers that can be employed. It will be the employer's obligation under the agreement to reemploy the same workers in the employment service to tap new sources of labor. Where growers have housing facilities only for bachelors, the S. 1129 program, to affect the farm for foreign workers, will in general have to provide bachelor domestics. No expensive modifications of accommodations will be required. If the S. 1129 program can provide suitable housing, the number of foreign workers may be reduced where on- or off-farm family housing is already furnished with a view to reducing the burden on the farm operator. A reduction in the size of a grower's labor force, for example, may mean that his bachelor housing, with slight modifications, could accommodate a labor force including families.

11. Does S. 1129 provide for the unionization of farmworkers?

No. The bill makes no change in existing law and regulations, either to promote or to discourage unionization of farmworkers. S. 1129 simply continues in effect the present rule, applicable to both the U.S. Employment Service and the farm labor centers established under the Agricultural Act of 1942, that workers will not be referred to aid in filling a job where the center is vacant because of a labor dispute or the filling of which is an issue in a labor dispute.
That morning the Washington Post set the tone of the day in the Nation’s Capital with an editorial entitled “Immortal Yankee,” pointing out among other things:

The most fitting memorial to Thoreau on the centenary of his death would be the passage in Congress of the wilderness bill, demonstrating to posterity that our land forever wild is a national treasure.

The Public Lands Subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was that afternoon concluding hearings on the wilderness legislation. It is designed to incorporate some 53 million acres of American scenic grandeur.

Against the carefully and conscientiously detailed legislation is the sentiment of many Americans, with a commercial ax to grind, who weigh lighter on the scales of public interest, which clearly requires that America’s dwindling heritage of wilderness grandeur be preserved to inspire and instruct future generations.

I compliment the Washington Daily News editorial staff for the excellent editorial, because it is in the public interest and it is a great public service. My colleagues and I by the thousands have been associated with an effort in the Congress to protect the great, fine, and vast areas of wilderness territory so that future generations might experience some of the natural recreations which is made available because of those public lands. We are deeply indebted to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] for his work in the field and for the leadership of the Senate, and as well as to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Chrusen], who was the Senator in charge of the bill when the measure was passed by the Senate.

It is a wise comment of the Washington Post that enactment of this wilderness legislation can be viewed as a “most fitting memorial to Thoreau on the centenary of his death.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks made by the Undersecretary of the Interior, Senator Stewart L. Udall, as the occasion’s master of ceremonies, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The meeting was opened by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Wilderness News. Mr. Zahniser, who is also a past president of the Thoreau Society, presented Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall as the occasion’s master of ceremonies. Secretary Udall introduced our great poet, Robert Frost, and Associate Justice William O. Douglas, who was on hand for the gathering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks made at this centenary observance of the death of Henry David Thoreau be printed along with my remarks in the Record, so that they may be a matter of record as the remarks at the Dumbarton Oaks gathering.

The meeting was opened by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Wilderness News. Mr. Zahniser, who is also a past president of the Thoreau Society, presented Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall as the occasion’s master of ceremonies. Secretary Udall introduced our great poet, Robert Frost, and Associate Justice William O. Douglas, who was on hand for the gathering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks made at this centenary observance of the death of Henry David Thoreau be printed along with my remarks in the Record, so that they may be a matter of record as the remarks at the Dumbarton Oaks gathering.

The meeting was opened by Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Wilderness News. Mr. Zahniser, who is also a past president of the Thoreau Society, presented Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall as the occasion’s master of ceremonies. Secretary Udall introduced our great poet, Robert Frost, and Associate Justice William O. Douglas, who was on hand for the gathering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks made at this centenary observance of the death of Henry David Thoreau be printed along with my remarks in the Record, so that they may be a matter of record as the remarks at the Dumbarton Oaks gathering.
Mr. Zahniser and Mr. Udall differed on what to call themselves. Mr. Zahniser pronounced it "Thor-O-Vians," while it came from Udall's western tongue as "Thoreau-ans."

Introduced by Mr. Zahniser as "captain of one of the great names," Secretary Douglas fell in turn introduced Poet Bill Meredith of New London, Conn. He read at the Library of Congress last year and suggested the gathering.

Another poet, Mr. Frost, told the Thore: "I sometimes feel it would be good to reveal in great names." Touching on the names of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Emerson, he observed it was the young poet, from Connecticut, who had the idea of this gathering and who is with us here today.

Bill, we are all in your debt.

The other is Mr. Robert Woods Bliss, who, with her late husband, the Ambassador, gave to the public these beautiful grounds and abode.

Secretary Udall. Certainly I know you will all agree we could not have chosen a better place or a better time to have this occasion.

I think that nothing is more Thoreausian than this present moment. I think the greatest gift that any man, or any couple, can leave to their fellow man is the beauty of their lives. This park here embodies Thoreau's ideals mentioned a while ago, and, therefore, I think it appropriate to thank again the late Ambassador Bl. and Mrs. Zahniser for the fact that we can have this occasion here.

I have received several communications. There are two which I will read to you.

One is from E. B. White, who said he could not be here, but wrote: "For a dead man, Thoreau manages to keep surprisingly abreast of the news. I am still assaying all in weathers and all ideas. I hope he and his friends enjoy a pleasant noon-time."

And Paul Brooks, the Houghton Mifflin editor, may who be here, said: "Someone has said of Thoreau that he could get more in 10 minutes with a woodchuck than most men could get out of a night with Cleopatra."

I am sure this informal gathering would have meant more to Thoreau than all the formal meetings held in his honor.

So I thought I would tell a few minutes with two men who, perhaps more than any other in this country, represent the Thoreau spirit and understand it today. It is my privilege to introduce these two men.

INTRODUCING ROBERT FROST

The first is a man who happens to be exactly twice as long as the time of his death. Henry Thoreau, when he died 100 years ago, was the age of President John F. Kennedy — 44. This, I think, makes us realize how much more he might have contributed had he lived longer.

Robert Frost will be 88 on his next birthday. Robert has the same qualities of mind, the same feeling for this land. He has the same regard for the need of being versed in country things — as he has put it. I think he has the same awareness that Thoreau had of the elusiveness of truth, and most Thoreauvians have as a favor to the story about when he was asked in his last illness whether he had made his peace with God, or not, he replied, "I did not know we had quarreled."

Robert Frost has his own relationship with God, but he is the kind of man that he is a man who, in his own words, has had a lover's quarrel with the world for 88 years. Whenever I am weary of the poem in my book: My Heart in the North, I go to the woods. And I think he would share that. He has a favorite poem: "I want to be lost not be able to find my way home. That is what the wilderness has." [Applause.]

INTRODUCING WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Secretary Udall, Thoreau called himself inspector of snowstorms. He was that. He had other outside assignments that he took upon himself, too.

I think if Thoreau has any successor as inspector of wilderness, it is William O. Douglas. I think it is William O. Douglas who has the friend of Thoreau's scorn for modern transportation. He is a shank's mare man. He has still today a concern, as lively and as keen as Thoreau's, for the estrangement of man from his natural surroundings.

I think he would share one of the things that Thoreau wrote or said in his last years: "The earth has higher uses than we put her to."

It is a pleasure for all of us to have as our other speaker, to pay homage to Thoreau today, Justice William O. Douglas. [Applause.]

REMARKS BY WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT

Justice Douglas. A recent visitor to Walden Pond, Edwin Way Teale, tells about the
thousands of people who now visit that sanctuary. He wrote in "North With the Sierras" that the "wilderness areas presents serious problems of this
..."

"With Walter Harding, Secretary of the Sierra Club, and his wife, * * * I made a trip to the Sierra Club headquarters in the Walden shore line close to the site of Thoreau's cabin. As we walked along, I joined things that were scattered at its edge. * * * The list includes:

"One hundred and sixteen beer cans, 31 milk bottles, 7 Coca-Cola bottles, the remains of a half-eaten sandwich, Dixie cups, cracker boxes, soda straws, cigarette packs, broken bottle caps, playing cards, broken glass, paper napkins, mustard bottles, firecrackers, banana peels, orange skins, a baby food jar, a piece of pink ribbon, the thumb of a leather glove, a flashlight battery, and a dollar bill."

This problem of mass invasion of wilderness areas presents serious problems of this character all over the country. We of the Sierra Club arranged for a summer team to collect tin cans and bottles and other debris at four remote lakes in the High Sierra. They packed out three and three summers of accumulation.

On the top of Mt. Whitney another Sierra Club team packed out eight gunnysacks of such debris.

The moral, I think, is plain, and one that Thoreau would have been the first to advance were he alive. We need more wilderness areas rather than fewer—and large ones, at that. But the trend is in the opposite direction. While it is true that our population is exploding. Even the sanctuaries of Walden are being threatened by man-made fires.

I am reminded of the advertisement: "Come up to Unspoiled Vermont," to which Binford added that well-known smile, "And help us despoil it."

Mr. Fossey (interrupting). Let me tell you about that. It is on every map in every restaurant, every dining place you know: "Come to Unspoiled Vermont." I always write on it, in my own hand: "And help spoil it!"

Justice DOUGLAS (continuing). We are all grateful to the Massachusetts Supreme Court for its 1960 decision in the Nickels case. Perhaps the most significant decision would have been the refusal of the courts for the beaches of Walden Pond, to widen the beach by cutting down the embankment, to clear the shore for fishermen, to put up a 100-foot concrete bathhouse. But for the intervention of the Massachusetts Audubon Society and Walden Pond would have become a highly modernized amusement park.

Thoreau did not know the world. In "Walden" he says that it is not worth while to go around the world to count the cats in Zanzibar. To this comment H. M. Tomlinson once replied that while Thoreau was right about Zanzibar, "we wish he had tried it. He would have counted more than cats. We miss the book he would have made." It is true, and a much more subtle truth.

Mr. President, we are now able to know the factors that would indeed have produced an exciting tome on Zanzibar, bringing to light things that its miserableness and the Arab slave traders never knew about the earth and its beauty.

I have traveled with Thoreau everywhere he went in New England. He did not pontificate far north in the Maine woods as I had imagined. He saw some headwaters of the Allagash, but not the wild river itself—the Wabanaki, the greatest of all the Penobscot—threatened by bulldozers, roads, motels, and civilization. Whether Thoreau went he was able to lead his solitude, something of which there are always new ones to be found, and always find something new that sends us to the libraries for research.

Thoreau, for example, never did identify the "night warbler" which I believe was the eastern phoebe. Three other birds: Were they sandpipers, telltales, or plovers? he asked. "Or they may be the turnstone," he added.

Thoreau's curiosity was about the wonders of creation, including man, but mostly about those wonders which are at our feet and yet which we generally disregard. "Has man the midnight dew, the mighty cones of the evergreens, like central Africa to most of us?" he asked. The answer as of 1962 is still "Yes." Yet wonders which are at our feet often transpire at midnight. How many have heard on wild March nights the armada of March snowbirds coming and perching on the palisades, heading for northern nesting grounds?

We do not have many whippoorwillin this area. Thoreau knew it from the north woods. It ushers in the darkness of night; and belies the first grey streaks of dawn are visible, it announces that the time for sleep has almost ended. The haunting song of that wondrous bird had strong appeal to Thoreau, who wished that he would hear it in his dreams.

Thoreau—an individualist—would be alarmed at the specter of purgatory, that is to conform. Thoreau, the individual, did not walk with the crowd, nor think like the crowd; he lived like the birds and the angels; the only man of leisure in his town; and his independence made all others look like tools.

Thoreau found his sanctuary, his cathedral, in the woods. The endless wonders of nature were his excitement. A swamp was not a spot to drain, but a place for reflection. The food chains discovered there, the symbiotic relation of plant to plant, of animal to animal, of fungus to tree—these were his excitement.

If we could all say with him "the heavens and the earth are one fellow," we would be as anxious to clean up our rivers and to preserve our islands of wilderness as we are to put a man on the moon.

On June 17, 1858, Thoreau noted in his journal: "If a man walks in the woods for love of them for half his days, he is esteemed a kind of lessee. If he walks as a speculator, shearing off those woods, he is esteemed industrious and enterprising—making a profit before its time."

Thoreau lived when men were appraising trees in terms of board feet, not in terms of watershed protection and birds and music. His protests against that narrow outlook were among the first heard on this continent. And they still plague the conscience of the bureacrats whose voice is the voice of conservation but whose deeds are destructive of wilderness values.

Thoreau noted that: "More of the insecticides and pesticides appeared to upset our ecological balances and to poison the gardens and fields where we grow our food and the waters that carry the poisonous insolutes off our farms into our rivers and lakes."

Thoreau lived when the symbol of destruction of wilderness was the ax and the jack-knife. He never knew the bulldozer and the reckless ruinous logging practices in which we now indulge. It would be a sign of the times if the bulldozer replaced the ax and the jack-knife.

Thoreau did, however, know the quiet desperation in which most people lead their lives. "If the earth and the sea are one fellow, it is a great comfort to all of us amateurs who, no matter how much we may call the wilderness the place for reflection,

"Thank you. [Applause.]"

THE DEVELOPING DIALOG ON ECONOMIC GROWTH  
Mr. GOLDFATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of the hearing the remarks of Walter Harding, Secretary of the Interior, entitled "The Developing Dialog on Economic Growth," delivered by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, at the commencement exercises of the Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park, Mass., on June 18, 1962.

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

"The Developing Dialog on Economic Growth"

(An address by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, professor of economics, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City, at the commencement exercises of the Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park, Mass., Monday, June 18, 1962)

I should like to devote my remarks this morning to what we may call, in the current idiom, the dialogue on economic growth.

The question of the adequacy or inadequacy of our rate of economic growth is not a new subject. The phenomenon of it in 1959 and 1960, especially in the latter year, but for some months now it has had fairly wide recognition of the fact that we have been in a phase of recovery and expansion, and it is only natural that under such conditions interest in the growth question should tend to recede.

What is more, business forecasts have been very optimistic, both those emanating from official sources and those put forward by private individuals and groups. One of our leading magazines of business has been talking until very recently—I assume they have stopped now—of a self-winding superbloom. It is true that what we may call, in the business debate over policies to promote growth has languished.

Suddenly all this has changed. There has been a fairly widespread realization of the fact that the expansion has not been a vigorous one. Not only has it failed by a wide margin to come up to the Federal Government's expectations, but it has been barely up to the standard of the last two recoveries. This was even more in evidence if we consider that for a variety of reasons the mood of determined optimism persisted. The spell was created by a variety of factors, none of which is now. It is a matter that is evident, now is that we develop an excessive pessimism and in an effort to stimulate the economy rush into ill-considered measures which in the end are proven to be marks rather than good.
In any case, the debate is on, and it promises to be an interesting discourse. Indeed, we are entering into what may well be the most important and just as intricate. It is exempt from common sense consideration.

And there are other questions that will be dealt with in this dialogue just as important and just as intricate. They are questions that go to the bottom of our understanding of what makes our economic problem work. More than that, we think about them deeply enough, as we must, we shall see that they go to the roots of our public policy. Indeed, if we do not make up our mind on the basis of facts, logic straight. And whatever else is a reality. Let me give you the truth is so old it looks.
This inflationary policy. Whatever other damage such an experiment might do, it is surely one of the marvels of modern marketing, and make well nigh impossible the elimination of our international balance-of-payments deficit. We can say that this bit of mythology is dead, not just for the moment, but for good. The third and last of the points in the dialogue on which we have to come to a moment briefly has to do with business profits. I am sure you have noted the theory that the rate of economic growth is largely by the rate of spending on capital goods. It is possible to overdo this theory, as it is possible to overdo any prescription for a cold no one could deny that the expansion of our base of physical capital is an essential condition for the achievement of rapid growth. If this is the case, then we must concede that we have done very badly in recent years. In a period in which spending on capital goods in foreign industrial economies, in terms of constant dollars, has been going ahead by leaps and bounds, capital goods spending in our own economy has actually failed to increase at all. In the years 1953-59 the constant dollar amount of capital goods spending rose anywheres, whereas it fell in Western Europe; in sharp contrast, there was actually a small decline in the United States. Construction of new capital and equipment in the second quarter of 1962 was not as large in dollar amount, at current prices, as it was in 1957, 5 years ago; and if we take account of the fact that the costs of construction of new plants and the prices of industrial equipment have increased significantly, there is reason to believe that we are nowadays installing annually a smaller volume of physical facilities than we were then. There is a very great danger that this will be a real dynamism here. We are not even holding our own. Why is this so? Let me comment on what I think is the most important aspect of this critical question. It would be a mistake to argue that the volume of capital goods spending depends exclusively on the level of corporate profits. But I think we could agree that profits are a major element, probably the major element, in determining the level of capital goods spending. Is it not important, then, that while wage payments, production, and sales have been rising, corporate profits have remained roughly unchanged? Corporate profits in 1961 were only very little larger, perhaps 3%, than in 1953, 8 years earlier, and corporate profits after taxes were actually lower. And this is in current not in constant dollars. There was an increase of $3.2 billion in the dividends paid annually by corporations, but the amount of income retained by corporations fell by $1.3 billion, or by about 25 percent. This is the point that must not be overlooked in the diollog on growth. We cannot get our economy moving as it should be moving unless we restore some dynamism to busi­ness profits. If this profit deflation, and that is what it is, is to be corrected we must understand its causes. I have no wish to oversimplify matters, but I have come to the conclusion that the cause in one sentence I would say that the squeeze on business profits results from the fact that the cost inflation has, for the moment at least, been largely checked, cost inflation continues. How can we escape from this condition? Surely a further and final answer is found in a reap­praisal of price inflation. Few people would prescribe this. There are some still unconcerned to price stability as an essen­tial condition of our growth, of sus­tainable economic growth, but inflation is such a thoroughly displeasing idea nowadays that almost absolutely are largely silent. They have been silenced, if not entirely persuaded, by the deficit in our balance of payments. Indeed, one of the great mass conversions of history has taken place on the question of inflation. And the excellent industry episode of this spring showed that the executive branch of our Govern­ment, from the President on down, is unre­morseful in its determination to elimi­nate. Circumstances have checked price inflation, but we have not succeeded in stopping cost inflation and therein lies the rub, or the squeeze, or whatever you want to call it. There are a number of avenues by which we might approach the problem of this squeeze. As individual businessmen you will find that one way to do it is by practic­ing some of the cost cutting techniques of foreign trade to your cost and profits. We shall also have to do that as a nation. We must remember that we are doing business at home, Federal, State, and local, is to a very large extent borne by American business as a business cost. And it is a rising cost. I hope that the dialog on growth, in which we have all been in­vited to participate, will lead to a thorough reexamination of governmental expenditures at the State and local as well as at the national level, the elimination of those expenditures that are not essential, and the passing on of those that are essential to wage, profit, and tax, to reduce taxes in business research. There are other avenues to a solution of the problem of cost inflation. One of these is the wage freeze, or the freeze on unit production costs by achieving a better rela­tion­ship between advances in wages and im­provements in productivity. The President's Council of Economic Ad­visers recently advanced a general guide­line on this matter in which they stated that the average of price increases in a particular branch of business should be equal productivity Improvements, on the average. I think we must conclude that this will be the key to this problem if its full­fledged development. If we agree that there has been a lag in profits, then the guideline should provide a price increase in steel of 3% or the price increase that will use labor's full proportionate amount of productivity improvements, which is what the guidelines call for will leave profits where they are relative to every­thing else. But we need to improve the rela­tive position of profits. Consequently, what we need to do is to take the time in the years that would be wage advances that are actually less than the improvements in productivity. Finally, I would like to draw attention to the price relationships that has been suppressing business profits and stifling investment expendi­tures. I would give a profit a chance to catch up. It would also provide opportunities for price reductions which would be enormously helpful in strengthening our international competitive capability and thus in eliminating our balance of payments deficit. A revision of the guidelines to this end is urgently needed. In addition to a redefinition of the wage guideline, there are other things that Gov­ernment can do to help prevent cost inflation. For one thing, the Federal Government is the largest single employer in the United States, is employed in about 6 million by the Federal Government in civilian jobs and around 6 million by State and local govern­ments; about 1 out of every 6 persons in the United States employs Federal or local Government. You can see from this that there is an enormous influence that could be brought to bear on the cost of living, if there is any change in the economy if Federal, State, and local governments were to adhere to wage and salary policies consistent with the labor market. Second, the Federal Government is an enormous indirect user of labor services through its contracting for construction. It has been alleged time and again that the pace of cost increases in the construction industry is much faster than the rise along the West coast, where Government procurement is the major element in the economy, is set by the wages paid by Government contractors and
subcontractors. Would it not be possible for the Federal Government, through its procurement agencies, to underwrite increases in costs that are consistent with those it wishes to have exercised by the business community generally? It would seem to me that this would be consistent with its own guidelines.

Third, consideration should be given to the impact on production costs of the determinations made by the Business Price Act, the Longshoremen's Act, and the Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts. Under these laws, the Federal Government sets what are in effect minimum wages for labor performing in a great variety of employments. And these minimum wages are well above the level of the minimum wage with which we are most familiar; namely, that which is set under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Certainly the Federal Government should have its own guidelines in mind when it sets minimum wages to be adhered to by its contractors.

You will see that there is a good deal that can be done by Government to achieve the kind of cost-price relationship essential to an improvement in profits, to a revival of plant expansions, to the securing of the most economical way of attaining a more satisfactory rate of growth.

I have said little or nothing about tax cuts because other matters are more basic. Let me comment on the current tax discussions very briefly.

We can dispense of the question of the "quickie" tax cut; that is, the temporary cut in individual income taxes very quickly. This is an antirecession measure. But so far as I know, no one is saying that we are in a recession already, and I am not prepared at this time to say that the outlook is so bleak that we cannot afford to use this kind of stimulus to our economy. But I have another matter. We should get started on it as soon as we can, but we must do it within the framework of a fiscal policy that will give us a fair chance of balancing the budget over the cycle. Neither our domestic nor our international affairs will permit us to go very long on a spree of higher expenditures, lower taxes, and bigger deficits. This would be a totally unworkable economic policy and I don't believe it would even be good politics, believe me.

One last word on taxes. Of all the potentially mischievous ideas I have heard recently, none is more discouraging than the notion that tax cuts for business would make it possible to give wage increases. But to give wage increases on this basis would totally eliminate the beneficial effects of these tax cuts. The tax cut is for larger wage increases. I don't advise it. You enter into careers well trained and you will find them, I am sure, full of excitement and satisfaction. May I say for myself and on behalf of those who have helped you reach this important milestone in your lives, especially for your parents and for the faculty of this institute, that we wish you every happiness and success. You will want to apply yourselves without stint to your individual work. The meaning of my choice of remarks this morning is that I hope you will also make your voice heard in your generation's own distinctive dialog.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, AND MAKE PERMANENT THE DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.


Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill laid before the Senate is H.R. 11221, providing for increases in the basic allowance for quarters for members of the uniformed services.

Mr. President, the military personnel who are eligible for the quarters allowances for which Government-furnished housing is not available. The purpose of the quarters allowance is to offset in part the expenses of military personnel who must occupy civilian housing. Mr. President, the quarters allowances have not been raised since the 14-percent increase granted in 1952.

We may note that there have been increases in the total military compensation for most pay grades as a result of the basic pay increases in 1955 and 1958. If my memory serves me correctly, there have been three increases in the pay of civilian personnel since there have been any increases in housing allowances for members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, the concept which was developed as a general guide for this bill in the previous quarters allowances for the various military grades should be related to the housing expenses for civilians at income levels comparable to the various military pay grades. The premise is that the housing costs for civilians are closely related to the costs which military personnel are normally required to pay to rent suitable civilian housing.

The President laid before the Senate a table setting forth the median housing expenses of civilians with incomes comparable to the military pay grades. The Senate will observe that these costs are related to the proposed allowances contained in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table which appears on page 5 of the report be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Housing cost analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military grade</th>
<th>Proposed total monthly military compensation</th>
<th>Proposed allowances with dependents</th>
<th>Median civilian housing expense</th>
<th>50-percent rental-15-percent utilities ratio</th>
<th>Military grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-10 general</td>
<td>$2,125.61</td>
<td>$201.00</td>
<td>$175.26</td>
<td>$83.13</td>
<td>E-1 recruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-9 lieutenant general</td>
<td>1,783.61</td>
<td>201.00</td>
<td>175.26</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-4 corporal (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-8 first lieutenant</td>
<td>1,432.61</td>
<td>201.00</td>
<td>175.26</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-7 second lieutenant</td>
<td>1,127.98</td>
<td>201.00</td>
<td>175.26</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-12 recruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5 junior officer</td>
<td>708.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporal (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4 major</td>
<td>969.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3 lieutenant colonel</td>
<td>708.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 private, 2nd class, 3rd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2 captain</td>
<td>1,541.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporal (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1 major</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7 first warrant officer</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-6 second warrant officer</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-5 sergeant major</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-4 captain</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3 first lieutenant</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2 major</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-7 first warrant officer</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-6 second warrant officer</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-5 sergeant major</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-4 captain</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-3 major</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-2 first lieutenant</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>E-8 private, 1st class, 2nd class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1 major</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-4 corporal (4 years or less serv.)</td>
<td>1,189.63</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>118.33</td>
<td>83.13</td>
<td>F-4 corporate (4 years or less serv.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The highest income level maintained by the Federal Housing Administration is the single bracket of $1,290 monthly or more. The civilian figures are, therefore, in cols. 2 through 6 as they are set forth opposite the grades 0-7 through O-10.
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EXTENT OF THE INCREASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are about 2,664,000 military personnel now on active duty. The increases under this bill would be received by approximately 1,287,000, or almost half the total military strength, the remainder being ineligible since they are furnished government quarters.

The remainder, of course, are ineligible, as they are now living in Government quarters.

On a budget average the quarters allowances are increased by 20 percent, representing an additional annual appropriation cost of $385 million, approximately.

The proposed rates for each pay grade are set forth on pages 6 and 7 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that the tables be printed in the Record at this point.

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

Proposed new rates for officers and warrant officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay grade</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Dollar increase</th>
<th>Percent increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-10 general</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-9 lieutenant general</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-8 major general</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-7 brigadier general</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-6 colonel</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5 lieutenant colonel</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4 major</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3 captain</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2 1st lieutenant</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1 2nd lieutenant</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-1 drill sergeant</td>
<td>$236.30</td>
<td>$160.20</td>
<td>$76.10</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDED INCREASES FOR ENLISTED PAY GRADES E-4 (OVER 4 YEARS) THROUGH E-9

Set forth below are the increased proposed rates recommended for the enlisted pay grades E-4 with over 4 years of service through E-9. It will be noted, as more fully explained hereafter, that the bill reverses the concept of allowances for these enlisted grades by removing them from the Dependents Assistance Act and authorizes the grades a quarters allowance similar to officers.

H.R. 11621—Recommended rates E-4 (over 4 years) through E-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay grade</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Dollar increase</th>
<th>Percent increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-9 sergeant major</td>
<td>$33.90</td>
<td>$55.20</td>
<td>$21.30</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-8 master sergeant</td>
<td>$33.90</td>
<td>$55.20</td>
<td>$21.30</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7 1st sergeant, 1st class</td>
<td>$33.90</td>
<td>$55.20</td>
<td>$21.30</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-6 1st sergeant</td>
<td>$33.90</td>
<td>$55.20</td>
<td>$21.30</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-5 corporal</td>
<td>$33.90</td>
<td>$55.20</td>
<td>$21.30</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommended allowances for E-4 through E-9 with less than 4 years of service

The bill recommends an increase of approximately 8 percent for all brackets in the pay grades E-1 through E-4, under 4 years of service.

Summary of Increases

The bill as passed by the other body repeals the class Q allotment, in effect, for the senior enlisted grades E-4 with over 4 years through E-9. Under the existing provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act, a portion of all enlisted grades are subject to what is known as the class Q allotment system. Under the 1950 act each enlisted person must make an allotment from his own pay as a condition for receiving the amounts authorized under the Dependents Assistance Act. This total amount is known as the class Q allotment. The sentence in himself has no right to receive this allotment and it is made directly by the military services to the dependent affected. Furthermore, existing law provides for a varying allotment, depending upon the number of dependents.

The bill as passed by the other body repeals the class Q allotment, in effect, for the senior enlisted grades E-4 with over 4 years through E-9. These grades are removed from the Dependents Assistance Act and they will be authorized a quarters allowance in the same manner as officers.

With certain misgivings the Senate committee agreed to this provision in the House bill. The change results in their being a single pay rate for those with dependents. This change was made on the theory that the senior enlisted grades are for the most part caretaker personnel and should be sufficiently responsible to their dependents to be paid their own money.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the departments have ample supervisory and command control to see that the family responsibilities are met in those few problem cases that are certain to arise where so many people are affected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it will be noted from these tables that for the officers and warrant officers with dependents, the percentage increase ranges from 15.1 percent for the lieutenant colonel, to 28.8 percent for the W-1 warrant officer. The monthly dollar increases range from $20.70 for the lieutenant colonel to $33.30 for the colonel, representing a 24.3 percent increase. Mr. President, for the officer and warrant grades this bill proposes a range for quarters allowances of $110.10 a month for the second lieutenant and W-1 officer, up to $201 for general officers.

The proposed legislation is the result of a long study that was conducted by a committee in the House of Defense, appointed by Secretary of Defense McNamara. Its membership was composed of civilian personnel. The study grew out of dissatisfaction which existed—and properly so, I think—on the part of many military personnel that they were not receiving adequate consideration in the matter of housing allowances which it was necessary for them to rent.

CHANGES IN CONCEPT FOR CERTAIN ENLISTED GRADES

There are other changes in the bill. Mr. President, the bill provides for a change in concept in the quarters allowances for the senior enlisted grades E-4 with over 4 years through E-9. Under the existing provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 all enlisted grades are subject to what is known as the class Q allotment system. Under the 1950 act each enlisted person must make an allotment from his own pay as a condition for receiving the amounts authorized under the Dependents Assistance Act. This total amount is known as the class Q allotment. The sentence in himself has no right to receive this allotment and it is made directly by the military services to the dependent affected. Furthermore, existing law provides for a varying allotment, depending upon the number of dependents.

The bill as passed by the other body repeals the class Q allotment, in effect, for the senior enlisted grades E-4 with over 4 years through E-9. These grades are removed from the Dependents Assistance Act and they will be authorized a quarters allowance in the same manner as officers.

With certain misgivings the Senate committee agreed to this provision in the House bill. The change results in their being a single pay rate for those with dependents. This change was made on the theory that the senior enlisted grades are for the most part caretaker personnel and should be sufficiently responsible to their dependents to be paid their own money.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the departments have ample supervisory and command control to see that the family responsibilities are met in those few problem cases that are certain to arise where so many people are affected.

It might be observed that the permanent law makes no provision for the class Q allotment system, with the result that
the enlisted man would be authorized to receive the allowance himself.

The bill continues the existing provision authorizing the class Q allotment system for the enlisted grades E-4 with under 4 years through E-1. The Senate committee made 2 changes in the House bill. First, the bill as passed by the House would have made the Selective Assistance Act permanent law. The Senate committee, after consideration, voted to continue the legislation on a temporary basis. It has been continued every 4 years since passage in 1950 as a part of the extension of the Selective Service laws. The committee was of the view that this measure should be continued on a temporary basis.

Second, the bill as passed by the House would have an effective date of October 1, 1963. The Senate committee amended the bill to provide an effective date of January 1, 1963. Departmental testimony indicated that the January 1 date was needed in order to accomplish the administrative changes necessary in connection with the elimination of the class Q allotment system. It would also result in lessening the cost of the legislation by approximately $70 million.

We have been very generous with the military personnel, who, if we leave their quarters alone, will be more than a part of the reason why the military personnel need some increases in their housing allowances. The study of the committee indicates that the rates which are set forth in the pending measure are reasonable. I hope the Senate will approve the bill.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I understand the Senator to say that if the bill is enacted it will cost $70 million annually?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much will it cost?

Mr. RUSSELL. It will cost much more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would cost about $285 million a year. The $70 million figure relates to the date that the law takes effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not hear all of the Senator's statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Defense requested that the bill become effective on the first day of January next year. The House made it effective the 1st of October of this year. The Senate committee went along with the Department and voted to make the effective date January 1, 1963. That is where the $70 million figure came in.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the increase in the allowance would go directly to the general or the colonel or the officer who receives it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed; that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. None of it is to be used as a milage fund. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. We have eliminated the revolving fund in the military construction bill as it was recommended by the Department of Defense. The Department had sent it up in the budget, but it was eliminated. The construction bill did provide for a family housing account which consists only of funds appropriated for the purpose. The quarters allowance goes directly to the man in the service whether he is a general or a master sergeant who live off a military base and who cannot find quarters furnished to him by the Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of this is strictly to pay for quarters allowances.

Mr. RUSSELL. In lieu of government-furnished housing; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator believes that the amount of the increase is normal?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is difficult to come to an exact computation, because rental costs throughout some sections of the country are less than they are in other sections of the country. It is impossible to base allowances on the variation, because there is not the same rate. However, there would be general increases believed to be fair. There have been no increases since 1953, a period of 10 years. The overall increases compare favorably with the increases in the rent generally throughout the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the Government would pay only the amount that the officer or serviceman must pay, and no more; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. That is not the rule at all. Every first lieutenant, for example, will receive the same amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether he pays it in rent or some other way?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us suppose that he gets rent for three-quarters of the amount of the allowance. What happens then?

Mr. RUSSELL. He would save about $25 a month. However, there are many cases where the military personnel are paying a good deal more than the Government is paying for housing.

In some areas, particularly Alaska, the housing costs are several times over what the man would actually draw if he had to rent his quarters outside.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have any ruling from the Department of the Army that officers and others who receive allowances should live in quarters maintained by the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. No we do not; but the reason why the bill is before the Senate is that the officers are complaining that they cannot provide quarters on their allowances which are comparable with those of persons in civilian life who have comparable incomes. The purpose of the bill is to try to equalize the difference. It will not work out exactly, but there will be some officers who will have to pay the difference out of their own allowances.

Mr. ELLENDER. Many of them will shop around to get their quarters as cheap as they can and pocket the difference.

Mr. RUSSELL. They will certainly do that; they would not be human if they did not.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUS. I shall support the bill, but I wish to raise a question concerning the retired officers on the subject of recomputation.

It was developed before the committee a few weeks ago, and the subject has been before us for some time. I voted in January 1958, when the incentive pay increase bill was passed, that retired personnel got no benefit from the bill at that time. It was felt by many that the situation was inequitable.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's statement is not exactly correct. The retired personnel received an increase, but they did not get one which was based on what would be paid in the same grade after the enactment of the bill. In the 1958 act all persons retired received a 6 percent increase except for those retired in three and four star-rank who received a 16 percent and 26 percent increase, respectively.

Mr. BUS. Yes; I thank the Senator for correcting me on that point. However, since then there has been the question whether they should not have been treated in a fashion similar to that of those who retired the day after the law went into effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. BUSH will bear emphatic testimony to the correctness of that statement of the Senator from Connecticut, regarding this being a constant question.

Mr. BUS. Yes. At that time I had contemplated the offering of an amendment to this bill, which would correct that situation. I recall that in a meeting of the Senate Committee on Armed Services a few weeks before the bill was raised, but it was decided then by a majority vote of the committee to postpone action until January 1963. As I recall, this was due to the fact that the Secretary of Defense had appeared before the committee the day before and had stated that he was studying the problem. I believe he said he had a staff of 25 persons, which seems to me to be a large number of people—who were studying the matter. Nevertheless, he said he had the issue under study and would be prepared to make a positive recommendation to the Congress in January. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that the Secretary stated he would make his recommendations in January, but he said he would do so early in the next Congress.

Mr. BUS. Early in the next Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator is justified in assuming that the Secretary intended that the recommendation would be made in January. I have the exact language. He said, "It would be presented early in the next session."

Mr. BUS. Whatever the Secretary from Connecticut knows shows this is a highly controversial question, one that has caused no end of trouble in the committee. As chairman of the committee, I can assure him that originally I was inclined to go along with the idea of recomputation, and I had no very strong feeling about it. However, I usually try to support the subcommittees which have heard all the testimony and have done all the work. For that reason, I did not support the first proposal to recompute. I have been con-
convinced since then that recomputation would not be fair to other retired personnel in the low grades. We must have a retired increase method which will be fair to those low grades.

Mr. BUSH. I hope that when the Secretary’s report is received, it will correct inequities between the groups.

I am convinced that it will, because if it does not, Congress will have to do so, since there are a large number of persons in the lower grades who are affected, whereas only some 25,000 would draw substantial benefits from the direct recomputation. Actually, of the 191,000 retired prior to June 1, 1938, there are about 83,000 who would get no increase under recomputation; there are 108,000 who would get some increase, but little for most in the lower grades; then there are the 28,000 in the higher officer ranks who would get annual increases from $561 to $4,856.

The Senate is correct in stating that it is time that the Commission studied all phases of the problem of compensation of military personnel. In my judgment, there will have to be some increases in the compensation of military personnel, in view of the very generous increases which Congress has granted the members of Congress.

I think we will have to include not only the question of allowances, but the question of purchases at commissaries and post exchanges. All of those matters are under review, and a package report should have been made early in the next session for Congress to consider. There is no question in my mind that it will be the first legislation the Committee on Armed Services will take up after we have our authorization on the military program. I think it will have to come first.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for his statement. I sincerely hope that this subject will be considered very early in the next session.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that the subject will be threshed out by the Senate in the next session. While our Government endures, as we all know it will.

Mr. BUSH. I express the hope that the Secretary’s report will be favorable to readjustment, so as to overcome the seeming inequity between those who retired the day following the enactment of the 1958 bill and those who retired prior to that date. I think there is a definite need for an equitable settlement on that difference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know what the group which is studying the question recommends. There is no question in my mind that it will recommend increases. Just what form the increases will take, I have no way of knowing.

Mr. BUSH. Naturally; I quite understand. One of the reasons the Secretary has suggested that the report be submitted by the Secretary will take into account inequities between the grades.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. BUSH. It is clear that under the bill before our committee there was definitely unfair treatment to the lower grades.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BUSH. Some of them received no benefit.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is why the recomputation was not adopted 2 years ago.

Mr. BUSH. Yes. I thank the Senator for his statement. I want to explain why I would not offer an amendment, and I mention the question with representatives of the Retired Officers’ Association as of yesterday and today. As a result of the conversations, I have concluded not to offer a pay adjustment statement that there would be a question of putting the Secretary’s report, when it is made, and the action of the committee following that report, will be favorable to the readjustment in a thoroughly equitable way, not only for the officers in the higher grades, but also for the personnel right down the line.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I am informed that he has made a decision which will be advantageous to all, and that no group can be prejudiced by letting the whole matter be considered in one package early in the next session.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-25-62-B" and ask that it be read. [The record clerk read it as follows:"

The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 12, it is proposed to strike the words "January 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof the words "October 1, 1962.""

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the amendment is a simple one. It merely changes the date from "January 1, 1963," to "October 1, 1962." The Department of Defense has urged the passage of the bill on grounds of desirability. In my opinion, if the bill is needed now, why wait until 1963 to make it effective? I should like to see the increased allowance become effective on the day the bill is signed by the President; but I know it will take a little time to put the act into operation. I am in favor of putting the effective date of the act off until 1963—and no later than October 1, 1962—for surely that will be sufficient time in which to put it into effect.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, has stated that the situation is disgraceful. Therefore, I ask, then why delay until 1963 correcting the situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. (Putting the question.)

The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on this amendment, I request a division; and I desire to address myself briefly to the amendment.

I have very strong feelings about the amendment; and knowing the tendency of the Senate, I assume that the amendment would have very strong support, because it involves the expenditure of about $7 million from the Office of Management and Budget has requested—and also $76 million above the budget, I may state.

When the Secretary of Defense was before the committee, he was asked about this matter. He testified that it would require that several hundred thousand personnel be offered an opportunity to change their allotments; and he said that to the extent that they did change their allotments, those allotments must be processed. He said a huge task is therefore involved, both with the basic rate changes and with the form in which the payment is to be authorized; and he said that in order to achieve an orderly transition from the current structure to the new structure, they believe more time than would be available between the passage of the bill and September 1, 1962 should be allowed. And, therefore, they continue to recommend that the date be January 1.

Mr. President, out of deference to the Secretary—although, as I have said, I have no strong personal feelings about the matter—I feel that this amendment should at least be made subject to a division vote.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Senator from Maine will state it.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I state the point of order that the decision of the Senate on the question of agreeing to the amendment was announced before a division was requested.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The Senator’s point of order is well taken. However, the Chair should have given the Senator from Georgia, who was on his feet, an opportunity to request a division, and should have announced, “The ayes appear to have it.” But the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the Chair actually announced “The ayes have it.”

So the Senator from Georgia will have to request reconsideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall be willing to do so, although it has been the rule here for so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary that a Senator who is on his feet may request a division. However, I do ask that this amendment be reconsidered, and I so move.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine. (Putting the question.)

The "noes" have it; and the amendment is rejected.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill (H.R. 11221) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."
DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in last night's Washington Star the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Zuckert, was quoted as having defended the $51.6 billion Kennedy administration budget against charges by former President Eisenhower that it reflects "unjustified fears" and "outmoded concepts."

In the course of his statement, Mr. Zuckert, the Secretary of the Air Force, stated:

I have never seen a military budget which has received the intensive scrutiny this one has.

If there was such scrutiny it certainly was not on the floor of the Senate, where debate of this huge appropriation was perfunctory.

Also, Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished former Secretary of the Air Force, the present senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], called on former President Eisenhower to specify exactly where he favored reductions in the defense budget.

Mr. President, I am one of the few Senators who have supported former President Eisenhower in his statement that I believe the defense budget should be reduced; but at the time I did so, I also called on former President Eisenhower to indicate where he favored making cuts in the defense budget. So I warmly support the request made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington].

Former President Eisenhower commands the respect, the admiration, and the affection of the American people, and I believe there is no field in which he is more expert or more competent than the defense field. So if he will speak up and will indicate where he believes the budget should be cut or reduced, that will give tremendous assistance to those of us who have been working hard in the Congress to discuss the defense budget on its merits and to try to reduce unnecessary spending. In the course of doing so, we hope to have, of course, a stronger defense, not a weaker one; and we hope to do so on the basis of eliminating the wasteful diversion of men and material as well as money into outmoded weapons; and instead of maintaining the strongest defense we possibly can obtain.

In the course of his statement, former President Eisenhower said:

Accordingly, I personally believe—with, I am sure, very little company in either party—that the defense budget should be substantially reduced.

Mr. President, the trouble is that former President Eisenhower is likely to have very little support in that connection unless he specifies where he thinks the cuts should be made.

It happens that I favored reducing the appropriate subcommittee's $3 billion defense budget. The position taken by former President Eisenhower could add great and even decisive strength to that position; and I believe that in the future, whenever there is a debate, we can make solid progress in terms of reducing unnecessary expenditures, if the former President will support us.

Once again I assert that I shall never vote to make any reduction in our defense expenditures which in my judgment would in any significant way weaken our national security. But I do favor making reductions in the defense budget, because, as former President Eisenhower has stated, I believe we are wedded to outmoded concepts; and I believe that, instead, we should have a stronger, defense when we wastefully spend money on the Defense Establishment.

COUNTRY NO LONGER FACES POSSIBILITY OF SERIOUS ECONOMIC DEPRESSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has called for a debate on economic policy. As I said yesterday, I think that request by the President is a very wise one, and certainly we need such a debate.

As has been indicated, the meeting of the Economic Policy Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Europe indicated that today even the leading economic experts in Europe are very much undecided about the economic dilemma which faces the leading country in the free world, the United States of America. Some of these experts consider it possible to prevent a depression. Others believe it probable. What is clear is that we must act quickly one way or another to prevent a depression, we are likely to have a depression. I think that we must recognize the great difference in the economy we are now enjoying as compared with the economy that existed not 30 years ago, but only 10 years ago.

I have in my hand the economic indicators for June 1963, the most recently available economic indicators. They show that the element of personal income, which has risen more rapidly in the past than transfer payments. These are social security payments, unemployment compensation payments, and payments of that kind, these have been rising rapidly, and we continue to get new unemployment costs. These now constitute a perfectly immense source of income that is stable and increasing, and in a recession or depression would not decline, but would increase.

How great these payments are as compared with 1953 is indicated by the fact that in 1953 the transfer payments constituted 14.3 billion. Today, 10 years later, they are $33 billion—2½ times as large.

We now have a situation in which transfer payments—social security and unemployment compensation payments, primarily—are more than twice as high as all the dividends paid in this country. They are three times as high as all the farm income received in this country. Shortly they will be higher than all business and professional income received in this country. They are three times as high as all the farm income received in this country. A matter of fact, within 3 or 4 years they are going to be the greatest source of income other than salaries and wages. In depression this income which was nonexistent 30 years ago and relatively small 10 years ago will increase, not decrease.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I commend the Senator for calling on the former Commissioner of Cooperation and Development in Europe. I would rather have Mr. Robertson, the Chief of Staff of the Army who criticized the defense budget we recently passed as being too high. It is easy whenever a bill gets a huge markup, to say it is too high, but the essential thing is to point out what items should be cut. In the testimony before us, from all the experts there, they were asking...
for a budget 25 percent more than they got. They were the experts. The House cut their requests down about $500 million. Most of our restoration was for the B-70.

I think they ought to make up their minds whether they want the B-70 or not, and not piddle around, as I told the Secretary of the Air Force. I said, "you may recall the quotation, 'If you are going to cross the Rubicon, cross it or don't stand in the middle and reach for both sides. We want it or we do not want it.'" As the distinguished Senator said, the B-70 is the only recognized superiority we have over Russia; they cannot touch it.

Now coming to the economic problem, I agree that we have built-in safeguards that we did not have in the great depression of the 1930's, but I want to call attention to the fact that the thirty banks made loans on real estate on an estimated 50 percent of their value and went broke. Now banks are making loans on real estate on 90 percent of mortgage value. The Senator think that if we have a real depression, real estate values will go down more than 10 percent? If they do not, we have billions of dollars in FHA loans by banks and insurance companies. Whether that will "curl your hair or not," it will be very bad. I agree with the Senator that we should not engage in reckless spending.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I join the Senator from Virginia in his opposition to reckless spending. We have Government insurance on mortgages that we did not have in the great depression of the 1930's.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true, to the extent of $38 billion, but how much money do we have behind that? Very little.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We also have Government insurance on bank deposits, which, if it has not made banks completely run proof or ruin proof, has come very close to it. It has been noted since there has been any bank failure. I feel this is another great source of strength.

I am pleading for is recognition on the part of business and Government leaders that we do not have to be afraid of a serious depression simply because the stock market is dropping sharply, and that we should have solid confidence in the overall economic system we have.

I called attention to transfer payments and the fact that these payments have become a stabilizing influence on income.

I now point to another firm basis of even graver importance. A recent analysis by U.S. News & World Report shows that three-quarters of total spending—three-quarters of the gross national product—represents spending of the type that tends to stay up regardless of business conditions. Actions in downturns. Spending on food, clothing, and other goods represents $160 billion. Spending for rent, transportation, and so forth represents spending of $147 billion, government spending—which we recognize is unlikely to decrease in a recession, but perhaps increase—represents another $110 billion. These expenditures alone represent three-quarters of our gross national product. In a recession period they will not drop significantly. They are stable.

The most interesting aspect of this analysis is one that is not stressed as much as I think it should be. In the quarter of the economy where spending does tend to drop, there is a present basis for fearing recession. On the contrary, there is substantial expectation of expansion and improvement. Fortune magazine today has come out with the prediction that the next 2 years are going to be prosperous and expansive.

When we recognize fully the main ingredients of this segment where the economy has fluctuated, we see five types of spending. One is on automobiles, in which spending has been about $45 billion. I think anyone who thinks about the automobile industry must recognize that the automobile industry will be better this year, better than it has done since 1955, and gives every promise of continuing to be good in coming years. We have more buyers and more people who will be driving. We have a substantially sustained income from the source. We have every hope and indication that automobiles will continue to be in demand, especially because of the increasing competitive situation in the automobile industry, and because prices and costs have stabilized.

Homebuilding Expected to Improve

The second type of spending has suffered a real downturn. It should begin to turn up; That is, home construction with $43 billions involved. And in fact, housing starts have improved. Home improvements have increased substantially. But they are still below what they were in 1956. With more people, more income and greater likelihood of more family formations, one has to think that homebuilding will increase. The construction cycle suggests such an improvement is due.

Also, this area is in control of the Government. It has a considerable extent because of Government determination of interest rates, which have such an enormously important bearing on homebuilding.

In the period 1955-57, when the Federal Reserve began a policy of hard money and increased interest rates, although income, wages, and population were increasing, homebuilding dropped sharply. I submit the drop was directly attributable to high and rising interest rates. Interest is such a big and decisive cost in homebuilding. A 1-per cent difference in interest rates on a $20,000 home paid for over 20 years could make a $3,000 difference in the cost of the home.

So here is an area where, if the policymakers on the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department can decide to give the economy a stimulus. They can reduce interest rates and increase homebuilding. There is a great pent-up demand in this field. I think we can expect, on any basis, to have this area of the economy improve steadily.

The next item is investment in machinery and equipment, where $28 billion of spending is expected.

The President's stimulation for this portion of the economy is part of the President's tax bill, in which he proposed the investment credit. I happen to oppose that proposal. I do not think increased depreciation would have any effect at all it should have some stimulating, not discouraging effect, if it should pass.

At the same time, the administration is trying to get through in a rather speculative fashion a revision of the depreciation schedules. Many people think this is a wise and necessary policy, and would stimulate investment in new machinery and equipment. It certainly should.

At any rate, the automation which the economic experts say is the wave of the future in our economy is likely to assist in stimulating the new machinery and equipment.

So here is another area in which we can expect an expansive not a contracting effect on the economy.

The next area of fluctuation in our economy is exports. A decrease up or down is additions to inventories of business. This is another area in which we can expect in the future a stimulating effect in the economy, because inventories have not increased lately as sales have increased. In fact, there has been a reduction in inventories. But now that inventories are low relative to sales we can expect not only a stimulating influence in the economy but also an expansive effect in this regard.

Exports May Be a Factor

The only other area remaining is a relatively small item, the net exports to other countries. We all expect that if no other major bill of this administration should pass this session, the President's trade bill is very likely to pass. The whole purpose of the President's trade bill is to increase exports to other countries. That is the main purpose of the bill. While the trade bill is controversial and will affect some industries in our Nation in an un­favorable manner, we all agree it is likely to have an overall effect of stimulating exports.

So, Mr. President, on every one of these—the automobile industry, the homebuilding industry, new machinery and equipment, additions to inventories, and net exports to other countries—we can expect the economy to move upward, to accelerate, and to become more rapid.

So far as the remainder of the economy is concerned, as the U.S. News & World Report in its very careful analysis shows, these are areas in which we are more completely dependent on consumption spending. We have not had that in the past. There is every reason to believe that the necessities which are bought by American families will continue to be bought.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me it makes sense for the policymakers, whether they be in business or in Government, to realize that we have a stable economy, an economy which is likely to move ahead, an economy which can be stimulated further by dropping
the present very rigorous tight-money policy which has resulted in the tightest ratio between the money supply and the gross national product that has been experienced to date. Under these circumstances, it seems, a sharp tax cut or an increase in Government spending is not warranted.

There is another point I wish to make in connection with economic policy at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before he embarks upon a discussion on that subject?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not an economist, but it has seemed strange to me that so much fear could be expressed with business generally moving as well as it is. Employment is high. The freighting car loadings, retail sales, and standards of that kind are favorable. The economy and business life has been the best it is. Employment is high. The stock market?

Mr. PROXMIRE. One of the things which has always disturbed me about the base of our whole economy is the great reduction in our gold supply. It might not have any meaning. Some people say it does not. As a practical matter, though, the United States does not have enough gold to meet the outstanding notes against it. In other words, there is not enough gold in the bank at Fort Knox to meet the obligations set out by way of law. There is a 25 percent requirement, I believe, for backing the currency. There are foreign holdings of dollar credits which must be paid in gold, much greater in amount than previously. I think that if we get into any serious trouble, it will be partly psychological. Does the Senator think there is any danger whatever that there may be a run on the gold of America from abroad, due to fears generated by the debacle in the stock market?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that this is a very serious matter which we should consider carefully.

There is no question in my mind in regard to the fact that the unfavorable balance of payments which exists, which will continue to deplete and to limit the gold supply, is a problem we have not solved or even begun to solve. The stock market effect is bound to be adverse in this situation.

As the Senator has indicated, the foreign claims on our gold have increased to such an extent that they exceed our gold supply. If as is very unlikely the foreign claims on our gold supply could possibly be completely exhausted. This conceivably could be true even if we gave up the legally mandatory 25 percent gold backing for our currency.

I think there are a number of things which we can do. One of them is to try to have a balanced budget. We can try to have a balanced budget which will inspire confidence on the part of people abroad.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The feeling on the part of European economists and bankers and many of them, according to the President of the United States, feels that we should try to get our economy moving by a tax reduction, by increasing our spending, and by having high interest rates. I take the exactly opposite position.

It is interesting to note that recent reports suggest a number of European economists disagree with the majority opinion and feel that the United States can follow a successful policy of fiscal restraint and of monetary ease. Along that line, I wish to say that the argument always made against those of us who suggest that the short-run controls on our American capital abroad, I think all these things are subject to the control of our Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. What about the serious problem if we do get into the position of depleting our gold, and it might become so serious that we might have to interrupt our foreign aid program. Some people feel that might happen.

What would be even more dangerous is that we might have to interrupt the stationing of American troops abroad. We might have to call back some of those troops.

To some extent, this problem has already been demonstrated by the action taken under President Eisenhower, when he ordered the elimination of support for the families of those stationed abroad. It was a great sacrifice for those who served abroad. It had an adverse effect on morale. I am sure that even General Eisenhower gave that order with great reluctance.

Of course, a more definitive action would be to bring the troops home. Therefore, I say this may have a serious effect on the defense of the free world, and it concerns us very much.

There are a number of things which we can do, but I think the basic action we can take is to make sure there is a stable, respected, and effective fiscal policy in this country which will result in balancing the budget, certainly in times of prosperity.

Mr. RUSSELL. One of the things which has prompted me consistently to vote for reductions in the foreign aid program has been the fear that we might put into the hands of others—even though of friends—the power to demoralize our economy, at least temporarily. That would be an almost certain result if there were to be a run on our gold. If you do not refer to a slight run, for we have been experiencing that for a couple of years. There has been a gradual depletion of our gold stocks.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know, for I have talked to a number of Senators who feel this way, as well as support among some economists in this country, relates to the fact that the United States is virtually the only country in the free world which has not imposed controls on the movements of capital. While this is a recourse we reluctantly would take, there is no reason why the Government should not say to many of those who would take advantage of higher interest rates abroad by moving their capital, the taking of capital from the United States could endanger the position of our gold and the position of our defense establishment throughout the world.

You are therefore not permitted to invest American capital in foreign bonds. So I think there are answers. We can stimulate our own economy by reducing taxes and stimulate it substantially without running a bigger deficit, without increasing spending sharply, and without sharp increases in taxes at a time when we are enjoying prosperous periods, at a time when we are enjoying a peaceful period. Now, if ever, we should have a surplus, or at least a balance in our budget, we ought to have it now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Why There Will Be No Big Setback in Business" published in the U.S. News and World Report, issue of July 2, be printed at this point in the Record.

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

Why There Will Be No Big Setback in Business

Once more talk of recession is heard in Washington. This time it is related to the market, the stock market. But the early 1963 is referred to most often as the probable starting point for a decline in business and industry.

The possibility of a recession in 1963 was mentioned publicly on June 19 by Ewan Clague, U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics. Speaking in Atlantic City, Mr. Clague
pointed out there has been a business decline every 2 or 3 years since World War II. He added that to tell whether the stockmarket sag would hasten a recession.

If the stock market does turn out to be signaling another recession, the Government's planners are confident that it will be moderate. They point out that in past recessions, output has slipped from 5 to 14 percent; personal income very little, and gross national product scarcely at all.

NO BUBBLES TO BURST?

Other reasons are given for confidence. For one thing, the Government's appraisers of the present situation see no appraisal of other major new bubbles that are likely to burst, now that the stock market has gone through a severe shakeout.

Effect of the stock market upset on business confidence and individual spending plans is described as uncertain.

At bottom, however, the confidence of Government planners in the underlying strength of business rests upon other grounds than business sentiment. These planners see number of cushions in the American economy that tend to soften any downward trend in business activity.

An important point is made of the fact that more than $3 out of every $4 in the Nation's flow of income is subject to little fluctuation. That provides a substantial underpinning for general business activity.

THE BIG SPENDERS

More than 20 percent of total dollars spent are government dollars—payments made by Federal, State and local governments for goods and services. Government spending now is on the rise. Demand coming from government for goods and services will increase in the period ahead.

Another cushion is the flow of dollars that individuals and families spend for necessities—food, clothing and other types of soft goods. This amounts to more than 20 percent of the country's total spending. The outlook for necessities seldom decreases much when business activity slackens.

A third cushion is provided by spending for services—rent, transportation, home repairs, medical care. This accounts for nearly 27 percent of the average consumer's dollar, and has been increasing their outlay for services for many years, during periods of good business and bad.

There leaves less than $1 in $4 that is subject to sharp fluctuations as business goes up and down.

At the present time, Government planners fail to detect any pronounced weakness in this less stable area of spending. Spending for autos, furniture, appliances has held high. Business investment in new equipment, though less than the planners had expected, also is going on at a relatively high level.

Building activity seems to be headed for another record year. Residential building, nonfarm, as well as farm, has turned up sharply—largely in apartments.

OUTLOOK IN INVENTORIES

It is pointed out that shifts in inventories of firmed goods, because of trouble. The signs are, however, that inventory accumulation has not been excessive. Steel inventories, in fact, are getting down to the point where increased buying is expected to be forced by September. The ratio of inventories to sales by Government agencies is expected to be much lower than a year ago.

The planners believe that in the period immediately ahead inventory policies will not be as constraining as in the past. In the judgment of officials who advise on Government policy, more than three-fourths of present total inventory holding is of the type that will be maintained or will rise through this year and in 1963. And they do not expect a collapse in the purchases of cars, homes, and household goods, even though demand for these items may shrink a bit.

Another source of strength for business is seen by Government planners in stable personal income. When business turns down and workers lose jobs, unemployment benefits and checks to farmers, payments on dividends, rents, and interest dropped by $3.7 billion. But benefits payments rose as payrolls went up by $3.2 billion, holding the decline to $2.5 billion. That performance was repeated in 1958-59, when a decline of $3.5 billion in other personal income was offset by a rise of $2.3 billion in Government wages and salaries and in benefits. That held the overall decline to a modest $900 million.

These cushions in personal income tend to keep individual purchasing power on an even keel and thus bolster total consumer spending.

Planners see additional protections against serious business decline.

Farm income, for example, are protected by Government price supports and other aids. Bank deposits and shares in savings and loans are insured by the Government, thus protecting people's savings and insuring against financial panics.

Mortgages now can be paid off over a long period of years, and many are insured by the Government. That prevents a wave of foreclosures.

IF RECESSION COMES

In the years since the great 1929 depression, Government has installed a whole series of safeguards to prevent a repetition of that crash. Observers cite the mild recessions of 1948-49, 1953-54, 1957-58, and 1960-61 as evidence that these safeguards are reliable.

Planners now say that if a recession occurs later this year or early in 1962, it is likely to be a mild one. There are indications that safeguards will not operate effectively again if a recession occurs late this year or early in 1962.

Finally, there is the power of the Government itself to stem a downturn in business. Government can and probably will increase its own spending for goods and services. A tax cut to add to people's purchasing power and to corporate profits already has been executed by the Secretary of the Interior, but such facilities (other than those necessary to protect the project works and the visiting public) shall not be completed until the bill, as amended, has been executed by the State of Idaho, an agency or political subdivision thereof, or an appropriate local agency or organization to assume the management and operation of the facilities. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonrecoverable under the reclamation laws.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the Mamm Creek project, to construct basic public recreation facilities for such purposes (other than those necessary to protect the project works and the visiting public) shall not be completed until the bill, as amended, has been executed by the State of Idaho, an agency or political subdivision thereof, or an appropriate local agency or organization to assume the management and operation of the facilities. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonrecoverable under the reclamation laws.

So as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, To provide for the purposes of providing irrigation water for approximately five thousand and one hundred acres, consisting of cropland, grazing land, and wildlife, and for providing recreational benefits, the Secretary of the Interior, acting pursuant to section 2 of the Federal Reclamation Act ([Act of June 17, 1936, 53 Stat. 828, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto]), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the facilities of the Mamm Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho. The principal works of the project shall consist of a dam and reservoir, diversion facilities, the reservoir, and drainage facilities."
I of power marketed through the Federal power program is excluded, for repayment of the construction cost properly chargeable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by irrigators may be extended to 50 years in the case of any development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of amounts, as determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within the repayment period on account of the applicable block shall be allocated to the reclamation fund within such period or periods from revenues derived by the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of power marketed through the Federal power system in southern Idaho.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the Mann Creek project, to construct minimum basic public recreation facilities, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary for that purpose, substantially in accordance with the plan in the report of the Secretary of the Interior, but such facilities (other than those necessary to protect the project works and the visiting public) shall not be constructed if such construction has been authorized by the State of Idaho, an agency or political subdivision thereof, or an appropriate conservation organization. Financing shall be provided for the management and operation of the facilities. The cost of constructing such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable, but may be included in the land cost and the land may be acquired in the event of failure to comply with his requirements to achieve such purposes.

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in the works authorized by this Act as he deems to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (48 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.), for acquisition and operation of facilities, whether or not the project is placed in operation, which are designed to facilitate the enjoyment of the purposes served by the project, and for care, operation, and maintenance of the facilities. The Secretary shall be authorized to acquire by condemnation such lands as may be necessary for the accomplishment of such purposes, at such times and in such manner as he determines to be proper.

Cost:
Reimbursable, irrigation... $3,390,000
Nonreimbursable, wildlife and recreation... 100,000
Total...
$3,490,000

Repayment of irrigation costs: Irrigators, 59 years... 1,014,000
Southern Idaho Federal power revenues... 2,375,000
Total...
$3,490,000
Benefit-cost ratio, 100 years... 1.52-1

The contract between the Department of the Interior and the Mann Creek Irrigation District would provide for the district to operate and maintain the facilities during the repayment period in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

WAURIKA RECLAMATION PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1581, Senate bill 114.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill shall be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 114) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the excise of the Water Supply Act of 1968, supra, relating to the rate of interest. Pay- ment of construction costs shall take the interest on the unamortized balance of that allocation at a rate equal to the average rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secre-
The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in connection with the works authorized by this Act, to exact, from the users thereof, such rates and charges as will, in his judgment, be sufficient to cover the cost of all irrigation, reclamation, and other works financed, or to be financed, from such funds, and to require the payment of such rates and charges as may be determined by him to be necessary. (b) The Secretary may, upon conclusion of a suitable agreement with any qualified agency, in conformity with the provisions of this Act, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any portion of any project to such agencies or any part thereof to be financed under the provisions of this Act. Such sale, lease, or disposition may be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary in his discretion.

S. 6. Expenditures for Waurika Reservoir, and other projects. Appropriations for project expenditures, including those previously authorized, may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1934, as amended.

S. 7. Construction of Waurika Reservoir. Appropriations for construction of the Waurika Reservoir project shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 1, 1933 (47 Stat. 954).

S. 8. Transfer of Water from Waurika Reservoir. Be it enacted, (a) That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to appropriate water from the Waurika Reservoir project to be used in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Waurika Reservoir project and to be made available to such persons and public bodies as may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and (b) That the Secretary of the Interior shall, at any time or times, transfer such water to such persons and public bodies as may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

S. 9. Water Rights. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire water rights for the Waurika Reservoir project and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such water rights to any person or public body who may be interested in the use of such water rights.

S. 10. Transfer of Water from Waurika Reservoir. Be it enacted, (a) That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of water rights for the Waurika Reservoir project to any person or public body who may be interested in the use of such water rights, and (b) That the Secretary of the Interior shall, at any time or times, transfer such water rights to any person or public body who may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

S. 11. Water Rights. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire water rights for the Waurika Reservoir project and to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such water rights to any person or public body who may be interested in the use of such water rights.
The project plan contemplates that operation of the reservoir would recognize the primary demand for supplying municipal and industrial water requirements. On this basis, the total capacity of 150,000 acre-feet of conservation storage capacity would be jointly used for municipal and industrial purposes. The last 40,000 acre-feet would be reserved at all times for municipal and industrial use.

The National Park Service has concluded that the Wairaka project could provide several facilities of substantial value to the population of the general area. The plan provides for recreation facilities at the reservoir and recreation opportunities of potential value to the population of the general area. Additional recreation facilities and construction of minimum basic facilities would include access roads, parking areas, water supply and sanitation, picnic areas, overlook developments, boat-launching ramps, beach developments, picnic area fencing, tree planting, and grass seeding. If found to be in the best interests of the Federal Government, funds would be transferred to the Division of Recreation and State Parks of the State of Oklahoma Planning and Recreation Department for operation of the facilities. Additional recreation facilities not appropriate for Federal construction would be developed under State direction. Pursuant to the authorization, a more detailed recreation plan would be developed by cooperative efforts of Federal and State agencies and the water users' organization. Thus, full consideration would be given to recreation needs, to safeguarding of the public health, and to the problems of adaption and adjustment during the occupancy and use of the reservoir.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO THE COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION OF NEVADA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1582, Senate bill 3089.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

Mr. HUMPHREY. By the Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 3089) to amend the act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada in order to extend for 5 years the time for selecting such lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report of the Railroad Boundary Commission (No. 1622), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 3089 would extend to March 6, 1968, the time within which the State of Nevada, seeking Public Law 58-389 (72 Stat. 31) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada in order to extend for 5 years the time for selecting such lands.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 3, line 13, after the word "select", to strike out "for", and insert "for"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the membership roll of the Pona Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska shall be closed at midnight of the date of enactment of this Act and no child born thereafter shall be eligible for enrollment. The Secretary of the Interior with advice and assistance of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska shall be permitted to issue regulations as may be issued by him, to prepare a final roll for the purposes of this Act, and the names of the persons whose names appear on the census roll of April 1, 1954, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1955, and the descendants of not less than one-fourth degree Indian blood of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska, regardless of place of residence, who are living at the time the roll is closed, and in so doing shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person whose name is not included on the census roll of April 1, 1954, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1955, to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name or from the roll. The Secretary's decision on all protests shall be final. After the roll is closed, the Secretary shall give the adult members an opportunity to indicate their agreement to the division of the tribe's property in accordance with the provisions of this Act and when a majority of the adult members have indicated their agreement, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register. Upon publication of the Federal Register Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nebraska, regardless of place of residence, who are living at the time the roll is closed, and in so doing shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person whose name is not included on the census roll of April 1, 1954, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1955, to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name or from the roll. The Secretary's decision on all protests shall be final. After the roll is closed, the Secretary shall give the adult members an opportunity to indicate their agreement to the division of the tribe's property in accordance with the provisions of this Act and when a majority of the adult members have indicated their agreement, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register. Upon publication of the Federal Register

DIVISION OF TRIBAL ASSETS OF THE PONCA TRIBE OF NATIVE AMERICANS OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1582, Senate bill 3174.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 3174) to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 3, line 13, after the word "select", to strike out "for", and insert "for"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the membership roll of the Pona Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska shall be closed at midnight of the date of enactment of this Act and no child born thereafter shall be eligible for enrollment. The Secretary of the Interior with advice and assistance of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska shall be permitted to issue regulations as may be issued by him, to prepare a final roll for the purposes of this Act, and the names of the persons whose names appear on the census roll of April 1, 1954, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1955, and the descendants of not less than one-fourth degree Indian blood of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska, regardless of place of residence, who are living at the time the roll is closed, and in so doing shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person whose name is not included on the census roll of April 1, 1954, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1955, to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name or from the roll. The Secretary's decision on all protests shall be final. After the roll is closed, the Secretary shall give the adult members an opportunity to indicate their agreement to the division of the tribe's property in accordance with the provisions of this Act and when a majority of the adult members have indicated their agreement, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register. Upon publication of the Federal Register

SEC. 2. Each member whose name appears on the final roll of the tribe as published in the Federal Register Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada, regardless of place of residence, who are living at the time the roll is closed, and in so doing shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person whose name is not included on the census roll of April 1, 1954, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1955, to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name or from the roll. The Secretary's decision on all protests shall be final. After the roll is closed, the Secretary shall give the adult members an opportunity to indicate their agreement to the division of the tribe's property in accordance with the provisions of this Act and when a majority of the adult members have indicated their agreement, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register. Upon publication of the Federal Register

SEC. 3. (a) All property of the United States used for the benefit of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska is hereby declared to be a part of the assets of the tribe, and all of the tribe's assets shall be conveyed to the tribe in accordance with the provisions of this section. The distribution shall be completed within three years from the date of this Act, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

(b) The tribe shall designate any part of the assets of the tribe to be held in trust by the United States for church, park, playground, or cemetery purposes, and the Secretary is authorized to convey such property to trustees or agents designated by the tribe for that purpose and approved by the Secretary.

(c) Each member may select for homestead purposes and receive title to not to exceed five acres of tribal land that is being used for homesteading purposes by such member, or that has been used and selected by one or more other members. The member shall pay the current market value of the homestead selection or encumbrance, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) All assets of the tribe that are not selected and conveyed to members shall be sold by competitive bid at not less than the market value. The tribe shall have the right to purchase property offered for sale for a price not less than the highest acceptable bid therefor. If more than one member exercises such right, the property shall be sold to the member exercising the right who submits the highest acceptable bid.

(e) The net proceeds of all sales of tribal property, and all other tribal funds, shall be used to pay, as authorized by the Secretary,
any debt of the tribe. The remainder of such proceeds and funds shall be divided equally among the members whose names are on the final roll, or their heirs or legatees. Any debtor to any member, heir, or legatee of the tribe or to any person who is an individual owner, and whose property in accordance with this section may apply on the purchase price his share of the proceeds of the tribal property conveyed.

The Secretary of the Interior shall adopt procedures that permit such action.

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall be authorized to select and secure complete interest (including any unrestricted interest) in any land in which an individual is owner, and such land shall be purchased by the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) All restrictions on the alienation or taxation of interests in land that are owned by members of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska three years after the date of this Act shall be deemed removed by the operation of law, and an unrestricted title to the property conveyed.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior shall be authorized to purchase the land within a reasonable time fixed by the Secretary of the Interior prior to the time the land is to be sold, but not less than the current market value. If more than one preference right is exercised, the sale shall be conducted to the person entitled to a preference. If the owners of a 25 per cent interest in the land so request, mineral rights may be reserved to the owners in lieu of sale.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Interior may represent for the purposes of this Act, if he considers it necessary to do so, the interests of the owners of a 25 per cent interest in the land so request after giving reasonable notice of the proposed partition or sale by publication, he may represent the Indian owner who cannot be located.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights, privileges, or obligations of the tribe and its members under the laws of Nebraska. No property distributed under the provisions of this Act shall at the time of distribution be subject to any Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this Act, such property and income derived therefrom by the distributee shall be subject to all Federal, State and Federal taxes, as in the case of non-Indians: Provided, That for the purpose of capital gains or losses the Internal Revenue Service may be the taxing authority.

Sec. 8. Such amounts of tribal fund as may be needed to meet the expenses of the tribe under this Act, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be available for expenditure.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 523), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 3174, introduced by Senator Church, of Idaho, at the request of the Department of the Interior as a result of an executive communication dated April 6, 1982, is to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members and to terminate Federal supervision and control over the tribe.

CANCELLATION OF IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST NON-INDIAN-OWNED LANDS, OREGON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the bill be engrossed as the consideration of Calendar No. 1584, Senate bill 3342.

The PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3342) 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.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1624), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The purpose of S. 3342, introduced by Senator Church, of Idaho, at the request of the Department of the Interior, is 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.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the bill be engrossed as the consideration of Calendar No. 1585, Senate bill 2973.

The PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2973) to revise the boundaries of Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex., to authorize acquisition of lands therein, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the New Mexico Travel Bureau for a joint promotion of the Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex., and for other purposes.
with an amendment on page 2, after line 16, to strike out:

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act:

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 3. There are authorized and appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the acquisition of this land, provided that the cost of the acquisition of private land shall not exceed $2,500.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve the scenic, scientific, and historic integrity of the Capulin Mountain National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and to provide for the enjoyment thereof by the public, the boundaries of the monument are hereby revised to include the following additional lands:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN
Township 26 north, range 26 east; section 5, north half northwest quarter southeast quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, south half southeast quarter, north half northeast quarter, west half northeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, south half southeast quarter, north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, containing approximately 1,656.35 acres.

Second. The Secretary of the Interior, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, may acquire, in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 1 of this Act, who may acquire, such lands and interests in land shall be administered as a part of the Capulin Mountain National Monument, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916, (39 Stat. 900), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

Sec. 3. There are authorized and appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out the acquisition of this land, provided that the cost of the acquisition of private land shall not exceed $2,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on approving the terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands within the area described in section 1 of this Act, who shall not be greater than $2,500, and as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the exterior boundaries of the Capulin National Forest in New Mexico are hereby extended to include the following described lands:

SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN
Township 11 south, range 59 west
Sections 1 to 4, inclusive;
Sections 9 to 16, inclusive;
Sections 21 to 27, inclusive;
Sections 32 to 36, inclusive.

Township 12 south, range 59 west
Sections 9, west half west half;
Section 10, east half;
Section 11, south half north west quarter, west half southwest quarter;
Section 12, west half north east quarter, west half southwest quarter;
Section 13, west half northwest quarter, north west quarter, northeast quarter, southwest quarter, northwest quarter, southeast quarter;
Section 14, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, north west quarter southeast quarter, north west quarter southeast quarter;
Section 21, north half, southeast quarter, southwest quarter;
Section 22, south half, southeast quarter, southwest quarter;
Section 23, southwest quarter southwest quarter;
Section 26, northwest quarter northwest quarter;
Section 27, west half northwest quarter;
Section 28, north half, southeast quarter;
Township 12 south, range 70 west
Section 23, southeast quarter;
Section 24, southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, south half southeast quarter;
Section 25, northeast quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, west half;
Section 26, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter.

Sec. 3. The exterior boundaries of the Capulin National Forest in New Mexico are hereby extended to include the following described lands:

NEWMEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN
Township 23 north, range 9 east
Sections 1 to 5, inclusive;
Sections 9 to 12, inclusive.

Township 24 north, range 9 east
Sections 1 to 4, inclusive;
Sections 9 to 16, inclusive;
Section 20, east half;
Sections 21 to 26, inclusive;
Sections 32 to 36, inclusive.

Township 25 north, range 3 east
Section 1;
Sections 33 to 36, inclusive.

Township 26 north, range 9 east
Sections 35 and 36.

Township 27 north, range 10 east
Section 3;
Section 4, north half, northwest quarter southwest quarter, east half southeast quarter;
Section 5, northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter;
Section 6, north half, north half southwest quarter.

Townships 24 and 25 north, range 10 east
All.
Township 26 north, range 10 east
All, except east half of sections 13 and 24.
Township 27 north, range 10 east
Sections 1 to 9, inclusive;
Section 16, north half, southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter;
Section 20, west half northwest quarter;
Section 30;
Section 31, north half.

Township 23 north, range 11 east
Sections 1 to 8, inclusive;
Sections 16 to 19, inclusive;
Section 20, north half, southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter;
Section 30, west half northwest quarter;
Section 31, west half.

Township 26 north, range 11 east
Section 6.

Also, that part of the Sebastian Marilh grant, as described on survey plats approved December 17, 1892, and filed in volume 4, page 22, New Mexico land claim plats records of the Bureau of Land Management, lying east of the projection of the north line from the west line of the Sebastian Marilh quarter grant, as described on public land survey plat of August 3, 1892.

Section 3. The exterior boundaries of the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico are hereby extended to include the following described lands:

(1) The Polvadera grants as described on plats of survey approved December 19, 1899; and that part of the Juan Jose Lobato grant, as described on plat of survey approved October 19, 1895, lying southerly of the Rio Chama River; excepting from the above areas the town of Abiquiu as described on plat of survey approved November 16, 1896, and also as shown on public land survey plat approved July 3, 1949; said grant plats being filed in volume 5, page 31, volume 4, page 12, and volume 8, page 6, respectively, of New Mexico private landclaim plat records of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) The Ojo de San Jose grant as described on plat of survey approved August 21, 1903, and filed in volume 5, page 14, New Mexico private land claim plat records of the Bureau of Land Management, excepting that triangular-shaped part in the northwest corner of said grant which overlaps the east boundary of the Ojo de San Jose grant as shown on said plat of August 21, 1903.
The PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1626) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to encompas within the exterior boundaries of the Pike National Forests, Colorado, about 18,100 acres and within the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in New Mexico about 249,900 acres. These areas are now within the boundaries of land utilization projects which for many years have been administered by the Department for land conservation and land utilization pursuant to Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1012), and in part for forest and range research purposes.

The recommend bill would give national-forest status to about 223,000 acres of federal lands within the described areas. These Federal lands adjoin or are adjacent to the national forests to which they would be added and are protected and managed together with them. A portion of the land in Colorado additionally constitutes a part of the Manful Experimental Forest Service research area which also includes nearby Pike National Forest lands.

The bill would add to the Pike National Forest parts of the Fountain Creek land-utilization project and two small parcels aggregating about 94 acres presently used for forest and range research. It would add to the Carson National Forest the Taos land-utilization project and the easterly portion of the Sebastian Martin grant which is part of the western New Mexico lands in the land-utilization project. Areas to be added to the Santa Fe National Forest are the Cpo de San Jose grant land-utilization project, the Juan de Gabaldon grant land-utilization project, the Peralta grant, and the part of the Juan Jose Lobato grant which lies south of the Rio Chama River. The two areas last noted are parts of the northern New Mexico land-utilization project.

The lands to be added to the Pike National Forest are located in the area already in the forest, and are in the headwaters of the South Platte River. They are well watered, have multiple uses - watered, timber, range, and wildlife purposes, and some of them have material values for public recreation. Some current form a part of the Manful Experimental Forest.

The lands to be added to the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests lie in the upper Rio Grande watershed. Careful protection and management to restore and maintain the adequacy of water resources and to reduce soil erosion and enhance watershed capacity. They present the same multiple-use possibilities as the lands in the northern New Mexico land-grant project which were assigned to it for management in 1954.

Homesteading entry of Lewis S. Cass

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1987, Senate bill 2530.

The PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2530) relating to a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue to the homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass (Anchor- age Numbered 051055) that was canceled because of the entry made on the land in a withdrawn status, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to process the land for sale under the applicable provisions of law, subject to such modification of time requirements as he deems equitable in view of the prior cancel- lation of the entry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1627) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The records of the Bureau of Land Management show that Mr. Cass' entry was allowed by the acting manager of the Anchorage land office on September 20, 1955. The land embraced within the entry consists of 67.07 acres, described as lots 3 and 4 section 23, township 1 south, range 14 west. Seward meridian, Alaska. Approximately 18 months after entry was approved, it came to the attention of land office personnel that the land entered by Mr. Cass was not subject to homesteading. In 1940 the land use had been withdrawn by public land order 585 (14 F.R. 1995) "from settlement, location, sale, and entry under the public land laws, except the applicable coal or other mineral leasing laws, for classification and examination, and in aid of proposed legislation."

On August 26, 1958, public land order 585 was modified by public land order 913 (18 F.R. 2816) to provide that lands subject to the initiation of any rights or to any disposition under the public land laws would not be provided by an order or proclamation to be issued by an authorized officer opening the lands to application under the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1958, 48 U.S.C. 682a, et seq.

On March 27, 1957, a letter was sent to Mr. Cas, informing him that his entry, apparently having been cancelled, was allowed on withdrawn lands, was suspended pending further investigation.

On June 26, 1959, a decision was rendered by the Bureau of Land Management's Alaska operations supervisor, canceling the entry; the decision was subsequently confirmed by the Director, Bureau of Land Management, on May 15, 1958, and the Bureau's decision, in turn, was affirmed by the Deputy Solicitor of the Department of the Interior on January 14, 1959 (Lewis Sanford Cass, A-27744). 6. 2860 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate Mr. Cass' canceled homestead entry, and to process it in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, subject to such modifications of time requirements as may be deemed equitable.

Since the withdrawn lands here involved are subject to Federal ownership, we have no objection to their passage from Federal ownership. The lands are, in fact, among those referred to by public land order 513, for disposition under one of the public land laws.

Addition of lands to the National Forests

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1688, House bill 9822.

The PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9822) to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1161) may be added to the national forest.

The PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1628) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

H.R. 9822 will grant national forest status to lands within the exterior boundaries of national forests acquired by the United States under the exchange provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315g).

Section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1272; 49 Stat. 1976; 62 Stat. 784), authorized the Director of the Interior, within certain limitations, to exchange public domain lands for privately owned lands of equal value. Under the
authority of this existing law some exchanges have been effected which have resulted in the acquisition of private lands within the boundaries of national forests. Although these lands within national forests should, logically, be administered in accordance with the laws governing national forest lands, there is no authority to accomplish this for many of the areas that have been acquired.

In the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, federal agencies have been given exchange jurisdiction over national forests except by act of Congress (16 U.S.C. 471, 471a). Because of this state of affairs, it is necessary in the case of the San Francisco national forest and other federal lands in the area to exchange smaller tracts of lands in the national forests for parcels of lands within the forest.

The committee was advised that there are at this time 3,300 acres of land within national forest boundaries in several of the above-mentioned States that have been acquired by the Department of the Interior through exchanges under the Taylor Grazing Act but to which these Acts do not attach without further legislation. The committee believes that these lands, which are subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to other lands within the national forest that have been set apart and reserved from the public domain, should be administered uniformly with the adjacent forest lands.

Even if S. 2262 will permit the Secretary of the Interior, upon a determination by the Secretary of Agriculture that the lands involved are suitable for administration as part of a national forest, to set apart and reserve, as part of the national forest involved, areas herefore or hereafter acquired under the exchange provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act within the exterior boundaries of the forest, after the entry of a public sale, to have these lands subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to other lands within the national forest that have been set apart and reserved from the public domain for national forest use.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH BARROW GAS FIELD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1589, Senate bill 3303.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3303) to amend part IV, subtitle C, of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop the South Barrow gasfield, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 7422 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following section:

"(c) The Secretary of the Navy may under subsection (a) develop the South Barrow gas field for the purpose of furnishing gas to the Government-owned facilities in the area for the Government-owned facilities in the area. This section applies to the Government-owned facilities in the area. This section applies to the Government-owned facilities in the area, and shall be amended by the Secretary of the Navy, with the advice and consent of the Senate, as provided in section 7422 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that S. 3303, the extension of the Defense Production Act, passed the Senate with a 1-year extension. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It went to the House, and the House passed a 2-year extension. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No amendments were accepted. The amendments of the Senate from New York and New Jersey would be included in the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No amendments were accepted. The amendments of the Senate from New York and New Jersey would be included in the House.
section of hearings by our committee. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. The chair
man stated this summer we would have hearings on all the amend­ments. The extension is a 2-year ex­ension, as the administration requested. In the Senate we cut down the extension to 1 year. It is the request of the mem­bers of the committee. The House in­sisted on a 2-year extension. We did not think the change was sufficiently material to make a conference necessary, so we agree to stay in the House provision, rather than to go to conference on it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to make it clear in the record now that I oppos­ed a 2-year extension, and I want to be re­corded as voting against a 2-year ex­ension. The reason I do so is that I feel that once again this year we have been hurried in consideration of the legis­lation as we were in 1960 because this is an election year, and there were great many new matters, and the admin­istration did not send to us a reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11879) to provide a 1-year extension of the exist­ing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCCARTHY of Wisconsin, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. Mason, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent res­olution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the printing for the use of the Senate Com­mittee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Constitutional Rights of the Mentally III" and "Wire­tapping and Eavesdropping Legislation."

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NEW YORK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my grandfather used to say: "The tendency of everything is to be more so." In 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States—a court for which, as a young lawyer in the early part of the current century, I had unbounded admiration—not only reversed all previous decisions of all Federal and State courts on the subject of the operation of segregated public schools, but, for purely polit­ical reasons, so interpreted the equal rights provision of the 14th amendment as to amend the Constitution by judicial action. It repeated the highest court of our land has violated a fundamental principle of judicial proc­edure. Three weeks ago the Supreme Court of Florida in adopting a Florida law which required the daily reading of a brief passage from the Bible in all public schools announced:

We think it necessary that, unless otherwise provided by competent authorita­tion of the statutes or the Constitution, the courts refrain from purely philosophical inquiries into the grounds on which the established and accepted customs of the vast major­ity of the American people. The recurrent whistling away of the bedrock foundations of our society can be nothing short of destruct­ive of free government. Every doubtful jud­icial withdrawal of the sovereignty of the States or the traditional freedoms of the people weakens the fabric of the Nation and the confidence of its citizens. If the Consti­tution be wrong it should be corrected by amendment and not judicial usurpation.

On yesterday, in deciding a very simi­lar case, which involved the recitation of a short and simple prayer in a public school in New York State—Engel against Vitale—unless students at the request of parents were excused. The Supreme Court, with only one dissenting voice, held the New York law to be in violation of the Constitution. The current controversy to the Constitution relating to the sepa­ration of church and state. I applaud the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Stewart, who among other things said: all respectful amendments apply a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an "official religion" is estab­lished by letting those who want to say a
prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in such prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I commend the distinguished and able Senator from Virginia on the speech he is making. He is one of the best qualified Members of the Senate to speak on this subject. He is in my judgment the most distinguished Biblical scholar in the United States, and is also one of this body's great historians. I think that his nomination to the Supreme Court, which I believe he will receive, is in fact a recognition of the fact that he is not only the greatest man in our country, but also the laws of our country, the origins of the Constitution, and the entire history and tradition of our Nation. I read the pertinent part of the Senate's amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia, has Congress ever made any law respecting the establishment or exercise of religion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It certainly has not.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has any Senator or any Member of the House of Representatives introduced any bill to attempt to have enacted a law respecting the establishment or prohibiting the free exercise thereof?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, because that principle was so clearly and forcibly announced in Virginia and written into the Constitution of every State that no one, since we have had our Government, has ever attempted to do it.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the only law that has been made on this subject was by the action of the Supreme Court yesterday when, for the first time in the history of our Republic, six of its Justices acted to prohibit the schoolchildren of the State of New York from opening their classes with a non-denominational prayer addressed to the Almighty Supreme Being?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Supreme Court has decided several cases in the past few years in favor of atheists and agnostics; however, this is the most extreme ruling it has made.

My grandfather said that the tendency of everything is to be more so. Once the Supreme Court started to write the law and amend the Constitution, it has reached this shocking state of prohibiting the recital of a simple prayer in a public school; not by an act of Congress, but under a State law of New York, which specifically exempted any student whose parents or guardian might ask that his child be excluded because he did not want him to say or hear the prayer.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. In the Senator's estimation, carrying the ruling of the Supreme Court to its logical conclusion, is it not possible that the practice of opening the Senate and House of Representatives with prayer every day is in jeopardy?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course; the Chaplain is paid from the taxpayers' funds.

Mr. TOWER. Could this practice conceivably jeopardize the whole system of having chaplains in the armed services?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Unless we adopt a Senate joint resolution, which I hope we will, saying that having prayer, having grace, observing the birth of Christ at Christmas, and other parts of the Constitution, I do not know what the Supreme Court might ultimately say with respect to any religious activity whatever in government.

Before I conclude, I shall introduce, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), a constitutional amendment. The Senator from Mississippi desires to change the Constitution. If the saying of a prayer cannot be done in any other way, then let us change the Constitution.

When the Supreme Court is so clearly wrong, I should like to see quick action by Congress, saying, "You are wrong. You have usurped your constitutional authority."

We cannot repeal this decision. Perhaps some subsequent Supreme Court will reconsider the action, but Congress cannot alter the matter except by proposing a constitutional amendment and by going on record as opposing any further extension of such doctrine.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the crue of the Supreme Court, from the days of Chief Justice John Marshall down to Chief Justice Warren, has opened the Court with the prayer:

God save the United States and this honorable Court.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely. The Court has done that from time immemorial.

Mr. TALMADGE. According to the interpretation of six of the present Justices, is not the Court acting unconstitutional? An opening its sessions in that manner?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It could not be construed in any other way. Perhaps some day the Supreme Court Justices will decide that they themselves are unqualified to sit on the Court because they had sworn on the Bible to support and uphold the Constitution. It was necessary, of course, for them to do in order to be sworn in, after the Senate had confirmed their nominations. What they have decided, in effect, is, "We must exclude the Bible from our Government."

Mr. TALMADGE. Can the Senator from Virginia think of anything more outrageous than to say that the Supreme Court in effect has held its own practice unconstitutional?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They certainly have cast very serious doubt on everything they have done.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that every President of the United States, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has taken an oath to Almighty God when he was sworn in as President of the United States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absurdly.
Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia thinks that the decision will have that effect, unless we who are responsible for the Government of the Nation stand up and declare the kind of government we are operating and the principles for which we stand.

Let us remember what Benjamin Franklin said in the Constitutional Convention. When he commented on the form of government we are operating and the small States:

"In this emergency, when we are groping in the dark for political economy, and scarce able to perceive it when presented to us, why has it not occurred to us to ask the Father of Lights to illuminate our understanding?"

"I have lived for a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proof I see of the fact that God governs in the affairs of men. If it be true that no star can fail to the ground without His knowledge, how can we follow our own way, see a new empire without His notice, without His aid?" (1962 ·)

That was the way our Government was started.

Mr. TALMADGE. Did the able Senator from Virginia vote, as I did, that at the same time the Supreme Court attempted to prohibit the youth of our country from praying in the public schools, the Court also prohibited the publication from bawdy magazines circulating primarily among homosexuals from the schools?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator has heard it said, as have other Senators, that God could not prevent the circulation of obscene literature among the youth of the country, but yet it would not allow them to join in the offering of a prayer when they go to school.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator from Virginia think things in our Nation have come to a sorry pass when the Supreme Court of the United States would take such two such actions on the same day?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indeed so. Later, I shall read from a statement made by the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis) on the wall of the Chamber, and have no doubt that he will not hesitate to join with us in a resolution to say to the Court, "We will not stand for this any longer. You have gone far in misinterpreting the Constitution and our form of government as we stand for; and if you go further, you will do so at your peril."

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Texas, Mr. Ervin, have a similar view? He is a friend of ours. And the Senator from Georgia was shocked, and I was shocked; and I hope all Members of the Senate were shocked, and that they will not hesitate to say they were shocked, and that they will not hesitate to join us in a resolution to say to the Court, "We will not stand for this any longer. You have gone far in misinterpreting the Constitution and our form of government as we stand for; and if you go further, you will do so at your peril."

Mr. TALMADGE. Why did the Senator from Georgia vote for the Jackson resolution? And the Senator from Virginia was shocked, and I was shocked; and I hope all Members of the Senate were shocked, and that they will not hesitate to say they were shocked, and that they will not hesitate to join us in a resolution to say to the Court, "We will not stand for this any longer. You have gone far in misinterpreting the Constitution and our form of government as we stand for; and if you go further, you will do so at your peril."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Indeed so; and before I conclude my remarks I shall read from a decision by the Supreme Court of Florida, rendered on June 6, in which it said there are now, roughly speaking, two forms of government, democracy and communism, and that the essence of a democracy is that we believe in God and have freedom of religion; those two distinguish us and others who call themselves democracies from the type of government which is called communism, which denies the existence of God and repudiates the Bible.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his efforts in this regard. I pledge him my wholehearted support for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Virginia, and, again, I wish to say that at the outset the Senator from Georgia paid me a tribute far beyond my just deserts, but in any event I knew it was coming. And if the Senator from Georgia will allow me, I would like to thank him for his tribute, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Was it not the intent of the framers of the first amendment of the Constitution to permit freedom of religion in this country, but not freedom from religion as the Constitution provides?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely.

Mr. TOWER. But does not the Supreme Court's interpretation tend to narrow the exercise of religion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, it tends to take away the freedom of religion. That is the point of this decision. But I shall quote George Washington's words in both his inaugural address and his Farewell Address to the people of the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia. At our Wednesday morning prayer breakfast, I have often been inspired by the great devotion to the Lord that I heard in his very profound and inspirational remarks; and I should like to thank him for his remarks on the floor today. I associate myself with these remarks and proffer him my support.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Texas very much.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield again to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia whether the records of the Constitutional Convention do not disclose the fact that at a time when it appeared that it would be most difficult, because of the differing views, to obtain a Constitution which would reconcile the varying views to such an extent that there could be a Constitution, the Constitutional Convention, at the suggestion of Benjamin Franklin, prayed to God for guidance and assistance?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely correct, and I have already referred to that fact. In fact, we probably would not have had a Constitution if they had not done that. It brought them together and gave them light—so much so, that Gladstone could say that the Constitution was the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me point out that in the United States, on the wall beneath the clock, there are inscribed in gold the words, "In God we trust."

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is true, and we thought those words signified the kind of government we have and the way we are attempting to legislate. But as the Senator has said, this ruling of the Court would not permit anyone to say to God, "In God we trust." But the Senate Chamber is also public property, as much so as the public schools, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. From Texas.

Mr. ERVIN. And this Chamber is likewise subject to the Constitution, as such, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.
Mr. ERVIN. So, under this decision, how can we be permitted to allow the words "In God we trust" to remain on the wall of this Chamber?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, we have to decide whether it is repugnant to the Constitution. It will not take me long to decide which choice to make.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to what Mr. Justice Stewart said in his dissent.

The Court's historical review of the quarrels over the Book of Common Prayer in England throws no light for me on the issues here. England, as you know, then and has now an established church. Equally unenlightening, I think, is the history of the early establishment and later rejection of an official church in our own States. For we deal here not with the establishment of a state church, which would, of course, be constitutionally impermissible, but with whether schoolchildren who want to hold prayer meetings in school prayer must be prohibited from doing so.

Moreover, I think that the Court's task, in this as in all areas of constitutional adjudication, is not aided by the uncritical invocation of metaphors like the "wall of separation," a phrase nowhere to be found in the Constitution. What we ventured to the issue here is not the history of an established church in 16th century England nor the history of America but the history of the religious traditions of our people, reflected in countless practices of the institutions and officials of our Government.

At the opening of each day's session of this Court we stand, while one of our officials invokes the protection of God. Since the days of George Washington, Mr. Chief Justice Stewart has said, "Our God save the United States and this honorable Court. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives open their daily sessions with prayer. Each of our Presidents, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has, upon assuming his office asked the protection and help of God.

The Court today says that the State and Federal Governments are without constitutional power to prescribe a particular form of words to be recited by any group of the American people or anyone subject to their authority. Mr. Chief Justice Stewart has said that the Spangled Banner made our national anthem by act of Congress in 1931, contains the word: "Blest with victory and peace, may the hea'n rescued land."

Praise the Pow'r that hath made and preserved us a nation.

Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just.

And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust.'

In 1954, Congress added a phrase to the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," so that it now contains the words, "One Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Mr. Chief Justice Stewart has said that the Congress enacted legislation calling upon the President each year to proclaim a National Day of Prayer. Since 1865, the words "In God we trust" have been imprinted on our currency.

The minority views of Mr. Justice Stewart coincide with the unanimous decision of the State Supreme Court of Florida in Graham v. County School Board of Dade Co., decided June 6, to which I have referred. In that case, the Florida Supreme Court held that the recitation of the prayer in the public schools was a religious exercise in violation of the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Justice Black referred to the fight that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison made in Virginia on that vital and fundamental principle of personal freedom. Unfortunately, however, he showed no familiarity with the history of that issue or with the real purpose James Madison had in mind when he helped Jefferson perfect his bill for religious freedom in Virginia and when he framed the establishment clause of the First Amendment of the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, which provided for the separation of church and state. Both Jefferson and Madison sincerely believed that the principles of democracy which they sponsored were based upon the teachings of the Bible, and while neither wanted to put government in religion, neither wanted to take religion out of government. But, when carried to its final analysis, that is what the decision of the Supreme Court on prayer in the public schools holds. Now we have been asked to face the fact that it is either back to the Bible or back to the jungle.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are a great many people in our country besides members of the Supreme Court who are not familiar with the views of Madison's views on religious freedom as I outlined it in a speech on the floor of the Senate on February 22, 1961, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Record at this point, what I said on that subject at that time.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MADISON'S CONTRIBUTION TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(An excerpt from Remarks of Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, May 13, 1964.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by a singular coincidence in the same week in which we commemorate the anniversary of the birth of the great and wise chief architect of the Constitution, as affectionately known as the Father of his Country, the Congress has received a proposal from the President of the United States, urging it to embark for the first time in our national history on a program of Federal aid to education. And involved in that program is one of the most unique and vital features of our Federal Constitution, namely, the separation of church and state.

President Kennedy, in recommending the appropriation of funds for public schools, has proposed that personalized students have the option of attending public schools at a certain level be excluded, but at the college level that they be included. That proposal will, of course, touch off a debate on the history and the meaning of the doctrine of the separation of church and state.

On many occasions, I have expressed the view that the ability of the Founding Fathers to devise a scheme for church owned and operated schools and colleges has never been excelled in this or any other nation. If that be true, and I challenge any one to deny it, then with the Founding Fathers on the principle of separation of church and state should be a lamp unto our feet.
Students of history well know that religious intolerance did not commence with this generation or the political fashion of the day, but is as old as the human species. The earliest historical evidence of religious persecution is found in the Book of Numbers, where God commanded Moses to put Pharaoh in his place as a trial to the Israelites. The story of the Babylonian captivity and the subsequent return to Jerusalem under Ezra and Nehemiah, with its emphasis on the reestablishment of the Jewish temple and its accompanying religious practices, is a vivid illustration of the power of religious belief to dictate the course of human events.

The story of the Roman Empire and the spread of Christianity is another example of the power of religious belief. The Roman Emperor Constantine's conversion to Christianity and his subsequent edict of toleration for Christians, known as the Edict of Milan, marked a significant moment in the history of religious freedom. The establishment of Christianity as the state religion of the Roman Empire, however, also led to the persecution of other religions, such as the suppression of the Druids in Britain.

In the United States, the story of the Constitution's First Amendment is a critical example of the struggle for religious freedom. The early framers of the Constitution, including George Washington and James Madison, were acutely aware of the dangers of religious persecution and sought to ensure that the new nation would be a beacon of freedom for all people. The First Amendment, which prohibits the government from establishing a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, was a direct response to the religious conflicts and intolerance that had characterized much of American history.

The framers of the Constitution understood that the protection of religious freedom was not just a matter of personal liberty, but a matter of national security. In his farewell address, George Washington warned against the dangers of religious fanaticism and the entanglement of religion and politics. He called for a national government that would remain free of religious influence and that would protect the rights of all citizens, regardless of their religious affiliations.

James Madison, the primary author of the First Amendment, was even more forceful in his opposition to religious establishment and the entanglement of church and state. In his essay, "Religious Freedom," Madison argued that the government should not support any particular religion and that all citizens should be free to worship as they choose.

The First Amendment has been a source of much debate and controversy over the years, but its underlying principles of religious freedom and the separation of church and state remain as important today as they were when they were first enshrined in the Constitution. The struggle for religious freedom is an ongoing one, and the framers of the Constitution understood that it would be a work in progress. As George Washington wrote in his farewell address, "We have been assured that the Constitution will endure as long as the American Union is a going concern."
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superstition, bigotry and persecution. Inquire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest lustre, and you will find, at least to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy.

Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil government. If he be urged as necessary for the support of civil government as a whole, it is a matter of supporting religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If religion be not a departure from the state, what is it? What can be the public benefit which may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure such a purpose, it needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property by neither invading the equal rights of any sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

"9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy which has been preserved to the personal and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a bitter to our country, and an accursed to posterity. What a melancholy mark is the bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an assurance that Virginia is left to her own device, it is left to the rack of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority.

"10. Because it will have a like tendency to banish our citizens. The stripes prescribed on the various modes are ever thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration by revoking the liberty which the people should be their own. The species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

"11. Because it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermediate with religion has produced among its several sects. Turbulent of blood have been split in the Old World, in consequence of vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscription of the religious principles."

"12. Because policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity, as it is disadvantageous as far as the tendency of every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill, with an ignoble and un-Christian policy of submission to every authority of man.

"13. Because attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of society.

"14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and difficulty ought not to be introduced on the evidence of a mere conclusion that it is called for by a majority of citizens and is necessary for the peace of the commonwealth."

"It is not the part of a minister to exhort the multitude to the support of an establishment, which in its principles, and as the basis and foundation of government, it is emancipated with equal solemnity, or ravings, and the language proper to the pulpit."

"We, the subscribers, say that the general assembly of this Commonwealth has no such authority. And in order that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it this remonstrance earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may, on the one hand, turn their hearts from all such pernicious schemes, which would oppose His holy precepts or violate the trust committed to them; and, on the other, guide them to such an end which may be worthy of His blessing, redound to their own proude, and establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity and the happiness of the Commonwealth."

"The influence of this document was widespread not only in Virginia but throughout the other Colonies as well."

A letter of Madison's describes the profound local effect. He writes that the "remonstrance" met with "the approbation of the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, and a few Roman Catholics, universally; of the Methodists in part; and even not a few of the sect; that is, the Anglicans—his own religion incidentally, formerly established by law." The Presbyterians adopted a strong memorial against the assessment bill specifically referring to the fact that it "would be unfair to the people of one only religion, Christianity."

The general association of Virginia Baptists was even more extreme in its denunciation of Henry's proposals. It could be said without exaggeration that Madison's Remonstrance so stimulated the Baptists that it did not only cause the assembly to reject the assessment bill in the session of 1788 but moved it to adopt by a majority of 20 to 30 the bill establishing religious freedom, which had been prepared by Thomas Jefferson and introduced into the Virginia Assembly as early as June 12, 1784.

The fervent overflowed Virginia's boundaries and helped stiffen attempts in other Colonies to diminish walls into the regular support of the churches.

Madison overlooked few opportunities to advance the principles of his Remonstrance.

His first amendment to the Constitution reads in part:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

"Wish to go further and proposed an amendment protecting the principles of religious freedom and separation of church and state not only from Federal encroachments but from State intervention. That failed to win acceptance, but it illustrates the extraordinary vision of this statement. The proposal had anticipated by 134 years the Supreme Court's application of the 14th amendment in Moyer against Nebraska (1922) to freedom of religion."

"The religious minorities had no greater friend than James Madison. In his youth he heard, with deep compassion, the sermon of a Baptist minister from the only pulpits legally available to him—the window of a jail.

"In his old age, after retirement from the Presidency, he received a letter containing the following tribute from a member of the Jewish faith: "I ought not to conceal from you that it affords me sincere pleasure to have an opportunity of expressing to you the sentiments of those of your illustrious colleagues in the convention the Jews in the United States owe many of the blessings which they now enjoy, and that of the same general and just example has been felt very generally and that to the creation of a sincere attachment toward this country for part of foreign Jews."

"Madison's influence on our Nation's progress is a matter of history. and his corollary, separation of church and state, was both extensive and enlightened. He is unexcelled among our forefathers for logical and consistent development of the constitutional idea of religious freedom."

In conclusion, I wish to quote again from the Federalist: James Madison, who, in his first inaugural address, said:

"It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act so fervent supplication that Almighty God may have found the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government established by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions assigned to his charge.

The debate of the issue of Federal aid to church schools can be a vital and dynamic contribution to the President's New Frontier program, if it challenges the willingness of our people to prove by their personal conduct that the motto on our coins, "In God We Trust," is something more than a political shibboleth.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial of the New York Times, published in the Washington. Evening Star of June 26, 1962, relating to the decision of the Supreme Court relative to prayer in the public schools of New York.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"From the Evening Star (Washington, D.C.)."

"And Forsooth There Not?"

Jesus, according to St. Luke, remonstrated with his disciples and said: "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not." Little children may not approach Him, however, through the public schools of New York. Six Justices of the Supreme Court have forbidden it.

At issue was this brief nondenominational prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence on Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country." This prayer had been composed for the State Board of Regents and recited each morning in at least some of the schools.

Had any child been required to recite the prayer, the Court would have had every reason to forbid it. But this was not the case. Those who did not wish to participate were not required to be present when the prayer was recited. Thus, the real effect of the Court's ruling is to prohibit children who might wish to do so from reciting the prayer, and this in the name of freedom of religion.

The first amendment says that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, the founders having in mind the established churches and similar early efforts in some of the colonies. But would the recital of this same prayer, as recommended by a State agency, be equated to enacting a law respecting an establishment of religion? Of course not, and Justice Black, who wrote the majority, was obliged to concede that it does not amount to a "total establishment of one particular religious sect to the exclusion of all others," as the Establishment Clause of the Constitution says, this. Nor does it bear any rational relationship to the religious struggles of 200 or 200 years ago.

In his dissent, Justice Potter Stewart noted that the Supreme Court begins each day by repeating the public recitation of the Lord's Prayer and intercoursing with words of importune: "God save the United States and this honorable Court." How long will this be tolerated? And what about the prayers?
Justice Stewart also noted that "The Star-Spangled Banner" was declared to be our national anthem in 1931. Yet its third stanza reads:

"Blest with victory and peace, may the heavenly resort
Praying on the hearts that have made and protected us a nation!

And this be our motto 'In God Is Our Trust.'"

Perhaps this could be substituted in New York for the proscribed prayer. But, on second thought, I wish to suggest it. The Supreme Court some day might rule that Congress, in its act of 1931, passed a law respecting an establishment of religion, and that the national anthem, therefore, is unconstitutional. Farfetched! We are not so sure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we all remember the untimely death of a friend and distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Mr. Case. His earthly remains were carried to their final resting place today, accompanied by a number of distinguished public officials, including our Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. The Senator from Mississippi was deeply upset, as a number of us were, by the Supreme Court decision; and before he left the Senate, he asked me to transmit a memorandum which he asked that I present for him to the Senate. In that memorandum, he said:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS

I have the conviction that people all over the country who rejoice in the spiritual heritage of this Nation were shocked, as I was, to learn that the Supreme Court has held that the permissive daily recital of a simple non-denominational prayer by public-school children breached the constitutional wall of separation of church and state. The prayer, thus condemned by our highest Court did nothing more than acknowledge the pupils' deep-seated belief in God. His blessings upon them, their parents, their teachers, and their country. Only those who desire the destruction of the recital of this prayer; no compulsion was involved.

It is not my purpose or intent at this time to challenge point by point the rationale of the decision in this case. I could hardly believe my eyes when I read that the Court had held that the prayer, even though admittedly non-denominational, and even though participation in it was admittedly voluntary, violated the first amendment, which merely prohibits the Congress from passing a law "respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

With all respect, I think the Court has utterly misconceived a great constitutional principle. I, for one, cannot comprehend how a prayer, such as this in public schools, could be entirely different from any other prayer. I have long been of the opinion that the prayer being effective, is in it without compulsion. Under these circumstances, few will believe that any real questions of constitutional law are involved, and I have always been of the opinion that this was the basis of the constitutional provisions upon the subject.

If there was any question of sectarianism involved, or any issue of favoring one religion over another, the question, of course, would be entirely different. All we have here, however, was a conscientious effort on the part of the teacher to do so as to say that they believed in an Almighty God and to call forth His blessings. The Court has not considered the implications of its decision are enormous.

This, of course, is not the first time that the Court has departed so far from established constitutional concepts. There is a remedy, however, for the American people. It is by the process of a constitutional amendment. And I am introducing a amendment, designed to right the wrong which the Court has perpetrated. I realize, of course, that this is a delicate subject area, one which needs and deserves careful study. However, I am convinced that, if necessary, my amendment can be perfected so that our constitutional guaranty of freedom of religion will be retained but will not in the future be allowed to become an instrument for the suppression of religion.

The voice of the people is already welling up in all of the corners of this Nation in protest against what I believe to be the injustice of this decision. The voice of those who believe in the spiritual heritage of this Nation and in the existence of a Supreme Being will be heard in an ever swelling chorus.

Perhaps as never before in history we need today the comfort and support of moral and spiritual values. We here in the Senate, therefore, on behalf of the American people, thus far not convinced, perhaps do not deny ourselves the edifying voice of the eloquent prayer of our Chaplain. We give it us strength for our daily tasks. The children of our public schools, on a permissive basis, should not be denied the spiritual strength which we have established for ourselves. We should act promptly to fill the void in the spiritual life of our children which will exist by reason of the Court's decision.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a Senate joint resolution prepared by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to permit the use of prayer in public schools.

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

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO PERMIT THE USE OF PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

ARTICLE

"Section 1. No provision of this Constitution or any article of amendment thereto shall be construed to prohibit non-denominational religious observance through the invocation of the blessing of God or the recitation of prayer, as a part of the activities of any school or educational institution as such, or in whole or in part from public revenue.

"Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the states by Congress."
Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Rogers in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHITE HOUSE MANIPULATION OF NEWS MEDIA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the New York Times for May 8, 1964, by its noted columnist, James Reston, appear in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Reston, who can hardly be regarded as unfriendly to the Kennedy administration, calls attention to what he believes is the serious dangers to our form of government, caused by domination of all forms of the news media by President Kennedy. As Mr. Reston points out, this is a result not only of the importance of Officer's capacity in our form of government but more importantly because of the conscious policy adopted by the Kennedy administration to dominate the news.

The dangerous results of the Kennedy manipulation of the news media has again been dramatically illustrated in the handling of the President's all-out political speech in support of his Medicare program delivered at Madison Square Garden. This purely political speech was carried free by all the major networks, while the doctors were compelled to pay for their reply.

Mr. Reston concludes his discussion of the political propaganda tactics of the Kennedy administration by citing the great danger which this poses.

He concludes, the danger signals are obvious. The opposition can continue to express its feelings on the floor of the Congress, but probably in the hands of Senators and Members of Members and spectators, but the President has an audience of millions at his command every day he likes. It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

Since Mr. Reston wrote his article, the White House has gone to still further lengths to control and manipulate the news. The New York Herald Tribune was completely banned from the White House when the President canceled the famous 22 subscriptions. This was done because the White House sought to approve of the manner in which the Herald Tribune presented the news to its readers. Certainly the President has the right to read or not to read any paper he may wish, but it is shocking to see that he would completely ban the newspaper from the White House, and thereby prevent even members of his staff from reading it. What is even more shocking is that the White House would deliberately publicize the fact that it had canceled the Herald Tribune subscriptions. By this means, this was intended to be a warning to other newspapers that they had better present the news in a manner acceptable to the President, or they too would be publicly censured.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBERTSON), I move that the Senate disapprove the amendments made by the Senate, and I move that the Senate ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill and that the conference on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess for 5 minutes, so that Senators may express their greetings to the President-elect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon, (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate being in recess.

His Excellency, Dr. Guillermo Leon Valencia, President-elect of the Republic of Colombia, accompanied by Ambas-
sador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaría, was escorted to the well of the Senate, where he was greeted by the Members of the Senate, the Majority Leader, the Ambas-
sador retired from the Chamber.

Thereupon, (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Moss in the chair).

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3161) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1966".

Sec. 2. Section 1(b) of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The unrestricted export of materials without regard to military and economic significance may adversely affect the national security of the United States."

Sec. 3. Section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by inserting of the United States immediately after the period at the end thereof.

Sec. 4. Section 3(a) of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Such rules and regulations shall provide for denial of any request or application for authority to export articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from the United States, its territories and possessions, to any nation or combination of nations threatening the national security of the United States, unless the President shall determine that such export does not make a significant contribution to a military or economic potential of such nation or nations which could prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of the Export Control Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "one year" and inserting in lieu thereof "two years".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBERTSON, I move that the Senate disapprove the amendments made by the Senate, and I move that the Senate ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill and that the conference on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Rogers in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the New York Times for May 8, 1964, by its noted columnist, James Reston, appear in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Reston, who can hardly be regarded as unfriendly to the Kennedy administration, calls attention to what he believes is the serious dangers to our form of government, caused by domination of all forms of the news media by President Kennedy. As Mr. Reston points out, this is a result not only of the importance of Officer's capacity in our form of government but more importantly because of the conscious policy adopted by the Kennedy administration to dominate the news.

The dangerous results of the Kennedy manipulation of the news media has again been dramatically illustrated in the handling of the President's all-out political speech in support of his Medicare program delivered at Madison Square Garden. This purely political speech was carried free by all the major networks, while the doctors were compelled to pay for their reply.

Mr. Reston concludes his discussion of the political propaganda tactics of the Kennedy administration by citing the great danger which this poses.

He concludes, the danger signals are obvious. The opposition can continue to express its feelings on the floor of the Congress, but probably in the hands of Senators and Members of Members and spectators, but the President has an audience of millions at his command every day he likes. It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

Since Mr. Reston wrote his article, the White House has gone to still further lengths to control and manipulate the news. The New York Herald Tribune was completely banned from the White House when the President canceled the famous 22 subscriptions. This was done because the White House sought to approve of the manner in which the Herald Tribune presented the news to its readers. Certainly the President has the right to read or not to read any paper he may wish, but it is shocking to see that he would completely ban the newspaper from the White House, and thereby prevent even members of his staff from reading it. What is even more shocking is that the White House would deliberately publicize the fact that it had canceled the Herald Tribune subscriptions. By this means, this was intended to be a warning to other newspapers that they had better present the news in a manner acceptable to the President, or they too would be publicly censured.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBERTSON), I move that the Senate disapprove the amendments made by the Senate, and I move that the Senate ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill and that the conference on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess for 5 minutes, so that Senators may express their greetings to the President-elect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon, (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate being in recess.

His Excellency, Dr. Guillermo Leon Valencia, President-elect of the Republic of Colombia, accompanied by Ambas-
This episode even moves so liberal a columnist as Robert Spivak to object to the petty petulance displayed by the White House, and I ask unanimous consent that his article appear in the Record following this remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Spivak, Los Angeles (June 12, 1962)

This isn't the first time that President Kennedy and his Press have been accused of trying to keep the news away from the White House. There is a curious parallel in history. In the days of the first President, the White House was more like a fortress, and the President was more like a monarch than a president.

But you never guess this if you watched his most recent televised news conference. It was his most astonishingly inaccurate news conference to date. The President looked tense and tired to many newsmen in the room with him. His voice was nasal, his eyes dead, he looked healthy and happy.

How much the televised press conference affects public opinion is difficult to measure, but in terms of accuracy, it has become a joke. There are many ways in which the televised news conference gives a distorted view of what is really taking place in Washington.

For this, a large share of the responsibility goes to the White House staff. They are increasing their coverage of national news, especially on the critical press. But newsmen are, not.

The summary firing of competent Jack Romagnia as White House stenographer, and 21 other subordinates, could only leave the impression that he is now dealing not with the real problems of the United States but with the near elections.

If newsmen, too, must accept a share of responsibility for the decline of the press conferences, then they should be protesting the surround-ings in which it is held. Certainly their questions should be phrased more sharply and their discipline should make them avoid trivia.

WHY THE DEMARY?

What is the basis for the widespread dis­ content of the press. The President's events have brought it to the surface, although any number of ineptitudes have helped to build up rumors. Speeches and conferences have brought it to the surface, although any number of ineptitudes have helped to build up rumors.

The summary firing of competent Jack Romagnia as chief White House stenographer, and 21 other subordinates, could only leave the impression that he is now dealing not with the real problems of the United States but with the near elections.

There is a joke making the rounds in Washington these days, "President Kennedy is a great politician, is overwhelming the voice of the smaller critic..."

THE NEWSMAN

It is true, of course, that the President has usually dominated the news in all generations. What he says and does command the front pages, even if he does not open the White House to the staff to the press and TV reporters, but there is a new dimension now.

As the new newspaper goes national, any of the large cities newspapers that used to concentrate on local news have to move into the national field. And, if the President, being an astute politician, is exploiting the trend as much as he can.

As this trend continues, the dangers are obvious. The press is, of course, to express its feelings on the floor of the Congress, probably in the presence of a handful of members and spectators, but the President has an audience of millions at his command any day he likes. It is not a situation that preserves the political balance of power in the United States.

KENNEDY'S TECHNIQUES

This is something new in American politics. It used to be that the President's radio and TV appearances were infrequent and kept the Washington press corps in a state of chronic frustration.

President Kennedy, however, is exploiting all the new mass communications. He had an audience of 85,000 for a speech at the University of California the other day. Over 200,000 tuned out to see him in New Orleans on TV last week. So the President, a seasoned TV acres, is still new at this.

Former President Eisenhower has receded into the background, and the Kennedy administration is still the center of national news in the opposition.

You can find precedent which isn't a fact... that promises to maintain a large theater in Washington, out of which is a cavernous... more like a large theater
On behalf of Mrs. Carroll and our daughter, I wish to express our deepest, heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Case and her family in this time of bereavement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado in the expression of sympathy and condolences to Mrs. Case, her daughter, and other members of the family of our late beloved colleague, Senator Francis Case, of South Dakota. South Dakota is my native State, and it was surely ably represented in the U.S. Senate.

Senator Case stood as a symbol of personal and political integrity. His record is one of great courage and dedication to the public interest. We shall miss this fine public servant, as will the people of his State.

I am most pleased to be able to associate myself today with the generous, yet factual and true remarks of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, like the able Senator from Minnesota, I am glad to assent with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I hope that fitting recognition will be made of the many worthwhile contributions he made to the public welfare and of the States of which he was a member and in the Senate itself.

For example, Francis Case was a leader in the study of the production of artificial rainfall. Also, his work in the field of desalination of water was extremely important. One of the first two plants established in connection with the tracking of development is located in his State of South Dakota and stands as a tribute to the work of Senator Case in that situation.

Having attended college with him and having known him for a long time, I regarded him as one of the finest men ever to serve in this body.

I am glad the Senator from Colorado has made the appointment today, in which he was joined by the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from South Dakota for their kind remarks. I feel certain that the family of Senator Case will be pleased to know that on this day, when the funeral is taking place in South Dakota, we who would have liked to attend, but could not because of circumstances beyond our control, desired to make these few remarks to the family during their time of sorrow.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1591, H.R. 12154, the amendment and extension of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which has now been reported, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Chief Clerk. A bill (H.R. 12154) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 26, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 860. An act to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes;

S. 1834. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes; S. 3003. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia;

S. 3896. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Traveling and Film Center, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1926, as amended (2 U.S.C. 188), relating to deposits with the Treasurer of the United States of gifts and bequests to the Library of Congress and to raise the statutory limitation provided for in that section;

S. 3991. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to invest in obligations of the United States directly from the Treasury;

S. 3880. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia hospital center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act; and

S. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate today, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 82 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 27, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 26, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Job 22: 21: Acquaint now thyself with Him and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee.

O Thou who art the help and hope of all who come unto Thee in their trials and tribulations, their sorrows and sins, may we offer our noonday prayer in faith and humility, in simplicity and sincerity.
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7722. An act to amend section 303 (v) of the Care Act of 1949 by increasing per diem rates and to provide reimbursement under certain circumstances for actual expenses incidental to travel.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the following title:

H.R. 3940. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Carolina Power & Light Co.; and

H.R. 5772. An act to amend section 205 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended. (50 U.S.C. 1016), relating to lump-sum readjustment payments for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13739. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rates, individual estate-tax rates, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses therein, and appoints Mr. Evan of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Connors to be the conferees of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 392. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 11381) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses therein, and appoints Mr. Jackson, Mr. Engle, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Beall, and Mr. Goldwater to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE PRAYER ROOM IN THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 594 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed fifty-four thousand four hundred additional copies of House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-fifth Congress, first session, entitled "The Prayer Room in the United States Capitol", of which forty-four thousand one hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

"Resolved, That there be printed fifty thousand four hundred additional copies of House Document Numbered 234, Eighty-fifth Congress, first session, entitled "The Prayer Room in the United States Capitol", of which forty-four thousand one hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate."

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

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

Mr. WALTER. In view of the decision handed down by the Supreme Court yesterday, does not the gentleman feel that perhaps we are violating some of the tenous provisions that the Supreme Court has placed in the Constitution of the United States? I certainly do not know that we ought to violate the provisions of the Constitution by providing for the printing of any documents with respect to the Prayer Room.

Mr. HAYS. I might say to the gentleman, I do not believe on the theory that everything is OK until the Supreme Court rules against it, and they have not ruled against this, so I think we are safe.

Perhaps someone will bring suit, but in the meantime we have nothing to worry about.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to note that the Supreme Court overnight has not outlawed prayer in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYS. I think the House can run its own business. It has done rather successfully in the past.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 651, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the proceedings in observance of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 454 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives the Senate concurring, that there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, three thousand additional copies each of parts I, II, and III of "Hearings on Small Business Problems Created by Petroleum Imports", Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 476 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives the Senate concurring, That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs one thousand additional copies of the hearings entitled "Judicial Review of Veterans' Claims", Eighty-seventh Congress, second session.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 490 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives the Senate concurring, That the report of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "Motor Vehicles, Air Pollution and Health", prepared in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 89-498, be printed...
as a House document; and that ten thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 69 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary one thousand additional copies of each of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings on "Constitutional Rights of the Mentally Ill", and one thousand copies of its hearings on "Wiretapping and Eavesdropping Legislation", held by its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 417, a copy of which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities twenty thousand additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of House Report Numbered 1278, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "The Truth About the Film 'Operation Abolition.'"

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that all of these resolutions which have just passed were reported from the Committee on House Administration unanimously by its chairman, a member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SCHENCK) was present.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PUBLIC SCHOOL PRAYER

Mr. TAYLOR. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Supreme Court ruled that a New York public school prayer was an unconstitutional breach of the law of separation of church and state. Recently in a Pennsylvania three-judge Federal court ruled that reading the Bible and reciting the Lord's Prayer as an opening exercise in a public school were unconstitutional acts.

I find myself agreeing with Justice Stewart who said in his dissenting opinion that the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle.

Our forefathers meant for this Nation to be free from religious domination but they never dreamed of religious faith and fervor and I believe that they would be amazed at this decision.

Freedom of religion was not intended to mean freedom from religion.

Dr. Billy Graham, my neighbor and constituent said:

Followed to its logical conclusion, we will have to take the chaplain out of the Armed Forces, prayers cannot be said in Congress and the President cannot put his hand on the Bible when he takes the oath of office.

And I might add that we would have to take the Bible from the courtroom and "In God We Trust" from our coins, "Subversion Under God" from the pledge of allegiance and prohibit the use of religious songs in school music programs.

This decision is not in the best interest of America. It is teaching and is dangerous in its implications. Public education should be infused with some measure of religious faith. As we combat atheistic, militant communism we need to often remind students that the guiding principle of this Government has been and is "In God We Trust."

In line with this thinking, this morning I introduce an amendment to the Constitution which if approved by Congress and adopted by three-fourths of the States, would overrule the Supreme Court decision, and would make legal the reading of the Bible and offering of prayers in public schools.

Mr. ABERNETHY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Supreme Court of yesterday, to which my friend from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) has just referred, should once again demonstrate to the Nation that an unbridled Court has the power to destroy this country as well as faith in God upon which the country was founded.

The Court's decision was shocking to the Nation. Of course, it was most pleasing to a few atheists and world communism under the leadership of Premier Khrushchev.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that we violate our law and the Court this morning when we opened this session with prayer. It is to be hoped that Justices Warren, Black, Clark, Brennan, Douglas, and Harlan will not cite the Members of this House and its beloved Chaplain for contempt of court.

Indeed, if there has been any doubt in the minds of Members of Congress that the Court should be trimmed down to size in power, the decision of yesterday should have dispelled all doubt. Appropriate legislation is pending before the Congress to calm the power grab of the Court and it should be passed without delay.

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

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

There was no objection.
Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Supreme Court about which we heard last night comes as no surprise to me. This is just one more decision in line with the philosophy of guiding the growth of men and women sitting there as the justices of our Court of last resort. They have been handing down similarly motivated decisions for a long while. As an example—just yesterday the Supreme Court upheld the conviction of a Communist who was indicted for contempt of Congress and was evidently in contempt. At the same session, using almost identical language, the Supreme Court sustained the conviction of a labor racketeer who also was convicted of contempt of Congress.

I defy anybody to distinguish between these two cases. Why was this decision as it was? Because the Supreme Court is determined to prevent the Congress of the United States from doing what we are obviously determined to do. Unfortunately, it is our own fault that the Supreme Court successfully invades our prerogatives. Several years ago a decision was handed down by the Supreme Court in the case of Cole against Young, where the Court very clearly legislated. There is no question about it.

I introduced a bill designed to correct this situation. I was accorded a hearing, and—nothing was ever done about it.

There are more instances where the Supreme Court has overstepped its bounds and asserted for itself legislative powers, and I remind the ladies and gentlemen of this Congress that this beloved Republic of ours is as great as it is because of the jealousy each branch of the Government has displayed in protecting its own prerogatives.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the sentiments so eloquently expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Walter), the chairman of our Judiciary Subcommittee.

The decision outlawing non-denominational prayer in the public schools is akin to the decision announced by the Court last year which held that it is unconstitutional for a sovereign State to establish a qualification for public office in that State "a belief in the existence of God." These two decisions represent a complete departure from established practice and precedent in American jurisprudence.

In my judgment, as someone who has always said, the first amendment guarantees freedom of religion, not freedom from religion.

This prayer, which was completely non-denominational and nonsectarian, did no more than acknowledge the existence of an omnipotent being. The Supreme Court itself opens each of its sessions with the words "God save the United States and this honorable Court." If the logic—or lack of logic—of this decision is carried to its ultimate extreme, then the Court undoubtedly will shortly abolish this part of its ritual.

Mr. Speaker, if this decision outlawed the invocation and benediction at high school graduation ceremonies,

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Pelly) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other Members of Congress and register my indignant protest at yesterday's Supreme Court ruling against use of prayer in our public schools.

The Supreme Court decided that use of a teacher to lead pupils in prayer is a violation of the Constitution causes me to express my belief that this interpretation is carrying the constitutional provision for separation of church and state too far.

The Constitution does not outlaw God. On the contrary it guarantees freedom of religion. Each State school authority has the right to establish a procedure of prayer providing, of course, the prayer is non-denominational.

Certainly the Court was in error. I agree with the majority. I also agree with the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Jonas) in his amendment to permit prayers to be offered in the public schools.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Jonas) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to the Constitution provides, among other things, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The New York State Board of Regents adopted the following prayer for use in the public schools:

Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

This was not an interpretation of the Constitution but once again writing law. The Supreme Court has been doing this in many decisions and unless the Congress takes drastic action, the Supreme Court will eventually rule that the Constitution has no right to open our daily sessions with prayer. Let us show the American people that the Congress can function constitutionally and legislatively so that we can have the voice of Almighty God not only in the Chambers of the Congress of the United States, where we need His guidance and wisdom, but in our schools in all parts of our country.

This was not an interpretation of the Constitution but once again writing law. The Supreme Court has been doing this in many decisions and unless the Congress takes drastic action, the Supreme Court will eventually rule that the Constitution has no right to open our daily sessions with prayer. Let us show the American people that the Congress can function constitutionally and legislatively so that we can have the voice of Almighty God not only in the Chambers of the Congress of the United States, where we need His guidance and wisdom, but in our schools in all parts of our country.

This was not an interpretation of the Constitution but once again writing law. The Supreme Court has been doing this in many decisions and unless the Congress takes drastic action, the Supreme Court will eventually rule that the Constitution has no right to open our daily sessions with prayer. Let us show the American people that the Congress can function constitutionally and legislatively so that we can have the voice of Almighty God not only in the Chambers of the Congress of the United States, where we need His guidance and wisdom, but in our schools in all parts of our country.

Mr. KORNEGAY. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Engel against Vitale, the New York Regents Prayer case, which was handed down yesterday, is very disturbing and distressing to me. The Court in this case held that a prayer which was used in the public school system of New York was an unconstitutional breach of the law of the land in that it violated the first amendment to the Constitution.

The prayer was very simple in its form, and it is inconceivable to me that it could have been offensive to anyone in that it merely asked God's blessing on the parents, teachers, and country, and acknowledged God's existence.

This decision should be disturbing to all God-fearing people in that it appears to foster and advance the cause of atheism. I am a staunch believer in the
separation of church and State but not in the separation of God and government. The Constitution was conceived and written, and this Government was established and promoted, by men of great faith, in the Supreme Creator, under whom we all serve, including, I trust, the members of the Court. The faith of our forefathers was instilled in them at an early age, and we have the obligation to pass this same faith and influence and that our posterity be deeply rooted and vitally cherished spiritual traditions are not made moot and meaningless.

My early training, education, and experience compel me to raise my voice in protest to this most regrettable and far-reaching decision by the Court. In an effort to correct this unfortunate decision, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, if approved by Congress and adopted by three-fourths of the States, will correct this lamentable situation and return to the schoolchildren of America the right and the privilege of praying on their parents, their teachers, and their country.

INVENTORIES OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when the House was considering extension of the Defense Production Act, I pointed out that I believed it was important that our committee hold further hearings on national stockpile.

Our national stockpile and the Defense Production Act inventories of strategic and critical materials were accumulated to provide our country with a store of vital materials for defense and the essential civilian economy in time of enemy attack. Needs which had been set in terms of 5-year requirements subsequently were reduced to 3-year requirements. Because the accumulation program for the acquisition of these essential strategic and critical materials was pressed vigorously and was successful, we now find ourselves in the position of having substantial stockpile excess materials due almost completely to the fact of the change in basic planning requirements reducing needs from a 5-year to a 3-year requirements program. As we are faced with a substantial disposal problem.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Symington committee sideline investigation is missing the boat. Instead of developing a brush-fire operation to the main tent Billie Sol Estes headline, the Symington committee should be doing some comprehensive investigations looking about a worthwhile disposal program.

To my way of thinking we have a real opportunity in a disposal program. Our partners in the common defense effort against the Soviet war potential, no less than ourselves should have real and urgent need for stockpiles of critical and strategic materials of their own. It seems logical they would welcome an opportunity to acquire substantial volumes of these materials and pay for them, perhaps in part, in gold. Certainly the opportunity exists for a worthwhile extension on a mutually advantageous basis and thoroughly in keeping with the intent of the stockpile acts that these materials be accumulated to meet defense and civilian needs in the event of enemy attack.

Mr. Speaker, I think our committee should reattribute hearings on the Defense Production Act and thoroughly explore the possibilities of such a disposition proposal. I am convinced in my own mind that our committee has a fine opportunity to make a real contribution to the common defense effort of our free nation allies.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Republican from Iowa for 24 sessions, only 4 of which my party was in power, I have gotten quite used to being in the minority. I have not always relished the circumstance, but I have endured it. However, due to yesterday's shocking Supreme Court ruling, I am sure I have not become one of a new minority.

I had always thought we could safely assume that acknowledgment of a Supreme Deity was somehow a universal common ground in this blessed land. I am horrified that six supreme jurists now think such recognition has no place in the schools where formative guidance is so important.

This is deliberate amnullation of a historical and sacred custom. I pray for America and its honorable Court.

STATE DEPARTMENT PROPAGANDA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I see by an article in today's Washington Post that the State Department is urging all out administration resistance to a mail cut on Communist propaganda.

I have today written the Secretary of State asking if this is his position on the Red ban and if he will assuring him to disclose the names of those officials in the Department who are opposing the defeat of this ban.

Such an attitude as this is certainly further evidence of the no-win or appeasement policy of the State Department in its dealings with communism.

I have urged the Secretary of State in the heretofore Court on this Nation, if he is opposed to this ban, to change his position and adopt one of firmness toward communism.

Neither the Reds, nor the uncommitted with respect appeasement or weakness, but they do respect strength and firmness and if we are to win the cold war, we must be firm in our dealings with communism and stop this capitulation.

To eliminate this ban on Red propaganda in the postal rate bill would, in effect, make the American taxpayer subsidize the continuing distribution of this material.

It is inconceivable to me to ask the American taxpayer to finance the distribution of this propaganda designed to destroy our freedom and country.

We are spending more money on defense than ever before in the history of our country. Why? To deter Communist aggression. We spend over $140 billion annually in the U.S. Information Agency to combat Communist propaganda. It is ridiculous to subsidize the distribution of this very same propaganda by allowing it to be delivered free through the facilities of the Postal Service Department.

When will these State Department officials wake up?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. JOHANSEN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the House to the fact that there were at least two decisions by the Supreme Court on yesterday.

The upshot of the two decisions seems to be: prayer, no; obscenity, yes.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of disturbance about the decisions of the Supreme Court that were announced yesterday. Every Member of the House ought to read the case of Marbury against Madison, decided in the early days of this Republic. You will find there the one possible loophole that could cause the failure of this Republic; it is the ability and the power of the Supreme Court to declare unconstitutional any act they desire to, and there is no appeal from it.
I introduced a resolution some time ago lodging in the Congress of the United States the same power to override decisions of the Supreme Court declaring acts unconstitutional that we have to override the veto power of the executive department of this Government. I would urge the Members of this Congress to look into that, because if we get this power in the Congress then there will not be need for a lot of empty words when one of these decisions comes out; we can act, and act promptly to cure the situation.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11879) to provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rates and of certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; and for Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference request made by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAsoN, and BYRNES of Wisconsin, King of California, O’BEErN of Illinois, MASON, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. 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. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. NATCHER] and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12276 with Mr. Proctor 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 consent agreement the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHoades] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time we present for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1963.

During our hearings, we carefully considered budget estimates totaling $299,134,476. The President's budget submitted in January requested $286,897,712 for the operation of the District of Columbia. Shortly thereafter, the District of Columbia Senate Appropriations Committee recommended $294,403,976 for the operation of the District. This amount was enacted and two House documents were submitted. House Document No. 376 requested $30,537,666 additional funds, and House Document No. 401 requested $2,880,100.

The New Revenue Act will produce $18,800,000 in 1963 and $11,800,000 in subsequent years. The increase in 1963 added to other revenue increases approved by the Commissioners will produce the additional amounts contained in the House documents.

For the fiscal year 1962, we appropriated the sum of $270,067,897 for the District of Columbia and our district favorites approved the sum of $285,900,143, in accordance with the amount requested in the budget submitted in January. The decision of the District government to request an increase in excise taxes and to take action in raising other taxes, such as the tax on real estate, thereby placed the total request for the operation of the Capital City in the category of being the largest among those of the district's history. The final amount approved and now recommended to the committee is the largest amount ever recommended by our committee.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five funds: a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary sewage fund.

The bill presented today provides for a Federal contribution of $39 million for the general fund, $1,938,000 for the water fund, and $961,000 for the sanitary sewage works fund. The Federal payment was requested and totaled $52 million and the amount recommended by our committee is $30 million. This is the amount approved for fiscal year 1962, and is an increase of $5 million over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1961.

A Federal loan of $18.7 million for the general fund is requested and approved by our committee. This loan will exhaust existing loan authorization of $75 million. Legislation is pending before the proper committee requesting additional loan authorization of $75 million.

For fiscal year 1963 we recommend a total appropriation of $280,059,000. Of this amount, $237,546,000 is for operating expenses and $52,513,000 is for financing 'Capital outlay' projects. The amount recommended is $30,103,000 above the 1962 appropriation and $9,075,478 below the budget estimates for 1963.

We recommend $16,005,000 for "General operating expenses" during fiscal year 1963. This is $536,340 above the current year and a reduction of $356,000 in the budget estimates. For "Public Welfare" we recommend the sum of $877,435,000. This is an increase of $1,369,373 over fiscal year 1962 and a reduction of $568,000 in the estimates. For "Education" we recommend $56,617,000. This is an increase of $2,610,680 over the current year and a reduction of $953,000 in the budget estimate. For "Parks and Recreation" we recommend $8,377,000. This is an increase of $272,400 over fiscal year 1961 and a reduction of $36,000 in budget estimates. For "Health and welfare" we recommend a total of $66,617,000.

For the fiscal year 1962, we recommended a total of $11,470,000. This is an increase of $555,000 over 1962 fiscal year and $70,000 less than budget request.

For "Capital outlay" we recommend a total of $46,713,000. This is an increase of $4,455,100 over current year and a 910 over current year and a reduction of $1,653,000 in budget estimates. For "Highways and traffic" we recommend a total of $11,470,000. This is an increase of $555,000 over 1962 fiscal year and $70,000 less than budget request.

For "Transportation" we recommend a total of $15,680,000. This is an increase of $3,680,000 over current year and a 910 over current year and a reduction of $1,653,000 in budget estimates. For "Public welfare" we recommend a total of $86,500,000. This is an increase of $4,500,000 over current year and a reduction of $1,653,000 in budget estimates.

Our Capital City continues to be faced with a large public welfare caseload, a difficult crime situation, and increasing governmental costs. Washington is one of the most beautiful cities in the world and should be a model city in every respect. It is the symbol of democracy for men and women throughout the world.

Today we are confronted with sudden shifts in population in certain sections of our city, and rapid movement to the suburbs of middle and upper income families. Further increases in the real estate tax in the District will drive more people to the suburbs.

We have our transportation, highway, housing, education, welfare, and delinquency problems. A city with a great many old and very young people. A city with $2,576 people receiving welfare assistance, and with 116,420 school children.

A city reporting 21,802 serious crimes in fiscal year 1961. All serious problems, but not insurmountable.

$25 million is not insurmountable.

For the first time since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, we have established an adequate reserve, both for the general fund and for the highway fund. We have submitted called for a reserve of $1,488,000—$350,000 for indefinite appropriations and $1,388,000 for pending legislation pertaining to shorter hours for firemen, transit subsidies, and increased pensions for the widows and children of policemen and firemen. This is excellent budgetary procedure and we approve of this reserve request. In addition we have increased the general fund reserve surplus $3,060,544. This makes a total surplus of $4,548,544. This surplus can be used to meet the interest on stadium debt as well as provide for additional amounts which may become necessary for St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for possible salary increases for District employees. But we do not recommend the highway fund regular account surplus of $1,675,382 which we have established. This amount is sufficient to meet indefinite appropriations proposed by the Department of Highways and Traffic, and is adequate to continue highway programs held in abeyance pending additional studies and necessary arrangements for solution of removal of displaced citizens.
The citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to a system of law enforcement which will insure them the right to enjoy their homes and business and to lead their daily lives without fear of assault. The same applies to the 17 million visitors to Washington each year, who, by the way, spend some $700 million in the District during their stay in the City. For fiscal year 1963 the amount requested by the Metropolitan Police force is $26,999,800. We recommend that the entire amount be appropriated. 55,888 additional police privates and 25 man-dog teams will be provided. This will bring the force up to a total strength of 2,900 and the Canine Corps up to 75 man-dog teams. The amount requested will also provide seven additional civilian employees and three precinct replacements. The best deterrent against crime is the foot patrolman. In order to have a more efficient police force, more foot patrolmen must be assigned to the precincts where the crimes are being committed.

The continuing increase in crime in the District has been halted, and in the Capital City must not be a haven for law violators. Pressure groups must stop interfering with law enforcement, and our courts should keep in mind that the rights of the people must be protected as well as those of the law violator.

The public assistance program in the District is in trouble. The disclosure that 66 percent of the 230 aid-to-dependent-children cases selected at random were ineligible for welfare payments is shocking and adequate warning that the welfare program must be overhauled.

The Department of Public Welfare administers all public assistance programs in the District. They include the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled; and dependent families. They include the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled and dependent families. They include the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled; and dependent families. The public assistance program is a welfare city.

The public assistance program in the District is in trouble. The disclosure that 66 percent of the 230 aid-to-dependent-children cases selected at random were ineligible for welfare payments is shocking and adequate warning that the welfare program must be overhauled.

The Department of Public Welfare administers all public assistance programs in the District. They include the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled; and dependent families. They include the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled; and dependent families. The public assistance program is a welfare city.

The public assistance program in the District is in trouble. The disclosure that 66 percent of the 230 aid-to-dependent-children cases selected at random were ineligible for welfare payments is shocking and adequate warning that the welfare program must be overhauled.

The Department of Public Welfare administers all public assistance programs in the District. They include the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled; and dependent families. They include the four federally aided categories of the aged, the blind, the disabled; and dependent families. The public assistance program is a welfare city.
The amount requested is $44,554,400 and the amount recommended is $44,285,000. Here we have a reduction of only $285,400.

Mr. ANDREWS. If the gentleman will yield further, I wish to thank the gentleman from Florida for his earnest recommendation in this bill, and say that in my opinion we get more for the money spent for dogs than in any other way in trying to prevent crime in this city. I have listened to any number of policemen in the last few months who are handling these dogs, and they tell me that in this city dogs do more to preserve order than any other single thing. They say it is a terrific what these dogs can do. There are certain people in this city who do not respect police officers, who do not respect guns, who do not respect razors, and it is a pleasure to see them surround respect for those dogs. I would like to see the time come when we have a dog on every block and a dog in every scout car.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for looking after the dogs for the police department.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] should be thanked and complimented for an accomplishment in another direction. Along with other Members, I have felt there has been too much legislating in the appropriation bill providing funds for the District of Columbia. I especially want to point out the efforts of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] in securing support for us in the community and for the police force which has been a very serious problem. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if he might clarify a little exactly what we are going to do in carrying out this bill regarding promotions of policemen, and so forth, through means outside the civil service system. This has been a very serious situation. The gentleman is to be complimented particularly for his efforts to straighten this matter out.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend for calling this matter to the attention of the House.

As you will remember, a few years ago a general statement was issued to the effect that beginning as of that time no longer would promotions be made in the Metropolitan Police Department. As my good friend from Iowa now knows the way to destroy the Metropolitan Police force is to have pressure promotions made from time to time. Promotions to any member of the police force and to any police officer in the civil service register and, under no circumstances should anyone be taken from No. 16 on a list and put to the top of the list and perhaps to any other position in the force. A thing of the past.

In the bill we have before us today you will notice a provision that is the same
as was carried last year concerning five police officers. Those men were heretofore promoted in appropriation bills. In the hearings this year we discussed this matter with the proper officials in the District and were informed that this provision would have to remain in the bill this year. I want my distinguished friend to know that these are not new promotions to the same positions that were made last year and several years ago and have continued to be carried in the bill from time to time.

The suggestion that these promotions were made and these men shall continue in the present category. I want the gentleman clearly to understand that these are not new promotions. It will no longer be in the bill after this year.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the gentleman has done an excellent job in a very difficult situation.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First of all, I want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, on the fine presentation he has made and to join the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Snell] in deploring the fact that there are not more here to hear the statement he is making. I want to compliment the committee too on the exhaustive hearing it has held. Hardly a stone was left unturned in the affairs of the District of Columbia that this committee did not explore. I would like to ask the gentleman, since he is on the subject of freeways, if I read in the hearings that the Southwest Freeway is supposed to be completed by mid-1962? It is mid-1962 now or awfully close to it. I wonder whether it will be before we can expect to see the Southwest Freeway completed? Does the gentleman have any information on it?

Mr. NATCHER. That matter was discussed at the time the highway officials appeared before our committee. We asked them the very same question that my distinguished friend from Iowa has just asked. They have assured us that they are behind a matter of months on this particular project, and it will not be completed within the time they indicated last spring. But it is in process of completion and we hope before the calendar year closes that it will be completed.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman shed any light on this situation, and I do not find this in the hearings and it may be beyond the reach of the committee, but the taxpayers went down to Fort Totten and built a single-lane or eight-lane traffic bridge across the Potomac River, and yet we find Independence Avenue still carrying the same traffic that it did in New York and other points along the eastern seaboard on south, and no relief from the heavy traffic in Washington. It was my understanding when the Jones Point Bridge bill was voted through the House that when it was completed it would relieve the outstanding amount in thorough traffic but I find that the trucks and cars are still coming through the city. Is there no ingress or egress from that bridge on the Maryland side of the river? What is wrong?

Mr. NATCHER. Not until after this freeway system has been resolved. During the past week, as the gentleman knows, we have jams on Independence Avenue. It took some 40 or 50 minutes to get down to the park one afternoon, by virtue of changing the traffic down at the Department of Agriculture corner. As soon as this freeway system is resolved, I can say to the gentleman that heavy traffic will come off Independence Avenue. The gentleman is exactly right, it should not be on there at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Well, somebody is fumbling the ball somewhere, that they have not diverted this traffic properly. I wonder if they do not have the roads in Maryland in anticipation of which this bridge was built? Something is wrong somewhere along the line and seriously wrong.

Mr. NATCHER. I would certainly agree with my friend, and I want to thank him for his comments.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say for the record that I think the District of Columbia as well as the Nation is extremely fortunate in having the gentleman from Kentucky, my good friend, Bill Natcher, chairman of this subcommittee. All of us know he is a member of several important additional appropriation subcommittees. He is the ranking member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee which is vital to his own area and on which I have the privilege of serving. But this is the National Capital, it is something in which the whole Nation has an interest, and I think that the people in this locality are extremely fortunate that I know the National is, that Bill Natcher has taken over this chairmanship. I congratulate him as well as those who serve with him on this fine presentation the gentleman has made.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend from Mississippi.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the majority leader, Mr. Albert.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join those who have complimented the gentleman for his excellent presentation. The Congress and the people of the District and of this country owe him and his committee a debt of gratitude for the fine job they have done.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have had occasion to help present this bill without the presence of our good old friend and former colleague, Louis Rabaut. Louis was chairman of this subcommittee for many years and did, I think, an outstanding job for the District of Columbia. He was a Member of the House who was greatly beloved by us all. He has been missed greatly. However, I certainly want to add my words of compliments to the presentation that this subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher]. In Bill Natcher the District of Columbia has a single and effective job to do.

I think the industry with which he approached his task and the fine ability with which he handled it is best attested by the fact that the gentleman from Iowa, the most thorough Member of the House of Representatives, probably the most thorough person who ever sat as a Member of the House of Representatives has just said that the hearings were so well handled that the matter so well covered there was very little left to be said. I find myself in that position, too, after the presentation that the gentleman from Kentucky has made. I thank the gentleman on the committee here on the floor of the House.

There is not much to be said except to reiterate the feeling that has been expressed here that Washington is a Federal city, the beloved Capital of our beloved country, that belongs to the constituents who live in my district as much as it belongs to the people who live here in the District of Columbia. All of us on this subcommittee have approached our task with the feeling that we are legislating not only for those who live in the District, but for those Americans who from time to time find themselves fortunate enough to be able to travel here to the seat of our Government, to be inspired by the beautiful buildings, the atmosphere, and the history which looks down upon every person who is able to come to the District of Columbia.

We feel very definitely that we want this city to remain worthy not only to be the capital of the greatest country in the world, but to be worthy of the people who have made this the greatest country in the world.

We are all ashamed, we are all possessed of a feeling of frustration when we read in the papers about the things which go on on the streets of Washington.

The chairman has reported the details which we have taken into consideration and the things which we provide in this bill to help the Police Department cope with this situation. He has also pressed every Committee chairmanship upon the fact that the Welfare Department is in a difficult period of its history. As he has indicated, we are all willing to help in every way we can to get this Department through this very difficult period in its history.

When a situation such as the one described by the chairman occurs, where out of 280 cases taken at random, 66 percent should not have been there in the first place, you can see what we mean when we say the Department is in a difficult period of its history. You can see what can be done in weeding out those who for
reasons of their own have decided they would like to pray on the taxpayers of the District of Columbia by becoming welfare recipients without a legal right to become welfare recipients. 

There is plenty of money in the District of Columbia, as there is in your district and mine, to take care of those who have no legal right to the welfare rolls: but there is not money to take care of the chiselers, and we do not intend to tolerate the existence of the chiselers on the welfare roles of the District.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's clear statement suggests lax administration somewhere. Do District officials contend they have not had enough money to properly administer relief? If so, has adequate money been made for money in this bill for personnel?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. When the Welfare Director was before the committee, he stated a need for funds and positions. The chairman of the subcommittee asked him what priority he placed on these positions. The No. 1 priority was in his own office to go through the welfare records so that on the face of it, at least, each person who is on the roll would be entitled to be there. The reason he made this first is that legislation has now ordered that 10 cases of the 260 should not have been on the welfare rolls and would have been taken off by a perusal of the records in the office.

Yes, there has been some laxness in the office. Whether it was because of lack of personnel or whether it was because of improper blocking out of the areas of responsibility is anyone's guess.

The second priority was for investigators; people to go out and investigate cases which appeared to be regular on the face, but, which, after investigation might be discovered to be cases which should not be on the rolls at all. There may be a man living in the house or where the person who was the head of the family may have had a job, and not on the rolls, but should be on the welfare rolls, or for some other reason.

So, I say to my friend from Iowa I believe the necessary funds for supervision have been included in this bill and that we should expect a great improvement in the next year in the administration of the welfare program. If there is not money on hand, we will be greatly disappointed and will have some pointed remarks to say about those who would be responsible for it.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Would not the gentleman agree with me that a person who puts his name on the roll and had taken the time to put him on the rolls, certain- ly should have been knowledgeable enough to know what the laws were so that we would see that those laws were obeyed, and that the people were really entitled to be on the rolls in the first place?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think the gentleman from Florida is absolutely right. However, in my work with the aelfare worker, I should say this: There has apparently been a feeling in the Welfare Department that the first thing that any investigator is to put him on the rolls and then find out later whether he should be on. Now, I happen to think that is wrong, and I know the gentleman from Florida thinks it is wrong. I think any chairman will agree with me that we made it abundantly clear in the hearings that we do not expect this to be done any more. We expect that this program will be handled with compassion; we expect that the human needs will be taken care of, where they fit under the laws under which the Department operates, but we do not expect any more people to be put on the welfare rolls and to be kept there without further study and without further investigation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, has there been any request to the Congress or to your committee heretofore for funds before this situation arose? Has there been a request for funds to carry out this investigation? And, if there has not, why, at this late date, when everybody now is aware of the situation of millions of dollars having been expended illegally, has this been brought up for the first time? Do you not think that somebody in this welfare setup should be held responsible for it?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I say to my good friend from Florida, if my recollection serves me right, we put additional investigators on during the last fiscal year, and therefore the idea of investigating to make sure that a welfare recipient should be on the rolls is not a new one. But, it is certainly receiving more emphasis now than it has in recent years. However, about 8 years ago an investigation was launched which resulted in the so-called man-in-the-house people who have as their function in school population, but will also provide for a slight decrease in the pupil-teacher ratio of the District of Columbia schools.

In the Parks and Recreation Department we have also provided ample funds for continuing the very successful roving program. This program alone pro- \v"rgram consists of some very dedicated people who have as their function in life to become acquainted with the young people of the District of Columbia in an effort to lead them into areas and activities which are helpful physically and mentally, and to get them away from some of the types of activities which we characterize by the term "juvenile delinquency." These people are in the Recreation Department because this was thought to be the best place for them. They do a magnificent job, and in my opinion have a more decisive effect in solving the problems of youth than any other group of comparable size.

The chairman has covered the situa- \which was supposed to be completed in November as to the overall delay for mass transportation in the District of Columbia and in the manufactur- \vory. But in the next breath, I would like to say this is not the only reason we have taken into consideration. We have made provision for the northeast leg of the inner loop, the cast leg, and interchange C.

The chairman has capably pointed out in these hearings that there will be great
dislocation as far as people are concerned. There are many people whose houses will be torn down, who will have to move, if these particular legs are constructed along the present alignment. So we feel it is not only necessary to take a long look at the alignment, as far as economy is concerned, but we also think as far as human convenience, in fact human emotions, are concerned, it is necessary that we displace as few people as possible. We feel the interim period can be utilized by the legislative committee of this subcommittee in an attempt to provide legislation to take care of the burdens which will fall on those people whose lives will be dislocated as a result of the construction.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, is it contemplated by your subcommittee that the Senate pass these two legs of the inner loop?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Our state of mind is something like this: We do not feel that the making of a decision by the subcommittee unless it becomes necessary for us to make policy. We feel the fact that two of the three District Commissioners came before our committee after having approved the budget with these legs in the budget and said they had changed their minds, that they had withdrawn their support from these legs, caused the red light to go on too soon, and we were concerned; and, therefore, it would be better for the type of committee that we are to give those who are engaged in the business of studying plans like this a chance to restudy the whole situation.

We were also told there might be a reasonable alternative route for the east leg which would take not only less money than the route as now proposed, but also be a route that is not contemplated but would result in the dislocation of no people, and also might well result, if the National Park Service will finally get the desire to do something about the west bank of the Anacostia River to a point where it would be a much more attractive stream than it now is.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman that our subcommittee had extensive hearings on this matter, and the Commissioners came before us and said they had withdrawn their support from the proposed plan at present; however, this is a very important part of the future of transportation in this city. Realizing this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is not a policy-making committee, I accept what the gentleman has said here today. It seems to me, though, we ought to push ahead as rapidly as possible with this entire inner loop. I do not believe that the problem of the traffic conditions of the next 10 years, insofar as the District of Columbia is concerned.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman fro Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

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

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) and his subcommittee held extensive hearings last fall on this and related problems here in the District of Columbia. I testified before that committee with reference to a bill introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss). This whole problem was held in committee and then referred to a subcommittee to go into extensively. In connection with the problem brought out at that time and what was being undertaken, I thought it right and proper to look at some facts that were relevant to the hearings and record that for the benefit of the House today.

Mr. Chairman, unless we are able, each year, to make some progress on the inner and outer loops, those particular problems in another 10 years will cause us to find ourselves in some real difficulty in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, there is another problem concerning the highway system of the District of Columbia which has been rather conveniently swept under the table for the last few years, and that is the inner loop by which the inner loop will be connected with neighboring Montgomery County, Md. The Wisconsin Ave. corridor has been well closed and locked by legislation of Congress, and for a time there have been no plans brought forth, and none contemplated, for connecting with the rather extensive system of roads which are being operated in Montgomery County.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this problem will be the subject of study, and that the District Commissioners and the Highway Department will address themselves to these problems in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I wish to point out again that this reserve fund in this bill. I for one—and again I am speaking as only one member of the committee—hope that the District Commissioners will save it. If they do not save it, I hope they will use it wisely. I might even say, and I certainly do not mean to be threatening anyone, that the first occasion upon which Washington which has gone up in rather good time, built by the General Services Administration. I often wonder whether it would not be a good idea for the Congress if it wished—I do not know why it ever would—to construct another building, why it would not be a good idea to turn the job over to the General Services Administration and let them construct it. They have the best construction knowledge in the Government, and we should use them.

Mr. GROSS. And let Mr. McCloskey build bridges or divide the construction contracts among others so that he is not involved in everything and spread so thin that he cannot complete his jobs in a reasonable time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Then legislation from Congress is well taken, as they always are.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?
Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee on Appropriations once again brings to you today for your approval the District of Columbia appropriations bill. It has been a pleasure serving with our chairman, whose ability and knowledge are exceeded only by his affability and congeniality, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. On this committee there were members who are experts in various fields—those who have the education, in the field of juvenile delinquency, in the field of welfare. The committee was ably assisted by Earl Silsby, our staff director.

Washington is one of the most beautiful and cleanest cities in the world. It should be a model for our civilized governments to imitate. From the air, the view of the Capitol, the various memorials, the Government buildings, the sprawling environs with the Potomac River meandering through the heart of the city and spanned by several bridges and numerous clean, and a sight to be held. But within the city there has been and is terror, unrest, waste, poverty, illiteracy. The beauty of the glistening institutions and marble buildings is offset by the ugliness of crowded and dilapidated schools, the inefficiency of inadequate, disjointed, and physically inefficient hospitals, the decay of morality of the 320,000 underemployed Negroes with crowded children's villages, the illegitimacy, poverty, and high incidence of venereal diseases. Our beautiful spacious avenues are accompanied by rundown neighborhoods where terror stalks and the lawless run amuck. Danger lurks for the unwary and the unsuspecting. Our newspapers dramatize the cases of murder, robbery, and aggravated assault, which terrorize the populace. The decent and law-abiding people are aroused and have resolved to put an end to this lawlessness, which in 1961 resulted in 21,802 reported major crimes.

A great deterrent is the cop on the beat, the foot patrolman. A greater deterrent is a police officer and his faithful companion, the police dog. The greatest deterrent is an aroused public which resolves to put an end and reduce this criminality and lawlessness.

Seventeen million people visit Washington annually. They spend approximately $66,528,000 for the activities of health and welfare during the next fiscal year. This is a decrease of $1,833,000 in the estimates and an increase of $4,332,910 over 1962 appropriations. We recommend a reduction of $1,337,700 in welfare from the estimates. Our welfare costs amount to $21,856,000.

Welfare is the yardstick of a community's compassion and sympathy for the individual. This Committee, the Senate, and the Congress must make themselves apparent after the hearings of the House subcommittee and during the hearings of the Senate subcommittee in this legislative area.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I extend my thanks to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for their cooperation, for their promptness in furnishing the data from which my figures are derived.

The greatest deterrent is the cop on the beat, the foot patrolman. A greater deterrent is a police officer and his faithful companion, the police dog. The greatest deterrent is an aroused public which resolves to put an end and reduce this criminality and lawlessness.

Seventeen million people visit Washington annually. They spend approximately $66,528,000 for the activities of health and welfare during the next fiscal year. This is a decrease of $1,833,000 in the estimates and an increase of $4,332,910 over 1962 appropriations. We recommend a reduction of $1,337,700 in welfare from the estimates. Our welfare costs amount to $21,856,000.

Welfare is the yardstick of a community's compassion and sympathy for the individual. This Committee, the Senate, and the Congress must make themselves apparent after the hearings of the House subcommittee and during the hearings of the Senate subcommittee in this legislative area. Where buildings had been demolished, I was comforted when I happened upon the sprawling environs with the Potomac River meandering through the heart of the city and spanned by several bridges and numerous clean, and a sight to be held. But within the city there has been and is terror, unrest, waste, poverty, illiteracy. The beauty of the glistening institutions and marble buildings is offset by the ugliness of crowded and dilapidated schools, the inefficiency of inadequate, disjointed, and physically inefficient hospitals, the decay of morality of the 320,000 underemployed Negroes with crowded children's villages, the illegitimacy, poverty, and high incidence of venereal diseases. Our beautiful spacious avenues are accompanied by rundown neighborhoods where terror stalks and the lawless run amuck. Danger lurks for the unwary and the unsuspecting. Our newspapers dramatize the cases of murder, robbery, and aggravated assault, which terrorize the populace. The decent and law-abiding people are aroused and have resolved to put an end to this lawlessness, which in 1961 resulted in 21,802 reported major crimes.

A great deterrent is the cop on the beat, the foot patrolman. A greater deterrent is a police officer and his faithful companion, the police dog. The greatest deterrent is an aroused public which resolves to put an end and reduce this criminality and lawlessness.

Seventeen million people visit Washington annually. They spend approximately $66,528,000 for the activities of health and welfare during the next fiscal year. This is a decrease of $1,833,000 in the estimates and an increase of $4,332,910 over 1962 appropriations. We recommend a reduction of $1,337,700 in welfare from the estimates. Our welfare costs amount to $21,856,000.
steps must be taken to clear the rolls of ineligible welfare recipients.

In addition, grants to large families were cut back by the Senate in 2,440 cases involving large families. The committee denied the request to restore $43,488 of those funds.

Public health poses serious problems. The committee reduced estimates by $285,400 and increased the appropriation by $3,351,000. The total amount recommended for public health was $44,269,000.

The committee learned of a corrosive condition existing and developing in the District. The rate of infectious venereal diseases in the District in the age group from 15 to 19 is in the ratio of 4,876 cases per 100,000 population while the median in the United States is 276. One need not spell out the consequences to posterity if such trends continue or expand. The committee has recommended an inclusion of $393,645 to control venereal disease. Also recommended is legislation that legislation be passed eliminating parental consent for treatment of venereal disease. A careless or misanthropic youth will suffer in silence and spread contamination rather than get parental consent to be cured.

Some of the committee, including myself, visited the District of Columbia General Hospital to review the plant and the program. I feel that the staff of best and interns are plentiful, the facilities are outmoded and antiquated. Operating rooms and recovery rooms are situated off the corridors where employees constantly pass and equipment is stored, with attendant noises in moving about them. Such conditions are not conducive to repose before an operation or recovery after surgery when trauma exists. Admitting quarters are cramped and inconvenient. Patients requiring emergency treatment must stand up and cannot be seated while waiting. There is lack of space and X-ray facilities are situated at a distance from confinement quarters, and there is much waste of time and energy because of confusion between the two quarters and the examination facilities. Consequently, the committee feels that this intolerable condition in the District of Columbia General Hospital should be rectified immediately, and, therefore, recommends approval of $12,670,000 for the consolidation of the District of Columbia General Hospital and for improvement of the mechanical and utility services.

EDUCATION

The city of Washington consists mainly of the young and the old. Of the 700,000 residents, 144,923 are children attending schools; 128,482 are in elementary schools and 15,441 in high schools in public schools. There are 2,150 teachers in the grades between 1 and 6. The pupil-teacher ratio is 31.6 to 1 and the teacher's salary begins at $4,800. It costs $12,670,000 annually to educate a pupil. Does the District get its money's worth in its educational system? I am not certain.

Recently U.S. Senator in a histronic fashion displayed obsolete books which tended to discredit the Congress in its appropriations. Last year the Education Department requested funds for books and asserted that it needed $283,000 for schoolbooks. This committee, under the chairmanship of our beloved late colleague, Louis Rabaut, did not approve this request. The question was whether the sum which the Board of Education said it needed. The Board of Education now claims that it was conservative and in error as to what it needed. The committee believes that, in addition to the $283,000 for schoolbooks and library books, children cannot properly learn. Therefore, the committee has approved all the budget estimates for the Board of Education. In addition, this bill provides $419,000 for the purchase of books for the schools and the libraries, $394,000 for textbooks and $25,000 for purchase of library books. We trust that the Board of Education knows its need and that it will not say next year once again that it was conservative in its request.

Lately I have been advised by the results derived from the Teachers College. I feel that the District is not getting its money's worth in the production of teachers. The Teachers College graduates only 65 and of those only 63 are willing to teach in the District of Columbia after receiving a free education from the District schools. Knowing that teachers are necessary, not only to teach, but also to provide classes sufficiently small so that children can receive more individualized attention, the committee recommends appropriations for a total of $1,560,000 to improve elementary, junior high schools, and 14 in the senior high. There is one ray of hope in the District school system. It is the adoption of a plan known as the Amilond plan. It is a program which emphasizes the three Rs and the teaching of the basic studies. The program is being gradually accepted throughout the District and offers hope to educate the children so that they will not be functional illiterates—those children who have been exposed to education, but have not learned how to read or compute. My colleague, Congressman Racooosin, and I, together with the Commissioners, inspected the notorious Hine Junior High School, and we are told that several lines have been destroyed, but the school is still in use and is congested far beyond its capacity. The committee is of the belief that quick action is indicated and a higher priority must be given to this report. This is an eyesore and hazard. It is conceded by the authorities that this building is the worst school building in the city. Consequently, the committee approves $400,000 to start the replacement of Hine Junior High School at Seventh and C Streets.

All in all, the committee recommends an appropriation of $56,817,000 for the operation of the public school system of the District during the fiscal year 1963. This is an increase of $2,610,890 over 1962, and a cost of $959,000 in the budget estimates.

Other appropriations are made for highways and traffic, sanitary engineer-
Under expenditure might not have been necessary if you had entered a few in the city of Washington? I think the gentleman will agree with me that there is one thing necessary to make this the greatest capital in the world, and that is money. We have been operating here in the Capital on a false premise that there is only one thing necessary to make this the greatest capital in the world, and that is money.

The other day three young, well-dressed youngsters are interested in getting an education. Now, if these youngsters are interested in getting an education, they should not permit themselves to be cheated because they do not have textbooks. Well, Abraham Lincoln did not have very many textbooks given to him; in fact, there were not many textbooks available at that time. But, he wanted an education. He walked many, many miles to pick up material from which to study and learn to read. Now, if these youngsters are interested in getting an education, they should not permit themselves to be cheated because they do not have textbooks.

I asked them what they were concerned with. They said, "Mr. Wilson, we are being cheated." I asked, "Is that what you are? In what way are you being cheated?" "Mr. Wilson, we are being cheated out of our education." I said, "Is that what you are? In what way are you being cheated?"

"Well, Mr. Wilson, we do not have enough classrooms, we do not have enough teachers. Our school day is 20 minutes shorter than in the District of Columbia. And certainly I am opposed to home rule. I have always been opposed to home rule, and I do not think I shall ever vote away my constituents' right to control their Nation's Capital. I want to make the point.

But along with such authority as I am asking for my people, the authority I hope they will retain, I also want to assure some further responsibility. It has always been my thought that responsibility goes along with authority, or that authority be delegated commensurate with responsibility. I feel my district has the responsibility of making our Nation's Capital the finest capital in the world. I want to contribute to that effort. But I do want to have an idea how I do away with the fallacy that there is only one thing necessary to make a great capital, there is only one thing necessary to make great schools, and that is money.

We have been operating here in the Capital on a false premise that there is only one thing necessary to make this the greatest capital in the world, and that is money.
period, consisting of 55 minutes or else add two new periods. I think the labora-
tory period should be extended so that the children would have an opportunity
to get the equipment out, assemble it, perform their experiments, and put the equip-
ment away before the period is over. That cannot be done now with the 40-
minute period, and admittedly so, by the superintendent of schools during the
hearings which we have just finished. A 40-minute period is not sufficiently
time new in the Amidon plan that is not being practiced in every good school
system in the United States, I would like to have you point it out. I have studied
the plan not only to enable me to have one of those principles is being and has
been in operation in those schools for many, many years.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chair-
man, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to
the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chair-
man, I would like to take this oppor-
tunity to compliment my colleague upon
his statement as an educator as well as an
experienced legislator. I think the gentleman has had ample opportunity to
view the school buildings and facilities in the District of Columbia with a
practical and yet a very experienced eye. I feel that the gentleman's remarks are
justified in receiving the very comprehensive attention of all the Members of
the House.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the
gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Harvey) for
those kind remarks.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chair-
man, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman
from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chair-
man, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona
(Mr. Rhodes) for allowing me this time,
and compliment the gentleman upon his
presentation earlier this afternoon, par-
cicularly his statement that the commit-
tee will keep a close watch on the de-
plorable relief and assistance situation in
the District of Columbia. It is my hope that the committee has made under the able
leadership of the gentleman from Ken-
tucky (Mr. Natcher) and the ranking
minority member of the committee from
Arizona (Mr. Rhodes), that it will cer-
tainly follow through next year on that
and other problems to which it gave so
much attention this year.

Mr. Chairman, I do not find in the
bill—and I have been reading in the
papers about the difficulties—anything
with respect to the new stadium in
Washington. Am I correct that there
is nothing in the bill with respect to an
appropriation for the stadium? I won-
nderer if the gentleman could enlighten me
to that situation?

Mr. NATCHER. If the gentleman will
yield, I would like to say to the dis-
tinguished gentleman from Iowa that
to that situation?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I want to
say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that our subcommittee informed the
Commissioners that under no circumstances will we come back to Congress and ask
for an increase in the Federal payment for the payment of any
money on the District of Columbia Stadium.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I
want to say to my distinguished friend
that during those years this stadium
will be a losing proposition and some
arrangement must be made immediately
to take this burden off the taxpayers of
the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am very
pleased with the gentleman's statement
from the gentleman and the attitude he takes
toward this proposition because unless
someone keeps the door closed either the
taxpayers of the District of Columbia
or the taxpayers of the entire Nation are
going to have to pay this huge bill. I
opposed the legislation providing for this
stadium when it first came to the House
floor. It was not the present time as far as
the stadium is concerned; one, the
Federal payment must be increased or
taxes increased in the District of Colum-
bia. I want to say to the distinguished friend
that during those years this stadium
will be a losing proposition and some
arrangement must be made immediately
to take this burden off the taxpayers of
the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I
want to thank the gentleman from Arizona
(Mr. Rhodes) for allowing me this time,
and compliment the gentleman upon his
presentation earlier this afternoon, par-
cipically his statement that the commit-
tee will keep a close watch on the de-
plorable relief and assistance situation in
the District of Columbia. It is my hope that the committee has made under the able
leadership of the gentleman from Ken-
tucky (Mr. Natcher) and the ranking
minority member of the committee from
Arizona (Mr. Rhodes), that it will cer-
tainly follow through next year on that
to pay for a very expensive stadium. I
suggest that a stadium could have been
built for far less than $20 million and
served the purpose adequately. So I am
more than pleased to have the statement
from the gentleman.

I have one serious criticism of the bill
that it be found on page 7, the provision
which reads as follows:

Provided, That the outpatient rate under
subcontracts and for services rendered by
Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed $5 per
visit and the inpatient rate shall not exceed
$200 per day as fixed by the Commissioners based
on audited costs...

And so forth. The gentleman from
Kentucky is very well acquainted with the
entire provision, I am sure. Will the
gentleman explain that to me a little
further?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I
would like the gentleman to know that
the committee does not favor the pro-
vision, and it has been underwritten by the
Commissioner of Columbia Stadium through the years per-
taining to the contract hospitals. Here
the provision on page 7 says that the rate
of $30 up, to $36, as determined by the
District of Columbia and the Commissioner ascertained by the District of Columbia
Commissioners may be paid the contract
hospitals. I want the gentleman to know that his objection is valid. We
agree with him. I want the gentleman
to know this. We granted and we rec-
ommend to the House $2,100,000 for use
in construction the main core section of
the stadium. We will start the District of Columbia Hospital with an
overall cost for this new core section of
$11,800,000. We recommended $2,100,-
000 in this bill for this particular project
to get underway.

I want the gentleman to know that
this matter of contract hospitals has been
given serious consideration this year
and some arrangement will be made next
year to delete this provision from the bill.
We will be in a better position at that
time to take care of this matter after
we start the District of Columbia General Hospital main core section construction.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my
distinguished friend. The cost per day
in the District of Columbia General Hospital
is $36. It is true that in some of
the hospitals in the District it runs
$28, $29, and $30, so why should they
receive $36 just because that is the day
basis in the District of Columbia General Hospital? We so explained to the
Commissioners.

I want the gentleman to know this:
This is a provision that has been carried
in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the District of Columbia
year it is based on audited costs. It might
be $31, it might be $31.50, but not to
exceed $36. The gentleman is en-
tirely correct, and I want him to know
that in the future we will not be contending
with this particular provision.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentle-
man that I do not like this open-end pro-
vision, and I will say to the gentleman that he should look at
the point of order against the language and
I hope that in conference a better provi-
sion can be worked out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the
gentleman from Florida (Mr. Smoot).
Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the members of his subcommittee for the fine work done on this bill. The hearings were conducted in the most formal and painstaking manner in which the committee has brought out the facts with a very close check on expenditures in the work the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has done as chairman has reflected itself in the reputation he has carved within the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], chairman of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMillan. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to congratulate you as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia and the members of his subcommittee on the fine service they have rendered the people of Washington and the United States. I have watched this committee operate during the past months and they have spent days, weeks, and months to help make our Capitol a beautiful and safe place to live. I think if I were a Commissioner and the heads of the District government agencies will cooperate with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natche] and his committee we will be able to make our budget in the District of Columbia balance so that it will not be necessary to increase taxes every couple of years. I again want to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natche] and every member of his subcommittee on doing a fine job and the cooperation they have given me and my committee.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. Whitener. Mr. Chairman, I, too, congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natche] and his colleagues on the subcommittee on the splendid job they have done, particularly with reference to the highway program in the District of Columbia. A special subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, composed of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Burke], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St. Germain], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Browning], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Manz], and myself has dealt with this problem recently. I concur that the cautious approach recommended by the Natche subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations is the proper one. There are many great decisions to be made in connection with the highway program, not the least of which is the dislocation of 26,000 people who live in the vicinity of highway projects in the District of Columbia. In our hearings, it appeared that no serious thought had been given to what would happen to those people. It is a problem that is still being considered by the action of the Committee on Appropriations that at least those people will have some opportunity to be considered by the governmental authorities of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Wachner].

Mr. Whitener. Mr. Chairman, these problems in the District of Columbia are great, but many of us are hopeful that if the government program is adjusted to that we will have the development of a rapid transit system in the District, with the coordination of the highway program with the rapid transit system, there will be a great savings to the people of the District and that there will be a great lessening of the displacement of human beings who have no place to go in the District if their homes are up-rooted by this wave of concrete strips through their communities.

Mr. Chairman, again I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky and all those who have labored so diligently with him to bring about a result which, I think, will be in the best interest of all the people in the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Burke].

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I want to take the time, as has been done by so many others here, to commend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natche] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] and their colleagues for the splendid job they have done. As a member of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, I have some appreciation of the thorny nature of some of these problems. Especially in view of the colloquy that took place between the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natche], I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natche] this is not what the committee means:

On page 4 of the report, in discussing the elimination of certain projects from the highway program, beginning in the fifth line on page 4, we find this language:

"However, to expedite this matter * * * there will be an adequate amount in the highway program of other important problems which will confront the District highway officials in the near future."

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. I would like to ask the chairman if that does not mean despite the existence of this money in the fund that no funds may be spent on these new projects until the highway officials of the District return to the Congress and get specific appropriations for these projects.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman's statement is correct. I would like to point out to him the fact that in setting up the reserve in the highway fund with the amount of $1,000,000 we had in mind that this matter could be resolved and should be resolved. There are adequate funds in the bill to take care of this matter at the proper time.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk reads as follows:

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Health and Welfare, including reimbursement to the United States for services rendered to the District of Columbia by Freedmen's Hospital; and for the care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health; $66,928,000: Provided, That the outpatient rate under such contracts and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed $5 per visit and the inpatient rate shall not exceed rates established by the Commissioners based on audited costs, and such contract rates and rates for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed comparable costs at the District of Columbia General Hospital: Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for the furnishing of medical assistance to individuals sixty-five years of age or older who are residing in the District of Columbia, without regard to the requirement of one-year residence contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, under the heading "Operating Expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital," and with the coordination of such aid rendered to such individuals to render assistance to such individuals who are temporarily absent from the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the following language beginning in line 6, and ending in line 2 on page 7: "and for care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health." And the following language beginning in line 2 of page 7 and ending in line 9 of page 7:

"Provided, That the outpatient rate under such contracts and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed $5 per visit and the inpatient rate shall not exceed rates established by the Commissioners based on audited costs, and such contract rates and rates for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed comparable costs at the District of Columbia General Hospital."
Leaving in on line 2 of page 7 the dollar sign and figures: “$66,528,000:”.
Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language I seek to have stricken is legislation on an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard on the point of order?
Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this matter with my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member (Mr. Rhodes). As pointed out to the Committee a few moments ago, this is a feature that has been carried in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for a great number of years; a provision that the members of the subcommittee do not favor. I believe, also, that this matter can be worked out after the bill goes to the other body, and in the conference report we can work out a provision that will not only meet with the objections of the subcommittee but also, I think, with that of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

We concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Supreme Court Decision to Abolish Prayer

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the Nation was shocked yesterday by the decision of the Supreme Court outlawing prayers in public schools as being unconstitutional. Mr. Justice Stewart—the lone dissenting—stated it mildly when he said the Court misapplied “a great constitutional principle.”

The State Board of Regents of New York adopted the following prayer:

Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

What is wrong with this prayer? Only a court composed of agnostics could find its defects.

Mr. Chairman, the Court has now officially stated its disbelief in God Almighty. This, to me, represents the most serious blow that has ever been struck at the Constitution of the United States. I know of nothing in my lifetime that could give more aid and comfort to the foes of this bold, malapportioned, atheistic and sacrilegious twist of this unpredictable group of uncontrolled despot.

This is not the first time the Court has veered off into a tangent of unjudicial chaos. You will recall in the 1954 decision of the school cases, the only authority the Earl Warren court could hang its nonjudicial hat on was Gunnar Myrdal and his ridiculous production known as “The American Dilemma.”

Mr. Chairman, if this Court is to continue to unbridle into every direction of the compass, the next thing we can expect to see are the prayers of the Congress of the United States and the abolishing of the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States. Never in my 23 years as Member of this Congress have I witnessed a complete breakdown of the moral makeup of this judicial body. Ninety percent of its time has been spent on the protection of Communists, Communist sympathizers, illegal travelers, and problems directly affecting the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Earl Warren has indicated that this Court has literally destroyed every vestige of respect which the American people once held for this body. This is a tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, this Court legislated—not adjudged—on one eye on the Kremlin and the other eye on the headquarters of the NAACP.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the Constitution of the United States be amended to any provision that is outmoded, outdated, and antiquated, it is that provision which permits members of the Supreme Court to hold office during good behavior. These men should be unseated and appointed to sit for their positions in an election before the American people. Their tenure of office should not exceed 10 years at the most. The Constitution should be brought up to date and referendums held which would require these men to state to the American people their dangerous propensities before they are shrouded in a robe of mystery and permitted to strike without notice at the basic concepts of the greatest document ever devised by the mind of man.

Failing this, Mr. Chairman, it is time for the Congress to at least exercise its constitutional right under article III to drastically restrict and limit the appellant jurisdiction of this court which flouts its authority in very farces and it flouts its authority because we have permitted them to run rampant over us.

Bear in mind that article III of the Constitution says that the Supreme Court shall have appellant jurisdiction both as to law and fact with such exception, “and under such regulations as the Congress shall by law provide.” The time has come to remove from this body of agnostics their jurisdiction to determine the social and economic future of America.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this body will recognize the fact that yesterday the Supreme Court repealed Public Law 851 which was the act of July 30, 1956. This was a legislative enactment by the Congress that the motto of the United States would officially be known as “In God We Trust.” It will be found in 15 U.S. C 186.

I suggest we amend that law if we are to permit the Supreme Court to continue on without change by adding to the motto the following: “In God we trust to the extent that the Supreme Court of the United States permits this.”

Finally, Mr. Chairman, so that my northern friends and particularly my Republican friends will not take exception to my remarks about the NAACP that we also suggest that the schoolchildren of this Nation will no longer be permitted to learn Lincoln’s immortal Gettysburg Address because, Mr. Chairman, this magnificent address has the unconstitutional words contained that this Nation “under God shall have a new birth of freedom.” The Supreme Court has said that we must not permit our children to listen to such heresy. Therefore, we would suppose that the Gettysburg Address can no longer be required reading throughout the schools of America.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. PARK, 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. 12376) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF CORPORATE NORMAL TAX RATE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference on
the part of the House have until midnight to file a conference report on H.R. 11879.

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

There was no objection.

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8291) to enable the United States to participate in the assistance rendered to certain migrants and refugees.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 712, Rept. No. 1294), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order in the future 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. 11970) to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes, and all points of order thereon shall be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the Committee stages and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

VACCINATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 699 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. 10541) to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect the entire community, special emphasis being placed on areas where the problem may be determined to be critical.

The purpose of H.R. 10541 is to authorize a 3-year program of special projects to assist States and local communities in the conduct of intensive vaccination programs designed to protect the entire community, especially all preschool children, against diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus, and against other diseases which may in the future become susceptible of practical elimination as a public health problem through such programs. The program is to be implemented through the epidemiologic and laboratory surveillance required.

The States and communities, for their part, would be responsible for supporting, through local funds, all other elements of the intensive programs.

The methods of organizing and conducting local programs would be left to States and local determinations.

The maximum appropriation authorized by the legislation for grants would be $14 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $11 million for each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 699.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of H.R. 10541, a bill that my colleague from California [Mr. Sisk] has filed with the object of accomplishing what is already in a simple bill, Mr. Speaker. But on the other hand it seems to some of us a little bit astonishing that at this time in our development as a nation we need to go into vaccination on such a large scale. It was my impression at least that we were pretty well taken care of in this respect. Now we find that far from being taken care of we have got to go out and spend in the next 3 years an additional $36 million to have this program carried through in the proper manner.

Certainly no one in this country or in this Congress considers it necessary. On the other hand, there are some people who, for religious and conscientious reasons, have reservations against vaccination. It is my understanding that in this bill we were going to be able to accept it against their own wishes or against the dictates of their conscience.

Apart from this one criticism, I have not yet had it successfully explained to me why so much money is needed and why the program has to be so greatly enlarged. I can see no possible objection to this resolution and I hope it will pass.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCulloch. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made earlier today under the 1-minute rule be carried at the end of the proceedings of the legislative day; and that I be permitted to include in the printed record the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Stewart.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one could have been more shocked and outraged as I was by the Supreme Court's decision of yesterday, which had the effect of outlawing prayer in our public schools. Surely no action ever taken by the Congress of Government in America has been so destructive of the basic foundations of our society. The
implications of this decision and the interpretations which it suggests are more terrifying even than the threats of another war.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say on this subject in days to come, as I am sure will others who can detect in this and other cases the deliberate and carefully planned conspiracy to substitute materialism for spiritual values, and thus to communize America.

Mr. Speaker, in all the highly vaunted 20th century wisdom, which has enabled us to split the atom and to send men around the earth in space, there has yet to be found a suitable substitute for faith in the existence of a Supreme Being, the edict of the Supreme Court to the contrary notwithstanding.

Recently, I came into possession of a copy of an address delivered in Jackson, Miss., to the annual convention of the Mississippi Congress of Parents and Teachers, on April 11, 1962, by Dr. W. Douglas Hudgins, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Jackson, Miss., and entitled "One Nation Under God."

This address is of such significance, and is such an excellent analysis of the American system and all that it means, that I will include its text as part of my remarks. In the light of yesterday's revolutionary ruling by the Supreme Court, this address should be of special interest to Members of Congress and Americans everywhere who still look upon our country as one nation under God.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks the text of an address delivered by Dr. W. Douglas Hudgins, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Jackson, Miss., entitled "One Nation Under God."

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Looking, if you please, at where we are in this moment. The Supreme Court has decreed that "belief in the existence of God" is no longer to have any place in public education in the United States, and even while we are here assembled today the basic religious principle of prayer to God in the public schools will be defended against a minority pressure from atheists, agnostics, freethinkers, and "intellectuals" who have outgrown their need for the Divine.

For many years we have boasted of the fact that we live in a democracy in the world. Actually, we do not live in a democracy. We live in a republic, for our manner and method of government is by and through those elected representatives whom we elect to public office. We do not make our laws or issue edicts for ourselves. Those whom we elect are not to be unaware of the fact that the judicial branch of our Government has taken unto itself by an unreasoned and uncalled for act the task of governing by the route of unwarranted interpretations of our Constitution.

The fact that those who seek to chip away, little by little, our basic tenets and our unshaken faith in God are very much in the minority is one of the deep religious aspects of our present plight. Let me remind you that we are a nation of 160 million people. Of this number only one-tenth are of an ethnic group much in the limelight for the past several years. But, this decided minority, by shrewd political maneuver and in the name of education, have abetted by a philosophy not indigenous to our shores, has forced its will and injected its presence by force and legal chicanery upon the nine-tenths of our citizenship.

In the second chapter of that book in which I said that this treasured Nation of ours is facing its moment of greatest crisis.

Early in 1960 I delivered a sermon in my pulpit here in this city on the subject "Decade of Destiny." In it I said that "the future of Americas and its role in the world depends on what it does with itself in the decade of the sixties." And, what the sixties will have decided our fate. That I still believe. The 10 years in which we are living will prove to be a decade in which we either will still be one Nation under God—or we will have succumbed to the insidious materialism of materialism, which will require us to longer recognize the reality and sovereignty of the Eternal God?

Some years ago, before the coming of Christ a serious, strange, mystic, and brave man had the courage to utter a word of warning to his nation. That man was the Prophet Jeremiah; the nation was Judah; and the record is carried in the Old Testament book that bears the prophet's name. In the second chapter of that book there is this warning: "Hast a nation changed its gods? But my people have changed their glory. What ye have gained we will lose. They that be slain of the sword, will be slain of fire. Will ye be a trainer to them that are slain of the sword? for according to the number of the thy cities are thy gods, O Judah."

Jeremiah was the voice of God to a people who had forsaken Him in the same manner and for the same reasons that we are forsaking Him. He had caused the prophets to be arrested and their messages to be sealed up, for the reason that they warned of the coming destruction. Jeremiah, therefore, became the voice of God to a people who felt that they had outgrown their need for the Almighty. They assumed that they were impregnable from without and unsalvageable from within. With a short time, disaster befell them and they, including the prophet himself, became cringing...
ing serfs to a world power who destroyed them as a nation. Such a story falls on deaf ears today. Our American complacency, the citizen's confidence, the American people appear to have been put under some kind of mental and spiritual sedation by what may aptly be called the flight of Jeremiahs. Serious, introspective, reflective thinking does not seem distinctly to characterize our space-age generation. The moral universe about us. All of us in certain respects have been given a new and worthy hero and reestablished, to a great degree, our national prestige. The increase of our citizens in the last forty years, and our clear era, 15. How long we will live in the space age before another epoch dawns there is no way of knowing.

Growing serfs to a world power who destroyed them as a nation. Such a story falls on deaf ears today. Our American complacency, the citizen's confidence, the American people appear to have been put under some kind of mental and spiritual sedation by what may aptly be called the flight of Jeremiahs. Serious, introspective, reflective thinking does not seem distinctly to characterize our space-age generation. The moral universe about us. All of us in certain respects have been given a new and worthy hero and reestablished, to a great degree, our national prestige. The increase of our citizens in the last forty years, and our clear era, 15. How long we will live in the space age before another epoch dawns there is no way of knowing.
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fundamental faith in Him as the ageless God, the Supreme and only God, who has not yet relinquished the control of the na- tion as a rule of law in the more so-called heavenly kingdom. He is the only one who can and does rule the world. In the Uni- versities and brilliant men of science. He is the One who issues His own edicts and pronounces His own judgments. History re- cords them--or does it? History, in its desire to keep human greatness but, forgetting Him, has disappeared in the crevices of time. There must return to America an unshaken faith in God.

Second, there must come among us a new and higher standard of morality and personal character. Moral conduct must supplant our immoral decadence. Virtue again must become an unqualified charac- teristic of our interrelationships. The home must be returned as the citadel of society and must serve as a holy haven for the shar- ing of the problems of our complex living. Truth once more must characterize us in speech, in government, in contract, in decision. This is the Kingdom of God. Honesty must spring from the teacher of individual responsibility to God and our fellow man must be restored. In short, a new moral stamina must be pro- duced—the kind of attitude produced when the individual recognizes that "Thou, God, seest me." 

In the third place, it would appear to me that we need to set a new standard of measure- ment for those whom we put in public office. If we are calling upon God why do we elect men and women to places of public office and service who themselves either deny the authority of God or assert to themselves a wisdom greater than the Divine? In our broad plea for tolerance in the past few decades, we have shied away from inquiring into a candidate's personal religious convictions and seem to be oblivious to the fact that our favorite candidate is agnostic, atheistic, or noncommittal in the manner of his faith in God personally. I would much rather have as my representative in the office of the Mayor, the Halls of Congress, or the White House, a man who is possessed with a great faith in God's power than someone who says, "I don't believe in God." If a person makes his concept of God sub- servient to his own personal ambitions or a modern philosophy stemming from material- ism or an even lesser threat to our spiritual well-being. Party lines, pressure groups, or- ganized minorities, special interests, per- sonal ambitions, and petty politics will have to be ignored if we put men in places of office who will maintain us as a God-fearing and honoring people.

Finally, I have no hesitation in suggest- ing that there is something even greater than your parent-teachers' assur- dation—as great as that is. You teachers—God bless you—have a real job with some of the most difficult assignments. We are overworked; but the school is not America's greatest institution. You parents, your home is the greatest church in the world; the most in this world to your children; and it is God's first institution for the human race. But, I repeat, a real church. Call it the cathedral, the church, the synagogue, the mission—whether you are Catholic, Jewish, or non- Christian. It is the one institution that we cannot afford to by- pass or neglect if we are to keep America one nation under God. There is a church or a house of worship near you. Most Ameri- cans live within 12 blocks or 10 minutes of one. Your house of worship, with your par- ticipation and support, can help us keep this land or even one nation under God. Unquestionably we are drifting toward irre- verence, paganism, religious apathy, spiritu- alism, moral decadence, materialism, and, I believe, the Federal State. Only a moral resurgence in recommitment to the Al- mighty, hierarchy, house church and one-body-of-Christ attitude in our place of responsibility in this decade of the sixties. America must be one nation under God. Let us hear, then, the word of God in the Christian Home—a word of our people of the long ago, 'If my people, who are called by my name, will humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven, and will forgivethem, and heal their land.'

One nation under God. So grant it, Al- mighty God.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to discuss with you some elements of H.R. 10541, because I think the bill is an extremely important one and because I think the principles enunciated in it are extremely important in our whole form of government.

This bill is a simple bill, as has been said. It provides for grants by the Fed- eral Government for distribution to States and to local communities—keep this in mind, to States and local communities—for vaccination and, as a second point of thought, to States and local communities of any person who is active in the organization or the promotion of a vaccination campaign in that area.

This has the effect of putting the Fed- eral Government right smack in the middle of every community in the United States. Any community within the au- thorization limits here that has a health department that is putting forth any other kind of health official which wants to say, "We are going to hire personnel for a community health program," can simply go to the Federal Government and the Federal Government is then right in the business of paying the sal- aries of the people in this area. I do not know how all of you feel about this. I do not know how all of you feel about this particular extension of Federal author- ity, but it seems to me that this is going even further than we have been asked to go in many other bills during the course of this administration. It strikes me that never before except in connec- tion with the proposed Urban Affairs De- partment, which was defeated on the floor of the House, have we been asked to inject directly into the local govern- ment the Federal Government, through its arm of the Public Health Service, by payment of salaries of those local personnel which may be active in a cam- paign in that area.

Secondly, I want you to notice that there is no provision in this bill for any offset which would reduce the Fed- eral grant. The only expense the State has to bear is whatever additional ex- penses may be involved in any com- munity which are over and beyond the ones provided for in this bill.

I also want to call your attention to a couple of other points which I think may be of interest. We have already in the law two programs providing for the pur- chase by the Federal Government and distribution to the States of vaccines which may be necessary for vaccination and inoculation programs. These laws remain in effect until 1965. The appropri- ations are available for purchases of vaccines and distribute them to States under bills which are already law. And yet here, we are in the guise of an authorization in fact doing nothing more than two things: In the guise of an authorization we are in fact making an additional appropriation for these pur- poses and, second, we are extending those programs in the guise of an authoriza- tion for this paying of State and local community health officer sal- aries.

For the life of me, I cannot under- stand why it is necessary for the Fed- eral Government to be involved here. For the life of me, I cannot understand why, when we have laws already on the books which will solve the problem, it is necessary to pass another law at this point in order to promote a program of which the local communities in many cases are doing themselves.

Now why do I make the last state- ment? Have before me an article written by Gene Lindberg on page 11A of the June 24, 1962, issue of the Denver Post. It is entitled "The Public Urge To Help Make 'Spiop Folio' Campaign a Success". I will quote a copy of this story so that the fine work of Denver and the surrounding com- munities with the help of local industry, the medical societies, the public health officials, this volunteer work which the local communities in many cases are doing themselves.

I do not know how all of you feel about this particular extension of Federal author- ity, but it seems to me that this is going even further than we have been asked to go in many other bills during the course of this administration. It strikes me that never before except in connec- tion with the proposed Urban Affairs De- partment, which was defeated on the floor of the House, have we been asked to inject directly into the local govern- ment the Federal Government, through its arm of the Public Health Service, by payment of salaries of those local personnel which may be active in a cam- paign in that area.

Secondly, I want you to notice that there is no provision in this bill for any offset which would reduce the Fed- eral grant. The only expense the State has to bear is whatever additional ex- penses may be involved in any com- munity which are over and beyond the ones provided for in this bill.
polio vaccination, on which our small State has spent over a half million dollars.

But now the Federal Government is called upon to assist the unfortunate Mr. KYL. At the proper time, I intend to offer an amendment which will eliminate these payments for the promotional people. Does it not occur to you that the general tax funds included in this bill would be utilized in a vast selling program rather than to actually accomplish the job that the bill purports to do?

Mr. KYL. Can the gentleman see any reason for including this in the bill?

Mr. DOMINICK. I can see absolutely none. I offered an amendment in committee but it did not go through. I have a similar amendment before me now.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LINDSAY. Can the gentleman tell me what the precedents in this matter are? I know that the National Health Foundations engage in a good many Federal programs in the medical field having to do with the prevention and control of disease. Are all of these programs engaged in a matching basis or with some community participation and are some of them outright grants?

Mr. DOMINICK. The two grant-aid programs which are shown on page 9 of the report, so-called appendix B, are both matching grant programs. Under these programs, for example, there were vaccinations given in the year 1960 for polio and 5,818,000 inoculations were given. We have continuing appropriations and authorizations under title V of the Social Security Act, and we also have it under section 314(c) of the Community Health Services Facilities Act. So we already have funds available for this program which will go beyond this particular program that we are faced with today. I do want to say to the gentleman from New York, if we can get certain amendments on this bill, probably I will not oppose it. It seems to me, in view of the existing programs, that we ought to take the Federal Government out of the position of paying the expenses for the promotional and organizational employees who will be involved.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LINDSAY. Can the gentleman tell me what the precedents in this matter are? I know that the National Health Foundations engage in a good many Federal programs in the medical field having to do with the prevention and control of disease. Are all of these programs engaged in a matching basis or with some community participation and are some of them outright grants?

Mr. DOMINICK. The two grant-aid programs which are shown on page 9 of the report, so-called appendix B, are both matching grant programs. Under these programs, for example, there were vaccinations given in the year 1960 for polio and 5,818,000 inoculations were given. We have continuing appropriations and authorizations under title V of the Social Security Act, and we also have it under section 314(c) of the Community Health Services Facilities Act. So we already have funds available for this program which will go beyond this particular program that we are faced with today. I do want to say to the gentleman from New York, if we can get certain amendments on this bill, probably I will not oppose it. It seems to me, in view of the existing programs, that we ought to take the Federal Government out of the position of paying the expenses for the promotional and organizational employees who will be involved.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.
In Denver there will be mobile as well as fixed clinics. Starting at 9:30 a.m. Sunday, one mobile unit will operate on the following schedule:

* Sacred Heart School, 2900 Lawrence Street, 9:30 to 10:30 a.m.

Annunciation Church, 3631 Humboldt Street, from 11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. or until the clinic is full.

* Sacred Heart School, 2900 Lawrence Street, 3:45 to 5 p.m.

St. Cajetan’s Church, Ninth and Lawrence Streets, 7 p.m.

Another mobile clinic will operate at Quigg Newton housing project, 4407 Montview Boulevard, from 11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m., and at Stapleton housing project, 201 East 21st Avenue, from 2 to 6 p.m. And a clinic will be held in the GAO Club, 4700 Lipton Street, from 8 to 9 p.m. Sunday.

**You need them all.**

The oral polio vaccine is administered in the drops, type I, II, and III. For complete protection, you must take all three types.

Several weeks ago many of your received type I vaccines are out. You still need to get type III in the current program, detailed in other stories on this page, and later you must get your type II.

**BRAIN ORAL VACCINE CLINICS LISTED FOR 10-COUNTY AREA.**

Stop-polio clinics will be at the following locations in the 10-county Greater Denver area Sunday. At this time the type III Sabin oral vaccine will be given out. The times other than specified, hours will be from 11 a.m. to 7 p.m.

**Denver**

University of Denver Medical Center, 2040 South Lincoln Street, 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Mobile clinic, lower downtown area (3:30 a.m. to 3 p.m.).

Quigg Newton housing project, 407 Marlboro Street (11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m).

Stapleton housing project, 201 East 21st Avenue (2 to 4 p.m.).

University of Colorado, 4620 West 38th Avenue, north end of Troodoare Ballroom.

Elementary schools: Ashland, 2475 West 44th Avenue; Central, 4634 Syracuse Street; Barrett, 2900 Jackson Street; Berkeley, 5025 Lowell Boulevard; Bronnwood, 3511 Columbine Street; Cowell, 4540 West 10th Avenue; Clear Creek Heights; Ebert, 4502 23rd Street; Fairview, 2715 West 11th Avenue; Garden Place, 4423 Lincoln Street; Gilpin, 730 South Street; Greenies, 1150 Espanola Street; Knapp, 500 South Utica Street; McMeen, 1000 South Holly Street; Sabin, 5026 South Clay Street; Schmitt, 1690 South Valisia Street; Sierra, 3000 South Clayton Street; Swanslow, 4630 Columbine Street; Whittaker, 451 Westport Street.

**Junior high schools.** (Every junior high school in Denver will be used.) Baker, 574 West 28th Avenue; Denver West, 2450 South Pearl Street; Cole, 3240 Humboldt Street; Gove, 1525 Colorado Boulevard; Grant, 1751 South Guadalupe Street; Hill, 451 Clement Street; Horace Mann, 4130 Navajo Street; Keppel, 911 South Hazel Court; Kunsammer, 2250 South Quintan Street; Lake, 1820 Lowell Boulevard; Merrill, 1851 South Monroe Street; Morey, 840 East 14th Avenue; Bishel, 451 South Tejon Street; Skinner, 3435 West 40th Avenue; South Park Hill; 2946 Holly Street; Where you Junior Academy, 2655 South Emerson Street.

**High schools:** Thomas Jefferson, 3500 South Holly Street.

**YMAC:** 25 East 18th Avenue.

**Catholic schools:** Cure d'Aris, 3500 Dahlia Street; Franciscan College, 11th Street; Blessed Sacrament, 1972 Elm Street; St. James, 1250 Newport Street; Presentation of Our Lady, 659 Julian Street; Loyola, 2850 Gaylord Street; All Saints, 2859 South Federal Boulevard; South Platte, 1200 South Colorado Boulevard and East 7th Avenue.

**Arapahoe County** (covering Douglas and Elbert Counties)

Englewood elementary schools: Cherrel, 2115 South Lincoln Street; Clayton, 2069 South Fox Street; North Englewood, 3100 East 31st Street; Scenario View, South Barton and West Denver South, 2319 Washington Street.

University Hills Medical Arts Building, 4401 East Yale Avenue.

Littleton schools: Centennial Elementary, 3350 West Berry Avenue; Littleton High, 300 South Wilson Boulevard; South Elementary, 9350 South Windemere Avenue.

**City** (covering Douglas and Larimer Counties)

Englewood: Our Lady, 5460 South Federal Boulevard; South Platte, 1200 South Colorado Boulevard and East 7th Avenue.

Metropolitan Area (covering Douglas and Arapahoe Counties)

Englewood: Our Lady, 5460 South Federal Boulevard; South Platte, 1200 South Colorado Boulevard and East 7th Avenue.

**Douglas County** (covering Douglas and Arapahoe Counties)

Englewood elementary schools: Cherrel, 2115 South Lincoln Street; Clayton, 2069 South Fox Street; North Englewood, 3100 East 31st Street; Scenario View, South Barton and West Denver South, 2319 Washington Street.

University Hills Medical Arts Building, 4401 East Yale Avenue.

Littleton schools: Centennial Elementary, 3350 West Berry Avenue; Littleton High, 300 South Wilson Boulevard; South Elementary, 9350 South Windemere Avenue.

**Larimer County**

Fort Collins Schools: Dunn, Barton, Moore, Laurent, Putnam; Colorado State University Student Health Service.

**Adams County**

Aurora: Aurora Elementary, 11th Avenue and Moline Street; West Junior High, Delmar Parkway and 13th Avenue; North Junior High, Montview Boulevard and Feorda Street; St. Joes Elementary and Fort Street; Sable Elementary, 2601 Sable Road; South Junior High, Parkview Drive and Fletcher Road; Brighton: Brighton High School; Bennett-Strasburg: Mobile Clinic A-Bennett 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m.; Bennett-Williamson School, Strasburg, 3 p.m.-7 p.m., public school.

Byers-Deer Trail: Mobile Clinic B-Byers 11 a.m.-3 p.m., public school; Deer Trail, 3 p.m.-7 p.m., public school.

Adams County: City Junior High, Kearney Junior High.

**Boulder County**

Boulder: Boulder High School, 2400 East Quinny Avenue.

**Jefferson County**

Golden: Golden Senior High, 701 24th Street; Pleasant View Elementary, 1520 West 16th Avenue; Manning Junior High, 13500 West 32nd Avenue.

**Clear Creek County**

Lakewood: Bear Creek Elementary, 2125 South Kilpning Street; Alamosa Senior High, 1355 South Wardsworth Boulevard; Greentown Junior High, 78 Independence Avenue.

West Larkspur: Holmoe Elementary, 6000 West Ninth Avenue; Lakewood Senior High, 9700 Wadsworth Boulevard; West High; Jefferson Senior High, 2305 Pierce Street.

West Ridge: Bear Ridge Senior High, 9535 West 32nd Avenue; Martinson Elementary, 6535 West 44th Avenue.

**Clear Creek County**

Arvada: Arvada Senior High, 505 West 57th Avenue; Balsam Elementary School, 6550 Independence Street.

Evergreen: Evergreen High.

Lake County: Lakewood High School.

Thornton: Thornton Elementary, 801 Epiphany Boulevard.

**Northwest Denver**

Westminster: Global High School, 1396 South Alkire Street; Central City: Clark Elementary School (3-7 p.m.).

**Boulder County**

City of Boulder: Centennial, Casey, and Ponderosa Junior High School; University of Colorado, Martin Park Elementary School, Wardenberg Health Center (University of Colorado campus).

Mr. SIGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WICKERSHAM).

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Gentlemen, when I ran for Congress 2 years ago, I made a promise to the people of Waurika that I would give the best of my abilities in trying to secure this project. I told them that everything reasonably possible would be done to secure passage of the Waurika Dam.

One of the first things I did upon my return to Washington was to introduce H.R. 3084, a bill authorizing the construction and maintenance of the Waurika Dam. I have since pursued every means known to me to gain passage of this measure.

To date, we have laid the groundwork, we have cooperated in every way with Oklahoma’s two Senators, ROGER B. KERAS and Mike Monroney. With their leadership and with the help of the good people back home, we have secured approval from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior. We have gotten the green light from the Bureau of the Budget. We have talked with the leadership of this House; we have even asked the President to encourage the leadership of the House to push this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubts as to the eventual passage of this bill. I honestly believe that if this bill does not become law this year, it will next. But this is not the point I am trying to bring out. My people are flooded out of their homes almost annually. I wish to exert every effort, share the pain of the burden, and make any sacrifice that they must bear in order to prevent such hardship in the future. Another year probably
means another flood and consequently more millions in damage down the drain. If it be physically possible to prevent this tragic loss, I wish to pursue a course which will make this possible.

Through constant pressure, and wonder ful cooperation of all parties concerned, we have moved forward at a swift pace, up till now.

My colleagues, we have every reason to believe that this project will make it all the way through the Senate this year. Yesterday, June 25, 1963, reports were made in the Senate included S. 114, authorization the construction of the Waun zika reclamation project, Oklahoma, with amendments (S. Rept. 1621). It is here in the House where the problem exists. Water rights on other projects involving Oklahoma and Texas are in contention. It is most difficult to reach an agreement especially in view of the fact that we are awaiting the decision of an interstate water compact commission. We have agreed upon that before a decision is made by the Commission's ruling. We will ask for no special rulings. We will not ask that the Commission give us any water that should not rightfully be ours. The Senator from Oklahoma and I have both personally assured our honorable Texas colleagues that their rights will not be maligned by the use of politics. We have offered the gentlemen every assurance of our good faith.

Mr. Speaker, it is in a spirit of humility that we ask Members of this House to stand up and be counted. It is difficult for a public servant to stand by while the people whom he serves suffer an almost annual pilgrimage at the hands of a flood torrent that could be halted. We appeal to the Members of this House. We ask your help.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The motion to previous question was ordered. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, The Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Sir: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of New Jersey my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 11th District of New Jersey.

Very truly yours,

HUGH J. ADAMS, Member of Congress.

VACCINATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10541) to assist States and, with respect to certain small States, to authorize the Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants-in-aid of public health programs to States and certain local governmental units therefor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 26 minutes.

Mr. Chair, the bill under discussion—H.R. 10541—is titled the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1963. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize a 3-year program of special project grants to the States and, with State approval, to local communities, for the comprehensive vaccination programs against four contagious diseases which constitute significant public health problems—polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. The intensive vaccination programs contemplated by the legislation must be aimed at immunizing practically all susceptible persons in the community with particular emphasis on the immunization of children under 5 years of age.

The maximum appropriation authorized by the legislation for grants would be $14 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $11 million for each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

Vaccine could be purchased with the Federal grant funds authorized under the bill only for children under 5 years of age. In addition, the grant funds could be used for salaries and related expenses of additional State and local health personnel required for planning, organizational, and promotional activities in connection with intensive community programs, and to maintain the epidemiologic and laboratory surveillance required.

The States and communities, for their part, would be responsible for supporting, through public funds or otherwise, all other elements of the intensive programs—including the services of physicians, nurses, and other health personnel required of public vaccination programs; the purchase of vaccine for persons other than children under 5; and the purchase of syringes and other materials required for administering the vaccine.

The requirement that the States or local communities match Federal grants by providing certain services and materials is of particular importance, for the vaccination programs take the place of the usual matching requirement found in other Federal grant-in-aid legislation which specifies the number of State or local dollars that must be expended for every Federal dollar granted.

The majority of the members of the committee decided that the usual cash matching requirement is poorly suited to the needs of this particular program. The adoption of this cash matching requirement would tend to delay the initiation of State and local programs pending appropriate action by State legislatures and local appropriating bodies. Furthermore, to attempt to apply the usual cash matching requirements to this type program might lead to serious complications in the administration of such programs and might require detailed, and consequently very expensive, cost accounting procedures. In reaching this decision the committee took into consideration the fact that the Salk vaccination program authorized by Public Law 84-377 did not require cash matching by States and local communities. However, substantial State and local contributions were required under that program in the form of additional personnel and equipment to assist in the administration of the vaccine, as in the case under this legislation.

The methods of organizing and conducting local community programs, including the choice as to which of the available polio vaccines shall be used for different groups—would be left to State and local determinations.

The bill provides, however, that nothing in the legislation shall be construed to require any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality of a State to have an intensive community vaccination program requiring any person who objects to immunization to be immunized or to have any child or ward of his immunized.

The bill would also require each State or political subdivision or instrumentality of a State, which applies for a grant of vaccines or of funds to purchase vaccines for use in connection with an intensive community vaccination program, to provide the Surgeon General with assurances that, if it receives the grant, it will make available to any physician in the area in which the program is to be carried out amounts of those vaccines reasonably necessary to permit such physician to immunize his patients who are in the group for whose immunization such grant is made.

The committee considered the advisability of including in this paragraph a specific provision prohibiting any physician from charging his patients for vaccines provided free to him under this program. The committee determined that this was unnecessary, but wishes to make it clear that it assumes that no charge will be made by any physician to his patients for the vaccine itself— as distinguished from any possible charge for administering the vaccine.

The committee held hearings on the legislation for a period of about one month, and the course of which it received testimony from, among others, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the representatives of the Association of State and Territorial Health
Officers, the American Public Health Association, the National Tuberculosis Association, and the APL-CIO. All of these witnesses testified in favor of the legislation. The committee also received a favorable report from the American Medical Association favoring enactment of the legislation substantially in the form of the committee amendment.

The committee is convinced on the basis of all the material and testimony that intensive community vaccination programs are necessary if the threat of epidemics of these diseases is to be wiped out.

The fundamental fact underlying this legislation is that we have a continuing public health threat in the United States because of our failure to use the vaccines we have against these diseases. Although the number of cases and deaths from the four diseases covered by this legislation has declined since vaccines became available, the large number of unvaccinated persons in the United States constitutes a continuing public health threat. A few figures clearly indicate the situation that allows this avoidable and totally unnecessary risk of serious epidemics.

Two-thirds of the children under 5 years of age in the United States have not yet received the recommended course of vaccines against these diseases. Even among schoolchildren who are the best protected group, more than one-third are not fully vaccinated. Among adults, the protected population amounts to less than 50 percent. It is this large number of incompletely vaccinated people—and particularly the preschool children—that represents a community health hazard because any such group contains the potential of an epidemic outbreak.

Evidence indicates that epidemics have begun in unimmunized groups and that epidemics in these four diseases occur in these groups. It has been shown that the unimmunized are primarily from the lower income groups who are not reached by the usual type of mass communication from the American Public Health Association, the National Tuberculosis Association, and the American Medical Association.

It seemed to me, as I listened to this testimony, that it could be said with every agency which I would anticipate would either have an interest or a direct influence in favor of the legislation. In examining these witnesses, all of whom had gone into this in great detail and there were certain reasons, I think, why this program had been undertaken in some States but there were still large areas throughout the country where nothing had been done and insofar as our testimony revealed nothing was intended to be done.

It is these areas we think that this legislation plans to cover.

Although the number of disease cases and deaths from the four diseases covered by this legislation—polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus—has dropped sharply in the past, we have become aware that the threat of some of these diseases may be perpetuated. Although the number of case reports that have been made in the United States as a result of the implementation of the national vaccine program, it is clear that the threat of these diseases has not been eliminated. It is these areas, I think, that this legislation plans to cover.

Second. Vaccine for individuals 5 years of age and over, Third. Registration and recordkeeping at vaccination clinics, and

Fourth. Equipment and Supplies—other than vaccine—needed to carry out the program.

The requirement that the States or local communities match Federal grants
by providing certain services and materials needed to carry on an extensive immunization programs takes the place of the usual matching requirement found in other Federal grant-in-aid legislation which specifies the number of State or local dollars that must be expended for every Federal dollar granted.

There was one important amendment which was added by a Member of our committee. This provides, and that is so summarized (d) of the same paragraph 3. This subsection provides that the Surgeon General may, at the request of a State or other public agency, reduce a grant after the termination of the 3-year period by the amount of the costs arising from detailing personnel of the Public Health Service to such agency when such detail is made for the purpose of carrying out a function for which the grant is made.

Many Members have asked me what happens at the end of the 3-year period and the answer ought to be given as to whether or not this program will be continued or whether there will be some kind of program that will continue after the end of the 3-year period.

Under title V of the Social Security Act the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to States to assist in the extension and improvement of maternal and child health services. These grant funds are also being used to assist States in the support of continuing vaccination services for children and will be available for such purposes after the end of the 3-year period. Several States have continued their programs for a long period of time under this legislation and have annually spent grant funds totaling nearly $11,000,000.

The annual appropriation authorization for maternal and child health grants is $22 million. The entire amount of this authorization is now being appropriated. It would be possible, however, for the Congress to increase the appropriation ceiling if it were determined that additional Federal financial support for continuing vaccination programs for children should be supported from this authorization after June 30, 1966.

The maternal and child health grant funds are allotted among the States on the basis of the number of live births and the financial need in the States. State and local matching is required on a dollar-for-dollar basis. While the funds are available for the purpose of carrying out a function for which the grant is made.

Thus the program will be continued, may I say, and it is anticipated that it will be continued through title V of the Social Security Act after the end of the 3-year period.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Collier).

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, it is a somewhat difficult thing to take exception to certain areas of legislation of this type; but if there is any opposition from the standpoint of favoring sin or opposing motherhood. However, I have some pertinent questions that I think Members of this Committee should understand, and I think the legislation before us: and I might say in almost the same breath that as a former president of a public health board no one is more sold on the necessity of the improvement of the anti-polio vaccine programs than am I. I think, nevertheless, it should be understood that at the present time, as I pointed out somewhat briefly in my exchange of notes with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Dorninick) that we have on the books at the present time a program which provides for the several States with Federal financial assistance for the improvement of their health departments. In turn the various community health departments, the various county health departments, may qualify for additional financial aid from their States for general programs. November in existing law under this program is there any foreclosures of the use of these funds for a community program of vaccine or inoculation.

I believe the gentleman pointed out one-third of the youngsters in the country have not received Salk vaccine shots, the fact remains that there have been and still are in operation public programs for the inoculation of young people. In fact, I understand that administering the program has now become so improved it is only a question of giving the youngster a treated lump of sugar. If the vaccine is improved, and it is, I believe that it is only a question of distributing. The fact that there are available through this program which provides for the several States with Federal financial assistance for the improvement of their health departments. In turn the various community health departments, the various county health departments, may qualify for additional financial aid from their States for general programs.

Nowhere in existing law under this program is there any foreclosure of the use of these funds for a community program of vaccine or inoculation.

I believe the gentleman pointed out one-third of the youngsters in the country have not received Salk vaccine shots—the fact remains that there have been and still are in operation public programs for the inoculation of young people with Salk vaccine. In fact, I understand that administering the program has now become so improved it is only a question of giving the youngster a treated lump of sugar. If the vaccine is improved, and it is, I believe that it is only a question of distributing them.

If we are going to inoculate youngsters and give them the necessary vaccinations prior to school age—and I might say this seems like a very, very sensible approach to this problem—obviously, then, the number of cases where these types of programs for school-age children would be vastly reduced by reason of the fact that the program at preschool age would take care of the problem in this field which generally was left until the child entered school. I understand this would be particularly so in the case of Salk vaccine programs.

I would like to direct a question to any member of the committee for the record. Was there any testimony, or have there been any studies, where a preschool program of vaccination or inoculation of any nature could not be conducted because of a shortage of funds, either at the community or State level? I understand there are many instances where such a program was foreclosed by not having sufficient funds or where communities wanted to offer such a program but could not do it because of lack of funds. I might inquire if any member of the committee has been approached by anyone in authority that presen-ently the various State Public Health authorities found a lack of funds to conduct programs for their vaccination or inoculation programs.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. On page 69 of the hearings, I asked the specific question of Dr. Smith, who was testifying:

Is there any indication in the States that people are not becoming vaccinated because there is no available vaccine or funds for the vaccination?

Although no direct reply was given by Dr. Smith, he said:

In every area where we have made studies, the fact that there are in particular population segments large groups who have not been vaccinated does mean that the community has not got vaccination facilities available.

In other words, he is saying the reason they were not vaccinated had nothing to do with lack of funds across the States.

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

Mr. HARRIS. In order that we can relate the whole story of Dr. Smith, see that he said in the next paragraph. Colleague, will from Colorado (Mr. Dorninick) ask the question:

And have the States failed to take the initiative in conducting such campaigns?

I think the States are doing a big part of the job. When you look at the number of school-age children who have been completely immunized, it is an impressive picture. The fact that they have not been able to get to the preschooler—and particularly the preschooler in the lower socio-economic area—not because they would not like to but because the way the program has programs to point to this particular critical area.

Mr. COLLIER. I will say in conclusion while I do not oppose this legislation, I simply would hope that in its administration those States which have been able to fulfill their responsibility in this field in the past not be given priority at any time so that any funds made available through this program would go into those areas where there are inadequate funds to do the job and that such aid would be directed to those communities which are unable to meet their responsibility.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement and I want to join him and emphasize the importance of what the gentleman has said. The purpose of this program is to stamp out these diseases everywhere in the United States. And, where it is needed the most is where I think the program should concentrate, just as the gentleman has stated. Our purpose
Mr. COLLIER. I would simply say that we are not assuming in this legislation as it is written that the Government might have to continue the program. I think an important part of this program is public education. Once a given number of people are awakened to the need, urgency and importance of this type program, that by its very nature it will, as new shots are needed, stimulate a reaction depending on the part of the local community, general public, and the parents.

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

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, this legislation provides for a crash program. It terminates within a period of 3 years. In the second place, based upon what experience I have had, I believe that every 2 years, in order to be completely effective against tetanus, it requires a booster shot. I have consulted medical authorities told some of us, at least, that if one travels outside the United States in certain areas of the world, one is required to have been inoculated in a given period of 2 years. I think I am right.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK).

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to pay some compliments to the chairman of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HARRIS). I think he has done an excellent job in trying to bring this program within some reason, compared to what was originally proposed.

For example, originally, and during the testimony, we had proposals that this be extended to any kind of communicable disease there was an available vaccine or inoculation. This proposal was rejected.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HARRIS) told us it was imperative that we have a program that could be used on a mass basis in order to respond to the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. COLLIER. I understand it, a tetanus shot—and I got this information from my friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DRAXLER), who is certainly a medical expert—is required every 3 years. However, this varies, as I understand it, with various types of vaccines. I understand that with the Salk vaccine shots are effective for a longer period of time than it is a tetanus shot.

Mr. KYL. If the gentleman will yield further, we are assuming today that having once received the Government shot, the youngsters will go back willingly and take his next succeeding shots?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes in order to respond to the question posed by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).
1962

So inoculated if he does not want to be.

Mr. HARRIS. I am reminded that the original proposal of the Secretary of Health requested standby authority for other diseases, but the committee did not go along with that request.

Mr. DOMINICK. And is it not also true that the committee rejected a proposal that it be expanded to include two other diseases?

Mr. HARRIS. It does not seem to me that this is a threat when two-thirds of the children under 5 are not inoculated.

Mr. DOMINICK. One-third.

Mr. SPRINGER. Two-thirds are not inoculated.

Mr. DOMINICK. It depends upon whose testimony you read.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am reading from the report that that was substanti­ally the testimony. But this is the rea­son I am supporting this legislation. As I heard the testimony I had a feeling that when a child got to school his chances become number one for not getting these diseases because he never gets these diseases, because his teachers and those who came in contact with him would then try to induce his parents to do something about the inoculation. The large area we are try­ing to cover here is an area which I think is composed of social strata which never would recognize the need to do anything about this kind of a program undertaken to educate them to the necessity for doing something about it. That is basically the reason I support this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not know whether or not the gentleman was in the Chamber when I talked on the rule, but at that time I put in as an extension of my remarks a newspaper article on a program going on in Colorado right now.

This program is being conducted mas­sively. It is being conducted totally free and without any cost to the Federal Government or to this Health Department. It is being done by the doctors and companies in the area in order to try to get people in the area aware of what is going on. It strikes me that that is the type of thing we need, and not more money when we already have the money available in two other programs.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I state in an­swer that the State of Colorado is one of the most progressive along this line.

I think that is a well-known fact. I congratulate the gentleman, coming from Colorado. But I am a farseeing one in undertaking this. May I say within a very large number of States, nothing is being done about this partic­ular problem and that was very well brought out in my testimony. But if the gentleman wants to take the States of Colorado, Illinois and California and a few others as an example, I do not think that is representative of what this legis­lation seeks to cover.

May I say the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] did do a good job in the committee. He is one of the most thoughtful of the committee. He was there at every session of the committee asking questions and he did a good job on this legislation. What I am saying here today is not in derogation of the gentleman, but I am praising the gentleman for the excellent job he has done and he deserves tribute for the energy and the ability he displayed when this bill was before the committee.

I do appreciate the gentleman's comment very much and thank him.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentle­man yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the gentle­man from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. The gentle­man mentioned the program that is now going on in the State of Colorado.

I would like to state that in Nebraska we do not have any program, our vaccinations for polio have run as high as 80 percent in the city of Omaha. Grand Island recently concluded one and the percentages were slightly higher than 80 per­cent. The people who were charged 25 cents. If they did not have the 25 cents, they were given this polio vaccine without any cost. It was conducted by the people of Grand Island on a voluntary basis without any material cost to the citi­zens of our State. I commend the gentle­man for his views. I would like to point out also in a questionnaire I sent out to Nebraska this spring, one of my questions was in regard to this partic­ular program. You may be interested in knowing that 73 percent of the replies were in opposition to the Federal Gov­ernment appropriating any money for this program. Only 20 percent were in favor and 7 percent, not sure.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the commen­t of the gentleman from Nebraska.

I know that Nebraska, Illinois, and other States are doing a very fine job here. I, frankly, have not been able to find out what States have not been. No­where in the record is there any spe­cific indication of what States have not been doing a good job on this program and, yet, here we are asked to appro­priate more money in order to go ahead and do this when we have two programs with continuing authorizations already available.

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

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

Mr. KYL. I can tell the gentleman this, if we offer programs of this type, there will be a lot of States that will not do the job voluntarily.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would agree with the gentleman from Nebraska. That is one of the problems I think we are facing in continuing to pass this type of program.

One of the additional points I want to make here is to make sure I am cor­rect and I yield to the gentleman from Ne­braska. I gather, Mr. Chairman, from page 9 of the report that there are two programs presently in existence which go beyond the term of this bill pro­viding funds under which vaccination services for these diseases and others can now be supplied.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is cor­rect in a sense that an individual can go to the Public Health Office in a given community, and if they need a given shot, they can obtain it. But there are no programs of this kind to give em­phasis to it to get the people concerned to the point that these children that they are trying to reach will be brought in either to the doctor's office or the Public Health Office for the purpose of im­munization.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, we see a mis­take or missipated correction as it is now under the two programs mentioned.
Secondly, we are not making the progress we should to avoid a possible disaster in either one of the fields involved here, in my judgment.

Mr. DURNO. I appreciate that answer from the chairman. Under section 314(e) we make matching grants to the States for establishing and maintaining a public health service, and it would certainly seem to me that this has been almost complete immunization.

Mr. DURNO. As I understand, the gentleman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would never be satisfied until it is stamped out permanently.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course not, not until we get that done as it has been done in the case of smallpox, in which if the program is not unbroken, in which case we have had almost complete immunization in the case of smallpox. There is no reason why we cannot achieve this result in this instance.

Mr. DOMINICK. I would certainly agree with the gentleman. My question is simply whether we need this type of program in order to achieve that result. The fact I am pointing out is that we already have continuing programs in this field. It strikes me we are seeking to make additional funds available in an entirely new program.

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

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

Mr. BRUCE. Does the gentleman think an additional program is going to influence any more people to bring their children in for immunization shots?

Mr. DOMINICK. We do have a program already in existence in the field of diphtheria, sitting in front of that patient. I saw two German prisoners of war die in Germany as a result of tetanus. I would not want to see any child suffer in this field. What we would make it possible to have something like that happen to a child or an adult in the United States. I appreciate your bringing this subject to the floor of the House, but I think it would be less than fair if I did not criticize what I think are weak points in this bill.

I was interested in what the gentleman from Indiana just said with respect to the tremendous amount of publicity, the constant barrage by radio, television, and press, and I would want to add to that, Mr. Chairman, the medical profession as well. The county medical society in this state, in a number of instances, have been actively engaged in this program for a number of years, ever since the Salk vaccine came into existence.

Mr. DURNO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Has been such a constant barrage by radio, television, and press, and where necessary, appropriations by local subdivisions of government, by States, or in rare instances by the Federal Governments.

Mr. DURNO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to highly compliment the gentleman that out of his viewpoint, I am going to the House today information that he is imparting to us. It was confirmed in a letter which the committee received from the American Medical Association. "The medical profession has taken the lead in these fields over the years and is still going to be in the forefront. The gentleman from Arizona is correct. The amount of this legislation is an effort to emphasize and try to persuade people through educational processes and familiarity with the need and the necessity for it. That is the reason for this legislation. And we hope after this is accomplished, just as the gentleman has so well said, existing programs may with some modifications take care of the continuing needs in the future.

I want to again compliment the gentleman for his splendid statement.

Mr. DURNO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Actually, what is referred to in the other two programs is a provision that has long been in the Public Health Service. Section 314(e) provides a general public health program that includes what we are talking about here today, but it does not emphasize or give special attention to diphtheria or any of the other diseases which it is to include.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is just included in the overall program, but here we recognize the need for and the importance of wiping out these diseases, and it is only with the cooperation of the community and the Federal Government at any time and all the children expected by those under 5 years of age. This is to then give priority, by this particular program, in an effort to do something about this dread disease which is going to involve a lot more diseases, a lot more inoculations, a lot more shots than have been delineated here in the bill. Thirdly, I do not think that it is the dollars in this bill or the medicine in this bill that is the answer. I think the answer is a continuation and an acceleration and an extension of the programs, not only in public health, but those programs should originate at the county level and at the State level more than at the Federal level.

So, in voting on this bill I think they have to decide in your own mind whether or not you want to extend the Federal arm of medical care into the total field of inoculation and vaccination, realizing that it is going to be expanded; realizing that it is going to be continuing; realizing that it is going to cost you $36 million in the next 3 years.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I rise in support of the vaccination assistance legislation. This legislation has been described by the esteemed chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee at page 26 of the House today information that he is imparting to us. It was confirmed in a letter which the committee received from the American Medical Association. "The medical profession has taken the lead in these fields over the years and is still going to be in the forefront. The gentleman from Arizona is correct. The amount of this legislation is an effort to emphasize and try to persuade people through educational processes and familiarity with the need and the necessity for it. That is the reason for this legislation. And we hope after this is accomplished, just as the gentleman has so well said, existing programs may with some modifications take care of the continuing needs in the future.

I want to again compliment the gentleman for his splendid statement.

Mr. DURNO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Actually, what is referred to in the other two programs is a provision that has long been in the Public Health Service. Section 314(e) provides a general public health program that includes what we are talking about here today, but it does not emphasize or give special attention to diphtheria or any of the other diseases which it is to include.
the House of Representatives, and the present legislation constitutes an excellent example.

On April 10 and 17, 1961, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I have the privilege to be the chairman, presented hearings on the polio vaccine. The hearings were occasioned by a request made by President Kennedy to the Congress to appropriate $1 million for approximately 3 million doses of vaccine to be stock piled in case of polio outbreaks in the United States. Hearings of our subcommittee were called on short notice since under the provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to biological products, no person may sell a vaccine unless such product has been manufactured in an establishment licensed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The subcommittee had been informed that as of March 14, 1961, when the Presidential request for appropriations was made, no applications for licenses had been received from biological manufacturers for the production of the oral polio vaccine.

It was the purpose of the subcommittee to determine the adequacy of the各种 with regard to the Salk and Sabin vaccines before the American public.

At the close of the hearings I requested Secretary Ribicoff to review for the subcommittee the vaccine picture in the light of all the testimony which had been presented in the subcommittee hearings. On April 10, 1961, Secretary Ribicoff submitted a preliminary report on the vaccination picture in the Nation. As stated by the Secretary the main facts brought out in this report are as follows:

First. The problem as it exists is not limited to poliomyelitis, but there is inadequate immunization against other important diseases for which specific, effective immunizing substances are available.

Second. Low levels of immunization are present throughout the Nation, both in urban and rural areas, and are concentrated in those segments of the population which have the least economic resources.

Third. The problem is not so much the type of vaccine that is available, not so much the actual provision of vaccine, but the development of methods of making sure that those now without protection become immunized.

On May 1, 1961, Secretary Ribicoff submitted a further report to the subcommittee which dealt with factors which contribute to the lack of immunization in large segments of the population and which suggests types of activities which might alleviate the situation and alternative ways of solving the problem.

It is my understanding that the reports prepared at the request of our subcommittee were brought to the attention of the Congress. As a result thereof legislation was prepared, the enactment of which was requested of the Congress by the President. Thus, if the executive branch can claim paternity in the case of this legislation, I should point out to the House that the legislative branch can at least claim to be the "grandpappy" of this bill.

It goes without saying that I personally feel very strongly that this is good legislation. The details of the legislation have already been discussed by the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hatfield], and there is no need for me to say anything more in regard to this legislation except to state that the price in dollars for this program is small indeed if we are able to eradicate four diseases which constitute a serious public health menace to the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I include as part of my remarks two reports of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated April 10, 1961, and May 1, 1961, in the Record at this point:


Hon. Kenneth R. Roberts,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Enclosed is the preliminary report of progress in the review of the vaccination picture in the Nation, as requested on March 17, 1961.

The main points brought out in this report are as follows:

1. The problem as it exists is not limited to poliomyelitis, but there is inadequate immunization against other important diseases for which specific, effective immunizing substances are available.

2. Low levels of immunization are present throughout the Nation, both in urban and rural areas, and are concentrated in those segments of the population where average incomes are low.

3. The problem is not so much the type of vaccine that is available, not so much the actual provision of vaccine, but the development of methods of making sure that those now without protection become immunized.

The Public Health Service is continuing their review of the problem and will be pleased to continue cooperating with your subcommittee in any way that you desire.

Sincerely,

Abraham Ribicoff,
Secretary.

Preliminary Report of Progress in the Review of the Vaccination Picture in the Nation

At the request of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Public Health Service has made a review of the immunization status of the Nation with particular reference to poliomyelitis. This document is a progress report on the review as requested by the subcommittee at the conclusion of the hearings on March 17, 1961.

No attempt has been made to review the relative merits of poliomyelitis vaccines, for this was adequately covered in the hearings. It is the function of the Public Health Service that massive reduction in the occurrence of paralytic polio depends less upon the availability of a vaccine than upon our citizens' acceptance of immunization procedures. For many years to come, physicians will undoubtedly exercise their freedom of choice between various scientific judgments in using either inactivated virus vaccine or attenuated oral vaccine. Many physicians have already taken upon themselves the task of comparing the various vaccines. The review deals with the extent of the problem of immunization and the logistics necessary to overcome the relative lack of nationwide immunity.

The problem is not confined to children. Children, however, are at the greatest risk; and concentration on protecting them offers the means for long-range progress in building nationwide protection against the four diseases for which specific methods of prevention agents are available.

Considering the immunization status against poliomyelitis, it is appropriate also to consider the immunization status against three other diseases: diphtheria, whooping cough (DPT). These three diseases together cause more deaths than does polio. The crippling of diphtheria, which so often leads to heart disease and mental retardation that follow whooping cough add to the seriousness of these diseases. Tetanus, except for babies, has the highest case fatality rate of any communicable disease. (See Table 1.)

At present, a vaccine for measles is being field tested. This disease alone causes more deaths than polio. The delayed effects of measles upon the brain, the eyes, the ears, and the lungs add to the seriousness of this common disease of childhood. The future will undoubtedly bring other vaccines against other diseases to be used in order to maintain the population at the highest level of health.

A Progress Report on the Review of Immunization Status in the Nation, April 1961, has been prepared by the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service. It delineates those areas in which there is adequate immunization and those areas in which levels of immunization are incomplete.

Beyond school age there is again a decreasing percentage of the population adequately protected. In general the white population has a better level of protection against diseases for which vaccines are available than does the nonwhite. Urban areas have only slightly better immunization status than do the rural areas of the Nation. There is a great variation of immunity by different geographic regions of the Nation, with the New England States having the highest level and the South Central the lowest level, the picture is fairly constant across the Nation.

Table 2 indicates that poliomyelitis is not strictly an urban disease but is about equally divided between urban and rural populations.

Table 3 (not printed in Record) is a compilation of data from Communicable Disease Center surveys of communities to determine the immunization status of various segments of the population. Surveys have been made in different areas of the Nation, and the findings are consistent. It has been shown in general, that immunization against disease is not a function of geographic location, but a function of socioeconomic status within the given community—the lower the socioeconomic class, the lower the level of immunization.

It is important to note that the request to meet the request of the subcommittee, indicates the size of the job that needs to be done to immunize the population to the best level of immunization possible. Today, 16 million children 7 and under have had no immunization against these four diseases. 16 million have had no immunization against these four diseases. To attain maximum immunization of this group it would be necessary...
to administer 160 million doses of vaccine against these diseases. The logistics of this problem have been simplified by medical science for immunization against these four diseases can be accomplished simultaneously. Susceptible population groups respond more readily to immunization campaigns directed to the prevention of multiple diseases than to a single disease. Not only will the people in need respond better, but the organizational and administrative problems are no greater to accomplish complete health protection than to segment the effort on a single disease.

Table 5 is a rough estimate of the cost of vaccine purchase. (Prices are based on list prices from manufacturers for sale to the Federal Government and do not take into account possible reductions for large-scale purchases. The estimated price of oral vaccine is that which was used for the supplemental appropriation presented by the administration to Congress.) The cost of such a program can be seen to vary in accordance with the priorities established. To protect unimmunized children under 1 against polio would cost $2.6 million. Vaccine to protect children 7 and under against polio-myelitis, diphtheria, tetanus, and whooping cough would cost $38.6 million. If it were decided that the Federal Government had the responsibility for furnishing oral vaccine to the entire Nation and sufficient vaccine against diphtheria, whooping cough and tetanus to maximally protect the Nation, it might cost as much as $275 million for the vaccine alone.

### Table 1 — Percentage of population with indicated number of Salk vaccine doses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-white</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>ENC</th>
<th>WNC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>WSC</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>PAC</th>
<th>Other areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 — Paralytic poliomyelitis cases, United States, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>North east</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 69</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 — U.S. total need — Number inoculations required for 4 doses at present levels of immunization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number of doses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 69</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of vaccine</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
<th>Number of doses</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newborn and unimmunized infants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unimmunized 7 years and under:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unimmunized 46-49:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborn and infants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of vaccine</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
<th>Number of doses</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral vaccine for unimmunized 7 and under:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral vaccine for unimmunized 46-49:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral vaccine and combined antigens (diptheria, tetanus and oral):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral vaccine and combined antigens (diptheria, tetanus and oral):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Oral only</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Oral and DPT</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Enclosed is a further report from the Public Health Service as requested at the close of the polio vaccine hearings of your subcommittee on March 17, 1961. This report completes the review of the poliomyelitis immunization program that you requested.

I have previously forwarded to you a preliminary report prepared by the Public Health Service which described the national status of the immunization problem. This second report deals with factors which contribute to the lack of immunization in large segments of the population, types of activities which might alleviate the situation, and alternative methods of solving the problem. You may also be interested to know that the Public Health Service is completing a movie depicting an excellent method of stimulating vaccination programs. This movie will be made available to you, if you desire.

Please let us know if we can provide any further information to you.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM RISIKOFF,
Secretary.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE BY PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE REGARDING IMMUNIZATION AGAINST POLIO, DIPTHERIA, Diphtheria, and Tetanus. TABLE—SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS REPORT

In an earlier report to the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Public Health Service has shown that good and effective vaccines exist against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. However, these vaccines have not been widely used in areas of low socioeconomic status. The problem of getting low income families immunized is not limited to any single geographic area of the Nation, although metropolitan areas have slightly better immunization status than rural areas. Both polio and diphtheria are becoming problems of increasing concern in smaller urban and rural communities.

Preschool children and young adults are less well immunized than school children.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

There is no simple or single explanation for the difficulty in getting these groups immunized. Attempts to do so vary because there is no single, national plan, nor is there a single, standardized pattern within the State. There are 161 local health jurisdictions in the 50 States. Each has its own problems and method of operation—each its own program priorities.

School programs

Some generalizations can be made, however. One reason school age children are better immunized is because many local school jurisdictions use registered nurses to administer various diseases as a school entrance requirement. But this is not the only reason; in fact, recent surveys by the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service have shown that the vaccination status of school age children is high even in communities that do not have this school entrance requirement.

School age children represent a captive audience. However, large numbers of children can be reached in one place at one time, school programs are more economical because they are conducted by teachers trained in immunization. This probably explains why, beginning with the early days of polio immunization, much effort has been expended in immunization programs for the school age population.

High-risk groups

The philosophy of concentrating immunization efforts on the school age population has considerable merit in changing age specific attack rates for polio. There has been some reluctance to mount programs aimed specifically at the school age, although this is now the high-risk group.

Preventive services

Undoubtedly, the changing patterns of medical care in the past decade have also contributed to this problem. Emphasis has been placed on the well-child clinic of health departments because of pressures of other programs such as home care of the sick. There has been a tendency to depend primarily upon the private practitioners to meet the preventive medicine needs of the infant and preschool child. This system has worked exceedingly well for those few people able to afford medical care. However, in the low socioeconomic groups, particularly among those who might be classified as medically indigent, preventive measures are less likely to be utilized from private physicians. Parents in this category make an effort to purchase medical care for acute illnesses, but tend to "economize" on preventive measures.

Although many health departments provide free immunization services they are unable to do the intensive work that is needed to reach large segments of the population who have not responded to general immunization programs. Recently, the technique of quota sampling, which the Communicable Disease Center has made possible for health departments and local communities to identify their soft spots, has been communicated to many local health departments to intensify their immunization programs among the most vulnerable groups of people.

The demand for vaccines

Even though it is now possible to pinpoint the areas where immunization programs are needed, not all health departments can undertake the program. In order to be sure to provide a multitude of services and must therefore make value judgments. This is particularly true for reasons for incomplete immunization. Health departments are continually being urged to enter new disease areas, but when such programs are offered they are not commensurate with the scope of operations which is demanded to them, nor is manpower available.

Consequently, they may have to accept immunization of the most susceptible groups, in the range of 20 to 20 percent, epidemics still do occur and in sizable proportions, as witness the outbreaks in Providence, R.I., and Baltimore, Md., last summer. While these epidemics did not spread throughout the entire cities, they intensively involved the unprotected population groups. The 107 cases in Providence are far less than the 927 cases in Boston in the epidemic of 1955, but still to those people, and to the community which must provide long-range care for these people, the outbreak was significant.

The responsibility for preventive services

Should it be the goal of the health professions to eradicate diseases for which the tools are available? If eradication is impossible, should we be dissatisfied with anything short of the most complete job possible in protecting the community and the individual? Or, are there priorities that should be established? Priorities relate not only to intensity of action, but also to the level of responsibility. How much responsibility for preventive medicine rests upon the individual? The private physician? The local, the State, or the Federal health agencies?

These questions are not easily answered. Priorities of action can be established more clearly than utilization. The total population cannot be reached, the most susceptible groups should have top priority. Three of the group of communicable diseases are poliomyelitis, diphtheria, and whooping cough, have their greatest impact upon preschool children.

Priority determination

This can best be seen by data on poliomyelitis. More accurate information about this disease is available because of the establishment of the poliomyelitis surveillance unit at the Communicable Disease Center when Salk vaccine first became available. Table 1 illustrates that the highest attack rates are in the preschool children, and table 8 shows that it is not simply the preschool children, but the unimmunized school children who are at the greatest risk.

Data such as this make possible program priorities decisions, but do not answer the problems of how responsibility for carrying out a program is to be assigned.

Advent of new vaccines

Soon we will be faced with the advent of the new oral polio vaccine. While the public appeal of this innovation may not have the same magnitude as that stimulated by the Salk vaccine in 1955, we can expect an upsurge of interest in vaccination against poliomyelitis. There will be great pressure for massive campaigns to immunize every child at once. The cost of the program will be larger, but the capacity to administer the vaccine will be the same as for Salk vaccine. The main problems may be those of how to arrange for increasing the number of vaccine dispensers to the amount needed and how to meet the demand for vaccine.
polio immunization, the problem of con­
tinued immunization of new entrants into the popu­
lation is going to be with us. Intensive efforts will be
needed if they are still in the hospital they will
need additional immunizations after they have gone home, and un­
less such efforts are made, it is likely to be necessary to un­
der dose to a certain extent, in the vacina­
tion of the required doses of vaccine, the job will not be complete. Also, people who
who are in one group should be vaccinated also and the logistics of furnishing vaccine to people
is no different for the oral, the killed, or the
vaccine. Individual crash programs in themselves are not the answer to the need for continued
long-range, adequate protection against communicable diseases.

Crash programs

Crash programs often occur in the face of epidemics. A major Midwestern metropolitan
area had a serious diphtheria epidemic in 1957. It was shown to be due to inadequate im­
munization. Intensive efforts were made to stop the epidemic with immunization. Yet
the next year the same community had a serious poliomyelitis epidemic, again be­
coming evident in the institution of the required doses of vaccine, the hospital
will not be complete. While they might be justified to get widespread use of a new immunising agent, other methods for
maintaining high immunisation levels also need to be explored.

Newborn vaccination

Special emphasis on immunizations of in­
fants under 1 year of age would appear fru­
tiful, both in terms of reaching a high-risk group and in terms of gradually in­
culcating the immunization habit into the
cultural patterns of these groups. Since registration of births is compulsory in all
States, health departments can obtain, from birth certificates, reasonably recent addresses
of all babies under 1 year of age. By per­
sistent followup work with the family during
the first year of the infant's life, it is prob­
able that initial immunisations could be
maintained at almost a 100-percent level.
This would not solve the problem of booster
shots, but if the infant group were com­
bined with the infant immunisation pro­
gram one might expect that the lower socio­
-economic groups would begin to adopt the
same attitude toward immunisation that the
upper and middle income groups now have.

Face-to-face approach

Experience with polio immunization indi­
cates that, whether these or other methods are adopted by a community, the approach
to the lower socioeconomic groups must be
personal. Despite a 5-year multimillion dol­
lar campaign by radio, press and television,
these groups did not take advantage of polio
vaccine. In contrast, isolated programs, us­
ging the personalized approach, were mark­
edly successful.

Program priorities

It is not only a problem of motivation and eco­
nomics but also of the present immunization practices.
We have indicated what elements immu­
nisation programs would need to contain in or­
der to arise immunisation levels in these groups.

Finally, we have discussed three typical situa­
tions, one or another of which is char­
teristic of the status of communicable dis­
ase control in most communities at present: i.e., primary reliance on voluntary agencies
over organizing the community effort; or
clusively governmental.

We have not considered it appropriate to
discuss in this report how immunization
practices might be changed or who is respon­
sibility each level of government—local,
State and Federal—might assume in achiev­
ing such change.

Table 7.—Paralytic poliomyelitis cases,
United States, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Paralytic poliomyelitis cases per 100,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Polio surveillance unit corrected for 60-day followup.
2 Based on 1969 population estimates.

Table 8.—Paralytic poliomyelitis attack
rates by vaccination status, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Attack rate per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 From data in CDC polio surveillance unit.
2 Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. When the gentleman speaks of medical testimony, did medical authorities, other than the Medical Advisory Committee of the United States Public Health Service, testify before the committee while hearings were being held?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes. The members of the State and territorial health associations from various States of the Union who appeared in support of the legislation.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, were representatives of the American Medical Association present at the hearings, and did they testify?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Dr. Neuman appeared at the first hearings in March 1961. Then I believe that at the May hearings in 1962 the endorsement of the bill was by letter from the American Medical Association.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If the gentleman will yield further, the American Medical Association has endorsed this legislation? Did the gentleman understand the chairman of the full committee, the chairman made that statement. I think that is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10541, a bill to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their populations, especially all preschool children, against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus, and against other diseases which may in the future become susceptible of practical elimination as a public health problem through such programs.

By authorizing a 3-year program of special project grants to States and with State approval, to local communities, for intensive vaccination programs against four contagious diseases which constitute significant public health problems, we will take great strides of prevention against the threat of epidemics.

It is true that, through the years, the field of medicine has taken giant steps to control and eliminate the dreaded diseases which have taken their toll of human lives. Vaccines have been developed, through countless hours of research, which have brought human beings from the dreaded effects of these four diseases. But the threat of an epidemic from any one of these killers still remains, unless we can provide the vaccine to a greater number of our population.

Evidence indicates that epidemics have begun in unimmunized groups and that most of the cases in these four diseases occur in these groups. It has been stated that the unimmunized are primarily from the lower income groups who are not reached by the usual type of health program.

Perhaps the greatest amateur benefit many individuals with protection against unnecessary suffering and death from these four diseases. We can gain knowledge from the administration of the program which may prove of great value in furthering our general health problems. The greatest benefit will be the freedom from threats of epidemics in the community.

It may also be noted that this legislation has important national defense implications. Considering, at the present time, that the adult population of this country has a low level of immunization against tetanus and diphtheria, two diseases which can provide a potential we could reduce the dangers of loss of lives resulting from these diseases in the event a nuclear attack should take place.

This legislation has merit and its cost will be justified when we realize the benefits which can be expected. It is my hope that this body will enact the legislation to provide a vaccine against a type of cancer which usually strikes children. Just imagine the rush there would be among parents for this magic vaccine. Under this bill as originally introduced, the children against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. The President recommended legislation of this kind in his message to Congress, in the health needs of the American people early this year, and I strongly endorsed it in the hearings of the committee.

However, I am deeply disappointed that in the bill as now written I rewrote it to take out of it one of its key provisions, and one which I considered of far-reaching importance. I am referring to the provision in the original bill which authorized Federal funds not only for vaccination programs covering the four diseases specifically named in the proposal, but also—I will read:

In connection with intensive community vaccination programs for other diseases for which safe and effective vaccines are available, the Surgeon General finds represents a major public health problem, has high morbidity, mortality, morbidity, disability, or epidemic potential and to be susceptible of practical elimination, the provision of funds for intensive immunization activity over a limited period of time with vaccines or other preventive agents which may become available in the future.

Mr. Chairman, as I informed the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during hearings on this legislation, this is the kind of provision which—had it been law 10 years ago—could have prevented the chaos and confusion and near-panic over the priorities to be assigned among children for receiving the Salk vaccine when it first became available.

Who is to say that medical science in the next few years might not come forward with some new vaccine of equal, if not greater, efficacy in the prevention of the major problems of human health? And who can predict the changes and the new diseases that will require preventive measures in the years to come?

Mr. Chairman, it is of the utmost importance that the Federal Government not waste its opportunity in the future to establish a program whose aims are: to prevent epidemics; to provide protection against other diseases which constitute a significant public health problem.

My feeling about that, however, is that the great breakthrough in one of the four diseases we are discussing might come to us in the time when we had adjourned sine die and are all back home campaigning for election to a new Congress—and then what? Unless a special session of the adjourned Congress were called, it would be months before a new Congress convened, and many weeks after that before committees were organized and the new Congress ready to consider any legislation.

In the meantime, we would go through the same chaos, I am afraid, we experienced in 1955 over the Salk vaccine. It seems to me that the Federal authority can not do any harm if no great immunization breakthrough should occur during the life of this proposed law—this provision would just be inoperative. Great breakthroughs in the Salk vaccine should indeed come into existence, and as dramatically as the Salk vaccine did in 1955, we would be prepared with flexible administrative machinery to take advantage of the fullest—whether or not Congress is in session, if this section were kept in the law.

With or without this provision, however, as I told the committee during
hearing on this legislation, we can now at least stamp out polio, diphtheria, whooping cough and tetanus—we know how; we have the vaccines. But the public must cooperate and so must the communities. Vaccines in test tubes and warehouses do not immunize children. This proposed program should reach and protect all children and therefore should be adopted now.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the legislation now before us to eliminate, through mass inoculation programs, serious infectious diseases among children is one of a series of proposals made by President Kennedy for improving the health of the American people. We are expanding our research activities in the National Institutes of Health, but the more we learn about disease the more expensive it becomes to put our knowledge to use. As a result, medical knowledge far outstrips our success in keeping people healthy—too many go without services because of the feeling that they cannot afford it. It is therefore that such feeling has permitted, or has been responsible for children going without protection against polio, or the other three diseases covered in this bill—diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. Yet according to the information provided in connection with this bill, much of the failure to immunize more of our young children against these diseases can be traced to economic causes or economic fears. This bill should not only make it possible, but make it a reality, that every preschool child in the country can be immunized against these four diseases, with State and local health authorities handling the actual details of the program. While some parents for religious or other reasons, do not accept or approve use of vaccines, and will not be forced under this bill to have their children immunized, nevertheless, I believe most parents will be pleased with this program and will be delighted to have their children participate in the new Federal program.

The success of this program should virtually eliminate these four diseases in our country as a scourge of children.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, the vaccination assistance bill under consideration today is designed to eliminate, for all practical purposes, the threat of polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus from the United States and communities throughout the country to launch intensive community vaccination programs over the next 3 years and to develop ongoing community programs to vaccinate the new children born every day.

From the standpoint of medical science, the status of each of these four diseases is ominous for the future. Medical research has developed for each a safe and effective vaccine that can prevent the occurrence of the disease in vaccinated persons. However, these vaccines, even of suffering, the same major expense, and the same fear of lasting crippling effect as any case occurring in earlier years. Indeed, these tragedies must have been prevented if victims and their families to accept, because all—or virtually all—could have been prevented. A highly effective vaccine has been developed in adequate supply in all parts of the country. Yet people—mostly young children—continue to get these dread diseases.

The reason for this failure that mars the victory is clearly revealed by recent studies of the immunization status of our population. These studies show that large segments of the population still remain unvaccinated, or have only partial protection, or have been partially protected. The largest of these groups is comprised of preschool-age children. Of some 21 million children under 6, only 7 million have received the protection recommended for polio. Yet children in this age group are more susceptible to the disease. In other words, the record is poorest in the specific area where it should be best. And of these unprotected persons represents another potential tragedy. And, in combination, they also represent a community health hazard, for any such group of unvaccinated persons contains the potential of an epidemic outbreak.

Another significant fact is that the highest percentage of unprotected persons is found in neighborhoods in which low-income families live. First, for example, among some age groups the vaccination level in the low-income families is 35 percent lower than in high-income groups for the many free clinics in recent years.

What these figures reveal is a failure, or a major shortcoming, in the planning and conduct of regular vaccination efforts in most communities. Existing vaccination programs conducted in many communities have been reasonably effective in reaching some groups of the population, but they have two major weaknesses. First, they have been so closely related to school admissions that they have provided poor coverage for preschool children. Second, they have been least effective in reaching families in low-income neighborhoods. This latter difficulty is not due simply to the cost barrier, for problems have been encountered in such neighborhoods even when vaccination is readily available without charge.

The principal purpose of H.R. 10541 is to encourage and assist States and communities to develop and carry out intensive community vaccination programs. Such a nationwide approach to the problem offers several advantages over an uncoordinated series of local actions.

First, the biggest obstacle to be overcome is one of inertia or lack of interest on the part of the public. The most effective approach to such an obstacle is to back up local initiative and action with a simultaneous national program which makes full use of the resources of national organizations—including professional and voluntary groups—and national communications media. In such a program the momentum and cumulative force of the program would give extra strength to every local program.

Second, a concentrated and coordinated attack has many advantages from the standpoint of overall efficiency and economy. The services of expert consultants and specialists can be more readily obtained and more effectively used. Some educational and informational materials and programs can be used by a number of communities, either simultaneously or in a planned sequence. Equipment and supplies can be obtained and deployed more efficiently, as can certain laboratory services and facilities.

Finally, if we are to achieve the goal of virtual elimination of these diseases, a nationwide attack is necessary. In a country with such a mobile population as ours, there would be far fewer cases of approach disease elimination across the Nation in a relatively short period of time.

In Massachusetts our record of vaccination against polio is better than for the country as a whole. In 1960, we had 2,771 cases of paralytic polio. We know that epidemics can and do come when there is a substantial lack of vaccination coverage. Already we have had two cases of polio in Massachusetts this year—both involving unvaccinated preschool children.

The people of my State are now engaged in a statewide program to improve the percentage of vaccination of young children. Last year, 2,500,000 doses of oral polio vaccine were given in Massachusetts under this program. The second stage of the three stage program is under way now. The third stage is scheduled for this fall. The assistance which will be provided to Massachusetts under this bill will help greatly to assure complete success of this State and local undertaking.

The State health commissioner of Massachusetts, Dr. Alfred L. Frechette, has said that when the percentage of immunized children is only moderately good there is a continuing danger that outbreaks of diphtheria, whooping cough, or polio may occur. Such outbreaks are dangerous to all inadequately protected persons, and the control of such outbreaks is far more expensive and time consuming than their prevention by means of thorough preschool immunization.

The success of immunization programs is very much dependent on the extent to which local communities take active responsibility for such programs. Dr. Frechette points out that education and enthusiasm are not in themselves enough. The lack of sufficient funds may dampen such enthusiasm be-
fore it can take root. The lack of adequate technical guidance and careful supervision often spells failure for such local programs.

Mr. Chairman, the emphasis of our nation-wide vaccination programs must be on excellence. We cannot be satisfied with mediocrity. The Federal assistance authorized by this bill is aimed at achieving and maintaining such excellence so that polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus may be eliminated as health problems from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the report, but as an original bill, for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Vaccination Assistance Act of 1964.

Sec. 2. Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after section 319 the following new section:

GRANTS FOR INTENSIVE VACCINATION PROGRAMS

"Sec. 317. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and $12,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to States and to political subdivisions or instrumentalities of States under this section. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, shall be available for making grants during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

Such grants may be used to pay that portion of the cost of intensive community vaccination programs against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus which is reasonably attributable to (1) purchase of vaccines needed to protect children under the age of five years and such costs by the Surgeon General, but shall be designed in accordance with regulations of the Surgeon General upon his finding that they are not normally served by school vaccination programs and related expenses of additional State and local health personnel needed for planning, organizational, and promotional activities in connection with such programs, including studies to determine the immunization needs of communities and the means of best meeting such needs, and personnel and related expenses needed to maintain additional epidemiologic and laboratory surveillance occasioned by such programs.

(b) For purposes of this section an "intensive community vaccination program" means a program of limited duration which is so designed and conducted as to achieve, within the period of the program, at least 95 percent of the prescribed number of personal immunization against such diseases of infants and for maintenance of immunity in the community. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require any State or any political subdivision or instrumentality of the State to have an intensive community vaccination program which would require any person who objects to immunization to have any child or ward of his immunized.

(c)(1) Payments under this section may be made as reimbursement in such instillaments, and on such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, upon such conditions and assurances as the Surgeon General deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States. If the applicant State or other political subdivision or instrumentalities so requests, purchases and provides an lieu of making money grants for the purchase thereof.

(2) Each applicant under this section for a money grant shall, at the time it files its application with the Surgeon General, provide the Surgeon General with assurances satisfactory to him that it will, if it receives such a grant, furnish any physician, who practices in the area in which such program is to be carried out and makes application therefor to it, with such amounts of vaccines as are reasonably necessary in order to permit such physician during the period the program is in progress to immunize his patients who are in the group for whose immunization such grant of money or other assistance is made.

(3) Each applicant for a grant under this section for use in connection with an intensive community vaccination program shall, at the time it files its application for such grant with the Surgeon General, provide the Surgeon General with assurances satisfactory to him that it will, if it receives such grant, furnish such other services and materials as may be necessary to carry out such program.

(d) The Surgeon General, at the request of a State or other public agency, may reduce the grant to be made under this section by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and any other costs in connection with the detail of an officer or employee of the Public Health Service to such agency when such detail is made for the convenience of and at the request of such agency and for the purpose of carrying out a function for which a grant is made under this section. Such a reduced grant shall be available for payment of such costs by the Surgeon General, but shall, if so reduced, be deemed to have been paid to such agency.

(e) Nothing in this section shall limit or otherwise restrict the use of funds which are granted under this section for the purchase of vaccine or for organizing, promoting, conducting, or participating in community vaccination programs, or being used for such purposes in connection with programs assisted through grants under this section.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their populations, particularly all preschool children, against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus."
was mentioned specifically, and in Vermont and Nebraska. And I might say a pretty good job is being done in New York, too. When we get all through with those shining examples of local efficiency in this field, we come back to the unanswerable and unanswered argument that two-thirds of the children under 5 years of age in the United States have not yet received their vaccination against these diseases of the two-thirds of the adult in the United States have not been vaccinated.

If there were a question here of saving some money perhaps the arguments might be more impressive. The suggestion that we have here in this amendment is that we only transfer the cost. No one has suggested that the local communities, operating individually, or the local States, will do a better or more efficient job. So actually there is no saving here. And even if there were, I wonder how we would measure in terms of dollars what this bill proposes to do. What is the life of a child worth? Eight dollars? Eighty dollars? I do not know. We cannot put that kind of a value on this kind of a saving here. And while some have suggested that the people are being educated day and night on television and radio, I can recall, we all recall, these warnings before a holiday "Drive Slowly," which everyone promptly forgets. But if the skilled people of the U.S. Health Service, together with the skilled people at the local level come into a community and provide a specific project, the response will be much greater than to the scattergun approach of an occasional public service announcement on radio or television.

I hope that this amendment will not prevail because if it does the bill will have very little effect.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

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

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

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from New York, with whom I can usually agree in almost everything he says, I do not see was talking about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, because all we are trying to do with this amendment is make more of this money available in immunizing the children of the United States so they will not face the threat of these horrible diseases.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. The gentleman from New York said that the children up to 5 years of age had not been inoculated, and two-thirds of the adults. I do not have the exact figure on that. I refer the committee to page 66 of the hearings, when Dr. Smith is talking, and he said:

"The figures are these: In the 0-to-4 age group, 90 percent have no immunization whatsoever.

I just want to get the figures correct on that.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from New York was talking about the other category we were trying to reach.

I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. I know there is the best of intentions in this amendment. I know he does not want to do anything that would impair the program at all. But let me show you what it would do. The testimony given to the House Government Operations Committee shows that $4.2 million would go for this purpose, which I will point out to you in a minute, and that $8.5 million will go for vaccine. In other words, about one-third of the total cost that is estimated to be necessary here would be stricken out completely.

The distinguished gentleman from Oregon, a doctor who is so familiar with what is needed, put his finger on it in the debate when he said that what we need to do here is to impress and make the people realize, educate the people of the necessity for this kind of a program. We are striking out all of that if we do this. The gentleman proposes to strike out in this program here additional State and local health services needed for planning, organizational, and promotional activities. The State offices do not have people to accomplish that kind of service and therefore they would not be available, and all of that would be stricken out, in addition to activities in connection with such programs, including studies to determine the immunization needs of communities and the means of meeting such needs and personnel and related expenses needed to maintain additional epidemiologic and laboratory surveillance occasioned by such programs.

I do not think the Members really want to curtail the program by doing this, and I know the gentleman does not intend to do it. But on page 8 the State is required to give assurances—that is their job—to give assurances satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the State, if it receives such grant, will furnish such other services and materials as may be necessary to carry out the program. We put an obligation on the State in order to help. It is a cooperative program.

I am confident that the gentleman does not want the majority of this program, the only part that really can be effective beyond the limited program that is in existence today, to be cut out. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. KYL. The gentleman certainly does not suggest that the State health departments do not now have capable and trained people who are now engaged in this work.

Mr. HARRIS. We have no information, no hearings, nothing was brought to the attention of the committee. The overwhelming testimony was that they do not have people to accomplish this service.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK). The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOMINICK), the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 6, line 16, following the word "texta"us", add this language: "and any other disease the Surgeon General shall determine.

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 8, line 2, following the word "surveillance", insert: "or other categories of existing diseases that could be at one time or another a very serious problem in a particular community or an even larger area such as a county or State; such a disease as smallpox, for instance, or even one that has been mentioned, measles. We cannot eliminate measles by vaccination but we can definitely minimize effects by inoculations.

Mr. HARRIS: I want to state that we do not have in mind any particular disease at the moment.

Mr. KYL. There is none stated in this amendment. It simply says the Surgeon General is to determine, if he so desires, that to prevent an epidemic in Arkansas, Iowa, and California because of floods or because of any other natural hazard or because of the unexplainable fact of epidemics decides that the Federal Government should participate through this program in trying to alleviate the misery and suffering attendant to a particular disease. As I say, if there is merit to anything that has been said here in favor of the bill, I can see no logical reason whatsoever for further action to present day reality. We tried to bring some reason to the program and we did not leave it in the discretion of some administration to do what has to be done. We have limited this program to diseases that we feel are confronting us..."
clined by the committee that there would be ample time, because the committee has not failed to respond to properly-supported requests—ample time to author­ize. Therefore, the Public Health Service is able to come to the com­mittee with the assurance that they have something that they would support or certify as being adequately effective to prevent measles or any other disease.

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

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

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

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

Mr. KYL. Was the original request that was made by the gentleman from Iowa approved at this time?

Mr. MOSS. That is quite true.

Mr. HARRIS. Consequently we had no information on which we could base action to set to this particular program.

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

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

Mr. KYL. The amendment that was made in connection with this legislation were predicated on the cost of the four pro­grams specifically stated. We had testi­mony making it quite clear that additional estimates could not be given.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Kyl).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the clerk then resumed the chair. Mr. Moss, 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. 10541), pursuant to House Reso­lution 699, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and the Senate to the bill (S. 2161) entitled to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes: requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CAPERHART, and Mr. BENNET to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole on the bill H.R. 10541 this after­noon.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at the appropriate place in the RECORD on H.R. 10541.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, an­nounced that the Senate had passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9622. An act to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1894, as amended (48 U.S.C. 3162), may be added to the national forest.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the fol­lowing titles:

S. 2164. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the First World Conference on National Parks, and for other purposes.

S. 3203. An act to extend the Defense Pro­duction Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2161) entitled "An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes: requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CAPERHART, and Mr. BENNET to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlemen from Arkansas (Mr. PAYMAN), of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2161) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, with House amend­ments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the confer­ence asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none, and appoints the following
SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my shock and distress for the appalling decision rendered yesterday by the U.S. Supreme Court which outlawed prayer in our public schools.

It is my prediction that this decision, which is a blow to the very foundations of this Nation, will arouse and offend the American people to an unprecedented degree.

This decision strikes at the very heart of our Republic which was established by the Founding Fathers in the belief of a free America blessed and guided by a Divine Being.

Our Declaration of Independence and our wonderful Constitution were written by God-fearing and religious men. Our Government, the Star-Spangled Banner," contains three verses which recognize God and offers a prayer for America.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the United States contains these words:

One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The Congress had enacted legislation which calls for a National Day of Prayer each year.

Our monetary coins carry the inscription, "In God we trust."

Each of our Presidents, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has upon assuming his office asked the protection and help of God and has taken the oath while swearing on the Holy Bible.

Here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and in the other body, our daily sessions are opened by prayer. Our school commencement services are begun by prayer. Is this now unlawful?

The Supreme Court decision violates the deeply entrenched and highly cherished spiritual traditions of America—considered by God-fearing men as God's bestowment for the protection of church and state; it is a question of oppression of religion in America.

It is my wish to denounced in the strongest terms possible the decision of the Supreme Court which I consider an affront to every American, regardless of race, creed, or religion.

FBI AGENTS TRAILING ALLEGED DRUG PIRATES

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1961, I submitted a bill for the consideration of this body, H.R. 6811, which has as its purpose the protection of American manufacturers from theft of patent rights and formulas of drug and pharmaceutical products.

This bill remains in committee despite the fact that I feel, with some pride in authorship, it is one of the more important pieces of legislation submitted to this Congress.

The need for passage of this legislation is demonstrated most clearly by an article in the Washington Daily News of June 21, 1962, written by Mr. John Troan. In this article, Mr. Troan points out the tremendous expenditures by our pharmaceutical manufacturers in the field of research to develop the so-called miracle drugs which have resulted in the saving of countless lives not only in the United States but throughout the world.

The theft of these patents has become a big business, and, as I have repeatedly pointed out to the floor of Congress, the greatest purchaser of these drugs manufactured from stolen patents is the U.S. Government.

It is incomprehensible to me that we, as a nation, should compound this theft and lack of ethics by purchasing such pharmaceuticals.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith this fine article by Mr. Troan:

NEW YORK AND CANADA INVOLVED—FBI AGENTS TRAILING ALLEGED DRUG PIRATES

(By John Troan)

The FBI is hot on the trail of an alleged international ring of drug pirates. Sources of agents from the Federal Bureau of Investigation—plus authorities in Europe, Canada, and the Middle East—have been combining three continents for months to unravel the fantastic case.

Involved is the alleged theft of chemical secrets from a leading pharmaceutical firm in New York and their purloined sale to six drug companies in Italy. Including one said to be headed by a Member of the Italian Senate.

The secrets deal with the production of four miracle drugs made by Lederle Laboratories in Pearl River, N.Y., a division of the American Cyanamid Company.

SPENT $12.5 MILLION Lederle says it spent more than $12.5 million over a 16-year period to develop these drugs—antiarthritic hormone, Aristocort, and the antibiotics, Amebicid, Achromycin, and Declomycin.

According to sworn statements just filed by Lederle with a New York State Supreme Court, Justice Arthur Markewich. Two of them named Mr. Sidney M. Fox, former chemist for Lederle, and Dr. Fox, 42, of Spring Valley, N.Y., worked for Lederle for 5 years before quitting in June 1959.

Lederle holds patent rights to all the drugs, and some of the Italian micro-organisms were spirited out of the country in small metal cigar tubes after being housed in a kitchen refrigerator.

EIGHTEEN-MONTH FIGHT Dr. Fox is fighting this, as well as a contempt-of-court conviction which grew out of his refusal to answer questions in a suit filed against an alleged accomplice, Nathan Sharff, an official of Italian Laboratories, Inc., in New York. To that proceeding, in the U.S. district court in Newark, N.J., Dr. Fox took the fifth amendment 62 times.

Lederle, in its civil suits, is seeking $6 million damages from Dr. Fox and a similar amount from Mr. Sharff.

It also wants $6 million from Elio Savelli, an Italian who allegedly served as go-between in negotiating deals for Dr. Fox. But Lederle has not yet brought suit against Dr. Savelli with the necessary legal papers. Mr. Savelli is believed to be either in his native Italy or in Canada.

CHECKING The FBI is checking to find out if any criminal violations have occurred. For one thing, property allegedly stolen from Lederle has been shipped to several places and even to Rome. In fact, one Italian company has returned to Lederle drug samples purportedly bought from Dr. Fox.

Lederle holds patent rights to all the drugs, and some of the Italian firms allegedly involved in the deals have, in turn, been selling medicine to the U.S. Government.

One of these is IBI (Istituto Biochimico Italiano), which has as its chairman, former chemical engineer for Lederle, IBI's...
president is Antonio Cremisini—a senator in the Italian Government.”

Mr. Canelarich, 83, now lives in Milan, Italy. In his sworn affidavit, he told of meet­
ing Mr. Cremisini when Mr. Salvetti was try­
ing to swing a $300,000 deal to sell ZBI enough imports to keep up demand for dioclon in. He said the deal went through.

Mr. Canelarich also told of seeing con­

fidential production records, purified drug samples and homegrown micro-organisms from Lederle for Dr. Fox. At that time, Mr. Canelarich still worked for Lederie.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON
PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCulloch, Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio, and for all, or nearly all of the 360,000 people in that district, I wish to commend Mr. Justice Stewart for his able and cour­
ageous opinion in the Regents of New York v. Engel et al. against Vitale, Jr., et al., decided by the Supreme Court on June 25, 1962, which in effect, held unconsti­
tutional the lawful order of a public school official which provided the fol­
lowing prayer to be individually, volun­
tarily said, aloud, at the beginning of each schoolday:

Almighty God, we acknowledge our de­
pendence upon Thee, and we beg Thy bless­
ings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

Mr. Speaker, the opinion of the Court, with which I cannot agree, and which appears so utterly unacceptable to so many, the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas and the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Stewart are, as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States—
No. 466, October Term, 1961]

STEVEn L. ENGEL, ET AL., PETITIONEES, V.
WILLIAM J. VITALE, JR., ET AL.

(on writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of New York)

(June 25, 1962.)

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

The respondent Board of Education of Union Free School District No. 9, New Hyde Park, N.Y., acting in its official capacity under state law, directed the school district’s principal to cause the following prayer to be said aloud by each class in the presence of the teacher at the beginning of each school day:

“Almighty God, we acknowledge our de­
pendence upon Thee, and we beg Thy bless­
ings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country.”

This daily procedure was adopted on the recommendation of the school board of re­
gents, a governmental agency created by the State constitution to which the New York Legislative Assembly granted broad superintend­
eutive, and legislative powers over the State’s public school system. These State

1See New York Constitution, art. V, sec. 4; New York Education Law, secs. 101, 120 et seq., 202, 214-219, 224, 245 et seq., 704, and 801 et seq.

officials composed the prayer which they recommended and published as a part of their annual report, "Prayer in Schools: Training in the Schools," saying: “We believe that this statement will be subscribed to by all men and women of good will, and we call upon parents to help us in giving life to our program.”

Shortly after the practice of reciting the regulations required by the school district, the parents of 10 pupils brought this action in a New York State court, in­
sisting that the prayer recitation in the public schools was contrary to the beliefs, religions, or religious practices of both them­
selves and their children. Among other­
wise, these things, these parents challenged the constitu­
tionality of both the State law autorizin­
g the school district to direct the use of prayer in public schools and the school dis­
10 N.Y. 2d 174, 176 N.E. 2d 579. The trial court’s opinion, which is reported at 18 Misc. 2d 663, 191 N.Y.S. 2d 453, had made it clear that the board of education must set up some sort of procedures to protect those who objected to reciting the prayer: “This is not to say that the Board of Education, and their children under the ‘free exercise’ clause do not mandate safeguards against such exercise.” It is not enough on this score, however, that regulations, such as were adopted by New York City’s Board of Education with its released time program, be adopted, mak­

ing clear that neither teachers nor any other school authority may comment on participa­
tion or nonparticipation in the exercise nor suggest or require that any posture or lan­
guage be used or dress be worn or be not used or worn. Nonparticipation may take the form either of remaining silent during the exercise, or if the parent or child so desires, being excluded entirely from the exercise. Such regulations must also make provision for those nonparticipants who are to be excluded from the prayer exercise. The exact provision to be made is a matter for decision by the board, rather than the court, within the framework of constitutional re­
quirements. The New York Board of Education’s regulations, which have been tested in the courts and administrative proceedings, would fall a provision that prayer participants pro­
cede to a common assembly while non­
participants are to be left alone. The Board did not non­
participants be permitted to arrive at school a few minutes late or to attend separate exercises in their classrooms which treats with equality both participants and nonparticipants.” 18 Misc. 2d, at 696, 191 N.Y.S. 2d, at 492-493. See the opinion of the Court on June 21, 1962, in the trial court, reported at 11 App. Div. 2d 340, 306 N.Y.S. 2d 183.

2 266 U.S. 938.

2 18 Misc. 2d, at 671-672, 191 N.Y.S. 2d, at 469-469.

1 and 3 Edward VI, c. 1, entitled “An act for Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm”; 3 and 4 Edward VI, c. 10, entitled “An act for the abolishing and putting away of divers Books and Images.”


1 The first major revision of the “Book of Common Prayer,” or providing for the reign of Edward VI. 5 & 6 Edward VI, c. 1. In 1553, Edward VI died and was suc­
ceded by his half-sister Mary. The rules of “Book of Common Prayer” entirely. 1 Mary, c. 2, and 5 Edward VI, c. 10, entitled “An act for the abolishing and putting away of divers Books and Images.” But upon the accession of Elizabeth in 1558, the so-called ‘reformed’ version of the “Book of Common Prayer” was again restored by the ascendancy of Elizabeth in 1558, and was firmly held under control during the reign of Elizabeth but, upon her death in 1603, a petition signed by more than 1,000 Puritan
the people struggled among themselves to impress their particular views upon the Government. In effect, they looked upon the British constitution as a book more suitable to their respective notions of how religious services should be conducted in order to advance the establishment and to advance their particular religious beliefs. Other groups, lacking the necessary political power to influence the conduct of religious affairs, decided to leave England and its established church and seek freedom in America from England’s governmentally ordained and supported religion.

It is an unfortunate fact of history that while the Puritans and other groups who most strenuously opposed the established Church of England found themselves sufficiently in control of colonial governments in this country to write their own prayers into law, they passed laws making their own religion the official religion of their respective colonies.6 Indeed, as late as the time of the Revolutionary War, there were established churches in at least 8 of the 13 former Colonies and established religions in at least 4 of the other 5.7

Shortly after the restoration in 1660 of Charles II, the Book was again reintroduced. The story of their struggle to modify the Book in the reign of Charles I is vividly summarized in Pullan, “History of the Book of Common Prayer,” (1902), pp. vii-xvi; Encyclopaedia Britannica 18, pp. 244-245.

For example, the Puritans twice attempted to modify the “Book of Common Prayer.” In 1619 an attempt was made to weaken the ceremonial which Elizabeth had approved. Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, was sent to Geneva to obtain a general modification of the Book. In his opposition to the distinctive tenets of Rome and of Geneva, he enjoyed the support of Charles and Laud. He helped the Scottish Church, who had made large concessions to the unconvincing habits of Presbyterianism, to draw up the Book of Common Prayer for Scotland. It contained a Connexion Office, resembling that of the Book of 1543, which was used in 1567, and met with a bitter and barbarous opposition. The vigor of the Scottish Protestant leaders to the English sympathizers. Laud and Charles were executed. Episcopal was abolished, the use of the “Book of Common Prayer” was prohibited.


The Church of England was the established church of at least five colonies: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Carolina and Georgia. There seems to be some controversy as to whether that church was officially ordained and supported in New Jersey New York but there is no doubt that it received substantial support from those States. See also, “Religious Liberty in America” (1902), p. 338, 408. In Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut, the Congregationalist Church was officially established against governmental establishment of religion, as reinforced by the provisions of the First Amendment. Government, by State or Federal, is without power to prescribe by law any particular form of religious worship which is to be made the official prayer in carrying on any program of governmentally sponsored religious activity.

There can be no doubt that New York’s State and religious programs were for religious beliefs embodied in the regents’ prayer. The respondents’ argument to the contrary, which was made in the complaint that the regents’ prayer is “non-denominational” and the fact that the program’s establishment clause, unlike the free exercise clause, does not depend upon any showing of a law directly violating the tenets of any religion, was violated by the enactment of laws which establish or foster or make it a duty to conform to prevailing officially approved religious beliefs. The purpose underlying the establishment clause goes much further than that. Its first and most immediate purpose rested on the belief that a union of government and religion tends to destroy government and to degrade religion. A history of governmental exaltation of religion is illustrated by the fact that Madison, in his Federalist papers, showed that whenever government had allied itself with one particular religious denomination, the result had been that it had incurred the hatred, disrespect and even contempt of those who held the opposite belief. He showed that many people had lost their respect for any religion that had relied upon the support of government to spread its faith.12

The establishment clause thus

[1] Attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obvious to so great a proportion of citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of society. If it is difficult to execute any law which is applicable generally to the civic community, what must be the case where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? and what means do the effect of the spirit of impotence in the Government, on its general authority?" Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, I Writings of Madison," 183, 100.

[2] "It is moreover to weaken in those who profess the Established Church, its own spirit and purity, its innate excellence, and the patronage of its author; and to foster in those who still retain it treasonable and unchristian notions of its fallacies, to trust it to its own merits. * * * [E]xperience witnesseth that the thing which maintains the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost 15 centuries, has the legal es-
stands as an expression of principle on the part of the founders of our Constitution that religion is too personal, too sacred, too holy, to be forced or intruded upon by the civil magistrate. Another purpose of the establishment clause rested upon an awareness of the historical fact that governmental attempts to enforce religious persecutions go hand in hand. The founders knew that only a few years after the "Book of Common Prayer" had been accepted as the form of religious services in the established Church of England, an act of uniformity was passed to compel all Englishmen to attend those services and to make it a criminal offense to refuse to attend. This and other like laws which was consistently flouted by dissenting religious groups in England and which contributed to widespread persecutions of people like John Bunyan who persisted in holding "unlawful (religious) meetings." The great disturbance and disruption of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and superstition, in the laity; bigotry and persecution. Enquiry of the teachers of Christianity for the age always interested in its prosperity and lustre, those of every sect, point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy.

"Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, II Writings of Madison" (1787).

"[T]he proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy, which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed by every form of religion, provided a huder to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a magnificent bill can be more generous? Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. * * * Distant as it may be, in its present form, from the inquisition it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other the last in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer under this cruel scourge in foreign regions, must view the bill as a beacon on our coast, where he is come to dwell and see liberty and philanthropy in their due extent may offer a more certain repose from his troubles." 3

2 and 8 Edward VI, c. 1, entitled "An act for the uniformity of service and administration of the Church of England, agreeable to the word of God and the primitive church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in quiet conversation." This act was repealed during the reign of Mary but revived upon the accession of Elizabeth. See note 7 supra. The reasons which led to the enactment of this statute were set out in its preamble: "Where there hath been a very godly order set forth by the authority of Parliament, for common prayer and administration of sacraments to be used in the mother tongue within the Church of England, agreeable to the word of God and the primitive church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in quiet conversation. This is a very profitable to the estate of this realm, upon the which the mercy, favor, and blessing of God, the Glorious Father and the Redeemer of our souls, is plenteously poured as by common prayers, due using of the sacraments, and often preaching, especially with the good officers of the end of the hearers: (1) And yet this notwithstanding, a great number of people in divers parts of this realm, following their own affection and interest, either with their own private, or with false, unscriptural or heretical, or otherwise, where common prayer, administration of the sacraments, and preaching of the word are used upon Sundays and other days ordained to be holy days."
In New York the teacher who leads in prayer is on the public payroll; and the time she takes seems minuscule as compared with the salaries and benefits she gets from the State legislature and Congress for chaplains to conduct prayers in the legislative halls. Only a bare fraction of the teacher's time is given to prayer. For some of the petitioners in the present case profess no religion.

In the absence of a legal occasion for prayer, recognizes the existence of a Supreme Being. Since 1864 it has contained the words 'in God we trust.' The motto on all currency and coins was made by the act of May 18, 1908, 35 Stat. 364. See H. Rep. No. 1108, 60th Cong., 1st sess.; 42 Con- gress, 2d sess., p. 2. The official recognition of this motto on all currency and coins was directed by the act of July 11, 1955, 69 Stat. 289. See S. Rept. No. 637, 84th Cong., 1st sess. Moreover, by the joint resolution of July 9, 1956, our national motto was declared to be "in God We Trust." 70 Stat. 732. In reporting the joint resolution, the Senate Judiciary Committee stated:

"Further official recognition of this motto was given by the adoption of the Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem. One stanza of our national anthem reads:

"Oh, thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved home and the war's desolation:
Blest with victory and peace may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must when our cause it is just.
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

"In view of these words in our national anthem it is clear that the motto of the Star-Spangled Banner is a strong claim as our national motto." S. Rep. No. 2703, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2.

Yet at times the setting of the question gives the impression of the teacher or the school in general being required to do. The point for decision is whether the Government can constitutionally finance a religious exercise. Our system of public education in the United States is presently honeycombed with such financing. Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes. First, a word as to what this case does not involve.

Plainly, our Bill of Rights would not permit a State or the Federal Government to adopt an official prayer and penalize anyone who would not utter it. This, however, is not the case. There is no element of compulsion or coerced prayer in New York's regulation requiring that public schools begin each day with a prayer. The prayer is said aloud in the presence of a teacher, who either leads the recitation or selects a student to do so. No student, however, is compelled to take part. The respondents have adopted a regulation which provides that a teacher or any other school official shall not require a student to stand, to recite or not recite, without permission of the student. The prayer is of a character that does not involve or require participation of the student. It is not that case, for there is no supplication, a prayer in which we, the judges, are free to join, but which we need not recite. Students need not recite the New York prayer.

What New York does on the opening of its public schools is what we do when we open court. Our marshals have from the beginning used the phrase "God save the United States and this honorable court." The words are "a strong claim as our national motto." S. Rep. No. 2703, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2. And see S. Rept. No. 1287, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 3. And see S. Rept. No. 1108, 60th Cong., 1st sess.; 42 Con- gress, 2d sess., p. 2. The official recognition of this motto on all currency and coins was directed by the act of July 11, 1955, 69 Stat. 289. See S. Rept. No. 637, 84th Cong., 1st sess. Moreover, by the joint resolution of July 9, 1956, our national motto was declared to be "in God We Trust." 70 Stat. 732. In reporting the joint resolution, the Senate Judiciary Committee stated:

"Further official recognition of this motto was given by the adoption of the Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem. One stanza of our national anthem reads:

"Oh, thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved home and the war's desolation:
Blest with victory and peace may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must when our cause it is just.
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

"In view of these words in our national anthem it is clear that the motto of the Star-Spangled Banner is a strong claim as our national motto." S. Rep. No. 2703, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2.

In the absence of a legal occasion for prayer, recognizes the existence of a Supreme Being. Since 1864 it has contained the words 'in God we trust.' The motto on all currency and coins was made by the act of May 18, 1908, 35 Stat. 364. See H. Rep. No. 1108, 60th Cong., 1st sess.; 42 Con- gress, 2d sess., p. 2. The official recognition of this motto on all currency and coins was directed by the act of July 11, 1955, 69 Stat. 289. See S. Rept. No. 637, 84th Cong., 1st sess. Moreover, by the joint resolution of July 9, 1956, our national motto was declared to be "in God We Trust." 70 Stat. 732. In reporting the joint resolution, the Senate Judiciary Committee stated:

"Further official recognition of this motto was given by the adoption of the Star-Spangled Banner as our national anthem. One stanza of our national anthem reads:

"Oh, thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved home and the war's desolation:
Blest with victory and peace may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must when our cause it is just.
And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

"In view of these words in our national anthem it is clear that the motto of the Star-Spangled Banner is a strong claim as our national motto." S. Rep. No. 2703, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2.
to reciting this short 22-word prayer, about the same amount of time that our Marshal spends announcing the opening of our sessions and offering a prayer for this Court. You will recall that the prayer is recited, and we are asked how briefly the prayer is said, for in each of the instances given the person praying is not likely to be on the public platform performing a religious exercise in a governmental institution. It is said that the element of worship is so integral a part of this prayer that if it is true, it is also true of the prayer with which this Court is concerned. President John Marshall presided over Congress. Few adults, let alone children, would leave our courtroom or the Senate or the House while those prayers are being given. Every audience is in a sense a "captive" audience.

At the same time I cannot say that to authorize this prayer is to establish a religion in the strict historical meaning of those words. A religion is not established in the usual sense merely by letting those who choose to do so say the prayer that the public school teacher leads. Yet once Government finances it is to be done

The first amendment states in dissent what I think is durable first amendment philosophy:

"The reasons underlying the amendment's policy have not vanished with time or diminished in force. Now as when it was adopted, it is to secure the freedoms of conscience and worship. And the reason is not double. It is that the church and religion shall live both within and upon that freedom. There cannot be freedom of religion, unless there is a separation of Church and State. That separation is by the church or its agencies in the state's domain or dependency on its largesse. Madison's Remonstrance, paragraphs 6, 8. The great condition of religious liberty is that it be maintained free from sustains, as also from other interferences, by the state. For when it comes to rest upon that secular foundation it vanishes with the rest. Id., paragraphs 7, 8. It is devoted to payment of religious costs, educational or other, brings the quest for more. It brings to the core a ward the larger share or for any. Here one by one numbers alone will benefit most, there another. That is precisely the history of societies which have had an established religion and dissident groups. Id., paragraphs 6, 11. It is the very thing Jefferson and Madison expected and sought to guard against, whether in its blurt or in its more screened forms. Ibid. The end of such stripe cannot be the society's or the church's liberty. The dominating group will achieve the dominant benefit; or all will embroil the state in discriminations. Id., paragraph 11."

What New York does with this prayer is a break with that tradition. I therefore join the Court in reversing the judgment below.

[Supreme Court of the United States—No. 468, October term, 1961]

Steven I. Engel et al., Petitioners, v. William J. Vitale, Jr., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

June 25, 1962

Mr. Justice Stewart, dissenting.

A local school board in New York has provided this prayer plan so that all may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each schoolday, acknowledging their dependence upon God and asking His blessing upon the students, their teachers, and their country. The Court today decides that in permitting this brief prayer, the New York school board has violated the Constitution of the United States. I think this decision is wrong.

The Court has said it, that New York has interfered with the free exercise of anybody's religion. For the State courts have ruled, over the objections of the school board, that to recite the prayer the prayer must be entirely free of any compulsion to do so, including any compulsion of the State. Of course there is no compulsion to attend school in New York;

Mr. Justice Rutledge stated in dissent what I think is durable first amendment philosophy:

"The reasons underlying the amendment's policy have not vanished with time or diminished in force. Now as when it was adopted, it is to secure the freedoms of conscience and worship. And the reason is not double. It is that the church and religion shall live both within and upon that freedom. There cannot be freedom of religion, unless there is a separation of Church and State. That separation is not by the church or its agencies in the state's domain or dependency on its largesse. Madison's Remonstrance, paragraphs 6, 8. The great condition of religious liberty is that it be maintained free from sustains, as also from other interferences, by the state. For when it comes to rest upon that secular foundation it vanishes with the rest. Id., paragraphs 7, 8. It is devoted to payment of religious costs, educational or other, brings the quest for more. It brings to the core a ward the larger share or for any. Here one by one numbers alone will benefit most, there another. That is precisely the history of societies which have had an established religion and dissident groups. Id., paragraphs 6, 11. It is the very thing Jefferson and Madison expected and sought to guard against, whether in its blurt or in its more screened forms. Ibid. The end of such stripe cannot be the society's or the church's liberty. The dominating group will achieve the dominant benefit; or all will embroil the state in discriminations. Id., paragraph 11."

What New York does with this prayer is a break with that tradition. I therefore join the Court in reversing the judgment below.

[Supreme Court of the United States—No. 468, October term, 1961]

Steven I. Engel et al., Petitioners, v. William J. Vitale, Jr., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

June 25, 1962

Mr. Justice Stewart, dissenting.

A local school board in New York has provided this prayer plan so that all may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each schoolday, acknowledging their dependence upon God and asking His blessing upon the students, their teachers, and their country. The Court today decides that in permitting this brief prayer, the New York school board has violated the Constitution of the United States. I think this decision is wrong.

The Court has said it, that New York has interfered with the free exercise of anybody's religion. For the State courts have ruled, over the objections of the school board, that to recite the prayer the prayer must be entirely free of any compulsion to do so, including any compulsion of the State. Of course there is no compulsion to attend school in New York;
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The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Supreme Court's decision outlawing prayer in the public schools has caused a wave of controversy in our country.

I never have and never will join in the battle for impeachment or worse of members of the Supreme Court because of a ruling with which I might not agree.

I also believe that the Supreme Court should remain aloof from temporary gusts of public passion.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe further that the Nation's highest Court should not engage in tortured interpretations of constitutional language. In the present instance, there seems to be such an interpretation.

I cannot quarrel with the position that our Constitution calls for separation of church and state. But, did the framers of our Constitution have in mind that civil authority should be exclude God? And what would be our reaction if there opened prayers in the House and Senate and their adjournments? I doubt it.

"Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's" surely does not mean that government, in all its forms, must be atheistic or mechanistic.

A short while ago, Mr. Speaker, we in this Chamber stood respectfully while our Chaplain opened this session with prayer.

When we interpret the word "state" are we to say that the Congress of the United States, composed of the elected representatives of 180 million people of all races and creeds, is less state than a public school classroom.

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that several Members of this House do not believe in God. How would the Supreme Court rule if one or more of those Members brought a suit challenging the constitutionality of the custom of opening prayers in the House and Senate?

Would we then be our way the Constitution if that Member or those Members were upheld in the High Court?

However, the Supreme Court has ruled and its ruling must be obeyed, at least until the Constitution is amended or, as has happened before, another group of Justices hands down a different decision.

Should we, then, seek a constitutional amendment specifically authorizing non-denominational prayers in our public schools? I am convinced that such an amendment would be approved by an overwhelming margin.

The next question is, Should such an amendment be proposed by Congress?

The Court has now held that the people who drafted that section of the Constitution under which the Court acted meant to exclude prayers from our schools.

Let us assume, again, for the sake of argument, that the Court was wrong. Can it then be argued that this Nation is bound forever by the opinions, even though expressed in the Constitution, of the people of another generation?

Our Constitution must be obeyed. That is academic. But, the same Constitution gives us, the people, an equal right to change any provision of the Constitution which violates our deep convictions.

I urge that solution upon my colleagues.

DEVELOPING A BROAD ANTIDELINQUENCY PROGRAM IN CHICAGO

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Chairman of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, announced a $292,000 planning grant to develop an anti­delinquency program in Chicago.

The Chicago Commission on Youth Welfare is receiving the grant, which will allow over 100 persons to work for a 6-month period to develop a broad anti­delinquency program.

The money will be used to develop a 18-month planning program for which a professional staff will coordinate Chicago youth programs and develop new programs to prevent and control delinquency.

Chicago becomes the seventh recipient of planning grants made available under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act of 1961. It will enable a professional staff of about 10 persons, assisted by part-time consultants, to analyze Chicago's youth problems and develop new programs to cope with them. It will begin by concentrating in the high problem neighborhoods, and the experienced gained will be expanded to other problem areas.

Chicago is working to reduce the problem of juvenile delinquency and youth crimes. Community sponsorship of programs, to assist the unfortunate young people, began many years ago. In the years ago, the Juvenile Welfare Board mobilized its vast resources in a total campaign to eliminate lawlessness. Its future holds great promise for health, prosperity, and congeniality.

But as in any large metropolitan area, there exists a problem of developing the youth to use their energies for useful purposes, and thereby gain proper recognition of their achievements. And, the youth, citizen will walk the streets unafraid and gang fights will have given way to sports events.

I am pleased to recognize Mayor Daley's coordinated program to eradicate juvenile delinquency in our great city of Chicago. And I am confident that our citizens will eliminate this problem in the same manner as they eliminated the problem of the twenties.

MILITARY SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have requested 60 minutes today to discuss a subject which I consider to be of great importance to our national defense and to our national economy. I therefore consider it to be of great importance to every citizen and certainly to those taxpayers in Missory.

I am speaking as a member of the Ways and Means Committee which has
a vital interest in this subject and also as a member of the Joint Economic Committee and as a former member of the Government Operations Committee. However, my subject is also of interest to members of Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and indeed every other committee of the House.

I am addressing myself to the necessary organization and operation of the supply and service activities of the Department of Defense.

Why is this subject important and timely? I will try to tell you as briefly and as simply as possible.

The Federal debt is around $300 billion.

The Federal budget for the current year is estimated at $92.5 billion; 55.9 percent of this is for national defense. In terms of dollars $52.7 billion is for national defense. Most of this amount is for major procurement, supply, and so forth, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National defense, 1963 expenditures</td>
<td>$32,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense, military</td>
<td>$15,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of aircraft, missiles, ships, and other military equipment</td>
<td>$13,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular, Reserve, and retired military personnel</td>
<td>$11,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millitary personnel</td>
<td>$11,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of equipment and facilities</td>
<td>$6,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, development, test, and evaluation of military equipment</td>
<td>$1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military construction and other</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military assistance</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomic energy</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense-related service</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total budget</td>
<td>$6,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTIAL LIST OF SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES IN THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

It has been estimated that about 60 percent of the military expenditures, annually, is for supply and service activities, such as procurement; warehousing; distribution; cataloging; surplus disposal; financial management; budgeting; photography; post management and housekeeping; mapping, aerial; mapping, other: disbursing; inspection; meat, other, accounting; medical and hospital services; transportation—land, sea, and air; intelligence; legal; public relations; recruiting, induction, and reenlistment; recruiting; police; training; liaison activities; communications; construction and real estate; engineering; weather; military justice; publications; renegotiation; and the personnel management; training; recordkeeping; research and development; printing; statistical reporting, reports control—hearing before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, June 12, 1961, "Prograse Made by the Department of Defense in Reducing the Impact of Military Procurement in the Economy," page 508.

Now, in addition to the annual expenditures for these activities, there is in being $158.5 billion investments in inventories, structures, buildings, and so forth—Committee on Government Operations, 87th Congress, 1st session, "Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report (Civilian and Military) of the U.S. Government Covering Its Properties Located in the United States, in the Territories, and Overseas as of June 30, 1961," page 64.

TABLE 1—Summary of property holdings by military department and type and class as of June 30, 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and class of property</th>
<th>Department of Defense</th>
<th>Army 1</th>
<th>Navy (including Marine Corps)</th>
<th>Air Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All types, total</td>
<td>$158,508</td>
<td>$38,824</td>
<td>$38,446</td>
<td>$36,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real property inventory, total</td>
<td>3,400,800</td>
<td>10,593</td>
<td>9,704</td>
<td>14,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument in progress (cost of work in place), total</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal property inventory, total</td>
<td>$122,036</td>
<td>26,253</td>
<td>46,978</td>
<td>45,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and supplies in supply system</td>
<td>40,380</td>
<td>15,947</td>
<td>12,446</td>
<td>12,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property other than supply system inventories</td>
<td>$81,194</td>
<td>12,416</td>
<td>35,622</td>
<td>30,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons and other military equipment in use</td>
<td>67,561</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>30,144</td>
<td>28,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant equipment</td>
<td>8,190</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>3,271</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess, military and foreign excess property inventories</td>
<td>5,314</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excludes from the totals are properties of the Civil Works Division, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, as shown in footnote 1, Table 1.
2 Includes $6,873,000 personal property of the Office, Secretary of Defense.
3 Includes $1,476,800,000 personal property provided Air Force contractors from other than the Air Force Supply System inventories.
4 Consists of materials, supplies, and work in process.

And to manage all these functions, activities, we had in April 1962 some 1,092,712 civilian personnel. By comparison there were 1,391,240 civilian personnel in the balance of the entire executive branch—see Congressional Record, June 7, 1963, page 14,726.

I am sure that no one will dispute the fact that the operation of the Department of Defense presents the greatest challenge to scientific management that ever existed. But the problem is more than magnitude; it is also one of eroded tradition, rampant bureaucracy, entrenched economic pork barrel with all its political overtones, and the complicated industrial-military wedding of mutual interests.

QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT

What has been the quality of management in the Department of Defense with respect to these supply and service activities? For many administrations, not merely years, they have been disgraceful, in light of the advancements in our society in the fields of accounting; supply management, and procurement. Indeed the governmental sector, in spite of recent improvement, is still decades behind the more enlightened procedures developed in the private sector. Unbiased authorities have stated that the degree of waste in these activities was almost critical during World War II.

Reports and studies almost without limit have pointed to the overlapages and waste in them. The two Hoover commissions, the Bonner, Richman, and others, joint economic, preparedness, and other congressional committees; reports and studies by task forces, boards, commissions, foundations have been the same.

The GAO during the past 3 years has issued about 500 reports, most of them dealing with military waste in common supply and service activities.

The billions upon billions of military surplus property declarations during the past 10 years bespeak of this waste. Granted that most of the surplus is scrap or salvage material, the fact still remains that billions have been usable items and much of it usable in the military itself if needs and inventories from all the departments, services, bureaus, corps, and so forth, were matched.

This is, of course, impossible when the departments and units thereof are separately administered as was the case from 1949 to 1953.

From the standpoint of scientific management, it is well known that first we should identify and isolate a manageable bite. This should be studied, analyzed, and solved without impairment to mission effectiveness.

For this reason, students of military supply and service activities have isolated them from major combatant missions or functions, have shown their great scope, and their commonness to more than one service, or bureau, or corps as the logical place to improve management.

However, entrenched personnel motivated by their personal vested interest in each provincial group fears that any step toward integration, standardization, unification even in the most minor and duplicative things will lead to further unification and eventually there will be loss of identity to some unit which has enjoyed independent or semi-independent status.

Now this did not matter too much in the days when we had separate land and sea wars and battles. But with the development of modern weapons, the land and sea and air have been fused into a common battle area—and may I add space to land, sea, and air.

Secretary McNamara recognized this merging of missions in a recent state-
ment when he said "separate ground, sea, and air warfare is gone forever."

Many other military leaders have made the same statement and surely we may accept this as a truism.

Yet, while every schoolboy knows that a football team must act as a unit and everyone cannot be the quarterback, it is impossible to sell this idea to many of the conscious members of the military academies and though they spend much time playing football, they do not want to apply the lessons they have learned to the greatest game of all—the game of survival.

I think we must now recognize that if we have unified commands and missions we must have unified support for them insofar as common supplies and services are concerned.

Not only does each service not need its own coffee roasting plants, clothing factories, subsistence, medical, hardware, and so forth, procurement, depot, and distribution functions, auditing, accounting, recruiting, engineering, weather—see list previously referred to, from page 58, June 12, 1961, Joint Economic Committee hearings—but we can no longer afford all this duplication and resultant waste.

**What has Congress done about this?**

A good question is, Why has Congress not done something about this situation?

I am frank to say that the congressional effort has been relatively weak, uniformed, intermittent, uncoordinated, conflicting, disappointing, and timid.

I would like to refer to a list, however, of some of the efforts that have been taken during the past 45 years—pages 63 to 72, October 1960, "Report of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement to the Joint Economic Committee, Economic Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply."

**PART III—CONGRESSIONAL EFFORTS TO IMPROVE SUPPLY MANAGEMENT**

*The Department of Defense, Budget, Economy, Action of the Joint Economic Committee.*

O'Mahoney amendment to Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1955.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953.

General Eisenhower's Baltimore speech.


*Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.*

Mc Cormack-Curtis amendment.

Intent of McCormack-Curtis amendment. Lag under new system.

**MCCORMACK-CURTIS AMENDMENT**

A I mentioned previously—page 64, Joint Economic Committee hearing, report of October 1960—the O'Mahoney amendment of 1952 contemplated an integrated supply system for the Department of Defense. The Senate report made this abundantly clear.

But despite this enactment, the National Security Act of 1947, as amended in 11 Senate hearings—provided that there should be "three departments separately administered."

The partisans of this philosophy maintained that a department could not be separately administered if it could not have control over every last thing it needed to operate the department. All efforts toward consolidation, standardization or unification ran into this barrier.

It took about $15 billion and $200 million to make a usable military supply catalog because this was viewed as a step toward consolidation of overlapping specifications, stores, and distribution systems. President Roosevelt ordered a catalog developed in 1945.

By 1958 many officials in the Pentagon complained that efforts to obtain economy, efficiency in supply and service activities ran into this "separately administered" provision of the National Security Act. They also said that they could not provide for the existence of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. For the purposes of this paragraph, any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate is a "major combatant function" within the meaning of paragraph (1) hereof.

First of all, this amendment contemplates that the Secretary of Defense will make a find and determination with respect to supply and service activities and when he finds that effectiveness, economy, or efficiency will be promoted he shall determine what type of organization is best suited for the function and where it will operate.

As you so well pointed out on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1958, when the amendment was adopted:

Mr. Speaker, to my mind Secretary McNamara has proved to be an excellent Secretary of Defense. He has shown the capacity to understand complex problems and to do something about them. As provided by the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958 he has identified common supply as a fruitful source of investigation. He requested that a study be made of alternative ways of organizing to uniform the function so as to increase effectiveness, economy, and efficiency. He requested the departments to make their recommendations—which true to form were all different—and then be made his decision or determination as he is required to do under the law.

He determined that common supply lends itself to common management and on October 1, 1961, set up the Defense Supply Agency. Mr. McNamara, Mr. Andrew T. McNamara, an excellent logistician and former Quartermaster General of the Army to be the first Director.
In a short space of time some 3,000 spaces have been or will be eliminated through fiscal 1963.

The fiscal 1963 budget has been reduced $27 million below the combined estimates submitted by the departments to the Office of Secretary of Defense for fiscal 1963.


The fact that Secretary McNamara is insisting that the total organization after a consolidation is to be smaller than the present one is a strong argument against the contention that another layer is being piled on top of the existing organizations.

Secretary McNamara also has stated publicly that he believes that the Defense Supply Agency will be able to make savings of hundreds of millions of dollars. I think this is a conservative statement.

When one considers the scope of the Department of Defense as I have partly outlined above and the irreducible degree of duplication and waste in the loose federation of agencies, there are literally "acres of diamonds" to be gathered by a good organization and staff. A start only has been made but it is a start and must continue.

According to the Senate Report No. 1578 of June 8, 1962, the Department of Defense supply systems inventories of $40.8 billion were in long supply by 1961, for the first time in 20 years.

Recent statistics from the Department of Defense also show these stores to be greatly imbalanced—many in very long supply and others in short supply. Congressman Haxxer's committee has also shown that though some progress has been made in getting competitive bids that "only 13 percent of purchasing is now done by sealed competitive bidding, and the rest not enough."

I heartily agree that only a start has been made in many fields but there has been a hopeful start which must not be snuffed out as has been the case several times in the past.

REACTION TO SECRETARY McNAMARA

In view of the vast waste in common supply and service activities in the Department of Defense over the years, Secretary McNamara, Secretary Gilpatric, Assistant Secretary, and General McNamara, Director of the Defense Supply Agency, brought a refreshing and hopeful atmosphere to these important activities. They actually started to do what they are supposed to do.

It has been a shock to me, therefore, that a move seems to be under way to emasculate the Military Construction Supply Agency before it is off the ground.

The basis for this statement stems from the record of the military construction authorization and maintenance hearings, fiscal year 1963.

The Defense Department had requested funds for facilities for the management of certain centralized agencies. The funds were made available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense rather than through the separate Department as heretofore.

At this point it should be noted that Congressman Haxxer, who has made some excellent contributions to better management of the Department of Defense, the last of which was a bill which passed this body by a vote of 362 to 0, to require more competitive bids in military procurement, expressed the thought that the establishment of the Defense Supply Agency would prove to be a "monument to Secretary McNamara's administrative genius." He also said hearings before Committee on Armed Services, 87th Congress, second session, military construction authorization, fiscal year 1963, March 1962, page 4528.

"The Chairman. When was the economy brought about?"

"Mr. HUBERT. Well, the economy, Mr. Chairman—I am giving my figures right from the Secretary's table. Mr. McNamara, who got $3,000 comes from General McNamara and the Secretary himself. Now these agencies will be consolidated under one general director, General McNamara. There is where your savings and economies will occur. This will be a centralized purchasing agency."

I tell you it is the greatest step forward that has been taken in Defense in years and years. And the Secretary is to be complimented on it.

"The Chairman. And this is in response to the amendment or the provision we put in the law for centralized purchasing."

"Mr. HAXXER. Yes, sir."

"The Chairman. That is all right."

"Captain CHRISTENSEN. We are all in agreement with the Secretary. We can eliminate duplication and we can do that in a great many other respects."

"Later in the hearings there seems to have been a change of heart as we have these statements from the record—pages 4540 to 4543:"

"The Chairman. Thank you very much.

Now members of the committee, this whole section, section 401, relates to authorization for the construction of various items for the Department of Defense.

Now the committee yesterday, and in the previous discussion of the Department of Defense general authorization, specifically this floor field, that is construction—the consensus of opinion was that these line items should be charged against each one of the departments, based on the occupancy of the department at the area that is going to be used, and where the Defense agencies have been established and are in existence. Of course, the Secretary of Defense, under his broad powers, has the authority to use Defense agencies. We do not control that. We have already given him that authority."

"Mr. HARBUT. Let's take it back. Mr. Chairman."

"Mr. HARDY. That is all right. Let's do that."

"The Chairman. Now, we have no control over that. The law is already passed. And the Secretary has the authority to use, as he sees fit.

Of course, Congress can repeal any law, if it goes through and is signed. It may take more trips than one to create that change. Nevertheless, we could take those trips.

Now, what we are confronted with here today is that one trip that can be wise at a later date to explore that field."

"But in this bill it only relates to construction."

"I hope we will strike out, entirely, section 401 and put each one of these items in the department for construction and maintenance to the department where this is located."

"Mr. SLATKINER. Yes."

"The Chairman. Now the question of maintenance comes up."

"The military department will have to assume the maintenance of the facility. And the Department of Defense will merely house its agency there. But the whole area will be under the military department—the physical plant. And all this relates to the physical plant—will be under the individual department where it is established."

I am assured yesterday that the amendments be prepared so when we, later on, get down to it, we can put each one of these line items under the military department.

"Now, I think that is wise."

"It may be wise later on to go in and see whether we were going to be wise to permit these Defense agencies to be set up.

But the Secretary is clearly within the law in establishing Defense agencies.

Now, the only question that occurred yesterday was: Is there no limitation in the statute as to the number of Defense agencies that can be created? The number of agencies created is going to be set by the Congress. We can only write the law. It will be up to the Congress to make laws for the future."

"Mr. HARDY. That is right.

"Mr. BATES. Of course; exactly what they are going to do. You will wind up with one department."

"This was never fully evaluated when this was written before the committee.

"The Chairman. That is right.

"Mr. BATES. They had the authority to consolidate functions. What I had in mind, in my own mind, instead of this kind of thing, was the assignment of a single manager concept."

"The Chairman. That is right.

"Mr. BATES. Not the operating of an agency by the Department per se."

"The Chairman. I believe with men on this committee, we can make a very, very fine study. We don't have to do it immediately.

I would like to set up a subcommittee, headed by Mr. Hardy and Mr. Bates and consisting of that other member of this committee.

"Mr. BATES. I want five others."

"The Chairman. We will look into this question as to the continuation of a policy to create Defense agencies."

Because if I know the record, I could just say I will starve this one or that one to death by just creating agencies.

"Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman."
Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get in that kind of a position. Let's approach it in that manner.

And I would like to voice Mr. Hardy and Mr. Bennett to subcommittee, to look into this. And we will set up an investigation—not an investigation, but a study of this question, the difficulty of the Defense agencies being built up just as fast as mushrooms come out of the ground.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chairman, you delegate to this subcommittee full authority to proceed with that study without being hampered?

Mr. BATES: Yes, sir.

That is right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would like very much for you to make those recommendations and very= 
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This timely amendment also includes any

The substance of the amendment is that when the Senate determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. It is significant to note that any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered major combat function within the meaning of sub-

section 9 of the committee bill.

The amendment permits flexibility so that the Secretary of Defense may provide the best possible type of each service function depending upon its nature.

Unfortunately, neither the President's bill, H.R. 11958, nor the Vinson bill, H.R. 12541, make any reference to supply and service activities though these functions constitute approximately two-thirds of the military establishment in the total budget and duplication where billions of dollars can be saved, each year, at the same time producing waste and inefficiency, by making it more efficient.
McElroy before the House Armed Services Committee on page 5977 of the committee hearings where Secretary McElroy states this:

"The National Security Act gives the Secretary direction, authority and control over the military departments as a means of reducing needless argument and misunderstanding which is the difficulty of administering the Department."

And, there is no question, as the 14-page letter of documentation of history indicates, of the military departments as a means of reducing needlessness and misunderstanding which is the difficulty of administering the Department.

I submit that the language of the committee bill is illusory. We must eliminate what Secretary McElroy said was one of the essentials of organization, the law. To accomplish this purpose the language in the bill must be definite. Congressional intent must be clearly defined by a language thoroughly in accordance with the law. The language in the O'Mahony amendment was definite—and even there the thrust of our argument is actuality of use of language. I submit the services will argue about any language. The committee certainly has given them ample opportunity to argue about any language in the committee bill, because on page 2 it is provided that each military department shall be separately organized under its own secretary and shall function under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense through the respective secretaries of such departments.

This statement permits the services to use the same argument that they used in regard to the language of "separately administered" to try to get around what was fully the intent of the O'Mahony act in 1946, and which is expressed in the O'Mahony amendment, and expressed time and time again in debate on the floor to try to bring about this unification.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I think it would be well to set out my full statement of June 11, 1958. In this statement is a 14-page letter I addressed to the Secretary of Defense, which puts this matter in a proper historical context. I ask unanimous consent to include this remarks at that point.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Report No. 1578 on the Department of Defense appropriations bill, 1963, has some timely and important statements.

On pages 7 and 8 we have these quotes:

"MANAGEMENT OF INVENTORIES

During the course of testimony, it was brought out that supply system inventories for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1961 totaled $40,800 million and that this included $12,900 million in long supply, which is that portion of the supply system inventory consisting of uncommitted stocks and mobilization reserve stocks and consists of stocks held for economic reten-

The Air Force, $6,789 million. At the request of the subcommittee, the General Accounting Office made a special investigation as to the nature of the items in long supply and the reasons why the Department of Defense has accumulated this inventory of items in long supply. The report of the Comptroller General found the committee is included in the
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billion; the Marine Corps, $4,789 million; and

of the Department of Defense has accumulated items in such magnitude, the Comptroller General finds that the Defense Department officials, the accumulation of items in long supply can be attributed in large part to the residual and emergency and the rapid obsolescence of equipment with accompanying dwindling of demand for related parts. However, the Comptroller General goes on to point out that two of the major categories involved are (1) the failure to order requirements and procurements which we included. In regard to an explanation of why the Department of Defense has accumulated items in long supply, there is a costly duplication of recommendations made in the past concerning the need for more coordination of electronics supply management authority, or an

The Comptroller General has indicated that, partly as a result of the Department of Defense having an inventory as of June 30, 1961, it would result in more effective use of procurement.

It should be noted that the Comptroller General of the United States has made recommendations to the Department of Defense concerning the establishment of Defense Supply Agency.

Accordingly, I have obtained from the General Accounting Office recommendations that have been made from time to time concerning the establishment of Defense Supply Agency and the more consolidated Department of Defense supply management and related statements—report to the Congress of the United States, "Review of Supply Management in the Department of Defense Within the Department of Defense"; letter of Comptroller General to the Speaker of the House of Representative, October 12, 1961;

Our review disclosed that inadequate coordination of electronics supply management activities among and between the military departments is resulting in significant additional costs and effect and is adversely affecting the efficiency and effectiveness of supply operations. Unnecessary increases in the number of supply centers, support centers are resulting from the failure to consider and obtain needed items available and in long supply as of current and recent needs; excessive costs and inefficient supply support are resulting from the failure to coordinate the various repair and overhaul activities of each service; and there is a costly duplication and overlap of electronics supply management functions and organizations.

Review of Interagency Utilization of Aeronautical Equipment and Supplies Within the Department of Defense, letter of Comptroller General to Speaker Rayburn, September 15, 1961:

Our review disclosed that, despite improvements made in the service support program, there has been little short of achieving the fullest practicable utilization of available Department of Defense materiel. The failure of the individual military departments to utilize supplies already available within Department of Defense has made it necessary to order additional supplies in unnecessary procurement and repair of material at significant additional cost to the Government.

The results of this and several of our previous reviews of supply management in the military departments indicate that the inter-service supply support program, as presently constituted, does not achieve effective inter-service utilization of Department of Defense materiel. We believe that increased effectiveness in the management of common supplies and equipment might be attained by revising existing inter-service coordination and agreements. Accordingly, we proposed to the Secretary of Defense that consideration be given to merging the common supply activities of the individual military departments into a single organization within the Department of Defense. This organization should be given the responsibility and authority to centrally control all facets of supply management.

Review of Management of Idle Production Equipment Within the Department of Defense, letter of Comptroller General to Speaker Rayburn, June 30, 1961:

The Department of Defense has taken certain measures to improve the management and utilization of available production equipment; however, we believe that the centralized control of the functions and responsibilities presently being performed by many relatively independent Department of Defense organizations and activities would result in a more effective system of physical control of the non-materiel. Accordingly, we proposed to the Secretary of Defense that present policies, procedures, organizations, and functions be reviewed and evaluated to determine in what manner and means whereby centralization under his direction and control could be accomplished.

Review of material standardization activities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense, Philadelphia, Pa., letter of Comptroller General to the Speaker, October 12, 1961:

We believe that a significant number of the 1,600 line items managed by the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency are susceptible of a high degree of standardization and that, if this were accomplished, it would result in more effective use of procurement funds and better service to the users through simplification of requisitioning and ordering. What this would result in is a Defense-wide supply management authority, or an operations center for the coordination of the various military services, while making certain that the military services are supplied with their justifiable needs and technical requirement for material.

Review of selected activities in the management of food supply by the Mili-
Review of interservice supply management and utilization of selected aircraft engines within the Department of Defense, letter to Speaker McCormack, May 17, 1982:

Our review disclosed that, because of inadequate control in the Department of Defense overall, the management of certain types of aircraft engines, the excess engines of one service frequently were not transferred to other services which had current or future needs for similar engines. This lack of coordination resulted in unnecessary purchases and unnecessary conversion of aircraft engines. For the engine models included in our review, we found that the Army, Navy, and Air Force had incurred unnecessary costs of approximately $4,160,000 through the purchase or conversion of engines by one service while similar excess engines were already on hand in another service. As a result of our review, 487 aircraft engines valued at approximately $15,140,000 were transferred from those services which had excess engines to other services which had current or future need for these engines. As a result of these engine transfers, the community was able to cancel the planned purchase of 101 engines at an estimated net saving of $4,040,000. Transfer of the remaining engines should enable the services to reduce future purchases.

Review of development and management of selected aircraft crash firetrucks in the Department of Defense, letter to Speaker McCormack, May 16, 1982:

The Department of Defense concurred in our proposal for corrective action but did not agree that a single agency should be assigned the responsibility for research and development of aircraft crash firetrucks. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) has said that, because of differences in service missions, the requirements of the military departments are more likely to be served by one service. A recommendation for research and development programs managed by the respective departments than by reassignment of this function to a single service or agency.

In view of the failure of the military departments to coordinate effectively to minimize such efforts in the past, as disclosed in this report, we are recommending that the Secretary of Defense take positive steps to establish surveillance and control by his office of the programs of the three Departments. Unless this is done, in all probability each service will continue to independently develop aircraft crash firetruck equipment as being unique to its own needs even though the vehicles developed are for support of categories of equipment common to the other departments. We are also recommending that the Secretary of Defense assign the authority to control the introduction of new equipment to the appropriate military department. The Assistant Secretary of Defense has stated that the Department of Defense is fully concurred with the principle incorporated in our suggestion. While the concurrence in principle would seem to provide a basis for precluding similar situations in the future, the system as actually established will depend upon the degree that the responsible agencies properly execute their management responsibilities.

Review of selected supply management functions and responsibilities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense, letter to Speaker McCormack, April 17, 1982:

Subsequent to our review, the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency was designated the Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center and was placed under command jurisdiction of the recently established Defense Supply Agency.

Our review disclosed that the Government will suffer significant losses since the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency procured defective material on the basis of specifications related to the military services. Losses amounting to $885,000 will result from the necessity of disposition of our inventory and using a defective material for a purpose other than that for which intended.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these statements and this decision from the Comptroller General I wonder why anyone would question the authority of the Secretary of Defense to set up the Defense Supply Agency as required by the McCormack-Curtis amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why anyone has any doubt about the scope and intent of the McCormack-Curtis and related acts—why the matter is not referred to the Comptroller General for decision or why the Comptroller General and his staff are not requested to testify before congressional committees that have legitimate questions of this kind to ask?

Mr. Speaker, I believe the place to make this point is a letter from the Comptroller General to Hon. Chet Holifield, Chairman, Military Operations Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, May 16, 1982, which bears directly on this point:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES


Mr. CHET HOLIFIELD, Cchairman, Military Operations Subcommittee, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives:

Dear Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request during recent hearings held by your subcommittee of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency that we supply for the record answers to two questions, posed by Representative Bill Lasser, dealing with the legislative authority of the Secretary of Defense regarding certain aspects of supply management. The answers are as follows:

1. Is there sufficient legislative authority for the Director of the Defense Supply Agency to centrally control all facets of supply management, including the long-range method of management. On October 13, 1981, we were informed by the Department that it was decided to establish a Defense Supply Agency (DSA). We were subsequently advised by the Department of Defense that those supply management functions considered to be beyond the scope of the DSA would be assigned to existing military departments on the basis of their unique requirements.

2. Is the Secretary of Defense have authority to control the introduction of new clothing items into the supply system and, if so, has he delegated such authority to the Director of the Defense Supply Agency?
has specifically delegated in writing to such an Assistant Secretary the authority to issue such orders with respect to a specific subject which would otherwise have been issued through the Secretary of such military department of his designee. In the implementation of such authority, the Secretary of such military department or his designee shall be the principal military authority and shall have the duty of each such Secretary, his civilian assistants, and the military personnel in such department to cooperate fully with personnel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in a continuous effort to achieve efficient administration of the Department of Defense, and in the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

The conference report in its report, accompany­ing H.R. 12541, House Report No. 2261 dated July 23, 1958, explained the pur­pose of section 171a(c) (7) as follows: "The House and Senate conferences agreed to language which provides that each military department (the Department of the Navy to include naval aviation and the U.S. Marine Corps) shall be separately organized under its own Secretary and shall function under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Secretary of a military department will be responsible to the Secretary of Defense for 'the operation of his department as well as for its efficiency.'"

Thus, under this portion of the Senate amendment which made each Secretary responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the 'efficient and economical operation of his department' have been construed as words of limitation with re­spect to the responsibility of the military Secretary. Thus, under this portion of the conference report, the military Secretary will be responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the entire operation of his department as well as for its efficiency.

"Likewise, the House and Senate conferences agreed that no Assistant Secretary of Defense would have order authority outside of his department except as provided in the conference report. Under the conference report, no Assistant Secretary of Defense can issue an order to a military department unless two requirements have been fulfilled:

1. The Secretary of Defense must specifically delegate to such an Assistant Secretary the authority to issue orders with respect to a specific subject area, and
2. Such orders must be issued through the Secretary of the military department of his designee.

The only exception to these requirements is in those specific provisions of other law which grant Assistant Secretaries of Defense the right to issue orders.

The House and Senate conferences agreed to the remainder of that portion of the Senate amendment which provides that it shall be the duty of such military Secretary together with his civilian assistants and military personnel of his department to cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense in a continuous effort to achieve efficient administration of the Department of Defense. They also directed the Secretary of Defense to carry out the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

Thus under the conference report—
1. Each military department (the Department of the Navy to include naval aviation and the U.S. Marine Corps) shall be separately organized under its own Secretary and shall function under the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of a military department shall be responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the operation of that military department;
2. No Assistant Secretary shall issue orders to a military department unless the Secretary or his designee has specifically delegated authority in writing in a specific area; and
3. Even when an Assistant Secretary of Defense issues an order based upon his specific delegated authority, such an order must be issued 'through' the military Secretary or his designee.

As a result, the original position of the House which sought to establish a separate identity of the military departments has been sustained. In addition, the Assistant Secretaries of Defense will not have the same authority, or have greater authority than, the military Secretaries. The Assistant Secretaries of Defense will, for practical purposes, remain as the most junior of the civilian assistants of the Secretary of Defense, and even when acting for the Secre­tary of Defense, their decisions will be interpreted as representing the policy and position of the Secretary of Defense. This chain of civilian command will permit an orderly administrative procedure, and will eliminate any action that might be unilaterally taken in order to achieve efficiency or economy. The new provisions have developed if statutory restrictions on the authority of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense had not been provided, and if the orders issued by such assistants were not channelled through the military Secretaries."

Thus, it is clear that the Secretary of De­fense was given full control over the entire Military Establishment while maintaining each military department as a separate or­ganization but, under it, exercises broad civilian authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense. Although this control is somewhat limited by subsection 171a(c) (1) of title 5, so far as functions and duties are concerned, limitations of that section are not applicable to the function of managing the supply of clothing and clothing items.

The only question remaining is whether the Secretary of Defense has delegated his authority to control the introduction of new clothing items into the supply system to the Director of the Defense Supply Agency, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, and the Conference Report dated 2203 of title 10, United States Code, requiring that funds for all phases of supply management be authorized only by the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary issued Department of Defense Directive No. 5100.12, dated August 10, 1969, further implementing single manager assign­ments for the purpose of eliminating duplication of effort between military de­partments and to improve the effectiveness and economy of supply and service operations throughout the Department of Defense. Under this directive the single managers was the Secretaries of the various military departments designated by the Secretary of Defense to be responsible for clothing and clothing items. This manager was not, however, authorized to unilaterally resolve disagreements arising among the military services as a result of his assignment but, rather, was required to submit any such matter to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I & I) for resolution.

At the conclusion of his presentations, the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­tor, Defense Supply Agency, the function of dismissing any assignments as a result of the Secretary of Defense delegated to the Direc­t...
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ry of Defense, the Secretaries of the three military departments, the chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I & L), who under directive No. 5126.22, dated January 30, 1961, was delegated responsibility for cataloging, standardizing, and quality control of items in the supply system.

Accordingly, each of the questions presented was referred to the affirmative.

Sincerely yours,

JOSHUA CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it became abundantly clear from the testimony that the attempts of the Congress to unify the military services in any respect meet a very strong and determined group within the military establishments who act to oppose it.

It is no great news to anyone who has served in the Congress that among the most efficient lobby groups we have, if not by odds the most efficient, are the military services.

The power of the military in any society today or in history is a great issue of proper balance of military and civilian authority similar to which in turn will create an imbalance in the areas of the military services. We have always been able to debate the issues in any society is a great responsibility for cataloging, standardizing, and quality control of items in the supply system.

Of course, supply and service must be responsive to military command, but that does not mean that the civilian must control the source of the supply or service to the extent that he must administer it. If he is doing his military job, he ought not to be removed from the responsibility of this know-how for which his military training actually is ill suited to make him proficient.

At any rate here is the area to be debated and those who wish to advance a contrary thesis should confine their arguments to it, not confuse it with the other area of dispute which relates to military and economic efficiency.

Frankly it does not suit a military leader to leave his argument against unification of supply and service to be hidden behind the cloak of too great a concentration of military power. I believe we can take charge of this side of the argument.

Our military leaders need to tell us what system spells the greatest military efficiency. They can contribute in a meaningful way, a knowledge of what spells the greatest economic efficiency, although this is an area where our private business and labor sector must provide the essential knowledge and wisdom.

To my colleagues in the Congress who have been fighting the battle for the Military Establishment's viewpoint in resisting the integration of the military supply and service fields; let me urge you to keep your arguments separate and definite and clear between military and economic efficiency and the danger of too great concentration of military power.

A forthright debate on whether unification in the military and service fields as contemplated by the McCormack-Curtis amendment and the implementation of the revision of the Alameda Medical Supply and Services set forth in the amendment is a restatement, possibly by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCOmMACK]. The McCormack amendment is a restatement of the O'Mahoney amendment which sought to bring about unification in the area of the service where there is overlapping of common use items. This timely amendment also includes any service activity connected to the position advanced by the Military Establishment.

In order to emphasize this point, I am going to read into the Record, a letter which I wrote to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, on January 19, 1955:


HON. CHARLES E. WILSON.
"Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C., and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, T. F. Pike, Supply and Logistics, announcing the dissolution of the so-called Alameda Medical Supply and Services Test and Demonstration unit operating medical supply separately by the Army and Navy and possibly by the Air Force as well.

In my opinion, this is directly contrary to the law passed by the Congress in words, and certainly in intent. It is directly contrary to the statement expressed by President Eisenhower from time to time. In my judgment, this is one more example of the weakness and dilution of its constitutional authority, has written laws and the Military Establishment has sought to subvert these laws.

I appreciate that these are serious charges. In order to give you the basis for making these charges, I am setting forth the background of the Alameda Medical Supply. The Congress expressed interest in it as a test case of the overall problem of eliminating unnecessary duplication of activities in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research.

In my opinion, it is the function of Congress to emphasize that I have no doubt as to the sincerity of those in the Military Establishment who have made the decision to go against what I believe you have stated, in my opinion, to be the clear, expressed will—and certainly the clearly expressed intent of the Congress. I have no doubt that they feel they know better than the Congress what is best for the armed services and what is the best for our country. Nevertheless, if we are to have constitutional government in this country, we must have the Military Establishment carrying out the laws passed by the Congress in accordance with the Constitution, both as to the letter and equally as to the intent. Anything else would be chaos. Certainly such insubordination within the Military Establishment itself would be handled with dispatch.

The Military Establishment has had full opportunity to present its arguments and views to the committees of the Congress in hearings. The Military Establishment has made the spokesmen for its point of view among the Members of the Congress so that its point of view is fully considered. In spite of this, in its wisdom the Congress, by law and by expression of what was meant by the language of the law, decided contrary to the position advanced by the Military Establishment.
The reason I stated in my second paragraph that this is one more instance was because the Armed Forces Committee attempts the Congress has made to have a single catalog system established for common medical supply items by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as other specific cases where attempts were made by congressional committees to see that the purpose and intent of the National Security Act of 1947 (as amended) providing for the unification of the services was carried out.

Mr. Lovett, in the history of the Alameda test as I see it. First, I might state it was my privilege to serve on the so-called Bonner committee towards the end of the 82d Congress and we found that there was a great duplication and costly cross-handling of medical and other common-type supplies between the service units.

"We selected the medical supply field for study as it has only 8,000 to 10,000 items, uses only a few hundred million dollars worth of supplies per year but the Army and Navy each had five depots at that time with stocks turning very slowly. Further, a joint agency bought the same items for each separate service. Fortunately, the Air Force cooperate with the Bonner committee agreements to get medical support from the Army though now they seem to be splitting here also. We reasoned that if two services can use common distribution, why in the test) to see for ourselves how it was working. We found that the Army was putting all out to make it work and it was very successful. The Air Force was pleased at the assurance it was getting but the Navy was glum.

"May I add that the test was operated under the authorization and support of each service, which owned part of the stock, requiring triple-accounting. Admiral McNeill testified later that one revolving fund could have been used 11 years was never. The excellent Syracuse study on medical supply recommended the same (one revolving) fund and has been supported and directed by that action. Public Law 210 (title IV) was enacted 3 years before for just such a purpose. This would improve financial control and management.

"After viewing with alarm the committee's pressure to establish a medical test across the board to the other depots and end up with perhaps 3 depots in place of 10 with fast-moving stock, the Navy came up with the idea of setting up functional supply systems, etc, cetera, each service to have its own integrated supply system. This would combine common stocks, theoretically, in each service. So Supplies and Accounts tout the new supplies and come to the head of what the committee was doing. Budget Bureau officials forgot their responsibilities and went along.

"After some months of operation, during which time the Korean theater was successfully served by the unified Alameda medical supply operation, the test broke the test and not extend it across the board.

"To my mind it was not only a sad mistake to dissolve the only effective effort made by the DOD toward integration of common supply distribution but it was a flagrant violation of the intent of the National Security Act, as amended. As late as last summer, the Army testified before the House Appropriations units that the test was to be extended. The service that we know the Navy knew better.

"You will recall that the original National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 258, 80th Cong.) provided for the authoritative coordination and unified direction of the services under civilian control but not for their merger. And that the Secretary of Defense under the direction of the President was directed, in section 202 (a) (3), to:

"(c) Priority study shall be given to the feasibility of assigning to a single service the responsibility for procurement, distribution, including depot storage and handling, in common stock items, supply and equipment, and depot maintenance of such equipment. Medical supply items shall be the third category to be studied.

"It should be stated that a battle raged from the day, March 255, of the establishment of the Medical Supply Test. The Navy, in particular, was unhappy at this step toward unified distribution. The Navy has, as you know, preached the gospel of ‘three services separately administered' and that all supplies and services must be responsive to service command demands the fact that everyone should know by now that we must have unified commands in the three services to supply responsive to that kind of command.

"The Korean emergency placed a heavy burden on the Army medical supply system with the Oakland, Calif, depot at the end of the continental pipeline. But the Navy medical supplies, system with a depot across the country from Army's in Oakland got small impact. Common sense without prolonged study should dictate to anyone that the services and the Navy and the Army should have been assigned at that stage. In order to make all medical supplies responsive to the unified command in Korea, the services in this field of battle, 1950s, the Armed Forces Committee. The innocent taxpayer can imagine, the medical test was started. The committee knew of the bills, at least one of the bills that went to Alameda (where the Army had moved the test) to see for ourselves how it was working. We found that the Army was putting 11770 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - HOUSE June 26

"The specific language authorizing the SECDEF under section 202(a) (3) of the 1947 Act to make an authoritative coordination or unification in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage and maintenance was not included in the 1949 amendments as it was argued such language was unnecessary in the light of the broader authority proposed to be conferred generally upon the Secretary of Defense by the Hoover Commission. See p. 16, Honors Overseas Report No. 1949, 82d Cong., 2d sess."

"The National Security Act amendments of 1949 took account of several of the criticisms and of certain recommendations in the Hoover report. The authority of the Secretary of Defense to separate the three military departments was somewhat weaker in that the role of the Munitions Board and its Chairman were pointed out and the Board was established more precisely as a staff arm of the Secretary.

"Nevertheless, the 1949 legislation again compromised between opposing concepts of proper organization in the Military Establishment. What was taken away with one hand was given back with the other. Although the Departments were deprived of Cabinet rank, the separate status of the Departments was not only reaffirmed but reinforced in the law. In an attempt to remove any doubts on that score, the amendments added to the declaration of policy the original Act the intent of Congress to provide three separate branches of military departments, separately administered.

"An interesting incident in the legislative consideration of the National Security Act amendments of 1949 illustrates the statutory setbacks to unification as well as the gains. The original Act, in section 202 (b), which created the Office of Secretary of Defense and prescribed the Secretary's duties, directed him to "take appropriate steps to eliminate unnecessary duplication and overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, personnel, health, research, and development.

"The Senate bill, in introducing the 1949 amendments, in seeking to strengthen and clarify the Secretary's authority, proposed that the above-quoted provision in section 202(a) be amplified as follows: "Takings appropriate steps, including such coordination, transfers, and consolidations as may be necessary, to eliminate unnecessary overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, personnel, health, research, and development." The Senate bill introduced the 1949 amendments, in seeking to strengthen and clarify the Secretary's authority, proposed that the above-quoted provision in section 202 (a) be amplified as follows: "TAKING OF APPROPRIATE STEPS, INCLUDING SUCH COORDINATION, TRANSFERS, AND CONSOLIDATIONS AS MAY BE NECESSARY, TO ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY OVERLAPPING AND DUALITY."

"The intensive Bonner committee investigated and as aforesaid clearly proved the terrible extent of overlapping, duplication and waste in the common stock field the Air Force acquired independent status as the result of the decision by the Secretary implemented by the Eisenhower-Spats agreements.

"General Eisenhow told the committee at that time that they had to be reduced by half. You have asked me whether I had in mind, as far as common supplies are concerned, the Eisenhower-Spats agreement several years ago when I was Chief of Staff of the Air Force or not. You refer to as the Eisenhower-Spats agreement several years ago when I was Chief of Staff of the Air Force and I believe I can give you a simple answer by that when General Spats and I served
together during the last war we frequently discussed ways and means of reducing what we believed to be a waste of supplies and of manpower, one of the main issues being the extent of scarcity. The so-called Eisenhower-Spaatz arrangement should be based would be that of common service to the greatest possible extent. The so-called Eisenhower-Spaatz agreement was intended to implement that agreement on basic policy.

"Again be stated:

"'I can illustrate some of the things I had in mind by giving you a few examples. Take blankets and bed sheets, for example. I saw no reason why there should be numerous types, sizes, and specifications for those things. I believed that a good blanket could be found in the Treasury Department that would serve the needs of all Departments, and so could a good sheet. * * * Mops, brooms, saws, rakes, etc., are good examples. * * * I could see no good reason why bread baked in an Army bakery could not be used in a Navy, Air Force, and vice versa. This same reasoning can be applied to the majority of commonly used equipment, such as rifles, etcetera.

"With respect of the need for unification of logistics in the theaters, the general stated:

"I will say that I am convinced that more unification is needed in logistical matters in all theaters. To my mind, the senior U.S. commanders—whether in the Army, Navy, or Air Force—should have responsibility and power for the overall coordination and the planning of all possible economies in common items or common supply functions.'

"At the time the general made these statements, i.e., June 9, 1952, with the Senate Armed Services Committee, the military services were still wrangling over the establishment of the common medical supply test as directed by the Secretary of Defense 4 months earlier.

"'On June 9, 1952, Mr. Boyntom, chairman of the committee, introduced a bill, H.R. 8130, which was designed to promote economy and efficiency through certain organizational changes having responsibilities in these fields; and (8) develop plans for recruitment and training of logistics personnel within the Department of Defense.'

"Meanwhile, the committee was in conference with certain Senate leaders who were also anxious to bring about defense changes. Subsequent to that, I saw secretaries of the various departments in a private session and was able to persuade them to the need of a greater degree of unification and coordination of supply and service activities within and among the military departments. This bill contained many important provisions, including:

"'Sc. 501(a). There shall be in the Department of Defense an Under Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civil or military life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.'

"'Sc. 501(b). The Under Secretary of Defense shall advise and assist the Secretary of Defense in preparation and execution of a comprehensive program to integrate supply and service activities within and among the military departments, and shall perform such other duties as are prescribed by this title.'

"This section of the 1952 Act recommended the integration of all supply and service activities in the military departments, and shall perform such other duties as prescribed by this title.

"'Sc. 507. [The existing programs of the military departments for the preparation and execution of the plan for integrated supply and service, and the plan for a single supply and service system, shall be continued and any programs for the preparation of plans for integrated supply and service, shall be continued.'

""(1) develop standardized procedures and forms for supply and service functions;

""(2) eliminate duplication and "scrap"ing" procedures by reducing or eliminating activities of the military departments in the fields of production, procurement, warehousing, and distribution, and

""(3) establish and operate depots for common items and other common supply and service functions, within and among the United States;

""(4) develop unified logistics organizations and training programs for supply and service personnel within the Department of Defense.'

""The Senate Committee was aware of the fact that it could be accomplished without a lot of duplicating hospitals, and that· a system had to be done to provide a system of the common medical supply test of the war, we agreed that the policy of the Common Supply System would be based on the Secretary of Defense to achieve such improvement at an early date.

""It is recognized that all the desirable changes cannot be accomplished in the 60-day period within which regulations must be issued. However, it is anticipated that, within that period, new interim regulations can be promulgated which will stake the general principles to be followed, effect certain of the more obvious improvements, and thus hasten the time needed for expanded supply facilities are created during the development of the definitive regulations.

""When the next Congress convenes the Department of Defense should present a program, based upon regulations in effect, for the improvement of supply procurements and "historical accidents" that recur and exist in the present system of procurement, warehousing, and issue of supplies and equipment.

"Under the new system, it should be impossible for two competing facilities to be set up or continued within the same area for the same purpose as determined by the Secretary of Defense. Service facilities already established for the supply of shops, laundries, and so forth should be integrated to serve all departmental requirements in the area. Special attention should be given to the procurement, production, distribution, warehousing, maintenance, and issue of common-use items such as clothing, food, medical supplies, and building materials, to minimize stocks, handling, transportation, and related supply management costs. Where possible, and the method of handling them will be made uniform throughout the Department of Defense. To the extent possible under existing laws this should be done within the powers and personnel ceilings presently set for the Secretary of Defense and Armed Services, and it is expected that necessary action will be taken immediately so that the program can be started without delay. At the same time, it is recognized that the Secretary of Defense in the absence of a compelling justification for special treatment, which justification will be given to the appropriate committees of Congress.

"'It is recognized that the administration of the program outlined above will require some changes in the organization and staffing of parts of the Department of Defense, including the Office of the Secretary of Defense. To the extent possible under existing laws this should be done within the powers and personnel ceilings presently set for the Secretary of Defense and Armed Services, and it is expected that necessary action will be taken immediately so that the program can be started without delay. At the same time, it is recognized that the Secretary of Defense in the absence of a compelling justification for special treatment, which justification will be given to the appropriate committees of Congress.

"'I want to talk with you tonight about the defense of our country. I want to talk with you tonight about what the most defense at least cost with least delay.'
Mr. Cannon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. CURRYS. Mr. Chairman, I am well acquainted with what the gentleman is talking about because I have been very much interested in the subject of the Unification Act. I have studied the political implications of the Unification Act. It is a subject that I have been following for some time. I have been convinced that it is a subject that needs to be studied carefully. I believe that it is a subject that needs to be addressed by the Congress.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, I am well acquainted with what the gentleman is talking about because I have been very much interested in the subject of the Unification Act. I have studied the political implications of the Unification Act. It is a subject that I have been following for some time. I have been convinced that it is a subject that needs to be studied carefully. I believe that it is a subject that needs to be addressed by the Congress.
I am hopeful it will be adopted. I say it is to be offered to the Voinson bill; I am referring to the committee bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I am happy that the gentleman going to offer his amendment. I have had the opportunity to read the language and I think it is what the gentleman says and will be a tremendous step forward.

The substance of the amendment is that whatever the Secretary of Defense determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or otherwise, he shall provide for the discontinuance of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizations as he deems appropriate. It is significant to note that any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered a major combat function within the meaning of subsection 3 of the committee bill.

This is an excellent amendment. It permits flexibility so that the Secretary of Defense can, as the best practitioner of operation for a supply or service function depending upon its nature.

Unfortunately neither the President’s bill, HR 12420, nor the Voinson bill, HR 12451, makes specific reference to supply and service activities through these functions constitute one or more areas of overlapping and duplication where billions of dollars can be saved, each year, at the same time producing a more alert and hard-hitting military organization by making it more efficient.

I see these three basic things must be done in this area.

First, we must have unification of the three services in procurement, supply, and distribution, with levels of warehousing, distributing, and so forth.

Second, Utilization rather than duplication of the civilian supply and distribution system.

Third, a personnel system that is trained to think in these terms and one that will improve on the system as it goes along.

Mr. Chairman, I previously stated that it is necessary to have unification in other areas. If the theory behind common-use items is accurate, as far as the unification of procurement, supply, and distribution is concerned, it is necessary, as far as the theory behind common-use items that are military in aspect among the three services. That is the importance of the amendment and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCloskey] and others on his side will recognize that it is for the best possible type of management in the military supply operation, and say that he and I see eye to eye.

Mr. HARDY. I don’t think it will do exactly what the gentleman from Virginia is going to propose.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman mentioned rifles. The different services do not necessarily use the same kind of rifles.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. In other words, the Marines might want to use a special rifle, the Army might use an entirely different rifle, and there might not be some interchangeability between the two services with respect to that rifle. Would the gentleman construe that to be a common-use item which should be procured by a single Defense Department agency?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I would not if it does not meet that definition, and as the gentleman has advanced the explanation of rifles, I would say that it would not meet that definition.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield further, let us pursue this a little bit.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Because this is extremely helpful.

Take, for instance, the case of aircraft.

Mr. HARDY. No, the aircraft used by the Army are frequently entirely different from those used by the Air Force or the Navy or the Marine Corps. The gentleman in his statement which he will make on this line, I might say, in the electronics area, where a particular weapons system area is peculiar to one service, and is not employed at all by the other.

Would the gentleman think that because each of these services procures electronics parts that might be used by only one service, a particular part, that those should be lumped together into one great big category of electronics parts and procured by an agency in the Department of Defense not responsible directly to any one of the services?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me say this. Of course, on electronics, I do not know how you would define that. We could get into a question of semantics.

Mr. HARDY. I am trying to avoid that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know that. That is why I wanted to make a basic point where we could evaluate not only electronics, but the other categories that are more interrelated. Mr. Voinson, I think each one has to be viewed on its own bottom. There might be some minor
Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Although I did not quote the gentleman from Virginia, I think it would have been too long for the purpose we were using it for. I do not believe there was actually any inconsistency in the position which we have been maintaining. And this is the gentleman took in his presentation, because I certainly subscribe, as he does, to the use of common-use items as those will apply to more than one service just as well as those that will apply to the military and to the civilian fields.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is where there was some confusion.

The point is this: I read the hearings that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Massachusetts participated in, in the Armed Services Committee, you are raising the question of whether the McCormack-Curtis amendment definitely refers to combat items in certain categories, yes. But there are certain items that could be expanded.

Mr. HARDY. Electromagnetics that would be used by more than one service.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. HARDY. But if you had a little black box that was a particularly critical item for a Polaris missile, and it was not used by any other missile service, does the gentleman think that that ought to be considered for being used by more than one service?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know the gentleman did.

Mr. HARDY. The purposes which we seek, I think, are laudable and the question of how it is to be done and the statutory authority is another matter. I would be happy if the gentleman from Missouri would yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to comment on that particular point.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I want to do so; and I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri and I have discussed this matter for the last half hour off the floor. I believe we have a meeting of minds as far as the intent of our committee is concerned. Like the gentleman from Virginia, when this amendment was presented to the floor, I did not think that much of it. Now, I think that the gentleman's amendment goes that far.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to comment on that.

Mr. HARDY. The amendment does go that far.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, Mr. HARDY. And I say to the gentleman, we have not resolved this. Our own committee held some hearings on it and we are trying to understand what the implication of the office has on the supply area. You include authority for entering into contracts, only in one other specific case has the Department of Defense done that, there is no authority to enter into contracts and that is in the research and development field. That was done specifically and deliberately by the Congress. In this case, of course, there is the amendment I supported the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know the gentleman did.

Mr. HARDY. The purposes which we seek, I think, are laudable and the question of how it is to be done and the statutory authority is another matter. I would be happy if the gentleman from Missouri would yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to comment on that particular point.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I want to do so; and I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri and I have discussed this matter for the last half hour off the floor. I believe we have a meeting of minds as far as the intent of our committee is concerned. Like the gentleman from Virginia, when this amendment was presented to the floor, I did not think that much of it. Now, I think that the gentleman's amendment goes that far.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to comment on that.

Mr. HARDY. The amendment does go that far.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, Mr. HARDY. And I say to the gentleman, we have not resolved this. Our own committee held some hearings on it and we are trying to understand what the implication of the office has on the supply area. You include authority for entering into contracts, only in one other specific case has the Department of Defense done that, there is no authority to enter into contracts and that is in the research and development field. That was done specifically and deliberately by the Congress. In this case, of course, there is the amendment I supported the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I know the gentleman did.

Mr. HARDY. The purposes which we seek, I think, are laudable and the question of how it is to be done and the statutory authority is another matter. I would be happy if the gentleman from Missouri would yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to comment on that particular point.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I want to do so; and I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri and I have discussed this matter for the last half hour off the floor. I believe we have a meeting of minds as far as the intent of our committee is concerned. Like the gentleman from Virginia, when this amendment was presented to the floor, I did not think that much of it. Now, I think that the gentleman's amendment goes that far.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to comment on that.

Mr. HARDY. The amendment does go that far.
Mr. BATES. It was my judgment after listening to the gentleman and discussing the matter with him that each item transferred would have to be determined on its own basis.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would think so.

Mr. BATES. To determine whether it was peculiar to a given service or common because of its having been used in one form of activity such as the Army or the Navy. I do not think it would be peculiar to a particular service if it should be required for a particular item so used.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let us take this list on page 10 of the remarks I have prepared. I list 12 supply organizations that have been included in the Defense Supply Agency; they are: Armed Forces Supply Support Center, Military Subsistence Supply Agency, I believe the word "Subsistence" would not indicate that it might be peculiar to a particular service.

Traffic Management Agency, Chemical Supply Agency. You could have different types of uniforms but I do not think that difference is one that would justify saying that that was peculiar for combat reasons and I would not think that would be unification.

Medical Supply Agency. There is an area in which the Bonner subcommittee particularly felt we needed to bring about unification.

Petroleum Supply Agency. Possibly there. There may be in petroleum.

General Supply Agency. I do not know what that would include.

Educational Support Agency. I do not know anything about that.

Automotive Supply Agency. That would undoubtedly include vehicles.

Construction Supply Agency—which I think brought about this specific question in the full Armed Services Committee, did it not? The question of the Construction Supply Agency, I would say to the gentlemen, both members of the Appropriations Committee. I would not put my judgment ahead of theirs at all, but if there are things that are used in common by the various services, the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, I would think any language of the amendment the amendment would contemplate that.

Mr. BATES. In other words, the gentleman does not refer to particular items but to a broad category.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is correct.

Let me call attention to the other material rather than read it. I refer in my report there to the gentleman's subcommittee at some length on the Comptroller General's opinion. It might be well, not that I want to be presumptuous, but you might call the Comptroller General's committees to get his views on this interpretation. You will find in my prepared statement some rather lengthy quotes from opinions and letters from the Comptroller General which bear on the interpretation of what this amendment contemplates.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the gentleman for the superb job he has done in this. I would like to associate myself with his remarks. I serve on the Military Operations Subcommittee which heard extensive testimony from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and other officers, and I think the record established made it abundantly clear that there was no intention of establishing a fourth supply agency or anything comparable to a fourth service. I have served as a staff member in the other body, and from my long experience I have been for many years apprehensive about a further supply agency or anything similar. This entire matter supports the gentleman's conclusion that there is nothing in the authority granted by the McCormack-Curtis amendment that would give rise to any particular concept which I am apprehensive about. I think the gentleman's leadership over the years has been one of the most commendable accomplishments of his career.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to make this observation about one of the major purposes that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] was seeking this particular matter at this time. As the gentleman from Missouri, I am sure, knows, our attempt to analyze what has been done is not connected to the Defense Supply Agency. We are looking at all of the departments which are being consolidated in a similar manner under the McCormack amendment, including the Intelligence Agency. I wish I had reached the point where I could state with conviction the statement which the gentleman from Missouri made a while ago that he had not gotten beyond these confines of what is good management and what would keep the services separate and put in the Defense Supply Agency only those items which are common items. I am not sure of that yet. I hope that we will be sure just where we are before we get through. I would like to ask the gentleman a question in connection with a key to supply, major concept which you mentioned. I agree that the requirements must be determined by the individual services to meet their needs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course, I certainly do agree.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to one point, and that is that the Defense Intelligence Agency was, of course, not established under the McCormack amendment, including the Intelligence Agency. I wish I had reached the point where I could state with conviction the statement which the gentleman from Missouri made a while ago that he had not gotten beyond these confines of what is good management and what would keep the services separate and put in the Defense Supply Agency only those items which are common items. I am not sure of that yet. I hope that we will be sure just where we are before we get through. I would like to ask the gentleman a question in connection with a key to supply, major concept which you mentioned. I agree that the requirements must be determined by the individual services to meet their needs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course, I certainly do agree.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MORSE. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to one point, and that is that the Defense Intelligence Agency was, of course, not established under the McCormack amendment, including the Intelligence Agency. I wish I had reached the point where I could state with conviction the statement which the gentleman from Missouri made a while ago that he had not gotten beyond these confines of what is good management and what would keep the services separate and put in the Defense Supply Agency only those items which are common items. I am not sure of that yet. I hope that we will be sure just where we are before we get through. I would like to ask the gentleman a question in connection with a key to supply, major concept which you mentioned. I agree that the requirements must be determined by the individual services to meet their needs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of course, I certainly do agree.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is correct.

Let me call attention to the other material rather than read it. I refer in my report there to the gentleman's subcommittee at some length on the Comptroller General's opinion. It might be well, not that I want to be presumptuous, but you might call the Comptroller General's committees to get his views on this interpretation. You will find in my prepared statement some rather lengthy quotes from opinions and letters from the Comptroller General which bear on the interpretation of what this amendment contemplates.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the gentleman for the superb job he has done in this. I would like to associate myself with his remarks. I serve on the Military Operations Subcommittee which heard extensive testimony from the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, the

Deputy Secretary of Defense, and other officers, and I think the record established made it abundantly clear that there was no intention of establishing a fourth supply agency or anything comparable to a fourth service. I have served as a staff member in the other body, and from my long experience I have been for many years apprehensive about a further supply agency or anything similar. This entire matter supports the gentleman's conclusion that there is nothing in the authority granted by the McCormack-Curtis amendment that would give rise to any particular concept which I am apprehensive about. I think the gentleman's leadership over the years has been one of the most commendable accomplishments of his career.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

I want to again pay tribute to our Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], who has fought in this area for this reform so long, and the great work that he has done. This is not a true instance where he sits here today that it has been a completely bipartisan approach in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. To those who differ with me, and there are many, I would like to say that it is not a matter of one side of the aisle being against the other side of the aisle. I hope, and in fact I know, that it will remain in this fashion in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

INFAMOUS SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and angered by what I have seen the U.S. Supreme Court do to the institution of Americanism and what they seek to do to the principles which have guided this Nation through all its years. This is a nation founded on spiritual concepts. It is a nation which has repeatedly affirmed and reaffirmed its belief in an eternal God and its adherence to religious precepts. Almost everywhere we turn, in virtually every act of Government, there is reference to Deity. Now the Supreme Court strikes a deep and serious blow at this historic concept by ruling that prayer may not be offered in the public schools. I find it difficult to choose the adjectives which properly describe this latest bid for infamy by the Nation's highest Court. But, I may say that if the Supreme Court were openly in league with the cause of communism, they could scarcely advance it more than they are doing now.
I note almost with abhorrence that in the briefest words which the Court refuses schoolchildren the right to begin their daily work with prayer, the Court strikes down a ruling by the Post Office Department to prevent obscene matter from going through the mail. I would have expected any court composed of just and honest and learned men to rule exactly the opposite in both cases. I trust that Congress will speedily set up the necessary legislative machinery whereby an amendment may be voted by the States which will specifically, in clear and incontrovertible language, enable prayer to be offered in the schools of the Nation. I am introducing and I shall work for the passage of this legislation—just as I have worked for years for legislation to curb the irresponsible and improper performance of this judicial body.

FREEDOM SEASON IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may extend his remarks at this point in the Recess and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORRMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year at this time I was privileged to be the first Member of this body to call attention to a great new enterprise in my district in California. It was called the Freedom Season, and I said about it at that time: If the rest of our country caught this fervor and propelled it into an expression of national joy for our hard-won liberty, it would serve as a clear demonstration to the rest of the world that, rather than the last refuge of secundrists, the American brand of patriotism is a moving force for truth, justice, and good.

I am pleased to say that the second annual Freedom Season has been celebrated in its birthplace, Woodland Hills, Calif. And I am happy to say that some of the fervor I alluded to in last year's speech has been caught in other parts of the Nation.

The result has been that Freedom Season 1963 is bigger, better, and more inspiring than last year. The ceremonies in Woodland Hills, and propelled it into an expression of national joy in its birthplace, Woodland Hills, Calif. And I am happy to say that some of the fervor I alluded to in last year's speech has been caught in other parts of the Nation.

The parade this year included continuing contestants from Santa Ana, San Bernardino, Redondo Beach, Twentynine Palms, San Diego, and Long Beach. More than 1,500 persons participated in the ceremonies in Woodland Hills, and more than 10,000 persons turned out to watch the parade.

But probably the most encouraging sign was the fact that the Kiwanis Club of Kenmore, N.Y., almost 3,000 miles away, has caught the spirit of Freedom Season and has established its own Freedom Season this year. Mr. Speaker, when an idea travels that far in 9 or 10 short months, it must have something to recommend it.

May I say that Freedom Season in Woodland Hills, embodying as it does all that is great about our America, has much to recommend it.

FLAGRANT IMPROPRIETY AND UNDER THE TABLE EX PARTE REPRESENTATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida may extend his remarks at this point in the Recess and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCHELL. Mr. Speaker, David Kraslow, of the Miami Herald, Washington bureau, in a series of copyrighted articles in the Knight newspapers has revealed a case of "flagrant impropriety" and "improper conduct," of representation in dealings before an independent agency of the executive branch of our Government.

The facts, in brief, are as follows: Two groups were seeking approval from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a savings and loan institution to serve the Negro community in Miami, Fla. One group had only one Negro among its original members, and the other group had three Negro members. While the applications were pending before the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, six members of one of the groups made a trip to Atlanta, Ga., to visit the home of Rev. Martin Luther King. They told him they were encountering difficulties with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board because they did not have enough Negro members in their group. Following this meeting, the Reverend Mr. King, last November placed a telephone call to Federal Home Loan Bank Board Chairman, Joseph P. McMurry, on behalf of that group.

Subsequently, the group in question was allegedly permitted by the Board to add four Negro members to its group and receive a charter from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in January of this year.

Now the other group has filed a motion with the Board accusing it of "improper conduct," "secret ex parte representation," "flagrant impropriety," and "violation of its own rules."

While this case may simply be considered as another in a long series of disputes of this type, none of the previous cases such as those involving airlines and communications licenses—have come to the attention of the Congress wherein an individual immediately and openly admits that he contacted an agency official directly seeking favor for a particular applicant.

Under present law and practice, there are those who contend that Members of Congress have the right and the responsibility to intercede with governmental agencies on behalf of their constituents without regard to whether such intercession is on the record or off the record. Therefore, when a private citizen is caught in the shadow of affairs it is not for us to determine whether or not there exists a need for such legislation and the establishment of a special subcommittee has called for it. The result of their thinking is my bill, H.R. 351. The ABA thinks it is necessary and right. The Miami Herald case shows that legislative and administrative action is needed and right to protect the public interest.

It is clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that my bill would fully cover such cases as the one raised by Mr. Kraslow's story. It is clear that such legislation is long overdue from the Congress and I, consequently, urge the appropriate committee of the Congress to immediately consider in full the issues and implications raised by the Kraslow story.

Mr. Chairman, this hearing has been before the committee for a long time. Ex parte representations and their attendant problems make it vital that the Congress consider and consider in full public hearings on this legislation as soon as possible.

FEDERAL SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida may extend his remarks at this point in the Recess and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 12282, a bill that calls for changing the name of the Small Business Administration and the Congressional Committee hearing on this legislation as soon as possible. The purpose behind the change is to alleviate the confusion caused by this agency's current name. As it exists, the Administration is not clearly designated as an arm of the Federal Government. It has been mistaken for State and local small business agencies, private
small business associations, and especially, for the common small business investment companies. In fact, it has come to my attention that a letter recently submitted by a high executive office in the Government to the Administration's regional director at Los Angeles was addressed to him as "President, Small Business Association."

Nor is the proposed new name without precedent. Among other examples, I can cite the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Power Commission. It seems to me worthwhile, for clarity and uniformity, that we add the word "Federal" to executive agencies, and particularly to those whose names are likely to be duplicated or similarly used by groups outside the Government.

I suggest that there is confusion enough in public understanding, and apparently even in official understanding, of Government operations. I ask your support for this attempt to clear up at least this much of it.

DEcISION BY THE SUPREME COURT TO BAN ALMIGHTY GOD FROM THE SCHOOLS OF THE LAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KORNEGAY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, not any time before in the short history of this Nation has there been a more disgraceful or evil act been perpetrated by supposedly honorable men than yesterday's decision by the Supreme Court to ban Almighty God from the schools of the land.

That these men are able to read the sentence "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" and solemnly find that the writers actually meant "little children shall not voluntarily repeat the Lord's Prayer in school" far exceeds the credibility of this mortal.

Is there a Member in this Chamber today who can, in honesty and candor, say he believes the majority of the people agree that there is some terrible danger and threat to our freedom and security when little children, of their own free will, out of reverence for their Creator, bow their heads and repeat the Lord's Prayer?

Is there a Member in this Chamber today who believes that this is what the framers of the Constitution had in mind?

I do not believe there is.

Is it the phrase, "Our Father, who art in Heaven. Hallowed be Thy name"? Is that the passage that strikes terror into the hearts of the members of the Supreme Court when repeated by little boys and girls?

Or is it, "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"? Is there treason in school, "Give us this day, our daily bread"?

Can it be wrong to ask that the Almighty, "Forgive our debts as we forgive our debtors"?

Or to invoke His blessings by asking that He, "Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil"?

And, though I have said it a thousand and more times, I have never conjured up visions of anarchy in the concluding phrase, "For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever. Amen."

Can it conceivably be that the Supreme Court would now have us say: "For Thine was the kingdom, the power and the glory up until today. We now hereby supercede Your kingdom, Your power and Your glory"?

I have not yet had the time to ponder the limitless reaches of this sacrilegious ruling, but I can only immediately that, if we allow this decision to go unchallenged, the House and the Senate are daily performing unconstitutional acts by opening our sessions with prayer. Whether any of us who placed our hand on the Bible when we took the oath of an office is now undoubtedly guilty of an unconstitutional act. Will we now be required to disband the Corps of Chaplains serving the Armed Forces and order that all chapels on military reservations be torn down?

Is this the preposterous end to which we have come?

I am thoroughly in agreement with the principle that the U.S. Government should not force anyone to participate in a religious ceremony against his will. But I think it impurifying the Lord's Prayer to say that this Government should not interfere in anyone's public worship of his God.

But is it possibly be said, as Justice Black has said, that the voluntary repetition of the Lord's Prayer is an "unhallowed" perversion?

I think not.

Examine, too, the simple prayer that is also branded as "perverse" and "unhallowed":

Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

Where is the perversion?

The perversion can only exist in the minds of the Supreme Court, for it surely does not exist elsewhere. If we allow this Court to hold up the Lord's Prayer to this ridicule, we are equating ourselves with the Soviet Union which also bans the mention of the Almighty in three words. What possible gain is there in bringing our philosophy into juxtaposition with theirs?

Reaction across the country to this bitter and galling decision includes, here and there, the weak-kneed expression of "disappointment" and "regret."

I do not share that apologetic attitude. I am appalled, horrified, ashamed.

And I am fearful.

Appalled that such an edict could come from a Court of men sworn to protect and defend us.

Horrified at the thought that the day may be drawing near when mothers may have to hide their children while they teach the Lord's Prayer to their children.

Ashamed to say to the world that we now officially denounce the Lord's Prayer and an "unhallowed" and "perverse" bit of doggerel.

Fearful for the safety of our country if we are to reject the prayers of our children in an hour when we are engaged in mortal combat with our enemies.

If we allow this decision to go unchallenged, yesterday will be recorded as our most infamous hour and I cannot abide it.

If there is one thing crystal clear in this finding it is the revelation that some of the members of the Supreme Court themselves feel that this is not their first time, a personal religious experience which would preclude ever again any decision such as this.

I am in the process now of preparing a constitutional amendment which will guarantee forever the right and the privilege of our children to repeat, of their own free will, the Lord's Prayer in our schools.

That it is necessary for such an amendment to be written is to our everlasting shame, but if it is required, then let us be about it.

WHO HAS INFLUENCE?

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Dole) 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman should drop further efforts to control the Nation's farmers and seek instead to win control of his own Department.

On the heels of the reputation of his farm bill by the House of Representatives last week, now comes another grudging admission by Mr. Freeman that his agency has been covering up the shady activities of some of its own employees in connection with the Estes cotton allotment scandal.

In line with his pattern of the past, which is to admit it only when it is exposed or about to be exposed, the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday issued a press release announcing he had issued a formal reprimand to Mr. Miller, Acting Southwest Area Director of ASCS for failing to reveal that he—Miller—prepared a report under instructions from a higher up indicating that cotton allotments in the Estes case be allowed to stand for 1961 and subsequent years.

These fraudulent allotments have since been canceled but only after the scandal was criticized by Texas State Courts and in the Nation's press.
In his press release, Mr. Freeman reports:

[Miller] now states that the recommendation he made was contrary to his own judgment and that it was made at the direction of Emery E. Jacobs, former Deputy Administrator, ASCS, who resigned April 13, 1962. The course of action subsequently initiated by the Department with respect to Estes transferred cotton allotments was in no way affected by Mr. Miller's memorandum and recommendations.

The Freeman statement goes on to say:

Miller has advised the Department in an attached memo that he dictated to him a memorandum justifying a departmental decision to permit Billie Sol Estes to retain all of the cotton allotments he had acquired at that time. He also states that he had disagreed with Mr. Jacobs but considered I had no alternative under the circumstances.

Here we have the spectacle of a high USDA official, Jacobs, instructing one of his subordinates to write a memorandum Justifying the Estes cotton allotments which Jacobs must have known were fraudulent. This is an act of which any administrator would be ashamed.

That Murphy was well aware of the activities financed by the Agriculture Department is abundantly clear by his request for an investigation of the Estes allotments.

As an interesting footnote to this latest retreat and coverup policy of Freeman with respect to the Estes scandal, I should like to quote from a letter which he sent in on the USDA meeting on January 8, 1962, at which Estes and his attorneys were in effect given a reprieve and another opportunity to establish the legality of an operation which was patent­ illegal from the outset. Murphy’s role in this matter calls for a much more detailed explanation than he has offered thus far.

Perhaps a further footnote is in order:

This concerns the news reports of Jacobs’ exit from USDA. It was related that the Secretary threw his arm around Jacobs and had told the departing official it was like losing his own right arm. Jacobs was admonished to go out and clear himself of what Freeman seemed to believe were ballooned-up charges and then come back to his former job.

For making an honest evaluation of this case, Hales was, in effect, demoted and subjected to indignities. His secretary was summarily arrested and detained for 15 days in the psychiatric ward of District of Columbia General Hospital.

For going along with the people who were attempting to cover up for Estes, Miller receives only a reprimand and that only after the Secretary of Agriculture learned investigators for the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee had been prevented from meeting with Mr. Miller to admit that he had written a false memorandum at Jacobs’ request.

My immediate order of investigation of the facts.

Yet it was not until yesterday—23 days later—that Freeman ordered a reprimand of Miller and then only after a newspaper reported the case.

Miller, in his affidavit, says Jacobs told him that Estes would be willing to accept the judgment of the public which he had already received and this was in accordance with the wishes of Under Secretary Murphy. Murphy, however, denies that he had ever met with Miller or ever discussed this matter. Murphy filed a report on the Estes cotton allotments until the past few days.

That Murphy was well aware of the Estes cotton case can hardly be disputed, however, in view of the fact that he sat on the USDA meeting on January 8, 1962, at which Estes and his attorneys were in effect given a reprieve and another opportunity to establish the legality of an operation which was patently illegal from the outset. Murphy’s role in this matter calls for a much more detailed explanation than he has offered thus far.

Perhaps a further footnote is in order:

This concerns the news reports of Jacobs’ exit from USDA. It was related that the Secretary threw his arm around Jacobs and had told the departing official it was like losing his own right arm. Jacobs was admonished to go out and clear himself of what Freeman seemed to believe were ballooned-up charges and then come back to his former job.

All of this confirms what I said at the outset: that the Secretary of Agriculture should quit trying to control farmers and let the farmers control their own Department. It also demonstrates again the utter futility of having him investigate his own agency.

It is abundantly clear by now that the Secretary of Agriculture is going to divulge or confirm what facts he has in connection with the Estes scandal only after they have been exposed first by Congress, the press, and the courts.

FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johnson] 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the operators of the foreign aid bureaucracy specialize in two kinds of handouts, both at taxpayers’ expense—money and self-laudatory news releases.

With the approach of the annual debate in the House on the foreign aid authorization, a news handout is being circulated to the Michigan press, television, and radio, purporting to show the total amount of foreign aid funds spent in the State of Michigan during the fiscal year ending in December 1961.

It includes a breakdown of such expenditures for 48 Michigan communities, including 3 in my own Third Congressional District.

When a similar news handout was made a year ago, I referred to it as political blackmail. I know of no reason for repeating the process.

However, I do have a few additional comments to make on this lobbying practice.

I note, for instance, that the operation this year involves an even more brazen and blatant violation of Federal law.

Last year there was at least the pretense that the handout originated with a nongovernmental source; namely, the Senate Committee for International Development.

This year, however, the pretense of a front organization is abandoned and the release is made by the Office of Public Affairs, a governmental unit of the Department of State, the very same office which was the source of falsified news releases.

I further invite these officials’ attention to the precise wording of the ban contained in this statute:

"No part of money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegrams, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner members of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any legislation, or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation."

This latest Aid handout shows the alleged beneficiaries of the foreign aid program in my own Third District of Michigan, including the City of Battle Creek, in the amount of $444,906; Coldwater, in the amount of $856,586; and Kalamazoo, in the amount of $321,808.

This type of news handout is an insult to the intelligence of the voters of my district.

They know that the only valid justification for foreign aid is that it contributes to the national interest and...
security of the United States. I am sure that they would vastly prefer the tax relief which would come from abolition or curtailment of foreign aid above the alleged trickle-down benefit of the million-and-one-half-odd dollars spent for foreign aid goods and services in the third district during the past 8 years. There is a particular irony in this year’s aid propaganda handout to the relief which alleged ...

1962 United States some distinguished majority leader of the \textit{United States} has much effect on the economic or social policy of that kind justified on the basis of personnel. The SPEAKER extends his remarks at this point in the \textit{Record} and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CAHILL, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision that the recitation of official prayers in public schools is unconstitutional has two serious consequences: First, it says to our children in our schools that God is a myth; that He does not exist, that if your family accepts it, it is all right—but the state cannot allow its children to be corrupted by any mention of a Supreme Being; and second, it plays into the hands of the determined effort of the atheistic Communists whose political and social philosophy is based on the concept that there is no God. The rest follows in order: First, since there is no God who created man, second, man is devoid of dignity and special worth; and third, the state can rule supreme.

This is a far cry from the historic spiritual foundation on which this Nation was founded. Destroy the recognition of God among our people and you destroy a respect for the very basis upon which our freedoms are founded, stated so clearly in the Declaration of Independence:

> When in the Course of human Events, it becomes necessary for one People to dissolve the political Bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the Earth, the separate and equal Station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a Respect to the Opinions of Mankind requires that they should declare the Causes which impel them to the Separation. We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

And in the concluding paragraph of that same great document:

> We, therefore, the Representatives of the \textit{United States of America}, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the Rectitude of our Intentions, do, in the Name, and by the Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly Publish and Declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States: That the \textit{British} Crown, and that all political Connection and Submission from any Association with his \textit{British} Government, has ever been the ruling Stock or Pretense, with which it is needless to trouble you any further. The only point of importance that I wish to make is this: that it is not required, nor do the children even have to remain in the room while it is repeated. I find it difficult to recognize
the name of consistency we can look forward to the time when it will become unconstitutional to read or to teach the Declaration of Independence in schools because this historic document includes these references to God as the very author of our rights.

Destroy the recognition of God among our people. Is there no respect for the very basis upon which our freedoms are founded.

It should be significant to the American that one who understood the individual, by the authority of the state, is denied the right to life, if the state so decides; is denied the right of liberty, if the state decides to put him into a work-slave camp to correct his "dangerous" thinking; and he is denied his right to the pursuit of happiness since the state tells him what he can and cannot enjoy.

I agree 100 percent with Associate Justice Potter Stewart, who said: the Court misapplied "a great constitutional principle" and is denying schoolchildren the "opportunity of our heritage in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

It is the spiritual heritage that has made and kept us free, not anything that the Government or men have done, since we have historically recognized its basic tenet, that it is God and not the state that is the author of our rights.

I warn the American people that this is the beginning of what will be a bold attempt to destroy the spiritual foundation of our Nation, and thus our freedom, by making it unconstitutional to provide spiritual guidance to our men in uniform, prayers at public functions, at opening sessions of Congress and official public gatherings in general.

If the mention of the word "God" is offensive, then our children will have no other choice but to believe that this great Nation of ours owes its greatness to men, not God, and ultimately is guided in its destiny not by the truths of God but by the dictates of men who reject the authority of God.

No doubt the decision of the Supreme Court was based upon an interpretation of the Constitution. If it is against the law to mention the name of God in public gatherings, it is time we clarified the intent written into our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. While it would never be my intention to deny the rights of any minority, even a majority of one, I believe that we have an obligation to protect the rights and liberties of the majority by preventing the destruction of these liberties from being destroyed. In view of this fact I have today introduced a bill to make constitutional the official recognition of God in prayer in our schools.

I hope it will serve to gather support for a more serious deliberation in Congress on this issue so we can fulfill our obligation to protect the spiritual foundation upon which this Republic has been founded.

I uphold the basic constitutional principle of separation of church and state but this should not hinder us in our determination to teach the vital role faith in God has in national life.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Bray) may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the so-called regent's prayer, recommended by the board of regents in the State of New York for use in the public schools, reads as follows:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we commend ourselvess and whatever we shall say and do, to Thy guidance and Thy blessing. Protect us in our endeavor to provide spiritual guidance to our men in uniform, and to those who are called regent's prayer, recommended by the board of regents in the State of New York for use in the public schools.

Mr. Speaker, for my part I believe the words of the late Mr. Potter Stewart, when he said, "I have deep respect for the law and its importance in protecting the individual or the minority from the tyranny of the majority."

As an attorney I have deep respect for the law. I can report, however, widespread concern among the people about the refusal of Congress to act on this matter for the last several years. It seems to many observers that there is always a way to excuse a wrongdoer if his cause can seem to be the greater evil.

A nation that can neither judge nor condemn its fellow travelers, to atheists and perverts, and to those who would destroy our society. They wonder why this protection is not more often extended to protect things which are good and decent in our society, encouraging patriotism, spiritual devotion, personal morality, and responsibility.

There are rules of law to be considered; there are also rules of common sense, and rules of public acceptability. When the Court, in one breath tells us that narcotics addiction is not a crime, and literature about homosexuals is not offensive, but that we cannot lead our children in prayer, one wonders if we are coming dangerously close to destroying the confidence of the people in our laws and in our courts.

I believe we must give serious attention to this matter, and if the only way to restore sensible practice is by amending the Constitution then we should undertake that action so that it may be submitted to the States for ratification next year.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders herefore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Waggonner (at the request of Mr. Williams), for 15 minutes, today, to reword and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Johnson of Maryland, for 15 minutes, Wednesday, June 29, 1962.

Mr. Ellsworth (at the request of Mr. Cahn), for 15 minutes, today, to re-examine and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Derwinski (at the request of Mr. Cahill), for 120 minutes, on July 16, 1962.
ENROLLING BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon referred as follows:

S. 1012. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power system of the Flathead Irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1014. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands held under the authority of the United States, prior to March 3, 1906, at the present fair market value; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. FINO.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 3065. An act to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

Mr. Moorehead of Pennsylvania. Mr. BATCHELDER. Mr. DELANEY.

(Senate bills referred, as follows:)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. FINO.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2238. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, relative to reporting an overobligation of the Secretary, 1920, on the appropriation (2020902, "Salaries and expenses, Internal Revenue Service," pursuant to Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-54 and of section 3070 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2239. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, relative to a report of the extent and disposition of U.S. contributions to international organizations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 806, 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 460); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2240. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of tax and other revenue collection activities of the Finance Office, Department of General Administration, District of Columbia Government, June 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2241. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A Study of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2242. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217), and also to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2243. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217), and also to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2244. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "sections 1904 and 1905 of title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 454. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 234, 84th Congress, 1st session, entitled "The Prayer Room in the United States Capitol": pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution (Rept. No. 1910). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 470. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of hearings on Judicial Review of Veterans' Claims, 87th Congress, 2nd session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 483. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a report entitled "Motor Vehicles, Air Pollution and Health" as a House document, and ordering for printing without amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a report on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Constitutional Rights of the Mentally Ill" and "Wicetapping and Eavesdropping Legislation": without amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 415. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Supplement to Cumulative Index to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities—1955 through 1960 (84th, 85th, and 86th Congs.)" 97th Congress, 1st session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 417. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the publication "Cumulative Index to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities, 1955-64," 84th Congress, 1st session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 417.
Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1278, parts 1 and 2, 87th Congress, 1st session; with amendment (Rept. No. 1918). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. A Concurrent resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1922. A house joint resolution to establish the purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11998. A bill to amend the act of January 30, 1919, to provide that the American Hospital of Paris shall have perpetual succession; without amendment (Rept. No. 1921). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 720. Joint resolution to designate September 17, 1962, as Antietam Day, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1922). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference. H.R. 12299. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1960, enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1923). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 717. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 11998, for the purpose of adjusting assistance to domestic industry, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 11970. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1925). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, 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. 1689. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecelia Aguasan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1943. An act for the relief of Hajime Sumita; without amendment (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2198. An act for the relief of Marie Berthe Marguerite De Simone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2600. An act for the relief of Patricia Kim Bell (Kim Booshin); without amendment (Rept. No. 1929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2607. An act for the relief of Lee Hwa Sun; without amendment (Rept. No. 1930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2633. An act for the relief of Susan Holt Leake; with amendment (Rept. No. 1931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2670. An act for the relief of John Axel Arvidson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2732. An act for the relief of Tsoon So Shin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1933). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7736. A bill to amend the act of May 13, 1960 (Private Law 86-286); without amendment (Rept. No. 1934). 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. FINO:

H.R. 12295. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a register for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 12300. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1924). Referred to the House Calendar.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 12301. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities in order to provide educational assistance under the provisions of such act to the District of Columbia and to make the change in the District of Columbia motor fuel tax law; and to ensure that such assistance will be fully effective; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STENN:

H.R. 12305. A bill to amend the Library Services Act in order to make areas lacking public libraries or with inadequate public libraries, public elementary and secondary school libraries, and certain college and university libraries, eligible for benefits under that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CERY:

H.R. 12304. A bill to amend sections 281 and 344 of title 42, United States Code, relating to the establishment of a register of the Armed Forces for demonstration and experimental occupational safety projects and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12307. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of the U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAFER:

H.R. 12308. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission of Nuisance and Obscene Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 12309. A bill to amend section 102 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 12306. A bill to encourage the development, initiation, and expansion of occupational safety programs in the States through grants to States for demonstration and experimental occupational safety projects and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SANTANA:

H.R. 12307. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of the U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAFER:

H.R. 12308. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission of Nuisance and Obscene Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 12309. A bill to amend section 102 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 12306. A bill to encourage the development, initiation, and expansion of occupational safety programs in the States through grants to States for demonstration and experimental occupational safety projects and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:
H.R. 12311. A bill for the relief of Naja Nessrallah, his wife, Samira Nessrallah, and their minor sons, Koehnya Nessrallah and Mansur Nessrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:
H.R. 12312. A bill for the relief of William C. Jeevy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUTLER:
H.R. 12313. A bill for the relief of Jane Froman, Gypsy Markoff, and Jean Rosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Facts on Communist Propaganda, IV—A Profit for the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I now include part IV in this series of background information on the problem of Communist propaganda in this country.

Previous parts in this series were part I, "Universal Postal Union"; part II, "Volume of Propaganda"; part III, "American Publications in Russia."

A PROFIT FOR THE UNITED STATES?

Some reference has been made to the pounds of mail sent from this country to Iron Curtain nations and to the pounds of mail received from these same countries. When considering such figures it is well to inquire further as to just what these figures reflect.

First, there are the figures for all types of international mail including letters, printed matter and packages, which are the three basic classes of international mail. It shows that Americans sent 16 million pounds of mail of all classes to eight Iron Curtain countries during the year ending March 31, 1961. During the same period there was delivered to this country by Communist authorities 2.3 million pounds of mail.

Second, there are figures which reflect only the amount of letters and printed matter. These figures show that we sent 2.5 million pounds and received 1.6 million pounds during the same period.

Third, it should be remembered that much of the mail going overseas is in the form of packages sent to relatives and friends behind the Iron Curtain, packages containing such items as soap, clothes, and other necessities which are not available as readily as they are here. These figures do not, however, reflect the sending of CARE packages, since they are handled through other channels.

Fourth, it should be remembered also that the amount of mail sent to Iron Curtain countries is not the same as the amount of mail actually delivered to individuals in those countries. There is ample evidence that mail is censored in the Iron Curtain countries. Many people in this country attempt to send magazines and books behind the Iron Curtain, which is one reason that we send more pounds of mail than we receive. But there is considerable evidence that much of the printed matter does not reach its destination; that religious material and publications are refused entry; that current events periodicals are banned; that only some travel magazines and other such material are actually delivered within the Iron Curtain countries.

Fifth, there is the claim made by some people that because we send more pounds of mail than we receive, we therefore make a profit on our international mail operations. This claim bears closer examination.

From the dollar point of view, it is quite possible to make a profit on international mail. To the port; and, third, cost of delivering all mail. That is why we have to take in more money through the sale of U.S. postage on international mail leaving this country than it costs our Post Office Department to handle all international mail. Post Office costs involve three things: First, cost of transporting our outgoing mail from all over the country to ports; second, cost of transporting this mail from our ports to its overseas destination—to a port or airport; and, third, cost of delivering all mail received from foreign countries to its destination in this country.

Obviously, there are high costs involved in these three operations. That is why international mail requires higher postage than domestic mail. But it is not high enough to cover the costs. Post Office Department official figures show that during the last fiscal year this country lost $17.8 million on international mail.

Obviously, there is no profit for this country. There is a loss.

Free Life Insurance for Members of the Armed Forces on Active Duty Outside the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide free life insurance to those members of the Armed Forces on active duty outside the United States.

The maximum amount of insurance to be provided in each case is $10,000 reduced by the amount of U.S. Government life insurance or national service life insurance held by the insured and in force at the time of his death.

This insurance will be provided by the United States without cost to the servant. In this regard, the bill provides that upon application, any member of the Armed Forces shall be granted a waiver of premium payment on any policy of National Service Life Insurance during the term of his active duty outside the United States. Such waiver shall render the insurance nonparticipating while the waiver is in effect. Additional premiums may be paid in effect, all premiums on 5-year level premium term insurance, and the portion of premiums on all other insurance which represents the pure insurance risk shall be waived.

The need for a program of this kind is certainly apparent. Today, large numbers of the Armed Forces perform vital and essential security and defense assignments outside the United States. Annually, many of these men die by accidents or other causes while in the performance of these tasks. Moreover, we need only refer to our daily newspapers to learn that a number of these men are also dying in Laos and other international trouble spots where they are engaged in direct conflict and combat with the enemies of our freedom.

These men who die for freedom's common cause are, in many instances, insured for much less than the maximum protection provided by this bill or the current National Service Life Insurance and the U.S. Government life insurance programs. In fact, in a significant number of cases, men die without the benefit of any life insurance whatever in favor of their dependents and loved ones. In this latter case especially, deserving dependents are too many for the too-little-too-late remuneration provided under the dependency and indemnity compensation provisions of 38 United States Code 3001, and the following.

Upon enactment of this bill the benefit will constitute a much needed and a very worthy improvement over the present system of insurance under which many servicemen—either because of lack of funds, or lack of wisdom, or just plain oversight—have not applied and perhaps will not apply for any insurance at all, or as is the case in too many instances, have applied for far less than the maximum protection to which they are entitled.

Under this bill, the loved ones at home would be more cheerful and more at ease in the knowledge of a certain measure
of economic security in the event of the death of a member of the Armed Forces who serves in the world's 'hot spots' or at our country's other vital defense posts outside the United States.

This bill, I might add, is identical in principal to the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, 65 Statutes 33. Consequently, within its limitations, the bill would produce a corresponding saving to the Government in the elimination of the red tape and expense in man-hours and money that is required in the administration of a premium payment plan.

This bill provides a $10,000 indemnity to the families of those individuals who lose their lives as a result of an active duty outside of the United States, in one of the branches of the armed services. There would be a maximum lump sum payment of $10,000 payable to the wife, child, children, parents, brothers, or sisters.

Secretary Ribicoff on Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1962

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, in discussing Federal aid to education on the radio-TV program "Meet the Press," the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on June 17, 1962, stated that there are five elements of aid which "would be the basis for a new discussion and a new dialog in America in the entire field of education."

With the thought that those of my colleagues who missed the program will be interested in the Secretary's latest views, under leave to extend my remarks, I include those excerpts from the interview which deal with educational aid.

SECRETARY RIBICOFF ON AID TO EDUCATION

New Brookes (moderator). And now resuming our interview, our guest today is the Secretary of Education, and Welfare, Mr. Abraham Ribicoff. You have just met Lawrence E. Spivak, our permanent member of the panel. Our other reporters are Jack Bell of the Associated Press, Miss Marianne Means, Hearst newspapers, and Robert McCormick, NBC News.

We will continue the questions with Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Do you agree with the President—I think it is a decision of the President—it is unconstitutional to give aid to secondary parochial schools, direct grants to them?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Across the board grants as the President has said, are unconstitutional.

Mr. BELL. Across the board, as you just pointed out, higher education comes in a different category, and of course these are hedged in, these grants. But I'm trying to get at the basic belief that you have of whether it is constitutional to provide for the education of children in secondary parochial schools.

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Well, let me say this: I think there are things that can be done that are constitutional, that would mention them to you. Higher education I think is constitutional. Special purposes grants, and loans for the purpose of science, education—science, math, and foreign languages—is constitutional. In my opinion auxiliary services that go to the child—such as health services, school lunches, bus transportation, school books—are constitutional.

There is another method that can be used that hasn't been used too much. I think that is constitutional, and that is the use of tax credits and tax deductions. And I would advocate this used as an alternative to give to all the children and their parents an equal opportunity and an opportunity for children going to private schools.

There are some 6½ million youngsters going to elementary and secondary private schools. They are not all Catholic. Mr. Bell. Out of the 6½ million, 1.2 million of these go to non-Catholic schools. Let me give you an example of one of these.

Mr. BELL. I didn't say they were all Catholic, Mr. Secretary. I regard a parochial school as a private school as a tax deduction, and I think that is the accepted sense of it.

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. And I would treat all students going to private schools the same way. Let me show you how the tax credit could work out.

Let us assume that there was voted across-the-board grants to pupils of $20 per pupil. I think under these circumstances it would be fair to give the parents of the child who is going to a private school a tax credit of $20 because in the final analysis, these parents are making a great contribution to all education. It is just as well as the public school, and I do think, in an element of justice, they should be entitled to a tax credit.

This is a method which I think with the other three I outlined, together with the possibility of the tax deduction approach, that could take us out of this great bind that could take us out of this bitterness, and come up with a new discussion, Mr. Bell, on this all-important subject.

These five elements could be the basis for a new discussion and a new dialog in America in the entire field of education.

Mr. BELL. Isn't the tax cut program which you are advocating almost exactly the same thing Senator Barry Goldwater has advocated?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. I don't know.

Mr. BELL. He has advocated a tax reduction to make up for local school taxes, which would amount to the same thing.

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Well, I don't know whether Senator Barry Goldwater advocated it or not, but I would say we should explore the tax credit and tax deduction feature in order to get over this particular problem because what we must be interested in in America is a good education for every child, whether in a school of our choice, a parochial school or a private school.

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Secretary, you are a lawyer. Do you first of all think that a Federal aid bill which gives money to private schools directly for teachers' salaries is unconstitutional?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. A Federal aid bill—no, I think it is a bill. Mr. SPIVAK. For parochial schools, too? SECRETARY RIBICOFF. For parochial schools?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Across the board it would be unconstitutional, but if it were across the board, it is the same thing as the deduction, which has nothing to do with religion, such as in the field of math, such as in the field of languages, such as in the field of education, similar to the approach of the National Defense Education Act, under these circumstances and for that purpose I don't think it would be unconstitutional.

Mr. SPIVAK. If you use the money to build the schoolroom, you couldn't designate it for building and not for other things?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Oh, yes, you could.

There is no reason why you couldn't use these funds for specific purposes for a math building that would be used for math, science, and languages, in which religion would not be taught at all.

Mr. SPIVAK. No, but of course if a parochial school were given money to build a building, you wouldn't insist it just be used for one purpose for one subject.

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Yes, if grants or loans were to be given for such purpose, it should be decided for that purpose only, Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Secretary, isn't that just splitting legalistic hairs to say that you can grants or loans for research such as mathematics will be taught, but you can't grant Federal funds to a parochial school for a classroom in which something else might be taught.

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. No, Mr. Bell, because there is always a fine line in every law, and basically we are engaged at the present time and have been for a long period of time in giving grants to medical schools, for giving grants to research, for giving grants to religious education, and we'll see whether that is constitutional or not. I don't know.

Mr. BELL. Has that ever been tested in the Supreme Court?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Measures such as this have not been tested in the Supreme Court.

Mr. BELL. We don't know whether it is constitutional or not?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. No, that is right, but there are outward limits to which you cannot go, and that is for say any measure that would happen to do with the teaching of religion, I believe would be unconstitutional. I think both sides would agree that would be unconstitutional. I think both sides would say you could do things that you can do, and I would try to confine it to the measures that can be done. And I think that I would advise you before the measures that could be done constitutionally. You have to confine it to the constitutional means.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. McCormick. I would like to ask a very quick one, and then I'll turn it over to Mr. Spivak. On this tax deduction, that would apply to the parents of students in parochial schools, is that correct?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. The children in all private schools, be they parochial or not, are eligible.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Yes, but I mean it would not apply—I mean this is not a new education program in which we give a tax allowance for it?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. No, it isn't a new educational program. It is what I consider a sense of fairness. And one of the means to get over this great hassle that has taken place, and I do believe that we could do this by way of a constitutional measure, and we could have a constitutional restriction to give this tax credit and deduction to the parents of children in parochial schools.

Mr. SPIVAK. How would the money get to the school itself? You would give it to the parents or the parents would give it to the school?

SECRETARY RIBICOFF. Well, basically, the parents would decide the method by which tuition in many private schools, and basically
tuition is not a matter that is given a tax credit or tax deduction at the present time and by a series of credits or deductions, you can equalize the sense of fairness and be within constitutional means, Mr. Spivak.

Mr. Spivak. They are paying that tuition now, are they? If you give a $20 credit, do you think they would turn that over to the parochial school for buildings or for teachers?

Secretary Ribicoff. That would be entirely up to the parents and their relation with the schools.

Mr. Spivak. I don’t see how that would do the parochial school any good.

Secretary Ribicoff. The parents are the ones who are paying all the extraneous private education, and to the extent you give them a sense of equalization, at least you leave the parents in the sense of wholeness, and they are not having their funds go for education in public schools and private schools at the same time. You are making a basis of equality between the parents who are sending their children to private schools and the public schools who really receive a Federal grant. So there is a balancing off.

Mr. Spivak. Yes, but the parent who got the $20 credit is likely to keep that credit and the parochial school that has to pay extra money for its teachers or for buildings would not get the benefit of the Federal Government gave it to them?

Secretary Ribicoff. Well, I would say “No.”

Mr. Spivak. The parent wouldn’t give a $20 to the parochial school. If the private school wanted to raise the tuition to the parents of the children, I suppose they could do it. But that would be an arrangement between the private schools and the parents.

Mr. Spivak. I still don’t see how— Secretary Ribicoff. To help the schools.

Mr. Brooks. I’m sorry at this point we are going to have to suspend our question.

Commonsense About the Common Market
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OF PENNSYLVANIA
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Tuesday, June 26, 1962

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the agreement, which begins the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. In view of this fact, I should like to ask permission to insert in the Record the text of a speech of mine which I made to the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh’s World Trade Council on February 22 of this year.

The speech follows:

COMMONSENSE ABOUT THE COMMON MARKET

(Remarks of William S. Moorehead to the World Trade Council of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh)

The entire free world is engaged in a military, political and economic struggle with the forces of international communism. On the political and economic front, there is one development that is a fact overtaking importance.

We have had our eyes so riveted upon the critical role of events in Vietnam and Laos, we have failed to realize the significance and the breathtaking possibilities of the European Common Market.

After World War II, Europe was a weak and divided continent, a vacuum attracting Soviet aggression. We propped up Europe with the Marshall Plan and NATO and defended it by our monopoly of atomic and nuclear weapons.

With our loss of our nuclear monopoly, the policy of unifying and strengthening the European economy became more urgent. We encouraged this development, which by 1957, established the European Common Market.

The success of the European Common Market has been so remarkable that it has exceeded dreams of its most loyal supporters. Its success has been so great and its future so certain that the British Government, despite the historic pressures for holding aloof from Europe, has decided to negotiate for membership in the Common Market. The British are attempting to join not to rescue the Common Market from its current weakness but to reap the benefits of membership in it. To do this Britain may have to adapt, though not necessarily weaken its ties with the Commonwealth, modify its traditional balance of power policy toward France and Germany and even surrender some of its sovereignty to the European political institutions.

Some of Britain’s partners in the European Free Trade Association, Outer Europe, will certainly want to follow suit. If these negotiations are successful, the European Economic Community will be enlarged to include more than 230 million consumers and producers whose goods, farm products and workers can eventually move across national frontiers nearly as freely as ours move across our own State borders.

The struggle between our Western society and the Eastern society has often been called a struggle for the minds and the souls of men. In our nuclear age, so long as there exists nuclear weapons, no one side can impose its doctrine and its ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men is not going to be decided merely by propaganda policy question that converts our adversaries and they are not going to convert us.

The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacities to become powerful and great; to become the leaders in science and technology; to see that their peoples are properly educated in order to operate such a society; to give their people the satisfaction which comes from having the opportunity to work for their best hopes.

In this connection, if the European Common Market continues to flourish, it will exert a tremendous and beneficent influence upon the peoples of the captive nations of Eastern Europe. As Western Europe prospers, the Eastern European nations may, of necessity, be drawn closer to the Western orbit and eventually tear the Commonwealth, which has been so remarkable that it has weakened its ties with the Commonwealth, to take advantage of it. I salute you as front line soldiers in the economic battle against communism.

Furthermore, I believe that you have taken a position which is a sound business one. Today the American economy, which has developed so magnificently because it had a mass market of 48 States in a free trading area, can no longer meet the demands of the people of 50 States but many of those of an expanding world market as well. This means that American demand such as existed in the immediate post war years. Instead our domestic market is expected to grow more slowly, prompted largely by the demands of a growing population and replacements. To continue to raise our living standards, it is obviously necessary to develop a longer time these new customers will not be found in the underdeveloped countries of the world. However, they can be found in the highly developed countries in Europe, Canada, and Japan.

For instance, in testimony given before the Joint Economic Committee in December, one witness estimated that only 10 percent of the families in the present Common Market area owned television sets as compared with 89 percent of the families in the United States: 20 percent owned radios as compared with 92 percent. Where 12 percent have either refrigerators or washing machines as against well over 90 percent of our families in America.

Further, wages have grown up at a rate in excess of 5 percent per year for many European countries and almost 10 percent per year for Germany since 1958. These wage increases reflect increases in the gross national product in real terms, which has also grown substantially for all the Common Market countries reaching from an average of 5.5 percent for France to 9.2 percent for Germany. Roughly 35.1 percent of the households in these comparative confirm my own impressions from a recent trip to Europe. I am convinced that Europe is the largest market that the greatest consumer buying power the world has ever seen. Consider the European woman. The European continues the upper income people will be able less and less to rely on domestic help. They must turn to labor-saving devices. Consider the European man’s paycheck increases, as wages continue to go up, his wife is going to insist upon some of these advantages that she have. Consider the fact that consumer credit and modern merchandising techniques are just as much a factor as making the European economy. All of these things should stimulate demands tremendously. Who is going to satisfy them? Is it going to
be only European business employing European workers or are we going to join in and let American business and American workers share in supplying this demand for goods?

Today, we have the technology and we have the mass market for these types of products. This gives us a competitive advantage, but protectionism will accomplish little.

We cannot, of course, be certain that new bargaining authority would guarantee a favorable outcome for the U.S. But this much we know: Year after year, the U.S. exports far more goods than it imports, both to the non-Communist and to the Western Europe. Even if, after new tariff reductions, our imports and exports should expand only slightly, our trade surplus would be larger, thus giving us a more satisfactory margin with which to finance our military and aid programs abroad, private investments, tourist expenditures, and the like.

During the period in which our balance of payments is being adjusted, we must guard against an international financial crisis which could cause a run on the dollar and affect our gold position. On January 31, the committee in Congress, the Banking and Currency Committee, will begin hearings on several important foreign exchange arrangements for the International Monetary Fund. The strengthening of the International Monetary Fund, and the present tendency of American business to invest in productive facilities abroad with correspondingly less capital available for investment in job-creating programs at home, will be the beginning of one of the toughest and most important battles in Congress this year.

Three alternatives face America and the Congress. We can either do nothing, or resort to protectionism, or negotiate a trading relationship with the free world.

In reality, there are only two alternatives because to do nothing is unthinkable. If we fail to act, the third cannot increase our imports and we cannot protect ourselves from imports. To maintain or increase our market in Europe for American goods it will be necessary for us to negotiate with the Common Market to reduce the common external tariff and other restrictions against American goods. At present, the President's authority to negotiate under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is extremely limited because the authority has been exhausted and because the item by item negotiation required under the act is not suitable for dealing with a bloc of countries like the Common Market.

On the other hand, if we resort to protectionism, we can be certain that our allies erect protectionist barriers against us. Production would fall and unemploy-ment would follow. We would be proceeding for a more limited market. We could expect an increase in capital investment abroad with correspondingly less capital available for investment in job-creating production in the United States. As our industry becomes lean and less competitive because it was protected from competition from abroad, we could expect to lose our share of the huge export markets such as Japan, Canada, South America and the other developing nations. Although the siren call of protectionism may be strong in the short-term, because it promises a means with which to buy our products. While there was not a demand in the United States, it was perfectly understandable for the businessman to sell exclusively in the United States where language, currency, and taste are the same. Today, a billion dollar profit in the United States, it was perfectly understandable for the businessman to take the leadership in assisting American business to be competitive in the world market.

A program has been established under the direction of the Department of Commerce to promote exports, both by increasing awareness, of the wide array and high quality of the U.S. products. The program includes regional conferences and a more active field service to provide information on foreign markets and exhibits and missions abroad, and an increased number of Government commercial representatives to aid the U.S. businessmen abroad. The expanding markets of the future will be found abroad. It is up to the American business to seek them aggressively.

The Federal Reserve has the legitimate function to perform in assisting American business to be competitive in the world market. A program has been established under the direction of the Department of Commerce to promote exports, both by increasing awareness of the wide array and high quality of the U.S. products. The program includes regional conferences and a more active field service to provide information on foreign markets and exhibits and missions abroad, and an increased number of Government commercial representatives to aid the U.S. businessmen abroad. In addition to improving the flow of information about export possibilities, legislation recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee was enacted to improve U.S. competitiveness in the important international financial markets. The new law: (1) eliminates the need for availability and export insurance for commercial and technical risks; (2) steps designed to place the U.S. businessman on a par with the foreign exporters. The Export-Import Bank has been working in cooperation with the commercial banks and a group of insurance companies, simplified and expanded opportunities for credit and export insurance. An exporter is now able to arrange for full credit and insurance advantages directly with his local bank.

Our tax policies should be updated, too. Many foreign factories which have been built from scratch since World War II are far more efficient than ours. Too many of our plants are obsolete, high-cost producers. To stimulate modernization, the Administration approved, legislated depreciation allowances and tax credits for plant improvements.

Plant modernization, however, will tend to dislocate workers. Therefore, accompanying any measures to stimulate modernization there should be a manpower retraining act so that our work force will be up graded so as to be able to perform the new jobs which an expanding and changing economy will provide.

Finally, we must recognize that there are some industries in which no degree of modernization or training of workers will do the job. In these industries a degree of protection geared to tariffs or quotas must be continued for the period of time necessary to allow adjustment to take place. Financial and technical assistance should be provided to make this transition as painless as possible.

If we take these steps, we will be competitive with Europe—not only in Europe but also with the third market of the world. We will find new customers for our production, and our production and our employment will increase.

Not only will we be working for world prosperity but also for world peace. If the industrialized nations of the world are cooperating together, then problems like that of Berlin or Laos become more manageable because the over-all political and economic power of the free world will be such that a match for the Communist world.

Nineteen hundred sixty-two is the year for the U.S. to take the leadership in the great and historic business of uniting the non-Communist world in one low tariff trading area. Unquestionably, the expansion of the European Common Market and the creation of a free world trading relationship will present the Soviet system with its greatest economic challenge in decades. To work for this end, as you are doing, is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do.

Senior Citizens Legislative Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 26, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my remarks last evening before the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons.

The speech follows:


Mr. Chairman, delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, I am indeed happy to have the opportunity to discuss with delegates to the American Association of Retired Teachers and the American Association of Retired Persons, sponsored by the pending legislation and some of the programs that are being considered on the Federal level on behalf of our rapidly growing retired population. It is a special
providing population and putting a greater continually increasing our so-called non-institutionalized care, for retired persons. In this area, we have a common interest too once one of the subject matters that has been referred to the general Subcommittee on Education of which I am chairman has to do with the coordination and expansion of all of our programs for the aged population. Representatives of your organizations testified before our subcommittee that the elderly do not want charity, they do not want a “handout,” they do not want to be treated as a necessary evil, or as one witness stated, they do not want to “vegetate.” Indeed an intense desire was expressed for an opportunity to be of service to their communities, for better employment opportunities, for a greater sense of their own value to society, to have available educational, recreational, and cultural programs that will lead to a more meaningful, purposeful existence, and for the type of medical care programs that will keep the elderly healthy, ambulatory, independent, and productive.

My limited knowledge of your organization indicates that you are making a substantial contribution toward meeting these goals. I am particularly impressed with the insurance for retired teachers at a time when many said that it was impossible to provide health insurance for retired teachers at a time when many said that it was impossible to provide health insurance for those over 65. Indeed, the insurance companies that 5 years ago said that it was impossible to furnish health insurance for the aged are now taking full advantage of the legislation that is now before the Congress of the United States, which is now bogged down in the Ways and Means Committee. The companies will sell more health insurance than physicians’ fees and surgery, and medical care costs, as has been charged, it is my belief that enactment of this bill would stimulate such growth. Such was the result of the leadership that your organizations have taken in promoting a wide range of programs on behalf of retired persons. In this area, we have a common interest too once one of the subject matters that has been referred to the general Subcommittee on Education of which I am chairman has to do with the coordination and expansion of all of our programs for the aged population. Representatives of your organizations testified before our subcommittee that the elderly do not want charity, they do not want a “handout,” they do not want to be treated as a necessary evil, or as one witness stated, they do not want to “vegetate.” Indeed an intense desire was expressed for an opportunity to be of service to their communities, for better employment opportunities, for a greater sense of their own value to society, to have available educational, recreational, and cultural programs that will lead to a more meaningful, purposeful existence, and for the type of medical care programs that will keep the elderly healthy, ambulatory, independent, and productive.

The answers are not simple, however. Along with our growing aged population and increased longevity come many problems—an increased need for medical services, more frequent, longer, and more expensive hospital stays, a greater need for nursing home and rest home care with the resulting need for more medical insurance. We also find a sad lack of adequate low-rent housing for the elderly, a continuing decline in the quality of the middle-aged, as well as those over 65, and a shortage of education, recreational and leisure time services and facilities. The aged are facing new problems and new problems are becoming critical. I need to hear to this the dedication and the opportunities, for the type of medical care programs that will keep the elderly healthy, ambulatory, independent, and productive.
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would, if enacted, provide effective Federal guidance, support, and stimulation for many different types of programs for the aged. And other State and Federal agencies operate a wide variety of programs for our senior citizens. One of the advantages cited for the establishment of a Federal agency to coordinate and encourage programs for the aging is that it will bring together the educational programs, serve as a central source of information, make studies and reports for the President, and function with the information as to the needs and problems of the aging, and finally to recommend national policies on an annual basis.

3. Establishment of a Joint congressional committee which will act as a watchdog over the Federal agencies. The committee will be made available to other agencies and organizations. Support will be given to developing programs, including training of personnel that will be capable of operating programs that can cope with the problem of the aging. It is hoped that we can secure the passage of legislation at this session of Congress which will provide the means through which our responsibilities will be fulfilled.

At the present time a study is being made in regard to the most effective methods through which effective action can be insured. The proposed legislation has as its main features:

1. Establishment of a President's Council on Aging consisting of top-level Cabinet officers in those departments that administer programs for the aging.

2. Establishment of a staff for the Council whose main function will be to promote coordination between existing programs, encourage the development of new programs, serve as a central source of information, make studies and reports for the President, and function with the information as to the needs and problems of the aging, and finally to recommend national policies on an annual basis.

3. Establishment of a Joint congressional committee which will act as a watchdog over the Federal agencies. The committee will be made available to other agencies and organizations. Support will be given to developing programs, including training of personnel that will be capable of operating programs that can cope with the problem of the aging. It is hoped that we can secure the passage of legislation at this session of Congress which will provide the means through which our responsibilities will be fulfilled.

Fire Island is a natural resource located anywhere on our eastern shore a few miles of metropolitan New York. It is even more valuable and worthy of the most enlightened processing of ideas than was the number of thoughts about what can and should be done about Fire Island in the national interest and for the benefit of the public. But as our population grows, we need a way to go about this. The improper way to go about this is the Stony Brook Fire Island project. In a letter dated June 13, 1962, Mr. Udall wrote to the President urging cooperation in behalf of a program that will secure action on many fronts for the aged.

3. Establishment of a Joint congressional committee which will act as a watchdog over the Federal agencies. The committee will be made available to other agencies and organizations. Support will be given to developing programs, including training of personnel that will be capable of operating programs that can cope with the problem of the aging. It is hoped that we can secure the passage of legislation at this session of Congress which will provide the means through which our responsibilities will be fulfilled.

As you know, many of our educational institutions will cause an awareness of the problems of the aged. As I have mentioned, the President and Congress which will keep them informed as to the needs and problems of the aging, and finally to recommend national policies on an annual basis.

4. Establishment of a grant program for the purpose of (a) $6,000,000 for the next 5 years for planning grants for the States to encourage development of programs for the aged; and (b) $10 million a year for 5 years for training personnel in communities needing them. Support will be given to developing programs, including training of personnel that will be capable of operating programs that can cope with the problem of the aging. It is hoped that we can secure the passage of legislation at this session of Congress which will provide the means through which our responsibilities will be fulfilled.
A great many millions of dollars will have to be spent, as the Army Engineers recommend, on hydraulic fill and other improvements to keep the barrier and dunes from being washed away and to protect the southern shore of Long Island. For another storm like that of last March could very well finish Fire Island, a work of art that has been catastrophic in its comparative isolation. And Secretary Udall, according to his latest fluctuation, thinks it would be a fine thing to go out and save preserves and dunes which contributed so much of Fire Island as is still possible and preserve the strip in more or less of a natural state.

Mr. Moses, however, believes that the people residing there are meant to be used by all the people. He would build a boulevard on top of the projected bulkwall, and thus ultimately unite the bridges at either end of Fire Island. There is nothing hideous about this, in the Moses opinion. With proper zoning, he thinks the result would be at least no worse than the island's existing communities. Instead of keeping Fire Island locked up as sort of a seaside isolationist, Green-

wich Village for the benefit of the relatively few, Mr. Moses wants to unlock the resorts for everyone's enjoyment. True, Fire Island won't be quite the same, but this should be no real cause for tears. We believe that Mr. Moses, in holding out for the road (and plenty of access to the ocean beaches), is right.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 26, 1962]

MOSES' ROAD WOULD LIMIT FIRE ISLAND ACCESS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

Your editorial supporting Robert Moses' proposal for a Fire Island road does an injustice to "the embattled Fire Islanders" as well as to Secretary Udall, in supposing that the Moses plan opens up more of Fire Island to the general public than the Udall plan which the Fire Islanders support.

The facts are exactly the opposite. Commissioner Moses wants to put a road on top of the dune along the entire 31-mile ocean front, but only permits the general public to get off this road at the Fire Island State Park on the west and Smith Point County Park on the east, (which 2-3 of the ocean front) he proposes "limited access." This means that only we supposedly "isolationist" Fire Island residents will be permitted to drive our cars off the road into what is left of our communities, after a 300-foot right-of-way has been chopped out for the road and plenty of access to the ocean beaches), is right.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 26, 1962]

SECRETARY L. UDALL

Secretary of the Interior.

The undeveloped, eastern reaches of Fire Island offer the last opportunity in the State of New York to preserve a natural, undeveloped public beach. If recreation is the goal, what is needed is a series of protective works to build up the dunes in accordance with a long-range plan authorized by Congress in 1960.

What is not needed is a through highway, as recommended by Robert Moses, that will turn the Island into a pandemonium route on week-ends. New York and Long Island residents have no shortage now of four-lane roads for such high-speed travel. The whole point of fire Island is to keep as much of Fire Island as is possible in its natural state, while at the same time preserving and protecting the area for public recreation. But this is not my position entirely clear. Let me repeat what I have said to many of your residents who have written to me in recent weeks: The Dunes, that will be the Interior, under existing and pending authorities of the Congress, stands ready to assist in building up the dunes in accordance with the long-range plan of acquiring and preserving areas such as Fire Island for the enjoyment of our people for generations to come. I will continue to support this position. But a matter of fact is that a sound conservation result will only be achieved on Fire Island with the cooperation of the State of New York and Suffolk County.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL
Secretary of the Interior.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1962]

USING THE SHORES WEEKLY—II

A National Park Service survey has identified Fire Island as one of the few remaining areas on the Atlantic coast suitable for preservation as a national seashore park. Undeveloped parts of the island ought to be acquired now, in a joint Federal-State acquisition program as recommended by Secretary Udall, in order to "keep as much of the Island as is possible in its natural state, while at the same time preserving and protecting the area for public recreation." Among the things from which Fire Island must be protected is the entirely unnecessary highway that Mr. Moses has projected for an area that is already freely accessible without any such destructive development.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 23, 1962]

Mr. Moses is Right About Fire Island

In the controversy over Fire Island, the leaders who speak for the State and county governments, and Secretary Udall and the embattled Fire Island residents, there is one unmistakable point of agreement.
In all political campaigns much is said about philosophy; this is pertinent because from his basic philosophy a man derives about philosophy; this is pertinent because and, consequently, he can make within the framework of those beliefs and the contribution to society that he can make within the framework of those beliefs. We live in a society which is flavored by the widest variety of individual differences. This is basic to our democracy. We sometimes forget that there is a distinction between unity and uniformity. What has been customarily and usual should not necessarily determine the direction of our social and political lives. Whether change is desirable or necessary depends upon given circumstances. The Constitution gives to the people the power of decision in the form of election, referendum, and direct exercise of public opinion. In other areas the people transfer some of their authority and power to their elected Representatives for the sake of an efficient political system, maintaining only an advisory voice.

Edmund Burke, in 1774, put into words better than I can, the relationship which I believe exists between the elector and the elected. He said: "It ought to be the happiness and the glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved common interest, with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unfeigned attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to put the interest of his constituents above his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. This he does not derive from your pleasure, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Applying this to our times, a Representative owes his constituents the closest attention to their problems and the most earnest consideration of their views. In respect to legislation, he must depend upon mature judgment and conscience in deciding how he votes.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress 49th Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1962

Mr. SIKES, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the membership of the House will read with interest a telegram sent by President John F. Kennedy to Henry H. Buckman, president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress during its annual meeting in Washington last month. The message follows:


Henry H. Buckman, President, National Rivers and Harbor Congress, Washington, D.C.

It was with great regret that I was unable to accept your kind invitation to address your 49th national convention. The continued development of our water resources is one of the important tasks to which this administration is dedicated. Your organization during the past half century has contributed greatly to our accomplishments in this field, and I am sure will continue to do so.

Heartening progress has been made in the conservation and development of our water and related land resources in the past 18 months. Many new water resources projects have been started and planning for such developments has been intensified. Surveys and advanced engineering have been accelerated so that more high priority projects will be ready for construction as needed. A most significant step was taken toward maintaining the quality of this country's water with the enactment last year of the amendments to strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. A new policy has been adopted in cooperation with Federal reservoirs to provide for the acquisition of land sufficient to preserve the recreational potential of those areas for the increasing public use in future years. Many others for which proposals were taken, as outlined in my conservation message to the Congress.

To assure that future developments will meet all foreseeable needs and provide maximum benefits for all purposes, I approved, a few months ago, a statement of policies, standards, and procedures for the use of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, Army, and Health, Education and Welfare in the formulation, evaluation, and review of plans for the use and development of water and related land resources. The Bureau of the Budget will use the approved statement in its review of proposed programs and projects and I have accordingly directed that Budget Circular A-47 be rescinded.

There is, of course, much remaining to be done in the field of conservation and development of our resources. Last year I transmitted to the Congress a draft of legislation entitled the "Water Resources Planning Act." Enactment of this legislation would provide a foundation for the continued development of our water resources by providing for preparation of comprehensiveriver master plans, for strengthening their participation in planning water development activities, and for periodic assessment of the water supply-demand outlook.

Our goal is to have sufficient water sufficiently clean in the right place at the right time to give the resources man and industrial needs. This administration adheres to the policy that our available water supply be managed so that it can do dual benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation, flood control, navigation, recreation and wildlife, and municipal and industrial water supply. Thus, I share your view on the need for the continued orderly and balanced development, conservation and use for all beneficial purposes of our water and land resources. To all of your members and delegates I extend every best wish.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, who didst guide our fathers when they laid the foundation of our land, give to those who now are called to order by the Vice President. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 26, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3161) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the differences in reports of the House and Senate on the Reserve Act of 1952, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1916), relating to lump-sum readjustment payments for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, to which the Senate had agreed:

MESSAGES TO THE STATES

H.R. 10541. An act to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their popu-