

A. Julia J. Norrell, 1332 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Gerald G. Wagner, G.M.I. Associates, 1332 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Feed Manufacturers Association, Inc., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hart Perry, 10 MacDougal Alley, New York, N.Y.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. and International Telephone & Telegraph Credit Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard A. Prentice, 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Proprietary Association, 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. L. C. Pyle, 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Robert H. Reiter, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Kollsman Industries, Inc., 2085 North Hawthorne Avenue, Mcrose Park, Ill.

A. C. C. Rouse, Jr., 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniel I. Sargent, 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Houston Chemical Corp., 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 830 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Royal Globe Insurance Cos., 150 William Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of American Importers, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., 30 Church Street, New York, N.Y., and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Metlakatla Indian Community, Post Office Box 142, Metlakatla, Alaska.

A. Supersweet Feeds, Division of International Milling Co., 1200 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 213 Slade Run Drive, Falls Church, Va.

B. Known heirs of Levi B. Gritts.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street, Washington, D.C.

B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakeman, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. F. S. Wardwell, 130 Holmes Avenue, Darien, Conn.

B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Colossians 3: 15: *Let the peace of God rule in your hearts.*

Almighty God, constrained by divine love, we are approaching Thy throne of grace and mercy where none has ever been repelled or sent away empty hearted.

Inspire us, during this year, with the rapture of the upward look and the joy of seeing our highest aspirations brought to fulfillment and fruition.

May we feel the thrill and throb of lofty promises and purposes as we daily confront unknown events and unforeseen experiences.

Show us how to cultivate our faculties of confidence and courage, of effort and enthusiasm and at the close of each day may we merit and receive the blessings of Thy praise and peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 9, 1963.

The Honorable the SPEAKER, House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 4:21 p.m. on January 9, 1963, and said to contain a message from the President accompanied by copies of trade agreements negotiated with the United Kingdom and Japan.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

## TRADE AGREEMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 34)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Presi-

dent of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

### To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith to the Congress copies of a trade agreement negotiated with the United Kingdom to compensate for the increased import duties placed on certain carpets and glass in an escape clause action which affected concessions previously granted by the United States on these products. I am also transmitting an agreement negotiated with Japan to correct the inadvertent omission of part of one concession previously negotiated. The agreement with the United Kingdom was signed on behalf of the United States on December 10, 1962, and that with Japan on December 18, 1962.

The agreements are submitted in accordance with section 4(a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 which requires that the President report to the Congress his reason for breaching any peril point findings of the Tariff Commission. Annex A, attached to this message, lists those instances in which I decided to accord tariff concessions at levels below those found by the Tariff Commission, together with reasons for my decision.

In the agreement with the United Kingdom, the United States granted tariff concessions to compensate for the increases in United States tariffs on certain carpets and glass. The action to increase the carpets and glass tariffs was taken under section 7 (the escape clause) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. Under the commitments in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade the United States is obligated to consult with contracting parties adversely affected by the escape clause action and to accord compensation for impairment of such country's trade as a result of the action.

The consultations with the United Kingdom began shortly after the United States had completed large-scale, multilateral negotiations in the 1960-61 tariff conference, in which it had nearly exhausted the authority for reducing tariffs contained in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 on the products on which public notice had been issued, except for a number of products on which the Tariff Commission had found that rates could not be reduced without in its judgment causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry concerned. These consultations began against the background of unsatisfactory consultations concerning the carpets and glass action with the European Economic Community which decided to make compensatory withdrawal of concessions against imports from the United States rather than to continue negotiations to obtain new compensatory concessions from the United States.

An agreement with the United Kingdom is clearly desirable not only to sustain our record as a country recognizing its obligations but also to avoid a possible "snowballing" of withdrawal actions.

The only feasible way that agreement could be achieved within the framework of authority existing at the time consultations were held was by granting concessions below the peril point levels found by the Tariff Commission.

As explained in my message of March 7, 1962, the Tariff Commission in preparation for the 1960-61 tariff conference was required to make hurried predictions as to future market conditions for thousands of individual articles. This necessarily resulted in the establishment of peril points at the existing tariff level, for a large number of products.

In preparation for the compensatory negotiations with the United Kingdom, the agencies concerned examined with care these earlier findings of the Tariff Commission on products of interest to that country to determine whether there then appeared to be valid reasons for excluding all of these products from negotiations or whether in fact some could be offered as concessions to compensate the United Kingdom without threatening serious injury to the domestic industry. In selecting products as possible offers, two main criteria were used: their value in reaching settlement with the United Kingdom and the extent of competitive adjustment likely to be placed on American industry by tariff reductions. In applying the second of these criteria, the interdepartmental organization determined that the items selected all met one or more of the following conditions: they are not produced in the United States or are not produced in significant quantity; the ratio of imports to domestic production is small; imports in recent years have declined, have been stable or have increased very slightly; they consist of raw or semifinished materials required for United States industries or a reduction in the rate of duty could be expected to have relatively little effect on imports.

In the agreement with Japan, the United States corrected an error consisting of the omission of a part of a concession it had agreed to grant Japan in the 1960-61 tariff conference but which it had inadvertently failed to include in either the relevant preliminary agreements with Japan or the United States schedule to the tariff conference protocol. It was necessary either to correct this error by including the concession, which involved breaching a peril point finding of the Tariff Commission, or granting Japan another concession of equivalent value. The latter course would have complicated already difficult negotiations in progress concerning compensation for increased United States tariffs on carpets and glass. It was the opinion of the interdepartmental trade agreements organization that the concession was justified on economic grounds since United States imports of the item in question (discharge lamps) are less than 1/2 percent of domestic production and imports have declined while consumption is increasing.

Both agreements were entered into pursuant to section 257(c) of the Trade Expansion Act which extends until December 31, 1962, the period for concluding, under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, trade agreements based on pub-

lic notices issued in connection with the 1960-61 tariff conference.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 9, 1963.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR DURING JOINT SESSION TO HEAR ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that on Monday, January 14, 1963, the date set for the joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open. No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privileges of the floor of the House.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 40 United States Code 175 and 176, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, as members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS AT 10 A.M. MONDAY, JANUARY 14

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise Democratic members that a caucus of Democratic Members of the House of Representatives is called to meet in the Hall of the House on Monday, January 14, 1963, at 10 a.m. for the purpose of nominating two members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—because this matter has been cleared with me, I wonder if the gentleman can tell us anything first as to the program for next week and, second, when we on the minority side having in mind such matters as representation on the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on House Administration, and so forth,

when our holdover members of those committees might be submitted to the House for approval.

Mr. ALBERT. I would advise the gentleman from Indiana that there is no problem as to that being done next week.

Mr. HALLECK. That is, in the forefront of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. I would think so.

Mr. HALLECK. In respect to the program for next week, I take it that that is probably getting underway?

Mr. ALBERT. The President's message will be the major program next week. We hope to proceed with the general legislative program as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WHITE. 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 Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that my vote on the enlargement of the House Committee on Rules would have been "yea" at the time of the roll-call yesterday had I been able to vote. But, unfortunately, I was called away from the floor of the House between rollcalls due to the illness of my wife and was unable to return to the floor in time to have my affirmative vote recorded.

#### APPLICATION OF EFFECTIVE, REASONABLE, AND FAIR PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS WHEREVER PRACTICABLE THROUGHOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BROOKS. 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. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, although we are a new Congress, we bring with us problems which our people already face. I am confident that under the present administration and the leadership of this Congress 2 years from now we will be able to look back with justifiable pride on the record of the 88th Congress toward alleviating some of these problems.

One of the most vexing problems we must consider during this Congress is the continuation of a disturbingly high rate of unemployment. Five or six percent unemployed may not sound important to some but it is critically important to those families without income; and unemployment is critically important to the economic health of the entire Nation.

We must find further ways to accelerate the economic growth and progress of America and we must find ways to better



utilize the precious man-hours of work being wasted, unrecoverable, each day that a man or woman who wants to work cannot find a job. Full employment must be a full partner of democratic government and we of the Congress must carry a large share of responsibility to make this partnership a reality.

The 88th Congress will consider, I believe, a number of proposals intended to stimulate the economy of our country and offer full opportunities for jobs for all our people. None of these proposals can be more important than effective relief from the tax burden of families who depend principally on wages and salaries for their livelihood. One of the most important criteria for effective tax relief is to give relief where the dollars saved from taxes will be used immediately for the needs of the families earning them.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering for the consideration of the House of Representatives today a bill which would increase the personal income tax exemption for individuals from \$600 to \$800 per year. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue estimates this proposal, if enacted into law, would provide a saving of approximately \$6 billion to our Nation's taxpayers. The largest part of this \$6 billion would be immediately directed into the retail trade of this country and can thereby furnish a genuine stimulus to the economy.

Each of us, however, Mr. Speaker, knows that responsible representation demands that we find further effective ways of reducing the administrative costs of our National Government at the same time we are seriously considering tax reductions to stimulate the economy. Each of us wants a full dollar's worth of good service and good government out of every tax dollar we pay and we may be sure that the taxpayers we represent feel the same way.

Last summer the Subcommittee on Government Activities of the House Government Operations Committee initiated a series of hearings to point up ways that some Federal agencies might make new efforts to encourage greater economy and more efficient service for our people. These hearings will continue and full reports are being submitted for more detailed consideration.

It is clearly apparent from these hearings thus far, Mr. Speaker, that significant steps can be taken at this time and without further study to save many millions of dollars in tax funds by the agencies of our National Government. One of the most significant steps would be the increased development and use of work productivity standards in every Federal activity in which such standards can be practically applied.

Each individual worker, union member or not, must meet every day his work standards of productivity and competence. Each supervisor and executive must answer for his work. Each competitive business can succeed or fail depending on its productivity reflected continually by a profit and loss statement.

There is no profit and loss measure of productivity in Government. Demo-

cratic government is a service, but the citizens who pay taxes and receive service are certainly entitled to ask that employees of Government meet similar standards of productivity that the citizens themselves meet in earning their living.

The President, the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission have already voiced their support for more economical and more efficient service to our people from Federal agencies. At this time the Bureau is conducting a pilot project on productivity standards. Some agencies—notably the Social Security Administration and the Veterans' Administration—have been using productivity standards on a limited basis for some time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems entirely appropriate that the Congress take united and specific action in supporting the President and further encouraging the agencies of the executive branch of our Federal Government to develop and apply at the earliest possible time effective, reasonable, and fair productivity standards throughout the Federal Government.

Not only will such standards result in cash savings in the operation of the Federal Government, but such standards can be made available to State and local governments for cash tax savings on these levels of taxation. There is no reason why the Federal Government cannot be the model of economy and efficient service for the entire Nation and I believe standards of productivity can be a most important step toward this goal.

In order to express the sense of Congress in support of more efficient service, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for the consideration of the Congress a concurrent resolution calling for the application of effective, reasonable, and fair productivity standards wherever practicable throughout the Federal Government.

The resolution reads:

Whereas provision for adequate defense of the Nation and other essential governmental services to the public may continue to be a heavy burden on the taxpaying citizens; and

Whereas in free, competitive enterprise the individual worker, supervisor, executive, and the business with which they are employed must maintain a high standard of productivity to compete successfully; and

Whereas the taxpaying citizen can rightfully expect an equally high standard of productivity, economy, and efficiency in all Government operations as the taxpayer himself is required to meet in his own work: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress:*

That efforts of the Executive to increase Government economy and efficient service to the public through the development and use of effective, reasonable, and fair productivity standards should be maintained and that such standards be extended and applied to as many Federal activities as may be practicable.

HON. ERNESTO RAMOS ANTONINI

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. 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 Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is mourning the death of its very able speaker of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, the late Ernesto Ramos Antonini, who departed from us suddenly yesterday afternoon.

His passing leaves a great void that will be most difficult to fill, for he was a noble patriot, a formidable leader, and one of the most eloquent orators that Puerto Rico ever produced. With his boundless energy and brilliant mind, Mr. Ramos Antonini was a devoted and effective public servant, and a firm believer in the people and in democracy. He was my friend, a fine person, and a courageous crusader for what he believed was right.

Mr. Ramos Antonini served the people of Puerto Rico with dedication and eminent distinction, having been elected to the house of representatives in 1932 and having served continuously since 1940, during which time he served ably as majority leader and as the speaker. He held the latter post from 1948 to the present time. In addition, he was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico 1951-52, where his contributions as chairman of the committee in charge of the judiciary provisions of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will always stand as his monument.

While his strong and persuasive voice has been stilled, the spirit of Ernesto Ramos Antonini will live on in Puerto Rico, and his example through a critical period in our development will continue to inspire the Puerto Rican people toward ever greater achievement in the principles of economic and political advancement within the democratic system.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the passing of Ernesto Ramos Antonini, the late speaker of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and I want to join my colleague, the distinguished Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, in paying tribute to the late Ernesto Ramos Antonini. He was a great speaker and a brilliant leader who made a major contribution to the remarkable development of the island. Puerto Rico has sustained a great loss, and I extend my deep sympathy to the family of the late speaker and the people of Puerto Rico.

TAX REDUCTION AND TAX REFORM

Mr. RYAN of New York. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing the Nation and the Congress is the state of the economy and the relation of taxation to our economic growth. The President plans to send to Congress a program of tax reduction and tax reform. There is widespread agreement that some form of tax reduction is vitally necessary. There is also general agreement that tax reform is long overdue. Within this area of agreement, however, there are different views as to what kind of tax cut and reforms are best suited to aid the economy.

I have introduced a bill which provides for the kind of tax relief which not only will have immediate effects on our economy, but will also be equitable. This proposal should be incorporated in the general program of tax relief and tax reform.

My bill would increase the personal income tax exemption from the present \$600 to \$1,000, effective January 1, 1963. I propose this increase for two inter-related reasons. First, \$600 is inadequate in terms of today's cost of living. Second, the increase in personal income tax exemption will provide a much needed stimulus to the economy.

The exemption has been at \$600 since 1948. Since 1948 the overall cost of living index has increased 26.5 percent. The price of food has risen 17 percent; rent has increased 44 percent; gas and electricity 26 percent; transportation 48 percent; and the cost of medical care is 63 percent more than it was in 1948. In spite of the substantial increase in these necessary expenses the personal income tax exemption has remained at \$600.

An increase in the personal income tax exemption will increase consumer purchasing power by putting more money into the hands of those who need it most. This is a measure to provide tax relief for the low and moderate income groups which will benefit the most.

The \$400 difference in exemption will give greater tax relief proportionately to a low income taxpayer than to a high income taxpayer. For example, suppose taxpayer A has a taxable income of \$1,000 and taxpayer B has a taxable income of \$50,000. A is taxed at a rate of 20 percent, B at a rate of 72 percent—assuming neither A nor B has dependents—an increase in the exemption from \$600 to \$1,000 will save A \$80 or 40 percent of his tax. It will save B \$288 or 1 percent of his tax.

Tax relief for low and moderate income taxpayers is needed to stimulate the economy. Business expansion and investment will follow increased consumer demand. Maximum impact from tax reduction occurs in the lower income brackets where the marginal propensity to consume is close to 100 percent. If, as some economists have estimated, gross national product is falling short of reasonably full employment by about \$30 to \$40 billion, then a tax cut of perhaps \$10

billion concentrated in the lower brackets might well increase gross national product by \$25 to \$30 billion through the multiplier effects of repeated responding.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and hope that the administration will include an increase in personal income tax exemptions as part of the overall tax program for this year.

**SOUTH GATE CITY COUNCIL, SOUTH GATE KIWANIS CLUB, SOUTH GATE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB SUPPORT HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, since on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] announced to the House that there were a number of the Members of the House who had planned to offer an amendment to the House rules that would undertake to transfer the jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary, but that on account of the parliamentary situation then existing, their resolution for this purpose would be presented to the House Rules Committee at an early date and that the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], had already agreed with him that he would join in the request of the group that their resolution be heard by the Rules Committee, I think it appropriate at this time to present to the House three of the many communications which I have recently received on the announced intention of the Communist Party to undertake to have congressional support sufficient in this session of Congress to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which I have been a member now for about 15 years, upon which committee I accepted member appointment at the request of the distinguished then Speaker of the House, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, and his Democrat associates in the House at that time.

So I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to present the resolution by the Kiwanis Club of the city of South Gate adopted January 3, 1963, which city, by the way, is the city of my residence. Said resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I also am proud to present the resolution by the City Council of the City of South Gate adopted on December 17, 1962.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present the resolution by the South Gate Republican Women's Club Federated of the city of South Gate dated December 17, 1962.

Mr. Speaker, granting that according to the announced statement by the distinguished gentleman from California

[Mr. ROOSEVELT] that the purport of his proposed resolution be heard before the Rules Committee may only go to the point and extent of asking transfer of the present work and jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I wish to make it crystal clear that Committee Chairman WALTER has made it clear that while he felt it appropriate to cooperate to the end that the announced resolution should have its hearing before the Rules Committee, he was and is opposed to the purpose of the Roosevelt-and-associates resolution.

The second thing I wish to make crystal clear at this date, is that I believe the incontrovertible evidence shows that for several years last past, the Communist Party in the United States and many of its avowed followers have sponsored and financed and tirelessly worked throughout our Nation to their purpose and determination to abolish or destroy the effectiveness of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Communications received by myself and those received by many Members of this House in the last 30 days are concrete evidence of this fact together with other evident activity by persons in Washington lobbying for the abolition of the House committee since the opening of this 88th Congress. I have heard say, that these Communists and their followers have concluded that for the present, they would again prove unsuccessful and fail in their longtime-standing intention to have the committee abolished.

Mr. Speaker, having been asked by a number of my colleagues in this great legislative body as to my position on the proposed move to transfer the duties and jurisdiction of the present House Committee on Un-American Activities to the House Judiciary Committee, I wish to publicly state that I am dead sure that the Communists, having again failed to gain sufficient support in Congress to abolish the House committee, will no doubt dance in glee at any action whatsoever in the U.S. Congress through any of its Members, or any of its committees, which will in any way discredit the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its work of many years duration, or which will lessen the extent of or emphasis upon the work which has been and is presently being effectively accomplished by the House committee and its able staff. However, under the circumstances, I think it is well that the basic issue involved in the Roosevelt and associates resolution to be submitted to the House Rules Committee be fully discussed.

Mr. Speaker, in closing these remarks, I wish to call the attention of your own distinguished self and other Members of this body, to the fact that on January 9 I filed H.R. 475 which is a bill designed to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action or Communist-front organizations, and further advise you that this bill was referred by the distinguished Speaker to the Committee on Un-American Activities. The ultimate purpose of this bill, therefore, is to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme



Court has over a year ago declared that the Communist Party of the United States is and always has been part of an international controversy emanating from a foreign soil. I think there is no question but that the Congress has the legal right and duty to outlaw such conspiracy. This is the intent of my bill and I will have more to say about it shortly.

**RESOLUTION OF THE KIWANIS CLUB OF SOUTH GATE, CALIF.**

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have been heretofore established by the Congress and Senate of the United States for the purpose of protecting our national security against the threat of communism; and

Whereas since their inception said committees have worked tirelessly to discover and destroy subversive elements in our Government; and

Whereas it appears that certain attempts are being made to discredit and destroy these committees: Now, therefore, the Kiwanis Club of South Gate, Calif., does hereby resolve, declare, determine, and find as follows:

1. The Kiwanis Club of South Gate, Calif., does hereby declare its support of said committees and does hereby request the Members of the Congress and Senate to support the continuance of such committees and to urge them to continue their vital activities.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 3d day of January 1963.

LEONARD H. WOODARD,  
President.

**RESOLUTION 2533 OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOUTH GATE, CALIF.**

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have been heretofore established by the Congress and Senate of the United States for the purpose of protecting our national security against the threat of communism; and

Whereas since their inception said committees have worked tirelessly to discover and destroy subversive elements in our Government; and

Whereas it appears that certain attempts are being made to discredit and destroy these committees: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of South Gate, Calif., does hereby resolve, declare, determine, and find as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of South Gate, Calif., does hereby declare its support of said committees and does hereby request the Members of the Congress and Senate to support the continuance of such committees and to urge them to continue their vital activities.

SEC. 2. That the city clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this resolution; shall cause the same to be entered in the book of original resolutions of said city; shall make a minute of the passage and adoption thereof in the records of the proceedings of the city council meeting at which the same is passed and adopted; and shall forward certified copies thereof to the city's representatives in the Federal and State Legislatures, League of California Cities, and to Mr. Floyd Wakefield, chairman, Americanism for South Gate Committee.

Passed, approved, and adopted this 17th day of December 1962.

LELAND R. WEAVER,  
Mayor of the City of South Gate,  
Calif.

Attest:

DOROTHY MCGAFFEY,  
City Clerk of the City of South Gate,  
Calif.

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,  
CITY OF SOUTH GATE.**

I, Dorothy McGaffey, city clerk of the city of South Gate, Calif., do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the city council of said city is five; that the foregoing resolution being Resolution 2533, was duly passed and adopted by the said city council, approved and signed by the mayor of said city, and attested by the city clerk of said city, all at an adjourned regular meeting of the said council held on the 17th day of December 1962 and that the same was so passed and adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dellmann, Sawyer, Hardy, Henville, Weaver.

Noes: Councilmen, none.

Absent: Councilmen, none.

Not voting: Councilmen, none.

Witness my hand and the seal of said city this 17th day of December 1962.

DOROTHY MCGAFFEY,  
City Clerk of the  
City of South Gate, Calif.

I, Dorothy McGaffey, city clerk of the city of South Gate, Calif., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of original Resolution 2533 on file in my office. Dated this 28th day of December 1962.

[SEAL] DOROTHY MCGAFFEY,  
City Clerk of the  
City of South Gate, Calif.

**RESOLUTION OF SOUTH GATE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CLUB FEDERATED  
To the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE:**

Whereas a report read before the South Gate Republican Women's Club Federated on December 14, 1962, which stated that the Communist Party, U.S.A., acting on orders from Moscow, have intensified their efforts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, when Congress convenes in January 1963; and

Whereas the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been declared subversive by the Supreme Court, and is a threat to the security and welfare of this great Nation: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That the South Gate Republican Women's Club Federated believes in order to keep America a free nation, under God, it is our duty to urge the Congress of the United States to support the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Congress of the United States; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That we remind the Congress of the United States of their duty to uphold and preserve the Constitution of the United States, and to keep in trust our American heritage which was bought with blood, sweat, and tears, by men who were willing to give their lives and fortunes that America would forever remain free under God.

GLADYS G. BLONDIN,  
President.  
VIRGINIA L. BLACK,  
Secretary.

**TIMING OF WORK PERFORMANCE  
OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in its December 14, 1962, publication "Wash-

ington Report," the National Postal Union expressed very adequately the feeling of nearly every postal employee with respect to the guidelines distribution system. The article follows:

**CHRISTMAS AND "GUIDELINES"**

As the Nation's half-million postal workers struggle with the largest volume of mail in history, postal patrons in the 200 largest cities should know delivery of their mail is being slowed by an extravagant, wasteful personnel procedure titled "Guidelines." Through this time wasting operation, postal officials believe they can achieve efficiency and increased productivity. However, under this program emphasis is placed on counting and weighing the mail rather than delivering same.

**MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS TO OTHER AGENCIES**

According to Washington Daily News Columnist John Cramer, the Bureau of the Budget has launched a new project to measure Federal employee productivity. Cramer reported "five agencies—Treasury, Federal Aviation, Interior, Veterans' Administration, and Post Office—have been designated to cooperate with Budget in the project. With Budget assistance, each will attempt to develop productivity measurement systems suitable to its own programs. This is to be completed no later than March 31."

The Bureau of the Budget has been fully aware of the Post Office Department's work measurement system from its inception during the early part of 1959. As a matter of fact, Budget, on several occasions, was asked by the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Post Office and Treasury, to submit an opinion on the benefits of work measurement system. Budget recommended continuation of the program with less emphasis on the paper work involved.

**WORK MEASUREMENT SYSTEM LOCAL SURVEY NO  
IMPROVEMENT**

When the new postal administration took office during January 1961, employee union leaders were promised individual local surveys of all offices using work measurement systems or guidelines with a view to developing "proper and accurate standards acceptable to management and employees." A thorough and objective job was promised even though it might take some 30 months to complete.

The effect of such surveys in several local offices are now evident. For instance, in Baltimore, Md., where the previous unscientific standard, requiring distribution of four trays of mail in the incoming section an hour had provoked considerable criticism, the new standard set by the survey team is five trays of mail per hour. The installation of new standards at Milwaukee, Wis., elicited the following remark from President Jerry Krajewski, hard-hitting leader of the Milwaukee Postal Union:

"It is evident that the whole program will result in a system that is equally as bad or worse than the one it replaces. The survey, as we see it, spent a great deal of time and labor to meticulously record all sorts of allied labor, accurately or otherwise, with the impression that it would benefit the distribution clerk. In actual practice, the beneficiary happens to be management itself as it can now take credit for so-called allied labor associated with production."

**CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT ESSENTIAL**

National Postal Union resident officers have been mandated to seek elimination of "guidelines" as the paramount issue during the next session of Congress. State, area and local unions are again requested to make personal contacts with their Congressmen and Senators to acquaint them with the facts on work measurement system. The 88th Congress will reconvene on January 9,

1963. It is essential that Members of Congress fully understand this costly procedure and the need for early action to eliminate same.

I am today introducing a bill which will prevent the use of stopwatches or any other system designed to time or measure the work performance of a postal employee. As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and who is concerned about practices such as this within the framework of our Government, it is my every hope and wish that legislation to eradicate this system will be given an early hearing so that an obnoxious practice such as this will be abolished completely.

#### THE STRIKE IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I rise for the first time in this Congress to call the attention of my colleagues to the disastrous labor-management relations in the maritime industry which presently create a 17-day-old strike—as of Wednesday, January 9, 1963—on our waterfront from Maine to Texas. As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I and my colleagues have looked into labor-management relations in this industry several years ago, and recently again last year. On the most recent occasion, the Secretary of Labor, appearing before us, pointed out that of the 19 times the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley law had been used, 7 involved the shipping industry; 4 of these involved east coast longshoremen and 3 strikes by seagoing unions.

It is becoming more and more obvious to me that while our committee calls upon Congress to enact legislation for the salutary effect of creating a more healthy, modern American merchant marine, much of these efforts will remain in a vacuum unless the basic labor problems of this industry are reasonably and promptly resolved. Work stoppages, in addition to weakening investor confidence in the private maritime industry, are clearly contrary to our national interest at this vital time in our country's history.

Americans have reached a pathetic stage in their development when union leaders are unresponsive to requests by the President for work continuation in hopes that a solution to particular negotiations can be found.

A work stoppage across more than half the sea coast flies in the face of our commitments abroad, our modernized trade policy, and accentuates our balance-of-payments problems which are threatening the very sanctity of the dollar. With a crying need for our country to become more competitive in world trade, it is impossible that labor leaders should make such demands as to raise the prices

of American commodities abroad to the stage where we are made far less, rather than more competitive in free world markets.

This situation cannot be allowed to continue. I am persuaded that the problem now is ours of the Congress. We must promptly, in the public interest, provide the authority to the administration to prevent labor-management disturbances grievously affecting our shipping and foreign commerce.

Mr. Speaker, a statement by Lawrence C. Gayle, director of labor relations of the New Orleans Shipping Association, and an advertisement of Friday, January 4, of the New York Shipping Association which detail the facts involved in the current longshore strike and emphasizes some of its implications, follow:

#### STATEMENT BY LAWRENCE C. GAYLE

I am sure that all of you are aware of the contract negotiations taking place since midsummer between the New Orleans Steamship Association and International Longshoremen's Association.

You've undoubtedly read how the two factions were unable to reach an agreement on a new contract by the September 30 deadline. You may have been affected by the strike which followed. And so, you were probably relieved when the President invoked the Taft-Hartley law, feeling that this would solve the problem.

Now, you undoubtedly have the same question in your mind as the little boy who was standing near a gold course one day, watching a duffer try to get out of a sand trap. The duffer had flailed away at the sand for a full 5 minutes. He had showered the green with sand—but to no avail.

Finally, the little boy turned to his mother who was watching with him, and tugged at her hand.

"Mommy," he said, "hasn't he killed it yet?"

The answer to the question then is no, we haven't killed our problem, we're not out of the trap. Since August 9, when the first meeting was held, we've swung hard at the ball. But the ball—the problem—is still buried deep in the trap. We've strewn a lot of sand. But we're not yet on the green.

And, unless labor leadership faces up to economic reality, it's going to be a long time before we get on the green, with a mutually agreeable contract.

Briefly, I want to tell you where we've been and where we stand now. If my crystal ball were in good working order, I might be able to tell you where we're going. But right now, that crystal ball is cloudy. It's cloudy because labor has shown no inclination—from the very first day contract negotiations began—to remove the clouds.

The parties agreed to their first meeting on August 9, at which time the unions had indicated they would present their demands. But these demands were not presented, as had been promised.

All we heard was much speech making. But no demands. As the meeting was concluding, I expressed management's grave concern and disappointment over this development. Further, I urged the unions to submit their demands quickly, in order that a new contract could be completed before the September 30 deadline.

The union proposal was finally submitted on August 17. After careful consideration, members of the Steamship Association concluded that the demands were entirely impractical, both from economic and operational standpoints of the industry. In a moment I'll tell you why.

But we wanted the unions to begin bargaining. We therefore submitted a counter-proposal on August 29, just 12 days after

the union demands were made. We offered them a 27 cents per man-hour money package, to be spread over a 3-year period. I'll show you, in a moment, why this is a reasonable, realistic offer.

The unions delayed 3 weeks before requesting further clarification on this relatively simple management proposal. We immediately provided this clarification on September 20.

At the next meeting on September 27 the unions rejected the association's proposal. Further, they refused to bargain on any points or to withdraw or modify any of their own demands. We left the door open for them to come back with another proposal. It has never been received.

The unions struck on October 1 and ended their walkout 5 days later with the invocation of the Taft-Hartley law. Following this, the union took no steps to begin bargaining. And so the Steamship Association tried again. We filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board on November 1 against the ILA locals for refusing to bargain. These charges were filed because it had now become apparent that the local certified union representatives had no intention of bargaining on a local basis. Their efforts were being directly controlled by the international in New York and they had no intention of trying to work out a New Orleans agreement, unless permitted to do so by their New York officers. But, under the law, they are required to bargain locally.

Following the filing of these charges, the unions agreed to meet. The first meeting was held on November 14 with the assistant to the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Mr. S. I. Schlossberg, in attendance. After this meeting, Mr. Schlossberg urged the association to withdraw the NLRB charges on the grounds that, in his opinion, the action would help assure genuine bargaining. The association withdrew its charges without prejudice.

On November 16 the parties met and agreed to review the expired agreement, to determine the points which were mutually agreeable or controversial. Following this, a second meeting was set by the Mediation Service for November 26. But this was postponed until November 30 at the request of the unions to accommodate other commitments on the part of the union representatives.

At the November 30 meeting, the parties continued to review the contract. But the story was the same. The union refused to bargain on any major operational matters, scorned the association's offer, and instead adopted a frivolous attitude toward the entire problem.

As you know, under the Taft-Hartley law, management is required to submit a last offer to the unions by the 60th day of the 80-day cooling-off period. This offer is then voted on by the entire union membership in an election under the NLRB supervision.

The 60th day would have been December 3. But at the meeting on November 30, it became readily apparent that the attitude of the union delegates was unchanged. There was absolutely no willingness to work toward a mutually satisfactory agreement. And so we submitted our last offer at this meeting—3 days ahead of time.

I apologize if I have been tedious in recounting these events, but I felt it would impart to you a better feeling of the atmosphere in which these negotiations have been conducted.

Now where do we stand at the present time?

The last offer by the association has been made. Both Alfred Chittenden and Clarence Henry, the presidents of the ILA locals, have said already that they will recommend to their membership that this offer be refused.



The vote on this offer is scheduled for next Monday and Tuesday—December 17 and 18. If it is either accepted or rejected, we have 5 days left to reach an agreement before the Federal injunction expires. If an agreement is not reached by midnight, December 23, then the union has two choices. It can continue to work under the old contract, while the parties endeavor to hammer out a new one, or, it can go out on strike again.

And this time, the President cannot resort to the injunctive powers of the Taft-Hartley law again. Under that law, this power is available once—and once only. If the union strikes on December 23, it would bring on a national calamity as the wheels of the country's ports on the Atlantic and gulf coasts come to a stop, with the resulting effect on U.S. foreign commerce.

Unions, sooner or later, must face the reality that management has faced. This industry, like many others, is facing the crisis brought on by steadily rising wage costs without a corresponding increase in productivity or income.

Now, we have reached the point where we can no longer afford exorbitant wage increases. And realistically, you people in the audience—and the businesses and companies you represent—can't afford them either.

I must emphasize here that it's not only the future of the steamship industry that's at stake in these present negotiations, it's yours, too. For any extraordinary increase in the cost of ocean-going commerce has a direct effect on 50 to 70 percent of businesses and industries in this area and an indirect effect on every one of them.

The reasons are many and complex. To try and explain all of them would tax your time and patience. But just think for a moment. Exorbitant increases in wages mean exorbitant increases in costs of operations. If the steamship industry retreats from its present stand, and grants labor's exorbitant demands, then sooner or later, the industry will have to seek increased freight rates or face financial collapse.

Did I hear a moan from the freight forwarders when I mentioned increased rates? Gentlemen, I assure you there is no alternative if we retreat.

Did I hear an anguished cry from the manufacturer struggling to compete for overseas markets? I know that steadily rising labor costs have already forced the prices of your products up. In some cases, industries in this country have all but priced themselves out of foreign markets because of this. Increased freight rates would only make it more impossible for you to compete overseas.

And so, your industry becomes limited to the U.S. market only. But you find the demand isn't there. And your only alternative is to reduce production. Others do the same. Thus, the economic ball starts rolling down the hill, faster and faster, gathering momentum until it spins toward economic chaos.

Do I present a bleak picture? I intended to, for it's just that bleak. But, you ask, How exorbitant are union demands? Perhaps you're magnifying them.

Well let me warn you first not to misinterpret what I'm going to tell you.

Actually, we don't know, positively, how exorbitant they really are. We've tried vainly since they were first made on August 17 to compute them accurately. But some of them are so wild that we can't put a price on them without operating experience.

But, based on the best costs we can arrive at which can be computed, we estimate that—if granted—they would amount to an increase of a minimum of 150 percent in labor costs over presently existing ones.

To illustrate, the industry paid dockworkers in New Orleans approximately \$30 million in wages and fringe benefits last year.

Based on union demands, the industry would have to increase this payroll by a minimum of \$45 million annually.

That would bring dockwork labor costs in the port of New Orleans to at least \$75 million annually and that doesn't count the cost of insurance and taxes that also have to be paid.

The industry cannot afford this. It would cause the economic collapse of every company. That's why I told you before—and I say again—the future of this industry is at stake in these present negotiations, and the economic future of this country in foreign trade is at stake as well.

In essence, the union demands would—

1. Impose extraordinary cost increases that are neither justified nor reasonable.

2. Lead to increased featherbedding in the handling of cargo.

3. Impose more bonds on management's fundamental right to utilize manpower most efficiently, thus causing rapid declines in productivity.

4. Assess outlandish penalties on management efforts to improve service through use of modern methods of handling cargo.

5. Expand pension, welfare, vacation, and paid holiday plans beyond all reason.

Let me take one of the demands to illustrate what effect it would have on costs—the union demand for 8 hours' pay for 6 hours' work. (Incidentally, this demand didn't say "8 hours' pay for 6 hours' work" at the current New Orleans rate of \$2.96 per hour or \$23.68 per day. They ask for \$24.16 per day—the rate paid in the North Atlantic ports. Remember, I mentioned that influence earlier.)

Nevertheless, comparing the union's demands with existing basic rates, the costs would look like this:

	Present rate per hour (including fringe)	Union demand per hour (including fringe)	Increase per hour (including fringe)
Basic time.....	\$3.44	\$4.51	\$1.07
Time and a half.....	4.92	6.53	1.61
Double time.....	6.40	8.56	2.16

This, in itself, is substantial. But, because of one of the peculiarities of our industry, it's far more damaging than this would appear.

As you know, we require 24-hour-per-day cargo handling operations. Usually, you think of time and a half or overtime being paid after an individual has worked 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week. But in our industry that doesn't hold true. Any hour worked after 5 p.m. and before 8 a.m. on weekdays and all day Saturday and Sunday is paid at the time-and-a-half rate—no matter if the individual hasn't worked a single straight time hour.

Under this demand of 8 hours' pay for 6 hours worked, the time-and-a-half rate would go into effect at 3 p.m. in the afternoon instead of 5 p.m. Sunday rates would jump to double time, rather than present time and a half.

A recent study we made shows that at the present time, 35.5 percent of the hours were worked at time and a half, 64 percent at straight time, and half a percent at double time. But under this demand, our industry would work 51 percent of its time at at least the time-and-a-half rate. And part of that 51 percent would be at the double-time rate.

Converting to dollars, this demand alone would increase the annual costs by \$17 million.

Other demands are just as staggering. For instance, the unions are demanding further featherbedding, by increasing the size of gangs handling general cargo from a minimum of 18 to 20 men, and those handling bulk cargo from 10 to 14 men. They would

impose unnecessarily low limits on loads moved mechanically, thus requiring more loads for a given cargo and unnecessarily increasing the time required to work such cargo.

They would penalize management efforts to improve cargo handling methods by assessing extra fees for loading or discharging cargoes moving on pallets or in containers. They would tax bulk cargoes—like grain.

Some of these assessments would include: \$1.50 per ton for all cargo moving in containers under 17 feet in length; \$2 per ton for cargo in containers 17 to 34 feet; \$3 per ton for cargo in containers above 34 feet; \$1.50 per ton for cargo banded before coming on the docks; \$1.50 per ton for cargo palletized or glued before coming on docks; \$1 per ton for cargo banded on docks and shipped as units; \$1 per ton for cargo palletized on docks and shipped as units; \$1.50 per ton for heavy lifts up to 10,000 pounds; \$2 per ton for heavy lifts 10,000 to 20,000 pounds; \$3 per ton for heavy lifts above that weight; \$1 per ton for loading or discharging grains, fertilizers, soybeans, etc.; \$1.50 per ton for ore, scrap iron, and similar products; \$1.50 per ton for sugar; and \$1.50 per ton for all other bulk cargo.

In other words, as our industry develops ways to provide better, faster service, we have to pay a penalty to the unions to do it. Thus, any savings that we might effect would be dissipated immediately.

And, mind you, we're not causing anyone to work any harder or take any greater risks by using these methods.

By now, I think you have an idea of the unreasonableness of the union demands. I haven't gone into all of them, but certainly this should be sufficient to illustrate my point.

The association is convinced that the unions must agree on a reasonable wage rate and work with the industry toward greater flexibility in work rules. Only in this way can our industry survive and the public welfare be protected.

To try and reach this goal, the association has offered the unions a 27-cent-per-man-hour wage increase spread over a 3-year period. This would amount to a 9.1-percent increase, adding \$3 million annually to the present waterfront payroll, and bring the basic per man-hour rate, including fringe benefits, to \$3.71. All work performed between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. would be paid at the rate of \$5.32. And remember, I pointed out earlier that 35 percent of all hours worked are at the time-and-a-half rate of \$5.32. Incidentally, this rate does not include the differential dock workers are already receiving for handling many special cargoes moving through the port.

The association has further proposed the elimination of featherbedding in grain gangs. Efficient, economical size grain gangs would neither impose extra workloads on individuals nor displace the present permanent work force. Such a move would place the port in a more competitive position, and, by stimulating more grain shipments, actually increase the number of available jobs.

The labor force in other ports work in inclement weather, fully protected from the elements by necessary shelter. Yet, here in New Orleans, despite management willingness to provide complete protection, work halts completely during periods of rain, even when the men are sheltered, and workers draw the full rate of pay.

Incidentally, one of the major problems we have is determining what is rain. Now, we've reached the point that one drop in a puddle of water is sufficient to cause work to halt. Again, in an effort to maintain New Orleans' competitive position, the association has proposed that standby time for rain be established at one-half the existing rate.

The unions are demanding that we eliminate the grievance and arbitration machinery established 3 years ago. This we refuse to do. This machinery assures union members and management representatives that all disagreements as to good faith in keeping the contract can be settled quickly and any wrongs corrected without resorting to wildcat strikes which plagued the industry previously.

In these last few minutes, I want to show you some charts [not printed in the RECORD] that give a broad picture of what has happened in the shipping industry and why we have been forced to take our present position. They are the result of research and analysis done prior to and during the current negotiations.

In conclusion, let me say that the members of our association are firmly convinced that there can be no retreat. We must maintain reasonable wage rates. We must have the opportunity to utilize manpower more efficiently. We must be able to install more modern methods of cargo handling without paying a penalty. Only in this way can management fulfill its obligations to its employees, its stockholders, its customers, and to the general public.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Jan. 4, 1963]

#### THE STRIKE THAT PERILS THE NATION

The issues involved in the longshoremen's strike that has paralyzed Atlantic and gulf coast ports are of serious concern to everyone because they involve the economic welfare of our entire country.

They are so serious that President Kennedy personally made proposals to avoid the impasse by continuing work while the issues were studied and a contract negotiated.

The employers readily accepted the President's recommendations—the leaders of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) rejected them out of hand.

#### A \$300-MILLION ADDED BURDEN

Think what will happen to our foreign-trade—the jobs it supports, the new jobs it can create—if the cost of loading and unloading ships from Maine to Texas is increased by \$300 million a year?

Yet that would be the additional cost if the demands submitted by the ILA were to be accepted.

Obviously, if this additional assessment were to be levied on the steamship industry the increase, of necessity, would be passed along to shippers and receivers of cargo in increased freight rates.

The prices of things we sell abroad would go up and our competitive position in world markets would suffer.

#### A THREAT TO THE U.S. DOLLAR

In 1961 the United States had an excess of exports over imports of about \$5.4 billion. But that was not sufficient to compensate for the heavy drain of military expenditure (\$3 billion) and foreign aid (\$3.8 billion). Consequently, we ended 1961 with an overall deficit of about \$2.5 billion in our international balance of payments.

This process of spending more abroad than we receive troubles the administration, influential groups in Congress, responsible labor leaders and business alike. The reason is a simple one. The settlement of our international accounts results in a flight of gold from this country and this, in turn, threatens our national currency.

The administration, in cooperation with labor and industry, has been waging a vigorous campaign to sell more American goods abroad because this will help to reduce the Nation's deficit while expanding job opportunities.

#### A THREAT TO OUR EXPORTS

Foreign trade is a tough, highly competitive field. When U.S. companies receive

inquiries from abroad—as from India or South America for new plants, machinery or bridges—bids are requested on a delivered cost basis, including ocean freight charges. Similar bids are also requested by buyers from the highly industrialized countries of Western Europe and from Japan.

If the cost of shipping such cargoes from the United States is increased by an estimated \$300 million annually in handling charges alone, it becomes more difficult for American companies to sell abroad in competition with other foreign producers who also seek to expand their exports and have the advantage of lower cargo-handling costs.

#### A THREAT TO JOBS

No matter how efficient American industry may be—no matter how fast or efficient modern ships may be—the increased shipping charges will make our products non-competitive. We lose the business—our industries lose orders—their workers lose jobs.

Our loss is a gain to our vigorous competitors in other countries.

#### A THREAT TO LONGSHOREMEN

Dwindling export cargoes mean loss of work for the longshoremen themselves. Also manufacturers for export and their employees, plus the employees of truck lines, railroads, steamship lines and all the allied industries will feel the effects quickly in reduced employment opportunities.

The Nation cannot afford this chain of events to occur: Periling the Nation, strangling the economy, threatening the currency, threatening our exports, threatening national employment, and threatening the jobs of the longshoremen themselves.

NEW YORK SHIPPING ASSOCIATION, INC.

#### UNITED STATES SAYS DOCK STRIKE THREATENS FOREIGN AID

NEW YORK, January 8.—Assistant Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds warned shippers and longshoremen today the dock strike is threatening the Nation's foreign-aid program and is a source of extreme concern to President Kennedy.

Reynolds said the 17-day walkout at east and gulf coast ports has hurt the Nation's trade and foreign relations.

"President Kennedy is extremely concerned because of the awkward position in which this strike places our foreign-aid program," Reynolds said. "But I regret to say there has been no progress whatsoever toward a settlement."

White House sources have said that Mr. Kennedy might ask Congress for antistrike legislation if the dispute is not settled soon.

The walkout has thrown an estimated 100,000 men out of work and has cost more than \$425 million—an estimated \$25 million a day in lost wages, sales, transportation fees, storage costs, and pier rentals.

Alexander P. Chopin, chairman of the Labor Policy Committee of the New York Shipping Association, said today that "there is no possibility of movement unless the International Longshoremen's Association changes its demands to a reasonable level."

Reynolds said that the union claims its demands come to a package of 55 cents an hour for the average longshoreman. But the shippers, who have offered a 22-cent package, claim the actual additional cost of the demands come to much more.

Reynolds met separately with the two sides today. He said there would be no joint talk until one side or the other modifies its position enough to justify face-to-face negotiations.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. AVERY. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, last night, and again this morning, the airways were filled, as I anticipated, with voluminous commentary on the vote in the House yesterday in connection with the packing of the Rules Committee. Without exception, it sounded something like this: A great victory for the President. President Kennedy wins the Rules Committee fight.

Mr. Speaker, as one who was on the losing side and as one who was personally affected, I would like to say that this was not a victory for President Kennedy. It was a victory for the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCORMACK, and I deplore the fact that the Speaker's name was not even mentioned in these reports.

I pay this tribute to you, Mr. Speaker, as one who has met the power of your persuasion. We will now proceed under the guidance that we hope you will provide for the now packed Rules Committee.

#### TREASURY BACK DOOR MUST BE LOCKED TIGHT

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to House Members of both parties, inviting joint bipartisan sponsorship of a resolution to change the rules of the House so as to strengthen congressional control over appropriations.

The resolution is the same as one which failed by 1 vote to be reported by the Rules Committee in 1961. It would tighten House rules by providing that legislation carrying language that would permit the withdrawal of money from the Treasury or authorize contract obligations in advance of appropriations, must be reported by the Committee on Appropriations, nor would any amendments proposing Treasury withdrawals be in order in the House unless the legislation being considered had been reported by the committee having jurisdiction over appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, all spending should be a responsibility of one committee of the House which was established to weigh the need and urgency of Federal programs as against the amount of Government revenue in the Treasury and available. Congress cannot control Government expenditures or exercise fiscal responsibility unless and until the device authorizing agencies of the Government to finance programs from Treasury borrowing is outlawed. My resolution would curb a practice under which the Treasury has been compelled to advance more than \$130 billion to various agencies, of which \$16 billion thus far has had to be canceled. In addition, further losses in the future amounting to billions will



likewise have to be forgiven. As of June 30, 1962, \$26.9 billion was still available for borrowing under old authorizations and the national debt ceiling is the only limitation under law of such Treasury withdrawals.

In these critical times, Mr. Speaker, control over spending by Congress is essential. It is time to lock the Treasury back door and compel Government agencies to go before congressional Appropriations Committees to justify their expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

#### AMERICA STANDS AT THE CROSSROADS TODAY

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, America stands at the crossroads today.

Are we, the elected representatives of the people, ready, willing, yes and more, are we determined to keep our oath of office inviolate, by taking the well-charted American road which leads to safe, sane, government? That, my colleagues, as you well know, is the question uppermost in the minds of an overwhelming majority of deep-thinking Americans today.

These are the people who know full well that, for the past three decades America has to a very great degree lived on the fruitful, honest labors of past generations. By hard work, right living, and right doing under laws fair to all, adopted by Congress free of dictation by the Executive, which were easily understood and honestly administered, they builded here during a century and a half, a Nation of the happiest, freest people on the face of this earth. How? By their Congress and their President's strict adherence to the precepts clearly spelled out in our U.S. Constitution. The framers of that world-renowned instrument, established for us our competitive, free private enterprise system of government, with its clearly defined checks and balances between Federal and State Governments and the people, by spelling out the duties and responsibilities of each with the other, but specifically placing the greatest authority and responsibility on the people, in order that they would be, not the servants but the masters of their own destiny, assured by the process of free elections of their public servants at stated intervals, without coercion or corruption.

But something happened, when almost exactly three decades ago the President of these United States ordered a subservient Congress, under control of his own party, to pass a number of laws irrespective to their constitutionality.

The records prove conclusively that from that day to this, our economy has constantly floundered from one national and international crisis to the next, both in peace and war, to the end that, at this very minute, we live under a cloud of national and international emergencies

and uncertainties as to how, where, and when it will all finally end. Yes, America is clearly at the crossroads today.

Now Mr. Speaker, having been a Member of Congress for the past 24 sessions, and a member of the Committee on Appropriations for the past 20 sessions, I feel duty bound at the opening of this 88th Congress to express my deep, studied convictions concerning the pitfalls along the road which we must evade in order to avert permanent disaster to our Nation and hence to every American living today, and to those who will come after us.

First of all, unnecessary, wasteful spending of our taxpayers' dollars, and constant Federal deficits with its certain aftermath of uncontrolled dollar devaluation to a mere fraction of even its present value in the purchase of every needed commodity, including food, clothing, medicine, and shelter must stop, and now. We need only to know of the starvation, misery, and strife that befall every nation across the seven seas that traveled the full length of the reckless, wasteful spending road on which we have been traveling full speed ahead for these past three decades to clearly see the fate which will be ours to suffer at the end of that road. Should that evil day come as it did in so many foreign lands as far back as history records, we the Members of this Congress will to a great degree be held responsible, by an enraged American public. Pray God such a fate will never befall our blessed land.

You may say, oh, well, that can't happen here. The answer is: It will happen here, unless we make an about face. What happened to those unfortunate people was this: The fatal day came, and fast, when there was not any market for their government bonds, because the people had lost faith in the stability of their governments, to the end that the people could not or would not risk their money to purchase such paper. The governments then had but one recourse; they started their printing presses turning out paper currency by the tons; soon it took a big handful of this almost worthless currency just to buy a loaf of bread. You can easily imagine the suffering it caused, especially to the working class, those on a fixed income, and the older people.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, it can happen here; all you need to do is to take note of the flight of many, many billions of dollars worth of our gold supply, which backs up the American dollar in your pocket. The flight of our gold is, of course, due to the fact that many foreign countries have lost considerable faith in the stability of the American dollar, hence for many years past those nations have demanded gold instead of dollars in payment for the goods sold to the United States. Why? Because they know we have spent our taxpayers' dollar wastefully and recklessly and that in due time unless very soon stopped, we will go the same way suffered by every nation that followed the reckless, spending route to the end of the road.

My colleagues, I am certain that most of you who are listening, regardless of party, are well aware of all these facts,

as are a majority of the American people. The big question is, Will Congress and the President act in time to head off the impending crash? My purpose in calling these facts to your attention today, and in doing so as forcibly and sincerely as is in my power to do, is purely and simply in the hope of stirring you to awaken to realities facing us now.

I am also certain that I need not point out how best to avoid the impending crash, for any average first grader knows full well that two and two make four, just as you know, my colleagues, that the preservation of our American institutions lies in stopping the spending of billions more of our taxpayers' dollars each year than is taken in by our U.S. Treasury, especially in peacetimes, even though it be a shaky peace. Hence now is the appointed time to stop unnecessary, wasteful spending, not next session or the next, but during this session of Congress, as the next or the next may be too late.

I said at the outset of these remarks that for almost three decades to a great degree America has lived on the fruitful labors of past generations. Let us analyze that statement for a moment. Three decades ago our national debt was \$27 billion. At that time, President Roosevelt assured us that the United States could safely afford a national debt of \$75 billion. But look at us today—our national debt is over \$303 billion, and still climbing by leaps and bounds.

A \$7 billion Federal deficit in fiscal year 1962, a larger deficit in fiscal year 1963, and now a still larger deficit for fiscal year 1964 is in the offing.

Mr. Speaker, dare I ask, are we of this generation really worthy of our wonderful American heritage, and are we of this Congress as a whole, worthy of being the representatives of the most blessed nation on the face of this earth? If we continue forever to pile debt upon debt for our children and their children to pay with sweat and possibly with blood, while we of this age ride merrily on, where will it all lead?

Our President must stop listening to these theoretical, unrealistic economic advisers who have little or no business experience and who erroneously believe they are capable of creating here a utopian form of government. American commonsense and basic economics cry out for the removal of all bureaucratic roadblocks to national progress, as was done in West Germany immediately after World War II and which brought about there a prosperous, flourishing economy within 6 years after the close of that war.

These book-trained economists have also convinced some of our recent Presidents that huge Federal deficits are good for the country. They contend that these huge Federal expenditures are necessary to put dollars in the hands of the people in order to keep buying power at a higher level. Apparently they believe the Government is more capable of spending your own money than you are yourself. But these economists must surely forget these facts, which are

that the dollar spent by the Federal Government pyramids itself on an average into national income a little less than twice, while on the other hand, a dollar earned and spent by the people pyramids itself on an average into national income over three times, as statistics have shown.

Of course, these book-trained economists also contend, but not for public conception, except those who are dyed-in-the-wool Socialists, that huge Federal expenditures are a must in order to force the rich, the well-to-do, and the near well-to-do, to pay heavy taxes on their property and income from every source in order to provide the so-called little people with the fruits of their own labor by the process of wealth distribution, commonly and correctly called "soaking the rich to help the poor." But it just does not work that way.

Let us take a look at that theory and see exactly how it operates. The ultimate consumer of all goods, whether here or abroad, must of necessity, now or in the future, pay every dollar spent by the local, State, and Federal government, under any form of government. The consumer, who is every person who buys goods, has no place and no way to add or to escape the multiple taxes placed on every commodity and on every service they purchase that had to be paid by the producers of raw materials, the transporters, the processors, and marketers of the finished products. The latter all must add the taxes they pay to the price of the goods they sell and the services they render, or soon be forced to close shop due, of course, to greater outgo than income. Would that our book-trained economists take a leaf from that book of truth and reality.

To develop the facts further, just as they exist, more than 70 percent of all finished commodities are purchased by citizens whose annual income is less than \$6,000; hence over 70 cents of every dollar spent by your local, State, and Federal government is paid by our so-called little people.

In light of these facts it is only fair to ask, Who among our public servants, local, State, and Federal, are the real true friends of the so-called little people? Surely not the reckless, wasteful spending liberals who are in fact liberal only with your inherent American liberties and your pocketbook.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I now promise that in due time, after the President sends his 1964 fiscal year appropriation request to Congress, I shall carefully analyze it, after which I will specifically point out to the Congress and to the people how and where reductions can and must be made, since we have already been informed that the President intends to send a budget request to Congress amounting to \$100 billion, using round figures.

In the meantime, let us be ever mindful of the fact that no one can deny; millions of our finest American youth have served in our Armed Forces, have fought, bled, and died to preserve our competitive free private enterprise system of government, wherein we find all our cherished freedoms, the freedom of speech, press, vote, and worship. Every

Member of Congress must ask themselves this question: Will I keep my oath of office inviolate?

It might be well if all of us would read it again and again:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

#### CRIME SITUATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BECKER. 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 York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced legislation to try to bring about some correction of the terrible crime situation in the District of Columbia for which this Congress is responsible. Actually no action was taken and no hearings were held.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Members of the House read the speech delivered by J. Edgar Hoover on crime in the United States, in certain areas. Now, we cannot do very much about this in certain areas of the country, but we are responsible here in Washington, D.C., to see to it that American citizens, not only those who live here but tourists who come to this great Capital, are protected. When this Congress adjourned in October, crime was on the increase. Now people cannot walk the streets; they are not safe in their homes; they are not safe in the churches; they are not safe anywhere in the city. I repeat again what I said last year, we are going to wait until one of our daughters or wives or Members of the Congress is killed or raped or injured in the city, and then we will take drastic action. I will introduce this legislation in the next few days and I hope we will get action in this Congress to show the people of America that we will get rid of crime in the District and I hope that the Nation as a whole will take adequate steps.

#### POULTRY FIASCO

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at recent events which suggest that the Kennedy administration is "acting chicken" instead of "talking turkey" in its efforts to recover our lost poultry market in the European Common Market—ECM—trade area.

The new variable tariff instituted by the Common Market virtually eliminates

a market for American poultry which was developed under the Eisenhower administration and which, until this past year, had expanded to a \$50-million-a-year market providing hope for an industry in great distress.

Last year the American people were treated to a propaganda deluge originating from the White House extolling the benefits which this country would accrue through passage of the President's Trade Expansion Act.

By the time the massive publicity campaign reached its climax, anyone who questioned whether our generosity in offering to lower tariffs would be politely and promptly reciprocated was regarded as a throwback to Neanderthal man. But now the "chickens are coming home to roost," and ironically, our domestic broiler industry is the first to suffer although wheat problems loom next on the horizon.

Within a few weeks of passage of the administration bill, the bill that was to open up new vistas of trade for American products, the Common Market announced its new variable tariff on poultry. The effect of this new tariff was to string a chicken-wire fence around our previous European market for American poultry. It is protectionism more restrictive in intent than anything we have had on the books for generations. And this, within days after the New Frontier sold the American public on the benefits of the trade bill.

I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this was a deliberate deception on the part of the President. But it indicates another degree of the New Frontier's naivete and I fear on the part of a great many network TV commentators who helped sell the Trade Expansion Act.

Furthermore, the felony has been compounded. The Kennedys have not seen fit to give agriculture a representative on the Herter Committee that is our chief negotiating agency with the Common Market. The Chief Executive has thus far ignored even the suggestion of his House Agriculture Committee chairman that the Nation's agricultural interests be given a voice on this top-level negotiating team.

It seems amazing that the administration would attempt to negotiate farm tariff matters without utilizing the services of a farm expert with some qualities of Yankee bargaining.

Although American farmers are able to deliver broilers at Hamburg at some 31 cents a pound, there is a duty that is, in effect, a 12½-cent tariff to be paid on the birds before they can even enter Common Market territory. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to order chicken in Europe in the past year and can certify they need access to our broilers and preparation know-how.

And that 12½ cents can go even higher. The Common Market's complex system of tariffs on farm products permits duties to range up and down as costs move up or down on domestic farm production. The purpose of the levies is to make up the difference between European production costs of farm produce, like poultry, and the price of identical products when imported.



The result is to discourage American imports and to encourage production in their home areas. While we politely talk about lowering tariffs, the Common Market methodically proceeds to raise them.

During a recent excursion to sunny Palm Beach, Secretary Freeman said he is making every effort to protect agricultural interests in our talks with the Common Market. It is going to take more than glowing speeches in sunny Florida to save our foreign poultry markets. One cannot help but wonder whether imposition of an additional tariff on Volkswagens, Renaults, and a few other foreign cars, would not accomplish more than a dozen speeches in Florida. Or perhaps we can suggest repayment of some of our past foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to a report just published by the Poultry Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business. In its recommendations, the report notes on page 24:

The following practices should be considered:

(a) Expand sales abroad where the consumption is far below that of the United States; and

(b) In connection with the above, make every effort to protect agricultural interests when negotiations are conducted with the Common Market nations and the governments of other nations.

The failure to anticipate the Common Market variable tariff, and the failure to appoint an agriculture member of our trade negotiation team belie these recommendations. Has our no-win policy been extended to the field of trade?

If this administration is in water over its head, perhaps the Congress should ruffle its own feathers and develop guidelines for firmer policy.

Our Ozark broiler producers know only too well what it is to be saddled by the regimentation-or-ruin controls of the New Frontier Agriculture Department. They will have no stomach for having their livelihood regimented also by the whims of our State Department.

#### REPEAL OF THE 10-PERCENT AUTOMOBILE EXCISE TAX

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the reports in national magazines and newspapers that tax cuts rank No. 1 on the President's legislative program, I want to avail myself of the earliest possible opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the bill I have reintroduced to repeal the 10-percent automobile excise tax. This outgrowth of the Korean war emergency has penalized purchasers of new automobiles and prohibited the full growth of the economy long enough. The temporary tax was imposed to dampen the demand and production of nonmilitary cars and trucks while we concentrated

on Communist aggression in Korea. But as any makeshift tax arrangement produces results detrimental to the long-term growth of the Nation, today, 10 years after the settlement of the war, the tax serves as an atrocious inequity in our tax system, and an anchor to the free movement of our economy.

The repeal of this levy will not only redeem a punitive tax inequity, it will go a long way toward filling the sails of the economy. The importance of the automobile in our economic life is reflected by the fact that \$1 out of every \$5 spent for goods at retail prices is spent on automotive products. If we sincerely want to reform our tax system and get this country sailing again, economically, we have no better embarkation point than the repeal of this depressive tax.

I earnestly urge the members of the Ways and Means Committee, who share the responsibility for providing this country with equitable and economically sound taxes, to give their most careful consideration and attention to this matter.

#### SPORTS SPECTACULAR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the scheduling of a tremendously worthwhile sports spectacular on CBS television this coming Sunday, January 13, at 2:30 p.m. This 90-minute show will cover an event in the new and thrilling "Olympics of the Air," the world sport parachuting championships held at Orange, Mass., during August and September of 1962.

The parachuting championships at Orange were the first full-scale Olympics of the Air event ever to be held in the United States. Two hundred and fifty contestants from 24 nations, including Russia and several Iron Curtain countries, participated. The U.S. women's team placed first, the U.S. men's team placed second, and a U.S. parachutist won the title of "World Champion."

Not only was the event significant because it was a first for the United States, but also because of the momentous problems which were encountered in its conduct. Though officially sponsored with the full verbal support of the U.S. Government, Federal cooperation and assistance, with a few exceptions, ended right there. This is just an example of the conflicts which are involved each time the United States participates in the World Olympics. We are in definite need of a solution, especially to the financial requirements of our teams.

Nevertheless, to see how such an exciting event, bringing together competitors from all over the world for an amazingly precise sport, can be brilliantly conducted with a minimum of resources, I commend the CBS sports spectacular to your viewing pleasure.

#### CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Cultural Development Act originally was introduced in the House of Representatives on July 17, 1962. Since the introduction of this bill I have received such an abundance of support and encouragement from every section of the country that I am convinced more than ever before of the need, the rightness, the timeliness, and the potential contribution to the Nation's well-being of this proposed legislation. Because of this I have today reintroduced the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the Record at this time a partial list of the organizations and institutions, with the officer or representative of each, which have responded favorably to me as of this time:

PARTIAL LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM ORGANIZATIONS OR INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE RESPONDED FAVORABLY TO THE BASIC PROVISIONS AND PURPOSES OF THE CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1962 (H.R. 12560)

Legislative representative, Actors Equity Association, New York, N.Y.

Director, American Association of Museums, Washington, D.C.

General secretary, American Association of University Professors, Washington, D.C.

President, American Federation of Musicians, New York, N.Y.

President, Blackburn College, Carlinville, Ill.

President, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

President, Central State College, Edmond, Okla.

President, Colorado State University.

President, Dana College, Blair, Nebr.

President and chairman, Department of English, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

President, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.

President and chairman, Department of Fine Arts, East Tennessee State College.

Assistant to the president, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

President, Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.

President, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.

President, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.

President, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.

President, Idaho State College.

President, Indiana State College.

Professor of art, Kansas State University.

President, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

President, Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.

President, Lambuth College, Jackson, Tenn.

Acting president, Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

President, Marymount College, Tarrytown, N.Y.

President, Montana State College.

Executive secretary, National Commission on Accrediting, Washington, D.C.

Dean, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, Nev.

Acting president, New Mexico Western College.

Chairman, Fine Arts Department, Plymouth Teachers College, Plymouth, N.H.

President, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College.

Vice president for academic affairs, Ohio University.

Director, Otis Art Institute of Los Angeles County, Calif.

Dean, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Assistant to the president, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

President, Regis College, Denver, Colo.

Provost and vice president, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

President, St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, N.C.

President, St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans.

President, St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans, La.

Editor, "School Arts" magazine.

President, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

President, State College of Iowa.

President and director, art education division, State University College, Buffalo, N.Y.

Acting president, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.

President, Trinity College, Washington, D.C.

Executive secretary, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

President, the Pennsylvania State University.

Dean, the University of Oklahoma.

Heads, Departments of Journalism and Creative Writing, and Speech and Drama, University of Alaska.

Chancellor, University of California.

President, University of Illinois.

Vice chancellor and dean of faculties, University of Kansas.

Dean, Graduate School, University of Minnesota.

President, University of Oregon.

President and dean of arts and sciences, University of South Carolina.

Dean, University of Tennessee.

President, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

Dean, Utah State University.

Chairman, humanities division, Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka, Kans.

Chairman, Department of Music, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

President, Western Illinois University.

President, Westminster College, Fulton, Mo.

President, Wheelock College, Boston, Mass.

President, William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa.

Dean, Yale University School of Art and Architecture, New Haven, Conn.

President, University of Arizona.

President and chancellor, the University of California.

Provost, the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.

President, University of Texas.

President and chairman, English Department, East Texas State College.

President, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans.

Vice president, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Vice president and dean, College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn.

President, Delaware State College, Dover, Del.

President, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

President, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.

President, Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minn.

President, North Central College, Naperville, Ill.

President, University of Miami, Miami, Fla.

President, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

President, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the response of the higher education community to the proposals contained in the bill has been overwhelmingly favorable.

It is evident that the need for programs such as those contained in the legislation is very keenly felt by the heads of colleges and universities and other educators generally throughout the country. We are indeed facing the danger of a critical imbalance in our education programs unless we begin to give attention to the arts and humanities at least in some small measure comparable to that now being given to the sciences and technology.

I am reinforced in my conviction that this legislation is needed by the fact that, while some have suggested changes in emphasis, functions or organization, not a single dissenting voice has been raised as far as the primary objectives of the bill are concerned. It is also significant to note that coming as they do from all sections of the country and representing many facets of the education community, they are almost unanimous in emphasizing that the Federal Government must act to support the arts and humanities to a far greater degree than heretofore.

Among the foremost supporters of Federal recognition and programs in the arts and humanities is Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University. On February 7, 1962, Dr. Keeney wrote me as follows:

It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements or lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

It was President Keeney's letter that stimulated my interest to introduce the proposed Cultural Development Act of 1962:

Again in response to the proposed legislation, Dr. Keeney has advised me in his letter of October 7, 1962, as follows:

I am very much pleased that you have taken the leadership in another important area and I hope very much that your efforts will succeed. If I can help, I should like to.

Another staunch supporter of the proposed legislation is Francis H. Horn, president of the University of Rhode Island. Dr. Horn has written me in part as follows in his letter of August 16, 1962:

As I think you know, I have been concerned about the advancement of the arts and humanities for many years. \* \* \* So all I can say is, keep fighting for this good cause. \* \* \* in the end the logic of your position, and the need for the services which your legislation provides, will win the necessary support. \* \* \* the possibility that the Office of Education will be working on a major program in this area adds considerably to the attractiveness of the matter \* \* \*.

Many other Rhode Islanders prominent in the arts and education have indicated their strong support. Among these are Francis Madeira, musical director of our Rhode Island Philharmonic Orchestra; Arlan Coolidge, chairman of the department of music at Brown Uni-

versity; Louis Pichierri, director of music for our department of public schools in Providence; and John Nicholas Brown, renowned Providence art patron and collector.

In an article in the Providence Journal-Bulletin of July 17, 1962, under the heading, "College Heads Praise Humanities Move," other outstanding Rhode Island educators voiced their support. William C. Gaige, president of Rhode Island College, was quoted as follows:

Such an agency is important to put back into balance the emphasis on science and the humanities. \* \* \* It is extremely important that we understand the nature of man, and keep in balance the educational and cultural forces which society makes available to him, and which so much influence his thinking, and through him the society of our country and of the world.

Albert Bush-Brown, president of the Rhode Island School of Design, was quoted in these words:

We ought to have an agency that is supporting performing arts through established institutions in local communities. At this time when our thinking is directed to space programs, communications systems, new power sources and computers, we have tended to neglect the necessity to reshape the communities in which we live. Unless our physical environment is qualitatively improved to sustain the social and cultural institutions that families need we shall have gained little by touching down on other planets.

Typical of the support for the objectives of this measure given by the Rhode Island press is the editorial of June 22, 1962, in the Providence Visitor, which makes an effective analysis of the objectives and need for the legislation. It also gives clear evidence of the wisdom of placing this new responsibility within the U.S. Office of Education. The entire editorial, entitled "Support for Arts and Humanities," is submitted for the RECORD:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, June 22, 1962]

#### SUPPORT FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Speaking at the commencement of Rhode Island College earlier this month, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. As envisioned by Mr. FOGARTY, this Institute would stand on an equal footing with the National Science Foundation. Its functions would include supporting research, providing a national clearinghouse for educational materials, and developing a program of fellowships for students in the arts or the humanities. In addition, there would be established a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities. The members of this council would be chosen for their eminence and would advise the Government as to the ways in which it might encourage the development of the cultural life of the Nation.

We believe that this proposal has great merit, although some might question the advisability of Mr. FOGARTY's plan to set up the new Institute within the U.S. Office of Education. It should, however, be noted that this office has undergone important structural changes. Under Commissioner Sterling M. McMurrin, a former professor of philosophy, the horizons of the U.S. Office of Education have widened considerably beyond the traditional function of compiling educational statistics. More and more in recent years we have seen a closer communication between the academic world of humanistic studies and the creative world of the



various arts. The moment that one realizes that each art has its laws and its disciplines, it becomes clear that as the Committee on the Visual Arts of Harvard University put it, "The great artist is great both as an artist and as an intellectual." The relation between the performing arts, such as music and drama, and the world of education has also long been recognized.

It is, of course, true that the history of the relations between Government and cultural pursuits has not been altogether without causes for criticism in those instances where that relation has taken on an official character. Recent discussions of the shortcomings of our own State legislature in this regard come immediately to mind. Yet we have many examples of Government activity in cultural matters that are most excellent illustrations of how things can be done with due regard to the highest professional standards. The National Gallery of Art combines public and private efforts very well, and the Library of Congress has long been an important center of artistic and scholarly activity. If the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation can be maintained, as they are, on a level which is well above petty political considerations there is no reason why we cannot also have an equally excellent National Institute of the Arts and Humanities.

As Mr. FOGARTY pointed out, there is a growing concern among scientists and educators over the danger of the loss of important creative human values as a result of an overemphasis on science. The Soviet Union has abandoned what we know as the liberal arts educational program. Its technically proficient dictatorship fears the liberating power of the humanities. An American institute devoted to cultural interests would further mark the difference between tyranny and freedom in the nuclear age.

Mr. Speaker, a subsequent editorial from the July 27, 1962, edition of the Visitor, which gives eloquent backing to the need for Federal support of the arts and humanities as proposed in this bill, is also submitted in its entirety for the RECORD:

[From the Providence (R.I.) Visitor, July 27, 1962]

#### SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN CULTURE

Speaking at the commencement exercises of Rhode Island College last month, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY proposed the establishment of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities. Sharing Mr. FOGARTY's concern over the imbalance which has developed as a result of necessary stress on science in education, we expressed our general approval of the Congressman's proposal. Now that he has introduced a bill to make his plan a practical reality, we are pleased to note that such leading educators as the president of Brown University have expressed their belief that this kind of legislation is welcome. Certain matters of the public good are involved to such a wide extent that it is not surprising to find that the idea of a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities does have the backing of men who know our educational and cultural needs. The vast sums of money and the abundant graduate awards which have been made available to science students are, no doubt, fully justified by the defense needs and other requirements of our society. Students who wished to prepare themselves through the equally long, difficult, and expensive processes of the humanities have, however, been offered very little such aid, when compared with the grants available in the sciences.

One consequence of this imbalance has been a decline in the enrollments in art and music schools. Another result of the heavy aid given to science has been that the number of Ph. D. candidates preparing to take their places as teachers in higher education has not kept pace with the Nation's projected needs. The American Historical Association, for example, recently pointed out that there will not be enough qualified Ph. D.'s in history alone to meet the expected needs of higher education in 1946. Under the graduate fellowships provisions of Mr. FOGARTY's Cultural Development Act, this situation would be at least partially improved.

But it is not only in the world of the universities that there is need for programs of information, advisory service, and financial help on a national scale. Statistics show that more of our people are going to concerts and other productions of the performing arts than ever before. More visitors are venturing into the Nation's museums. Both museums and producers of artistic enterprises are, however, finding that getting money to cover their operating expenses—to say nothing of their expansion—is increasingly difficult. The time is long past when the world of the arts was the special preserve of wealthy patrons. Cities and universities alike, faced with the fact that many of our libraries are increasingly inadequate and obsolete, cannot expect to meet the costs of the future with the help of private donors alone. Mr. FOGARTY's bill at least makes a start in facing these difficulties. More tax relief to wealthy art patrons, as proposed by the Providence Evening Bulletin is no solution. Museums and libraries which have been the special preserves of a few wealthy donors in the past are, in some instances, barely surviving today.

Mr. FOGARTY's plan was criticized by the Evening Bulletin as an attempt to buy culture for the American people, with the Government setting the critical standards. Not only does the bill specifically prohibit Federal interference of this kind, but it also assumes that we already have a culture which deserves public recognition and support.

These comments so far have focused on the strong support of this proposed legislation in behalf of the arts and humanities by key persons, organizations, and institutions within the State of Rhode Island. However, support from the other geographical areas of the Nation has been equally enthusiastic.

Chancellor York, of the University of California, has put it this way:

As for myself, I find your bill and the proposal for a national organization of arts and humanities a most encouraging step forward. It is important that the welfare of arts and humanities be taken seriously, for we cannot continually perpetuate and seek a high standard of excellence in the sciences to the exclusion of other areas of learning. I am convinced that a balance must be struck between the technical and the arts and humanities that will provide this country with well-rounded individuals whose abilities in any given area have only been enhanced by their knowledge of, and education in, the arts and humanities. Your bill also lends itself to the furtherance of the arts and humanities, by assuring, through scholarships and fellowships, the education of those persons pursuing study in these areas. This is a strong point in its favor.

Dean Peltason, of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences of the University of Illinois, confirms the existence at his in-

stitution of a situation which we know to be widespread throughout the country. Here is the way Dean Peltason describes it:

What is happening is that the availability of research support for the sciences, as much as it is welcomed, is forcing the universities to divert more and more of their own resources to the sciences at the expense of the other areas of our concern. Not only is this because we must divert university resources to cover indirect costs of Government-sponsored science research, but since matching funds are available for science buildings and programs, there is an unavoidable tendency to give these items high priorities.

In addition, research support for science is creating even greater disparities in the rewards to scientists in contrast to those working in fields where Federal funds are not available. Research grants permit scientists to acquire equipment they need and to attend international conferences. Scientists are paid during summer months to do research. Scholars in other fields do not have these opportunities so that in effect the salary of almost every university scientist is at least two-ninths more than that of comparable scholars in other fields.

The president of Trinity College, Washington, D.C., has pointed out that we must be concerned with "the development of a man as man, as a human person"; and further, that "our architecture, music, sculpture, literature and painting must represent the very best of which we are capable, just as our scientific development does."

President Hart of Duke University has written to me, stating:

I think it is highly important for the student, the universities and the country as a whole that the humanities not be neglected in our emphasis on the sciences.

Former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has responded to the presentation of my bill in the Congress in the following words:

The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny.

Stanley A. Czurlies, president of the Eastern Arts Association, representing some 3,000 art educators in the northeastern part of the United States, has recorded that organization's support of my bill. He has called it "very realistic in its approach to the problem" and "in line with several developments which institutions and organizations working in the art field have been seeking to bring about."

On a broader scale, the National Council of the Arts in Education, representing over 150,000 persons concerned with the arts at all levels of education, has re-

cently concluded the first National Conference on the Arts in Education at Lake Erie College in Painesville, Ohio. Dean Norman L. Rice, of the College of Fine Arts, Carnegie Institute of Technology, who served as chairman of this conference, has recently written to the U.S. Office of Education as follows:

Of major importance to the conference was a realization of the urgent necessity for strong, enlightened Federal support in the arts. Indeed, this need may be said to have occupied the prime position in the conference's survey of the arts today.

Dean Rice goes on to present specific recommendations from the Council in the areas of conferences, research, services of specialists, and publication in the field of the arts. Each one of these needs would be met under the provision of this bill.

President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, has written to me in these words:

The purposes intended by your bill are of great importance to our national life which can most surely advance with security and strength only if we develop the full potentials of our intellectual resources, both humane and scientific.

Dean J. A. Burdine of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Texas has stated:

Representative FOGARTY's bill to create a National Institute of Arts and Humanities represents an excellent balance to the imbalance that has been created by the recent emphasis on science. It seems to me that the heart of the matter is the provision for scholarships and fellowships to be awarded to outstanding students.

Dean E. W. Doty, of the College of Fine Arts of the same university, has made the following comment concerning this proposed legislation:

Of all the bills which have been introduced which I have studied, this seems a more fruitful approach than trying to set up a separate national agency.

The chairman of the music department at Washington University in St. Louis sums up his conviction this way:

The arts are no longer a frill or the preoccupation of a fringe group of eccentrics; rather, they are basic, fundamental to meaningful living in the contemporary world.

He further states that—

only the Federal Government can attack the problems of the arts on a scale large enough and at a level high enough to be meaningful and effective.

And of course, this is the fundamental need which my bill proposes to meet. However, while it is broad and flexible enough to attack the needs and problems in the arts at the Federal level, my bill provides specifically that there shall be no Federal control over the policies and the functions of the institutions, organizations, associations, and individuals which it seeks to assist.

At this point, I should like to submit for the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Providence Evening Bulletin which appeared on August 1, 1962. It was written by Dr. Gustav O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools

in the United States, in reply to the Bulletin's editorial of July 20 entitled, "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies." This letter makes several facts abundantly clear. First, the enlightened scientist agrees that full value and support must be given to our artistic, literary, and scholarly efforts as a Nation if our science itself is to reach its fullest potential. Second, the gross disparity in relative support by our educational institutions of scientific programs on one hand, and of programs in the arts and humanities on the other, has been heightened by our own actions in the Congress in behalf of our defense, as essential as these have been. And finally, the experience in recent years of educational institutions which have received substantial Federal support through agencies such as AEC, NIH, NSF, and NDEA proves beyond question that Federal assistance is possible without Federal control.

THE COUNCIL OF  
GRADUATE SCHOOLS  
IN THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., July 25, 1962.

To the Editor,  
*Providence Evening Bulletin*,  
Providence, R.I.

Your editorial of Friday, July 20, 1962, entitled "Buying Public Culture With Federal Subsidies," requires a reply, not so much to let you and your readers know that the universities and colleges of the country heartily support Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY's Cultural Development Act of 1962, but chiefly to point out certain distortions of fact and erroneous conclusions in the editorial.

I need not waste time and space to prove that a great imbalance exists in favor of the natural sciences over the humanities. You yourself admit it. But I do wish to quote a few sentences from the now-famous Seaborg Report of November 15, 1960, a statement by the President's Science Advisory Committee.

"Much of the basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. \* \* \* Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report."

These sentences were not written by Representative FOGARTY or by a professor of arts or humanities, but by 14 of the most distinguished scientists of the Nation. Granted that the expenditure of vast sums in the advancement of the sciences was dictated by the needs of national defense, the fact remains that this advancement was accomplished by the impoverishment of the arts and the humanities. This impoverishment resulted not only from the direct absence of Federal support but also from the fact that many universities have had to siphon off funds from their arts and humanities programs to pay the indirect costs of federally sponsored science programs. In other words, the imbalance which exists today was created both directly and indirectly by the Federal Government.

I am sure that you must have had tongue in cheek when you wrote that the remedy for the plight of the humanities and the arts lies on the campus of each college along with the responsibility for poorly trained

teachers. Even a professor of the arts or humanities has to be paid—not as much as a chemist, to be sure—and he needs space, equipment, books, museum materials. Who is going to buy these necessities when the budgets of humanities departments are cut to the bone to provide overhead costs for the sciences?

No, Mr. Editor, the remedy for the imbalance lies with the same agency that created it—the Federal Government. And the remedy does not consist of curtailing subsidies to the sciences so that we can all be poor and mediocre together. It consists of reasonable, not extravagant, intelligently allotted aid to the undernourished areas. Then, and only then, can the universities and colleges improve the deficiencies in their arts and humanities departments. And I don't know where you got the notion of a "crash program"—an anomalous term in itself; how can anything that crashes be constructive? Certainly there's nothing in Mr. FOGARTY's bill to suggest a crash program.

Finally, I wish to object most strongly to your statement that this bill implies that the Government "can and should decide what has and what has not cultural value, and that it can and should shape humanities programs in American colleges." In the first place, section 102 of the bill expressly prohibits any Government supervision or control of educational policy. More impressive, however, is the record of the past. In the last 20 years, the Government has invested billions of dollars in higher education, through such agencies as AEC, NASA, NDEA, NIH, NSF, and others, and there still has to be found a single instance in which Government has attempted to formulate, supervise, control, or shape programs, curriculums, or policies of universities and colleges. Believe me, sir, we, the administrators and faculties of the universities and colleges, would be the first to raise our voices in protest against such interference.

You cannot, indeed, "buy public culture with Federal subsidies," but you can buy the personnel, the facilities, and the equipment by means of which the universities and colleges can produce the teachers and practitioners of the arts and letters in a favorable cultural climate. For the first step in this direction we thank Mr. FOGARTY.

GUSTAVE O. ARLT,  
President, the Council of Graduate  
Schools in the United States.

Financial statistics clearly show that present Federal programs in institutions of higher education are heavily weighted to the natural and physical sciences. The effects of this emphasis on these institutions has recently been analyzed in a study of 36 colleges and universities. The study was performed by Harold Ordans of the Brookings Institution under contract with the Office of Education. It is part of the "Survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education." Some of the findings of this study follow:

The effects which Federal programs have had on the quality and nature of higher education have been varied and uneven: pronounced in some areas but virtually undetectable in others where one would expect a marked effect. On the whole the effects have been decidedly good.

They have been most striking and direct in scientific research and education at a few leading graduate and professional schools and institutes of technology, and most imperceptible and indirect in scholarly work and teaching in the arts and humanities at 4- and 2-year liberal arts colleges. We have not explored either the tenuous effects at the latter institutions or the pronounced effects



at professional schools of medicine, engineering, and agriculture, but have focused on the impact on liberal arts education at a broad group of public and private universities and a select group of private colleges.

Federal programs have aided these institutions to improve the quality, increase the numbers, improve the salaries, and reduce the teaching loads of their faculty in the sciences and some social sciences \* \* \*.

Perhaps the most unfortunate consequence of Federal science programs has been the cleavage they have engendered between the status and rewards of faculty in the sciences and humanities. Surely this is the major problem posed for educational institutions by the unbalanced nature of present Federal policies and expenditures, and it suggests the desirability of either counterbalancing programs in the humanities or of broader forms of institutional aid.

Faculty members in the 36 institutions were asked their opinion on the wide difference in Federal support between the sciences and humanities. Their response follows:

A small majority of scientists believe that the concentration of Federal funds in the natural sciences and relative neglect of the humanities is in the present national interest, but over two-thirds of the social scientists and a still larger proportion of humanists affirm that it is not. Some 70 percent of the scientists, however, state that the present pattern is neither in the long-run national interest nor in the best interest of their institution, and nine-tenths or more of their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities agree.

Asked further, "If you could redistribute the Federal funds presently available, what would you do?" over 70 percent of the respondents indicate that they would, "Give the humanities somewhat more and the sciences somewhat less, but still the major portion." It is worthy of special note that 67 percent of the scientists at universities now receiving the largest sums from the Federal Government also subscribe to this position, and the comments of many suggest that an even larger proportion would favor a policy which gave both humanists and scientists more money, or at any rate which did not penalize the sciences in order to help the humanities.

In summary, I would say only this: Seldom, if ever, in my experience as a legislator, have I observed a more clearly felt need for appropriate legislation such as that represented by the comments and convictions of these leaders in the fields of the arts, sciences, and the humanities which I have shared with you in part. I believe my bill, the Cultural Development Act of 1963, makes a comprehensive yet reasonable beginning of Federal support in this area. I feel certain the Congress will accept this nationwide surge of united opinion as an unequivocal mandate for forthright action.

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that the 88th Congress enact the

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. This day I have introduced legislation providing Federal grants and loans for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems. This measure will authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide additional assistance for mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas in the Nation.

It is my firm belief that if our urban areas, both large and small, are to escape strangulation by traffic congestion, the efforts of all levels of government are needed to solve the critical transportation problems now confronting them.

The transportation problems of the urban areas are of true national concern. Seventy percent of the Nation's population live in urban areas and it is here that the highest rate of population growth is occurring. It is evident that because our Nation is predominantly an urban nation, the solution of urban problems is very much a part of the current worldwide race for economic, scientific, and cultural leadership. The strength of our very Nation will be demonstrated in the cities. These core cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding urban and suburban territory have been the fastest growing sections of the country since the start of the century. Over two-thirds of the population of the Nation today resides in urban areas.

One of the key and unique pressures that faces the city today is the burden of handling a daytime population 30 to 50 percent greater than the residential population. The continuing decline in the use of mass transit facilities is making this task enormously more difficult. Within recent years heavy emphasis has been placed on building or planning freeways to the central cities and by adding to the supply of parking spaces. It strikes me as apparent that a highway program alone will fail to solve the problem of accessibility for many cities as they are constituted today. The question of accessibility has a great deal to do with the decision of the businessman to stay downtown or the decision of the shopper to go there. In fact, the very question of accessibility to the modern city is closely tied to the question of the survival of the central city.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it to be a fact that the movement of the great masses of people into and out of the central city can be accomplished only by a mass rapid transit program. Nationally, it makes little difference what form this transport takes—elevated trains, subways, surface trains, buses, or a combination of any or all of them. What is clear is that the fact of galloping congestion in our urban areas must be met—and with dispatch.

Our highway programs, our urban renewal projects, and all urban planning assistance programs will become more effective with the enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. Under this act Federal aid will be given to State and local government agencies. They are in the best position to keep abreast of the trends which indicate need for specific transportation facilities and the best ways to meet local problems.

Mr. Speaker, I feel we have come to a point in the development of our Nation at which neither the Federal Government nor the American economy as a whole can afford the expense and damage if metropolitan areas fail in their productive function. Enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act will do much to insure the good health of the American city.

#### THE NEED FOR A COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years have passed since I introduced in the 86th Congress, 2d session, a House resolution on a Committee on the Captive Nations. Referred to the Rules Committee, the resolution has never been discharged, in spite of numerous bipartisan companion resolutions, statements on the floor, and letters from constituents, scores of which were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The primary reason for pigeonholing the measure lies in the strong opposition of the State Department.

As stated in Mr. Dean Rusk's letter of August 22, 1961, to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, the State Department objected to House Resolution 211 for two reasons: First, identifying certain nations, such as Armenians or Georgians, as captive nations weakens our position, since we appear "advocating the dismemberment of an historical state"; second, a Committee on Captive Nations would "form a pretext for Soviet actions interfering with the resolution of the Berlin crisis."

As to the first reason, one is at a loss to understand how our position could be weakened if we were to insist on the universal application of national self-determination rights. Brought to its logical conclusion, Mr. Rusk's argument would mean that our position in Africa is being steadily weakened, since we consistently support independence aims of every nation on that continent, sometimes even at the cost of chagrining our allies.

Conversely, it is not easy to comprehend how our position could be strengthened if we keep silent on the Russian denial of self-determination to the numerous non-Russian nations, which Congress, after an exhaustive study, found captive—Public Law 86-90, sponsored by, among others, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK—and if we apply a double standard in this respect in Africa and Russia.

One also fails to understand how our theoretical support of independence for Armenia, Georgia, or Turkestan would contribute to the dismemberment of historical Russia, if our endorsement of independence for Algeria, Congo, or Angola makes no contribution to the dismemberment of historical France, Belgium, and Portugal. If one speaks in historical

categories, France and Belgium acquired their African possessions at about the same time Russia expanded on the Caucasus, while her acquisition of Turkestan took place 40 years after France's acquisition of Algeria and more than three centuries after Portugal's acquisition of Angola.

As to the second reason in the letter, although Mr. Rusk's hands have not been tied by such a committee, he has failed to resolve the Berlin crisis in the more than a year since he wrote that letter. Conversely, it would be safe to assume that world war III would not have erupted over Berlin because of the committee, even if we had had one.

Speaking of further opposition to House Resolution 211, it also was voiced in unmistakable terms by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Invited to state his views before the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman THOMAS E. MORGAN, insisted that his committee was taking good care of the captive nations, and no changes in the setup were necessary. The gentleman from Connecticut, JOHN S. MONAGHAN, who chaired the hearings on nine European captive nations last summer, asserted that "there was feeling in the Foreign Affairs Committee the question of jurisdiction of matters like this lay with this committee and the objectives might be reached in the way we are attempting to do it here," that is, without any special committee on captive nations. The gentlewoman from New York, EDNA F. KELLY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, likewise claimed that the captive nations were her category and that her subcommittee practically covered all the nations of the world.

It cannot be denied that the committee did not endorse the dismemberment of Russia. It never questioned Russia's right to hold captive 40 million Ukrainians, 10 million Belorussians, 10 million Caucasians, and millions of other non-Russian people in Europe alone, listed in Public Law 86-90. The committee's only concern were nine smaller captive nations—Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania—with combined population of about 90 million. As the committee, for some reason, was not concerned about nearly 20 million East Germans, it disregarded more than 100 million captive people in Europe alone—including the European part of the Soviet Union.

Only this year did the committee recognize the inadequacy of its approach to the captive nations problem. The excuse was that the subcommittee had been prevented from doing a good job by the practical limitations of jurisdiction and time. As a result of this soul-searching, the subcommittee recommended on October 29 that a consideration be given to the establishment of a Subcommittee on Captive Nations under the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

While such a subcommittee conceivably could deal with matters pertaining not only to the European captive nations, but also to the captive Cubans,

Chinese, Tibetans, Mongols, North Koreans, North Vietnamese, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, and other non-Russians in the Asiatic part of the Soviet Union, numbering some 700 million people, that is, nearly four times as many as in Europe, no favorable results are likely to spring from such a subcommittee. The fact that it would remain subordinated under the Foreign Affairs Committee raises grave doubts in this respect.

In its report of October 29, 1962, the committee was unable to list a single measure in behalf of captive nations it had sponsored or carried out. All the committee could do was to refer to the hearings, held 8 years earlier by the Kersten committee, and list the latter's publications. Had it not been for my resolution, House Resolution 211, introduced on March 6, 1961, and the ensuing interest in this proposal, the committee, most probably, would not have held any such hearings as were held last summer. Actually, it was only 10 months ago that the committee took initiative, in an apparent effort to forestall the passage of House Resolution 211 and keep the matters as they had been heretofore.

The House, for example, has not investigated the wisdom of discounting 1 billion people behind the Iron, Bamboo, and Sugarcane Curtains as our friends. It has not questioned the replacement of liberation or rollback policy by containment, coexistence, disengagement, evolution, and nonpredetermination policies. It has not investigated the full implication of the powerful tide of self-determination running throughout the captive nations, nor looked in to the vulnerabilities of the Russian Communist empire, including the Red army, as a consequence of a reborn spirit of national independence.

The House has not assessed the results of our containment policy, which has alienated 1 billion captive people and gained no new allies among either the captive or nonaligned nations. It has not asked itself whether such policy is serving our purposes, and what changes would be advisable in view of our witnessing the disappearance of East Berliners behind the Concrete Curtain, the Cubans behind the Sugarcane Curtain, the Tibetans and the North Lao behind the Bamboo Curtain, and the vacillation of several nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The House has not brought to the surface the vested interests at the State Department that vociferously advocate Russian nationalism, although precisely the same line is being pursued by the Kremlin, and evidently is serving its purposes. It has not given a thought to the puzzling circumstances that both the Russian emigres and Russian Communists equally violently oppose the Captive Nations Week commemorations and try to prevent a congressional inquiry into the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

The House has not examined the prudence of our open alinement with the supernationalist Russians, in spite of their disregard of all the ideals we cherish, as exemplified in their century-

old policy of militant expansionism at the expense of their weaker neighbors, racial and religious intolerance—anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism—forcible Russification, denial of self-determination rights to the non-Russian nations, and colonial exploitation of more than a score of captive nations for the benefit of the Russian heartland.

If the State Department wants to win the friendship of 96 million Russians at the cost of alienating over 100 million non-Russians, the House has not determined whether the Department sincerely believes the Russians could be bought without compromising the principles for which we stand, and without opening the United States to the defeating criticism that, wherever it suits our selfish purposes, we forsake our principles and support the philosophy of tyranny and the violently antidemocratic regimes.

The House has done nothing to ascertain whether it is in our own interest to support the Russians and alienate the non-Russians in view of the possibility of an armed conflict with the Red army, where we could have all non-Russians lined up for us and all Russians lined up against us, since the Soviet Union, after all, is a Russian Empire, its rulers and privileged class are Russian, and its primary beneficiaries are Russian. The House has not brought out the fact that a disproportionate share of rank-and-file members in the Soviet Communist Party are Russian, while a shockingly disproportionate share of political prisoners in Soviet jails and concentration camps are non-Russian.

The House has not weighed the fact that over 100 million non-Russians in the Soviet Union, if told clearly and well beforehand of our favorable disposition toward their national aspirations, would become invaluable allies in case of an armed conflict with the Soviets. It is the non-Russians who hold strategical important positions on land and sea approaches to Moscow and control most of the wheat, coal, oil, and raw materials sustaining Russia's heartland.

Nor has the House dwelt on the reasons why the Germans in World War II were greeted as liberators in the non-Russian borderlands of the Soviet Union, why non-Russian troops laid down arms and offered full cooperation in defeating imperial Russia, and why whole non-Russian towns and districts were taken over by nationalist guerrillas long before the Germans arrived. Had the Nazis not refused the extended hand and replaced Communist slavery by Nazi slavery, our task in liquidating them would have been much more difficult.

The House has not requested an explanation from the State Department for its lukewarm support of the United Nations inquiry into Russian colonialism. It has not asked the Department whether the ruthless Russian colonialism is considered as different from the enlightened colonialism as still practiced by some Western nations, and which the Department so vigorously opposes.

Finally, the House has not scrutinized on its merits the State Department's untouchable policy of opposing the Soviet Union's dismemberment nor evaluated



advantages that may result from, first, breaking up the biggest war machine in history which menaces our own security; second, reestablishing the balance of power in Europe; third paving the way toward a community of free, democratic nations; and, fourth, abolishing mankind's most ruthless imperial dictatorship.

The failure of the House to do all these things actually denies the leadership of Congress that enacted Public Law 86-90. It also deprives the American people of their right to open public inquiry on a vital issue. The failure of the House to show interest in the captive nations on the same subject serve as proof that no changes may be anticipated even if a subcommittee were established under the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Therefore, the only effective solution is to establish a new House Committee on Captive Nations. Completely dissociated from the present policies on captive nations and bearing no responsibility for their endorsement in the past, such a committee would be a proper congressional instrument for examining the problem in its entirety and suggesting to Congress ways and means to communicate with and aid our true friends behind the Communist curtains, aiding thereby our own security and leadership position in the world. We live in a climactic period of history. It is high time that something was done to put the U.S. Congress on the alert in regard to the danger caused by our passive attitude toward 1 billion captive people all over the world.

In his address before the United Nations General Assembly over a year ago, President Kennedy condemned the new Soviet colonialism and interjected this warning: "The tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire." It stands to reason he believes that the tide will reach the Russian prison of nations. Hence, our State Department lags far behind our President in understanding the tide of nationalism which moves toward the Communist empire. Congress must not lend itself to the State Department's errors in strategy and policy. Rather Congress should move ahead with the President, preparing for the day when the riptide on national independence dismembers the Russian empire.

While communism is experiencing internal dissent and difficulty in achieving its objectives, both at home and abroad, the free world must mount a vigorous political offensive on all fronts. The Captive Nations Week resolution, that has caused so much commotion in the captors' world, must be followed by proper measures that would implement its moral objectives, instead of remaining a meaningless repetition of annual declarations. The centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation is a fitting date for action.

#### THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend

his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night of this week, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN, delivered the 1963 Burton lecture on education at Harvard University. I find Mrs. GREEN's speech, entitled "The Federal Role in Education Today," a valuable contribution to the discussion of the need for Federal assistance to colleges and universities. In the speech the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] makes a major proposal for legislation in this area—the creation of cooperative educational centers in 15 areas of the United States. I know that my colleagues will be most interested in reading this fine paper.

The speech follows:

It is a very special privilege to be here tonight and for several reasons: Dr. Burton, whose career in education and whose leadership has been so outstanding, is now a resident of my State. Then, too, my home in Portland is about six blocks from Reed College—and so I feel very pleased to be invited to speak at the Reed College of the East.

Then I feel especially pleased to be on the campus of Dr. Pusey whose demands for academic excellence and academic freedom have been a source of great encouragement—great inspiration to many of us in the Congress. Those of us on the Education Committee of the House have appreciated his expert testimony, his wise counsel, and we will continue to look to him for facts on the state of higher education today—and its future needs.

I also look forward to a very close working relationship with your former dean, our new Commissioner, Francis Keppel. His appointment was very enthusiastically received; his responsibilities are staggering in a country—in a world where education is the key not only to military success—but also international understanding; where not a rocket thrust—but a national education thrust of massive proportions may determine who wins the race to the moon; in a world where—as Agnes Meyer said, "the cold war has been shifted by the astute leaders of the Kremlin from a competition in physical strength to a competition in brains; and in a world where there are still many who believe that education is not the mere training of shoemakers and tanners and nuclear physicists—but is for the formation of the complete individual, his curiosity stimulated, his abilities fully developed and his potential made clearer and more available to him."

For generations we have talked of the importance of education—George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy. But now there is new urgency, because not just our way of life but our life, our very survival, may depend on its degree of excellence. I found it very difficult to decide on a theme for this lecture. I'm not an expert in education. Almost every one of you in this audience has specialized in this field.

I know the Burton lectures have been established for a discussion of problems in elementary education, but as a member of the House Education Committee I find it difficult to divorce the needs of the colleges from the needs of elementary and secondary schools.

Our public educational structure is the foundation on which our higher education

institutions must rest, and the colleges and universities provide the area in which the work of the elementary and secondary schools is brought to fruition. Essentially we have to look upon the entire educational process as a single process in which the Federal Government and the people of the entire Nation have a deep and continuing interest. Therefore, I hope I will be forgiven if in this Burton lecture the comments are not limited to elementary education.

In discussing the role of the Federal Government in education, the question is not Should there be Federal aid. That was decided over 100 years ago. The questions of importance today are what kind of Federal aid, and where and how the Federal dollars should be spent and why.

How much Federal aid will be determined by the priority we give to education. There is no unanimity here, nor has there been since 1787 when the Northwest Ordinance was established.

Every time a crisis in education has occurred we have marched forth boldly to meet it by establishing a new commission to study and make recommendations. And so in 1929 Herbert Hoover's Commission issued the report that "The Federal Government has no inclusive and consistent public policy as to what it should or should not do in the field of education. There are national responsibilities for education which only the Federal Government can adequately meet. \* \* \* Federal aid should be given to education as a whole rather than to particular types of training. \* \* \* Requiring the matching of Federal funds with State or local is an undesirable policy in the field of education. \* \* \*

"The Committee recommends establishment of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet."

The Wall Street crash occurred; the depression slammed the doors of our colleges to thousands and thousands of men and women who today are in the age bracket of the Werner Von Brauns, Glenn Seaborgs, the Tom Dooleys.

And in 1936 Franklin Delano Roosevelt appointed a commission. Twenty-one volumes were published. With the exception of the National Youth Administration and Civilian Conservation Corps, no bills were passed. They reported that the "inadequacy of local programs in education is increasing and recommended general aid to elementary and secondary education, improved preparation of teachers, construction of school buildings, Federal aid for students from 16 to 24 years of age." War clouds gathered; another crisis.

In 1939 the National Resources Planning Board was established. In 1943, among their recommendations for the postwar period, they said that "The Office of Education should be expanded to offer educational leadership in the Nation. \* \* \* That equal access to general and specialized education be made available to all youths of college and university age—according to their abilities. \* \* \* And that the increases in expenditures for education in postwar period must be financed principally by Federal funds."

In 1946 President Truman's Commission on Higher Education studied the situation and reported:

"The Federal Government recognizes the desirability of providing financial aid to students in higher education because of the public benefits which accrue. \* \* \*

"A national program of Federal scholarships in the form of grants-in-aid should be provided for at least 20 percent of all undergraduate nonveteran students—based on need and ability."

No bills passed.

In 1947 the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government reported—surprisingly—"the U.S.

Office of Education has not been properly equipped to perform its appropriate function."

In 1953 the Second Hoover Commission and its report.

In 1955 the White House Conference on Education.

In 1956 the President's Commission on Education beyond the High School, the National Commission for the Development of Scientists and Engineers, and several non-governmental conferences and commissions.

No one could say that the educational needs have not been studied, and no one could argue that in the postspunk period there is not an increased amount of Federal aid; but with the exception of the Federal impact bill, the National Defense Education Act, and the college housing program, I think it can be said that Federal activities in support of education have been incidental to other national objectives.

As a result we still do not have a national policy; the Office of Education administers fewer than half the educational programs and the words of the Hoover Commission are more descriptive of conditions today than in 1929 when they said: "The multitudinous Federal educational activities are scattered throughout the various Federal departments and independent agencies, among which there is little evidence of cooperation in the discharge of educational responsibilities having the same major purpose."

Today, excluding the in-service training programs of many departments and agencies, there are nine agencies and subdivisions of the Government that have major programs involving education in the United States:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Atomic Energy Commission.
3. Department of Defense.
- 4-7. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Office of Education; Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; Public Health Service proper; Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health.
8. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
9. National Science Foundation.

In addition there are six agencies and departments which have programs smaller in scope—or less clearly identifiable with education—or directed toward a highly specialized project. They are:

- Department of Commerce.
- Housing and Home Finance Agency.
- Department of the Interior.
- Department of Justice.
- Department of the Treasury.
- Veterans' Administration.

In international education, in addition to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, Space Agency, National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation, the following agencies have major programs:

- Department of State.
- Agency for International Development.
- Peace Corps.
- U.S. Information Agency.

It should be noted too that in addition to these 9—some 16 other departments and agencies of the Government participate in training foreign nationals in their particular fields—largely through a transfer of funds from AID—and in sponsoring research abroad through the use of foreign currency.

There are, however, only two agencies of Government specifically charged with concern for education; these are the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation.

The programs in education of all other major agencies are in total considerably more extensive than those of the two just mentioned. They have a special mission, and since this must be their overriding concern very little consideration is given to the educational needs as a whole and the impact the particular program might have. And yet, in this last year, these several agencies spent

\$926 million for education and another \$545 million for research in educational institutions; it is obvious that these agencies must have a major impact on the educational system in the United States.

The Department of Defense and its component parts are more heavily involved in the educational process than any other department or agency of the Government. The budgets for the operation of its schools, when calculated by the same ground rules used by civilian institutions, exceed those of most of the largest private and public universities. The budgets for research contracted with universities and associated research centers exceed those of any other department except the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with its enormous program in the Institutes of Health. The Department of Defense is supporting more students working full and part time toward baccalaureate and postgraduate degrees than any other agency. Its expenditures for training under the Government Employees Training Act exceeds the amount expended by all other agencies of the Government combined. It operates the largest and almost the only Federal system of elementary and secondary schools and is responsible for the staffing, the curriculum, and the direction of that system. It operates all but two of the Federal degree-granting institutions in the country and is expanding its operations in this field. It operates, independently of the State Department, a program of international education under the military assistance program.

To consider the involvement of the Federal Government in education without reference to the Department of Defense is impossible. And yet the questions raised, the arguments used, against general education programs are never used against education by the Pentagon—"Segregation-integration," "Church-state issues," "Federal control," "This is just the beginning," "Don't let the camel get its nose under the tent," "We can't afford it," "Taxes are too high." With the education program in the Department of Defense, these arguments are never made. The money is appropriated with little question.

What college or university president wouldn't like to have the operating budgets of the three academies: West Point, \$11,261 per student per year; Air Force Academy, \$13,037 per student per year; U.S. Naval Academy, \$7,354 per student. None of these include capital outlay. Some questions, but not many on why—in terms of Federal dollars spent—it costs from 400 to 600 percent more to produce a career officer through the service academies than through the ROTC programs in public or private universities.

I'm not sure how many people know the full scope of the program at Madison, Wis., under the U.S. Armed Forces Institute. It is designed to meet the educational needs of all branches of the service in all parts of the world; correspondence courses are produced and distributed in various academic disciplines at secondary and higher education levels. In 1961, 116,000 students were taking correspondence courses; 189,000 were studying in groups and 10,600 were in participating colleges and universities. The Department of Defense operates a foreign language program considerably larger than that of the State Department or the Office of Education under title VI of the National Defense Education Act. The Department of Defense spent on research on various college and university campuses this last year \$197.9 million. In total amount spent on research on college campuses by all agencies we were able to identify expenditures of \$613 million. And it is here where duplication and overlap is most probable. It is here that expenditures have grown most rapidly and the degree of duplication cannot be ascertained. There are several reasons; but a major one is that research projects, research findings, have far outstripped the Nation's ability to

store, catalog, report, and disseminate the knowledge. An illustration of this may be found in the fact that a large percentage of the Defense Department research findings have not at this time been reported to the Armed Services Technical Information Agency which was specifically created to serve as a clearinghouse for such information.

Leaving the Defense Department—and I've only touched on a few of their education programs—another illustration of the probability of overlap in research programs may be found in the fact that the following agencies were engaged in medical research and research directly related to the health sciences, varying in amounts from \$1,870,000 to over \$500 million:

- Atomic Energy Commission.
- Federal Aviation Agency.
- National Science Foundation.
- Office of Emergency Planning.
- Veterans' Administration.
- Department of Agriculture.
- Department of Defense.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Department of Interior.
- Department of State (AID).

In oceanography alone—in 1962—research was carried on by the Navy, the Army, the Departments of Commerce and Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, and the National Science Foundation.

There is no question but that better inter-agency cooperation and coordination of existing programs is desirable.

I have touched on only a few of the education programs in which the Federal Government is involved. Because of the many departments and agencies which are involved and because of the jurisdiction of committees in the Congress, I do not believe there is any one person in either branch who really knows and understands the overall role of the Federal Government in education.

We, in Congress, must certainly share part of the responsibility. Nearly every committee in the Congress has jurisdiction over some type of education legislation. This leads to some inconsistencies and overlapping.

For example, legislation to provide assistance for construction of college classrooms, when introduced as an amendment to the College Housing Act, was referred to the Banking and Currency Committees. But similar legislation, introduced separately, was considered by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare and the House Education and Labor Committees.

Likewise, legislation amending the student loan program of the National Defense Education Act to provide additional loans to medical and dental students was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee in the 87th Congress. At the same time, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was considering a separate program of financial assistance to medical and dental students. It may be noted further that the National Science Foundation has had authority to grant medical scholarships under legislation in existence since 1950. Although this authority has not been used, consideration of it falls within the jurisdiction of a third House committee—Science and Astronautics.

Numerous bills to provide income tax deductions or tax credits for college expenses were introduced in the 87th Congress and referred to the Ways and Means Committee in the House and Finance Committee in the Senate. These proposals would have an effect akin to granting of Federal scholarships, yet direct scholarship legislation came under the jurisdiction of the Education and Labor and Labor and Public Welfare Committees. Also, while legislation to permit tax deductions for college or other educational expenses remained under the jurisdiction of



the Ways and Means and Finance Committees, legislation to rebate to the States for educational purposes a percentage of their Federal income or cigarette tax collections was referred to the Education and Labor and Labor and Public Welfare Committees.

In the House, general scholarship legislation was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor, while separate proposals for scholarships for veterans came under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, scholarships for medical students and nurses were considered by the Commerce Committee, scholarships for medical training for the Armed Forces were referred to Armed Services Committee; scholarships for agricultural research were referred to the Agricultural Committee and scholarships in the sciences to the Science and Astronautics Committee.

Furthermore, while nurses scholarship legislation comes before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee because of its general jurisdiction over public health matters, legislation to assist in training practical nurses was handled by the Education and Labor Committee because of its general jurisdiction over vocational education.

Both the school lunch and school milk programs are administered by the Department of Agriculture. But in the House, school lunch legislation is the province of the Education and Labor Committee, while the school milk program is under the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction.

Donations of surplus Government property, which include many pieces of equipment, are considered by the Government Operations Committees in the Congress. Yet the furnishing of new equipment to educational institutions may be considered by several committees—the Space, Education, Defense, or Health Committees of either House.

As I stated earlier, the diffusion of responsibility for educational programs in the Congress makes it difficult for any one committee, subcommittee, or individual Member to ascertain the overall achievements of the Government's existing educational programs or the overall effects of proposals for changes in them.

My Subcommittee on Higher Education has been making a detailed study. I hope we will have recommendations and the printed report ready sometime in February. There are many questions we are asking:

Over 90 percent of all the research funds are spent in 100 institutions. Is this necessary? What does it do to the other 1,900 institutions? The President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended a widening circle of centers of excellence. How can the Government help to bring this about?

What effect does the matching-grant requirement have on the local college or university? For example: A small college decides that top priority should be given to a general library—but then an agency of Government offers to provide \$1 million for a science building if the institution will match it. Because such a high percent of the funds are in the science field, does this create a further imbalance?

Is the emphasis on research undermining the importance of teaching? Are we drawing our best scholars away from the classroom and into the research lab, and decreasing the time they spend in educating the next generation?

Is the concentration of Federal funds in the sciences creating a serious imbalance in our academic system? Except for the GI bill which is being rapidly phased out, the National Defense Education Act loan program and the Reserve Officers Training Corps programs—nearly all of the direct student aid is at the graduate level and most of it is in the physical and life sciences and engineering. Nine agencies sponsor fellowship programs. Are we producing enough people at the baccalaureate level to fill up these

places? Should the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education be combined? Is our race to the moon and the inevitable competitive emphasis on science decreasing the interest in and the training of people in the humanities? Freedom is not going to be won or maintained by bombs alone.

In the Inglis lecture of 1945, George F. Zook discussed the role of the Federal Government in education. He must have been looking into the crystal ball at that time when he said:

"It behooves us—as educators to acquaint ourselves with its many complexities and ramifications and to exercise such leadership as we can in its consideration and solution. Otherwise we may some day wake up to find—at the end of our generation—as the result of patchwork and piecemeal legislation, a distorted and disjointed national policy in education which represents neither the considered judgment of educational leaders nor the needs of our country."

The needs of our country are very great. Van Allen has said that our ambitions in outer space already exceed our scientific competence. We're told that we need 13,000 additional scientists and engineers on the man-on-the-moon project alone. We desperately need teachers, social workers, medical doctors, nurses.

Our country has shown, time and time again, that we can do whatever we must do—we can do what our times demand of us. We can, whenever we set our minds to it, amaze the world, and even surprise ourselves by what we can achieve. But the achievements that loom before us—the challenges that beckon us on—will require above all, an education program carefully planned—an educational system not only equal to our foreseen need, but far in excess of anything this country, or any country, has ever known.

We must prepare our young people not for the 20th century, but for the 21st century in which they will be living most of their lives and give them the kind of an education which will help them find the answers to questions which today we cannot even imagine.

We will have to invest in education, as we now invest in dams and flood control projects, as a utilization of public—and private—funds, with a guaranteed return far in excess of cost. To put it another way—we shall have to abandon the kind of thinking that reckons education in terms of costs, and not in terms of value.

Schools are faced with a decade of tremendous responsibility and need for growth and improvement.

A half century ago, 1 out of every 20 high school graduates entered college. Today, one out of three goes on to college. And this is wonderful. But many Members of Congress are very much concerned about the 60,000 to 100,000 capable young men and women who should be graduating this year but are not.

There have been several studies at the State level, and one study at the national level, which indicate that between 25 and 40 percent of our most capable students do not now go beyond high school—and largely because of financial need.

I am talking now of students with IQ's of 120 and above, who have maintained high academic records during their high school years and who would like to go to college. In addition, there is another group of 60,000 to 100,000 extremely capable high school graduates each year who are not properly motivated and do not attend college. In other words, we have between 150,000 and 200,000 students of outstanding ability who do not go beyond the high school level. This is in addition to the million who drop out during their high school years, and too often become the unemployed.

So, on one side of the national ledger we have a shortage of trained manpower in al-

most every area—and on the other side we have a huge reservoir of untrained people, from whom come most of the unemployed, and to whom we are apparently willing to pay unemployment compensation benefits or spend over \$1,000 per person under manpower retraining. But, apparently, we are unwilling as a matter of national policy, to help make it possible for them to obtain the highly skilled and professional first training that this Nation so desperately needs.

We have always considered education a private matter—something to be determined entirely by the individual, and perhaps his parents. I think this can no longer be considered as a private matter, but rather as a matter of great public concern.

This year, I will again introduce legislation to provide Federal funds for academic facilities for higher education. I am sure that you are familiar with the statistics on college enrollments. Today we have about 4.2 million students; by 1970 we will have almost 7 million. We're talking not about a situation that may or may not occur. It most certainly will occur and no amount of wishful thinking will alter the course of events. In this decade our colleges and universities will be asked to provide the equivalent in facilities of those it has taken them 150 years to build. Our competition with the Soviet world, perhaps, is making us understand what Aristotle said a long time ago: "The destiny of an empire depends upon the education of its youth."

And there is growing evidence that not only the leaders in the Kremlin, but also the leaders in Red China, are familiar with the history of other countries and other empires. It was a professor of philosophy at the University of Berlin 160 years ago who said, "Education is not a function of the state. It is the function of the state if it wishes to survive."

Bismarck came along and is credited with the statement that "The nation that has the schools has the future."

For many years we were unwilling to admit that the Russians could develop a school system anywhere near as good as ours. Then Sputnik jarred us out of our complacency. Today we know that they are graduating two or three times as many engineers as we are—and that the quality of their education is at least as good and maybe better.

But what we refuse to look at is the startling projection of figures for the 1970's which indicate that in Communist Europe and Communist China there will be far more students enrolled in their colleges and universities than in the colleges and universities of the United States and Western Europe.

All of the studies—all of the reports—all of our leaders who know of the manpower needs of this country have told us that time and time again we must do more in the way of providing educational opportunities.

Admiral Rickover has said, "To talk of the necessity of more engineers, more scientists, more doctors, more teachers and not provide facilities for learning is a kind of cynical nonsense this Nation cannot afford."

Where do we go from here?

As I have outlined earlier, we do have many educational programs for a specific purpose—with the largest part of the Federal dollar spent in research in 100 institutions of higher education.

We have no across-the-board program of Federal support of school construction or teachers' salaries at the elementary or secondary level. We have no across-the-board program of Federal aid for construction of academic facilities at the college level.

For years the Federal Government has helped to provide places for the students to eat and sleep—dormitories and dining halls—and also student lounges—but we have not been willing to provide the financial

help to build classrooms, libraries, and laboratories where the students can work.

We have several Federal programs for student assistance at the graduate level—in fact so many that we have advertised for applicants for Fellowship programs—but we have no scholarship programs at the undergraduate level.

This year, the Education Committees in the House and the Senate will be asked to review, expand, and extend the Federal Impact bill and the National Defense Education Act.

In the National Defense Education Act—I would predict that the ceiling on the loan provision would be raised considerably, that the forgiveness feature would either be extended to all teachers in colleges as well as secondary schools and in both public and private schools—or that it would be removed altogether. I would predict that the Fellowship program would be expanded.

This year, I also propose a new program of support in addition to the higher education bill of which I spoke a few moments ago; the establishment of a cooperative education center.

We are aware of the tremendous explosion of knowledge. The National Science Foundation tells us that of all the scientists who have ever lived since the dawn of history over 70 percent are living and working today. Of all the research that has ever been printed—over 50 percent has occurred since 1950. We are also told that every major executive must acquire the equivalent of an additional college education every 10 years just to keep abreast of his competition.

This outpouring stream of knowledge courses through our lives. Its implication is obvious—we must all run faster just to stay in the same relative place.

When I was graduated from college, not even the most imaginative science fiction writers ventured to prophesy that man actually would sail through space. Now we are literally and physically "reaching for the stars." Those who cannot, or will not, stay abreast of these new developments will find that—not the world—but the universe will pass them by.

To provide an adequate research library is often beyond the financial capabilities of many of our 2,000 colleges and universities.

Fully equipped science buildings and laboratories to serve the space age are becoming more and more costly.

Educational television offers great hope—great opportunities—but an individual educational TV station on each campus is out of the question.

A computer system would be of great help to most universities—even though it was not used or needed full time.

In several places—Harrisburg, Pa., in the Amherst, Mount Holyoke area in Massachusetts, in Claremont, Calif., cooperative programs have been started. Tomorrow, I will introduce a bill which will provide Federal assistance for the construction of cooperative educational centers where institutions of higher education in the same locality can share the specialized facilities of such centers and thus develop programs that are beyond the resources of single institutions. This may not be of the greatest help to Harvard and the 100 other institutions which are the recipients of over 90 percent of the Federal research dollar. But, I believe it would help to accomplish what the President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended—an increase in the number of centers of excellence in this country.

The national interest requires an expansion of national support of research in a widening circle of institutions and an expansion of programs designed to increase the supply of highly trained people and college and university teachers.

The bill I am sponsoring will authorize \$75 million for the first year and \$150 million

for the second year in Federal funds to construct cooperative educational centers in 15 areas throughout the country. It is frankly an experimental approach, which has not been considered before in Federal legislation to assist educational institutions. But I believe that it has great possibilities in producing the "centers of excellence" which the President's Science Advisory Committee has recommended.

No institution would lose its identity, and an institution which had made for itself a unique place in the American educational scene because of an outstanding program would find that its whole program would be strengthened, not weakened. It is not designed to create centers of mediocrity, but rather centers of excellence, made possible through the cooperative effort of several colleges and universities.

I am told that college librarians estimate that the number of books in college libraries doubles approximately every 20 to 25 years—not including the proliferation of learned and professional journals and pamphlets. Would it not contribute to academic excellence if two or more higher education institutions cooperatively built a research library, where the faculty and students would have facilities never available at a smaller college?

Through cooperative effort, the curriculums of all colleges participating in an educational center might be broadened and enriched through the offering of courses which no single institution could afford, or could justify. Perhaps a center might provide an engineering laboratory, with its expensive equipment. Or perhaps it might offer the facilities, and attract the learned faculty, for instruction in the languages, culture, and history of some of the newly emerging countries of the world.

And might not a cooperative center raise the quality of education in its participating institutions by enabling outstanding scholars to devote their full teaching time to the specialized field of their choice.

If we are to progress as a nation, we must devote more attention and resources to the education of our youth. And at the same time, we must insure that we are providing quality education.

Philosopher Alfred North Whitehead stated the case for education quite clearly when he said:

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

#### PAY INCREASE FOR THE MILITARY

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been extremely concerned at the delay of the Kennedy administration in pushing for a pay increase for the military, despite the fact that other governmental employees have benefited from pay raises on two occasions since the last general military pay increase in 1958.

Last fall I pledged to introduce, if necessary, and support legislation calling for a substantial pay increase. Included was to be a section correcting the inequities in the pay scales for those retired personnel who left the service prior to July 1958. These retired persons were discriminated against and a great inequity has existed for over 4 years as a result.

A few weeks ago I was heartened to learn that the Defense Department was supporting a pay increase measure amounting to as much as 14 percent in some categories, and also correcting the inequities I mentioned previously.

Rather than introduce my version of a pay bill I have decided to defer such action until the administration's measure comes before the Personnel Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. As a member of the subcommittee, I recognize that legislation as introduced by the administration is merely the raw material from which a truly effective and meaningful pay bill can be molded by our subcommittee and subsequently by the Congress.

It is the responsibility of the Congress to act with dispatch on a substantial and constructive pay bill for active duty and retired personnel of our military service and I am looking forward to helping to expedite this much-needed legislation.

#### MUST WE ALLOW OUR MAILBOXES TO BE INVADED BY UNWANTED OBSCENE MATERIAL?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a new flood of objectionable and possibly obscene material is being sent to persons across the country from New York and other places. An article in the Washington Star recently stated that over 25,000 protests had been received by the Post Office Department, and I am sure that most Members have also received similar complaints.

The core of the problem in this field is the attitude of the courts. Repeatedly in recent years court decisions have struck down State, local, and Federal statutes designed to afford a measure of protection against such filthy material, especially protection against such unsolicited material sent through the postal system.

This is not an easy problem to solve, in view of this situation. Yet I think we would all agree that we should seek an answer within the framework of court decisions and constitutional guarantees.

Accordingly, I am introducing today a bill prepared at my request by the staff of the House Post Office Committee in cooperation with the House legislative counsel. It is similar to a bill I introduced in the last Congress in that it



gives certain recourse to the citizen whose mailbox is invaded by unsolicited and unwanted obscene material. The provisions of the bill will also apply to unsolicited and unwanted Communist propaganda.

This bill would allow a citizen who receives unsolicited matter which is obscene or Communist propaganda to notify his postmaster that he does not want to receive any future mail from the sender. The Post Office Department so notifies the mailer, and if additional mail is sent to the person in question, the sender stands to lose his special bulk mailing privileges and permits.

I believe this approach will give partial solution to the problem of this new flood of material. It will not solve the whole problem until we have on the law books an effective antiobscenity law which is upheld in the courts.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has a companion measure which he is also introducing today. It is aimed at this same problem but varies in degree. We serve together on the House Post Office Committee and will jointly seek action against this matter.

#### INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF OUTSIDE EARNINGS ALLOWED RECIPIENTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to increase from \$1,200 to \$1,800 the amount of outside earnings allowed recipients of social security retirement benefits.

This bill would materially assist our retired folks by letting them provide for themselves additional income many of them so desperately need. I introduced similar legislation in the 87th Congress but it was not taken up by the Ways and Means Committee to which it was referred.

My bill would permit the increased earnings without loss to the individual of any of his entitlement to benefits under social security. Moreover, the bill does not add to the cost of the social security program.

Most retired persons who are able to work desire to do so, to be both productive and independent. In this they should be encouraged, not discouraged as so many are by the restrictions imposed on them by the present unrealistic law.

One of the major problems facing our country today is the difficulty our older citizens encounter in trying to provide for themselves on small fixed incomes a decent and dignified life—incomes which remain constant while the cost of living continues to rise.

These citizens paid toward their retirement—through social security assessments and other means—in years

when the dollar had not depreciated to the extent to which it has declined in purchasing power today. Many contributed toward retirement on the basis of a 100-cent dollar and now are being repaid on the basis of a 45-cent dollar.

The earnings limitation of \$1,200 a year penalizes people for living long lives, for having the spirit to want to go on working and being useful and productive, and for having the ability to do so.

Raising the earnings limitation to \$1,800 is not a panacea, but there are plenty of persons I know who would appreciate being allowed to help themselves to that extent.

The Government continues to study and plan ways and means of aiding our retired and older citizens. This to me seems to be one of the best ways and means.

#### DR. AND MRS. JAE H. YANG

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang and his wife, Jeong S. Yang. The Yangs are natives of Korea who came to this country in the mid-1950's. Through previous action on the administrative level, arrangements were made to change the status of Dr. and Mrs. Yang to immigrants. The legislation which I have now introduced would refer their entry as immigrants back to the date when they actually arrived in this country so that Dr. Yang may obtain his citizenship and qualify for the practice of medicine in the State of Missouri, where the Yangs now reside.

Without this legislative relief, it would be some 7 or 8 years before Dr. Yang could enter the practice of medicine and his talents would be wasted during that time. General legislation to assist those among the top quota immigrants, which was passed last year, did not cover the group of which Dr. Yang and his wife are a part, but the underlying philosophy of the general legislation applies to the Yangs case as well. I would urge early action to determine the eligibility of the Yangs for relief and the merits of their case.

#### TO MEET THE SOVIET ECONOMIC CHALLENGE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the battles of the cold war are fought on many fronts, in space technology, the minds of men and the complexities of international trade and economics. These are

difficult battles in which the advantage goes not to brute strength but to ideas. One of the most important of these cold war battles is fought in the field of international commerce, and this was one of the bases for the enactment last Congress of the Trade Expansion Act. To win in the area of international economics, we and our free world allies must keep strong the trade links which bind us and those which harmonize the economics of the uncommitted nations with the economics of the Western alliance.

The use of international trade as a weapon in international relations is as old as commerce itself. It is a refined game, played for high stakes. We must master it if we are to be secure against the threat of the international Communist movement.

The United States and its allies have some important advantages in this contest. We are far stronger than our opponents economically. In this context, I should like to make note of the excellent work which has been done by the Joint Economic Committee in bringing the facts of the comparative economic strength of the United States and the Soviet Union to light. Through the efforts of this committee, and the generous cooperation of experts throughout the country, much valuable information in this field has been brought to a focus. And the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from this information is the superiority of the United States and the free world's economy over that of the Soviets.

This is not to dismiss the threat which the Soviet Union poses, however. The Soviet economy is strong, overwhelming unless matched by the economic force of the free world leaders. And, as a controlled economy, it can be used in ways which are not open to the economic or political leaders of our free economy. The Soviet economy is subject to manipulation for the ends of the political state. There need be no economic justification for these acts; their political impact is the profit they seek. Thus the Soviet economy can be used effectively in spot situations, concentrating its strength in predetermined areas, even against the stronger and sounder Western economies.

The examples of such use are a legion. Basically they come down to a pattern not unlike that of the classical monopoly. The monopolist, or the Soviet international trader, chooses a market within which to operate and by cutrate, cutthroat tactics drives all competition from the market. Then each seeks his own profit: The monopolist by forcing prices up where there is no longer any competition to keep them down and the Communist by infiltrating the economic and political structure of the trade partner it has chosen and welding it irrevocably to the Communist bloc. Or the Communist goal may be merely to disrupt a mutually advantageous trade relationship between two countries outside of the Communist bloc. In either event the result is detrimental to the goals of the free world.

The immediate targets of the Soviets in such a spot economic invasion are the free world companies doing business in

a particular place. It is only through driving them from the market that the Soviet goals can be achieved, and they cannot long stand against the concentrated strength of the Soviet economy, which is willing to weaken itself overall for the chance of a particular victory.

To effectively counteract this threat of Soviet economic pressure, I have today introduced a bill to establish a U.S. Trading Corporation. This bill would create a corporate body under the aegis of the U.S. Government which would provide assistance to private enterprises against whom the weight of Soviet economic might is asserted in particular market areas. It would help nullify the short-range competitive advantage of the Soviet controlled economy and place American businesses in a position to compete successfully with the tactics of the Soviets in this phase of cold war battling. The powers of the Corporation are made broad in the bill for great flexibility will be necessary to counter the broad range of challenges in the complex field of international commerce. Basically, however, the Corporation will be a service unit for American business, not controlling or coercing it but standing ready to assist when the challenge of concentrated economic power is placed against our firms.

This will not end the competition with the Soviet Union in the world's market-places. There is no one easy way in which we can achieve victory. This is one step, however, which will help strengthen the position of the United States and the free world in meeting the Communist threat.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is quite fitting, in light of the protracted 2d session of the 87th Congress which scarcely sputtered to a halt before election day, that the Congress turn its attention on the day it convenes to the question of when it shall adjourn. For this reason I have today reintroduced a bill which I offered in the closing days of the last Congress in the hope that by raising the point now, rather than next autumn, we can spare ourselves the unhappy experience of another 10-month session this year.

My bill is quite simple, it merely calls upon the Congress to abide by the decision which was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; that is, to adjourn by July 31. This decision was based upon sound reasoning, I believe. It recognized that if the Congress would put its mind to its work it could finish its business by that date. If, instead of wasting the first 3 months of the legislative year in sessions whose most important and most time-consuming business was the opening prayer, this time could

be put to use, we could shorten the time the Congress must meet and do the same amount of business.

It also recognized that the Congressman, to do an adequate job of representing his constituency, must be a part of the community he represents and it was designed to give him a chance to keep his roots firmly settled among the people of his district. I have been taken to task from time to time when I say that the job of the Congressman should be a part-time job. This is not to say that a Congressman should not give the best he has to the job; far from it, it means that to do the job here he must keep himself current with the thoughts and feelings of those he represents. He cannot represent his district when he lives in and feels himself a part of the Washington area. He must keep his interests and his contacts in his home area alive. He must be a part-time Congressman and devote the rest of his time to maintaining the liaison between his constituency and himself.

Certainly the majority of the Congress itself has no desire to spend ever more weeks and months in session every year.

As I noted, the July 31 date is fixed by law as the date upon which the Congress is to adjourn. Yet it does not do so, for the law provides also, and with good reason, that the Congress may stay in session beyond that date in years when there is a war or national emergency. And we are, according to the record, living in a period of national emergency, so proclaimed by President Truman on December 16, 1950, to meet the Korean crisis. I contend the crisis which brought about this proclamation of a national emergency has ended insofar as it bears upon the adjournment date of Congress and my bill so states.

Certainly, should other grave national emergencies arise, requiring the Congress to meet beyond the July deadline, provision can then be made for continued meeting by the proclamation of an emergency or by vote of the Congress, another procedure authorized in the Reorganization Act for lengthening the congressional session. But I believe we should recognize that, for purposes of holding the Congress in session past a reasonable date, the Korean war is over.

It may seem early in the session to worry about adjournment, but if we do not think about it now and if we do not put our shoulders to the wheel from the very beginning, we shall once again be forced to stay in session long past the Reorganization Act's appointed adjournment date.

#### DR. NARAYAN CHANDRA GUPTA

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill for the relief

of Dr. Narayan Chandra Gupta, a doctor presently residing in the St. Louis, Mo., area who entered this country under our exchange program.

It is the policy of the Congress and of the executive agencies who administer our immigration statutes to look with disfavor on all but the very rare cases in which a visitor to this country under an exchange program wishes to alter his status to that of immigrant while residing in the United States. Our exchange program is based upon the idea that Americans will go abroad and foreign nationals come to this country, each spending some time absorbing the culture and learning of the other so that they might return to their homes and enrich the understanding between the countries.

There must be flexibility in these programs, however, and private legislation is one means of providing it. Dr. Gupta is a Hindu, a native of an area which was incorporated into Pakistan at the time of the division of the Indian subcontinent. It is out of the question for him to return to his home and he has no place in the present country of India to which he can return as a home. I believe that this is the type of case which should be given consideration by the proper congressional authorities to see if a special exception, in the form of private legislative relief, is justified.

#### MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new version of my voluntary plan for medical care of all Americans over the age of 65.

The Bow bill provides Federal Government assistance for the payment of premiums for medical care insurance, either through the issuance of a certificate which may be used by those of little income to pay their premiums or by a tax credit for those of higher income.

The new bill raises the amount of premium that will be covered through either kind of Government assistance from \$125 to \$150, with corresponding increases in the benefits specified as minimum essentials of a satisfactory medical care insurance contract.

Also included is an income limitation restricting benefits of the bill to individuals age 65 with incomes of \$4,000 per year or less, and married couples with incomes of \$8,000 per year or less.

I estimate that the income limitation would leave some 14.7 million Americans over 65 eligible to participate in the insurance program.

I believe this is the best solution to the problem of medical care for persons over 65. It preserves their freedom of choice, it encourages improvement in the policies offered by insurance carriers of



all classes, it offers incentive to relatives and former employers to give assistance, and it eliminates any possibility of Government interference with the hospital or medical establishments of this country.

I hope it will have widespread support in Congress, in both parties. The experience of some 35 Members of Congress who introduced the 1962 bill indicates that it has widespread popular support.

#### THE IOWA PLAN FOR PROGRESS AND GROWTH IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill on higher education which I believe holds out more promise for real solutions in this area of education, that we need to come to grips with, than any proposition yet offered. Because this bill was pretty largely conceived and evolved through a program of study and research at the University of Iowa we have chosen to call this the "Iowa Plan for Progress and Growth in Education."

I had hoped that this bill would have a very low number; in fact, I had hoped it could have No. 1 billing on our schedule. I had hoped that because I think education is the No. 1 problem of America. Obviously this is not going to be possible but it seems I do have the first opportunity to speak, under a special order, in this Congress; so in that way at least education is getting No. 1 billing here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the greatest need of our Republic, I believe, is an educated constituency, citizens with a thorough understanding of the basic philosophies on which our system is built, with the ability to choose intelligently leaders to govern itself. It is my firm belief that the answer to our Nation's problems and the challenge of freedom everywhere is more and better education for all people everywhere.

Education in America, and I think in most places of the world, is now geared to and lays great stress on scientific pursuits of our age. The pursuit of scientific achievement is certainly not wrong, but we must also learn to control this knowledge and to learn to live with each other more intelligently and more adequately. In order to assure this, we must also encourage putting great stress on the teaching of the basic philosophies that deal with man's human relations.

I believe it is a paradox of our time that we live in a time when we can create and control missiles that reach 54 million miles from the earth but, as is evident in so many of our recent experiences in society, still not reach the hearts and minds of people on the basic principles of human decency.

I believe our Nation was founded by a multitude of different people with a multitude of different ideas. From the amalgamation of these men and their ideas came the great Nation we are pleased to call America. This diversity of ideas is reflected in our system of

higher education, in which the student can choose from a great variety of colleges and universities and, once in those schools, choose from a great variety of subject material, making for a diversity of opportunity and ideas which serve both to encourage growth and to give us strength and stature as a nation and as a people.

Compare this to the authoritarian selection and appointment to specific courses of study in the Soviet system, which, because of this, has a built-in weakness, a weakness which I think we should avoid. Certainly the preservation of our system of freedom in higher education and the opportunity afforded the individual regardless of his status must be preserved, encouraged, and extended, if our system is to survive. Our system will not survive by an imitation of the singleminded system of the Communists. Rather, I think to remain great, to progress and grow, we must adhere to the principles that made us great.

The value of and the need for higher education, I repeat, is inestimable. The individual involved gains a lifetime earning power as well as ability to understand and appreciate his society and the societies of others.

Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation thus benefits in that higher education better prepares an individual to participate in his society and, more importantly, to contribute to the solution of the problems of that society. It may be accurate to say that the future success of our Nation and the continued existence of our way of life depends on making the benefits of higher education available to the greatest possible number of people.

However, the cost of obtaining college and university education has steadily increased. Today the cost of obtaining such an education is prohibitive for many and will become so for an increasing number in the years ahead. For those faced with the prospect of financing an education for more than one child, especially at the same time, the dilemma is oftentimes compounded.

Certainly, there is no business in my thinking more important than the business of education. At a time when every person and the Nation is expected to find and apply the very best of its talents in order to compete with and defeat those who would destroy freedom, it is imperative that we show some interest in the 27 percent of the parents of college age students, capable of doing college level work, who are unable to send their children to college because their budget will not permit including this expense without lowering of their own standard of living.

Making it possible for all of these young people to get a college education will do much to fulfill the demands made on us in these very critical and challenging times in which we live.

In this decade, our system and way of life has put a greater emphasis on the values of higher education than ever before. As a result, college enrollment figures have shown a greater increase than the growth of our population. During this period, the population of the United States grew only 18.5 percent or only about one-third the rate of growth of our

colleges and universities in America. Between the falls of 1958 and 1959 there was an increase of 143,741 or 4.5 percent in the enrollment of universities, liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges, technological schools, religious schools, and junior colleges in the United States. During that period a total enrollment of 3,402,297 full- or part-time students compared with 3,258,556 in the previous year. Between 1957 and 1958 the enrollment increase was an additional 5.5 percent. A more alarming figure, perhaps, is the increasing number of freshmen entering our colleges and universities each year. The number of freshmen enrolling in the fall of 1959 was 5.6 percent above the total freshman enrollment of 1958. For the year 1962-63 it is anticipated by the U.S. Office of Education that enrollment in institutions of higher learning will increase 300,000.

There can be no doubt that powerful social, industrial, and population factors are not only putting tremendous pressures on our institutions of higher learning, but on the individual, and his family, who desires a college education. Let me cite some facts to substantiate this and to give stress to what I am trying to talk about today:

First. A distinguished scientist reminds us that we are doubling our knowledge in science each 10 years—think of that.

Second. Then ponder the implications of this one by an authority on science: 90 percent of all of the scientists who ever lived are living today.

Third. For all of those interested in the health of our people: 90 percent of all drugs used today were unknown 10 years ago.

Fourth. The implications of automation are reflected in this one: 90 percent of all of the light bulbs produced today are manufactured by only 12 men.

Fifth. As to the efficiency of the American farmer is noted when I tell you that today a smaller percent of the population is producing more food for the whole population today than ever before, and that percentage is going down every year.

Sixth. Labor leaders and economists need to know that three-fourths of the working force which will be employed in our plants and factories in 1975—and that is only 13 years away—will be turning out products which have not yet been invented.

Seventh. The future burden of our schools is reflected in this one: By the year 2000—only 37 years away—the average person now in high school will need to be retrained vocationally three times before he retires.

Eighth. It is hard to imagine but they say by the year 2000 travel by rockets will be as commonplace as travel by jets is today.

Ninth. That we are living in a period of revolution becomes certain when I tell you that there have been 63 generations of people since the time of Christ and more changes have occurred in the past 1½ generations than in all the rest of time.

I think, in addition, that it is obvious in view of all this that we are going to have to know something about the hu-

manities if we are to enjoy the benefits of science.

Recent studies point out that in all probability this trend will continue or even accelerate during the decade ahead. In 1940 only 15 percent of all Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 were enrolled in institutions of higher learning.

By 1950, this proportion had reached 30 percent, or double the percentage in only 10 years. However, this financial increase can in some measure be attributed to the large number of ex-servicemen receiving financial aid through the GI bill. By 1960 this figure reached 40 percent, and it is expected that fully one-half of the persons in this age group will be attending college by 1970, if the present trends continue.

As could be expected from these figures, more students from lower income families are attending colleges and universities now than in the past, and an increasing number from these families are expected in future years. However, there are still a great many potentially excellent students who are unable to obtain educations above the high school level. A recent study has revealed that approximately 50 percent of the students graduating in the upper one-fourth of their high school classes do not go on to college. Of that 50 percent, lack of the necessary funds prevents the majority from attending.

A survey in the April 1960 issue of *Scholastic Teacher* pointed out that 63 percent of the high school students taking part in the survey said they planned to go on to college. The survey also showed that only 22 percent, or only about one-third of those interested in attending college, have the funds necessary to finance a college education.

Elmer Roper in a recent survey for the Ford Foundation found that 69 percent of the parents interviewed say they expect to send their children to college, but only three-fifths of these families feel that they can afford to do so. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that by 1970 the cost of obtaining a college education will be double that of today if the present economic spiral continues.

To be in harmony with our heritage it is certainly imperative that we seek sound answers to these crises in higher education. None of the Federal planning or programing will meet this challenge. Because of this, and the challenge set forth in the book, "Decisions for a Better America," by the Republican Committee on Program and Progress headed by Charles H. Percy, which among other things predicts that by the year 1976—the bicentennial year—there will be—listen to this—12 million young Americans seeking a college education—1976. As we look to the future there will be 12 million boys and girls wanting to go to college compared to 3,400,000 in college today. Think of that a little.

So this is the reason that I directed my research team of college students at the State University of Iowa Law School under the direction of professors Dr. Deil Wright and Dr. Rosell Ross of the political science department to make a thorough study of the problems of higher education.

The result of this study and program is what we choose to call the "Iowa Plan for Growth and Progress in Higher Education"; in short, the "Iowa plan."

After further study and refinement of bills I introduced in the 87th Congress I have combined into one bill two-thirds of the Iowa plan. It is my belief that this, along with phase 3 yet to be written, and the Iowa plan, comes closer to meeting the real needs of higher education than any plan I have seen or has been presented in the Congress.

Section 1 of the Iowa plan would grant to the parents or guardian or their designee a \$50 tax credit each year for each child up to the age 18 or entrance into college—whichever is first—providing that an investment certificate was purchased at a private savings and loan company, a bank, an insurance company, or any other financial institution meeting the requirements of law. These certificates, which would be negotiable only at an institution of higher learning, would create a loan fund upon which colleges and universities could borrow. The handling of these funds is not at this time in bill form; this will involve the formation of State policy and authorization boards to handle the funds on deposit from the purchase of investment certificates. In case the child did not attend college the account established for him would revert to the Treasury, or perhaps into a special fund, which would be used to make grants to educational institutions.

These certificates, at \$50 a year, plus interest, would amount to approximately \$1,400 at the time of college entrance. In addition to this the student attending a recognized and approved institution of higher learning could apply for a loan from the revolving fund created by these investment certificates.

Section 2 of the Iowa plan would grant a \$100 tax credit to the person sustaining the major burden of the student's expense in school, or his designee. This would bring the total fund to \$1,800, distributed over a period of 4 years. Again, the student would have access to this revolving fund in the form of a loan, should his financial status be such that he needs additional funds and if he or she attended an approved institution of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, a nation that finds it good business to sustain a revenue loss of \$11.3 billion a year due to depreciation allowances—and this figure does not take account of the estimated further revenue loss of \$1.5 billion resulting from the latest liberalization—should find it good business to grant a tax credit to parents who have ambitions for their children in higher education.

A nation that finds it wise in the interest of free enterprise, and apparently it is, to support laws on expense accounts that prevent between \$1 and \$2 million revenue from entering our Treasury can support laws that grant a tax credit of \$50 a year to parents who desire to send their children to college.

An administration that feels business will be aided by an investment tax credit that will cost the Treasury an estimated

\$1,340 billion should show some interest in a tax credit to extend the opportunities for a higher education to our citizens. A Government that finds it in the national interest to grant depletion allowances that result in a loss of revenue close to \$2 billion, of which approximately \$1 billion involves gas and oil, should find it in the national interest to grant a tax credit aiding those on whom our future depends; indeed, upon which our future system depends.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what this Nation cannot afford is to neglect the freedom and well-being of our educational institutions.

Our studies indicate that the Iowa plan would be an investment in higher education of approximately \$2 billion a year. However, this figure would be reduced by the fact that the Iowa plan would replace some of the Federal programs now in existence.

It is estimated that over a period of years a revolving fund of \$20 billion would result from the purchase of educational certificates. This \$20 billion would do a great deal to stabilize and to expand the private sector of our economy. This leads me to say just a few words about phase 3 of the Iowa plan. This phase is still in the research stage. This, however, is what it would involve. As I mentioned, a revolving fund of \$20 billion would build up in just a few years. A State board, made up of about 25 members representing the major interest groups of the State—labor, business, various leaders in the field of education, the professions, and so forth—would be set up. This board would be a policy committee to study the major problems of higher education in that particular State. The board would also be authorized to make loans to institutions of higher learning and to individual students if they can prove the need and ability to repay. This would mean a fund that would enable the expansion of the school's physical plant, its library, or whatever the individual institution felt its need to be.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tax credit proposal that gives a fairer distribution of benefit than does the administration's tax credit for business program.

This is a plan which would greatly stimulate and encourage our economy, though that is not its major objective.

This is a plan which avoids the church-state issue.

This is a plan which avoids Federal control and allows those closest to the individual problems of higher education to work on them as they see fit.

This is a plan which looks to the future and builds for that future.

#### 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 concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution establishing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 14, 1963, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon.



### TELECASTING PUBLIC HEARINGS OF HOUSE COMMITTEES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced two resolutions relating to telecasting, broadcasting, and still and motion photography of public hearings of House committees.

The first resolution is essentially the same as one I have introduced in previous Congresses. It would amend rule XI of the House rules to authorize committees to permit radio, TV, and photographic coverage of their public hearings.

The second resolution would contain the same provisions as the first with the exception that it would be limited to the sessions of the 88th Congress and would be a special resolution, rather than an amendment to the House rules.

I was encouraged to adopt this alternative approach by a passage in a speech delivered at the fall conference of the National Association of Broadcasters by NAB President Leroy Collins, October 25, 1962. It reads as follows:

In the past few weeks Howard Bell and I have consulted with House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK and the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Representative HOWARD SMITH, about the possibility of the House modifying its bar to broadcast coverage of its committee hearings. And I am pleased to report that these conversations were "most cordial and useful"—to borrow a phrase from the State Department.

Specifically, Judge SMITH, with no commitment of his ultimate position, has agreed that the Rules Committee will hear us early in the next session on a proposal to modify—at least on an experimental basis—the so-called Rayburn rule barring broadcast coverage of House hearings.

My resolution on this subject in the 87th Congress—House Resolution 173—was narrowly defeated in the Rules Committee by a vote of 8 to 6 on February 22, 1961.

There seems to be a good prospect of this reform being adopted, at least on a temporary basis, if the public and trade associations and others concerned with news of House committee hearings would make that interest known and request an opportunity to present facts and arguments before a hearing of the Rules Committee. I was the only witness testifying on my resolution at the hearing 2 years ago.

The text of the resolutions follows:

*Resolved*, That rule XI26(g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by inserting "1" immediately after "(g)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Each committee may, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its public hearings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such hearings by such methods and by other methods and media of communication."

*Resolved*, That, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, each standing or select committee of the House of Representatives may, upon

such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its public hearings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such hearings by such methods and by other methods and media of communication.

### THE LARSEN REPORT ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS PROGRAM

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a Department of State press release of December 21, 1962—press release No. 744—reports that four major recommendations to improve the U.S. program of overseas cultural presentations were made in a report submitted on that date to the Department of State by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The 30-page report was based on a survey conducted by Mr. Roy E. Larsen, Vice Chairman of the Advisory Commission and chairman of the executive committee of Time, Inc., and Mr. Glenn G. Wolfe, a veteran Foreign Service officer, at the request of Mr. Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

Mr. Battle, we are advised by the press release, said he accepted the conclusions and recommendations of the Larsen report "in general," and noted that some points in it would require further study before being acted upon.

The Larsen report, based on interviews with more than 50 persons and study of all available documents on the program since its inception in 1954, described this record as "a paradox of inspiring achievement on the one hand and troublesome obstacles on the other."

In recommending reconstitution of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, the Larsen Commission said that the Committee, authorized by law in 1956, has not been effectively used by State Department officials in conducting the cultural presentations program, and added:

So greatly had its functions diminished that it has not even been reappointed since the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961.

The function of the revitalized Committee would be, according to the Larsen Commission, "to provide overall policy-level guidance and counsel" to the administrators of the program.

In a related recommendation, the Larsen report said the State Department should assume the functions now discharged under contract by the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—and a subordinate branch, the International Cultural Exchange Service—ICES.

The Larsen Commission noted that:

ANTA's role was to appoint and bring together panels of experts to pass only on the artistic caliber of performers and, through ICES, to make all tour arrangements with performers selected by the Department.

The arrangement with the American National Theater and Academy, though

undoubtedly essential in the early days of the program, has proved to have inherent shortcomings, according to the Larsen Commission, "not because of a lack of devotion or competence on the part of the people involved, but because of the inadequacy of the organizational arrangement itself."

Observing that long-range planning could "dissipate a great many complaints and annoyances," the Larsen Commission suggested a "3-year forward projection of the program." It said that some of the time required to prepare the 3-year plan could be gained by withholding commitment of the balance of fiscal year 1963 program funds until late in the fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1963.

The Larsen report says that:

While this may have the unfortunate consequences of not having any attractions abroad during the spring season of 1963, it is our opinion that such a sacrifice at this time will greatly enhance the potentials of the program's future.

As a feature of long-range planning, the report suggested that consideration be given to selection of amateur groups by a system of competitions.

In recommending increased recognition for participating artists and groups, the Larsen Commission cited the need for "increased psychic incentives." The existing incentives—travel, opportunity to serve the national interest, monetary compensation, enhancement of professional reputation—are important but not enough, according to the Commission which stated that:

The ideals and aims of the program are such that there should also be about it an aura of greater value, and the distinction that springs from the recognition of excellence.

The Larsen Commission reported without comment a suggestion that participants be issued a cultural certificate by the Secretary of State and that an honor award from the Secretary or the President be conferred on those judged by the Advisory Committee on the Arts to have completed the most successful tours.

The effort to enhance the atmosphere surrounding the cultural presentations program, the Larsen report stressed, should be directed "not only toward potential artistic representatives, but also toward their environment—the American public."

On this latter point, the Larsen report said that:

Perhaps one of the great weaknesses, as well as a major source of uninformed criticism, is the lack of broad knowledge or understanding by the American people of the program and its purposes. \* \* \* What seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose and character of the cultural presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an image with a strong appeal to American pride.

As to the purpose of the cultural presentations program, the Larsen Commission offered its own appraisal:

It is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture.

Mr. Speaker, little publicity has been given this report to date, a fact which, I am told, has concerned the Department of State. Yet it is one of the more important documents of our time in its through-going analysis of a highly significant part of our foreign policy.

I am, therefore, including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks so that it will be generally available.

At the same time, I should like to point out that I introduced yesterday a joint resolution to carry out the major recommendations made in the Larsen report and to implement those recommendations by a number of steps which, I hope, will meet with the approval of my colleagues.

The time is auspicious to bring our country's cultural presentations program up to date, especially in view of the impetus given to cultural exchange by the enthusiastic welcome extended to the Mona Lisa in the Nation's Capital by the American people.

The joint resolution I have introduced would advance peaceful relations between the United States and other nations by strengthening and expanding the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 by such steps as:

First. Implementing the recommendations of the Larsen report.

Second. Establishing biennial art competitions similar to those in European countries which give the arts a status equal to that provided athletics by the international Olympic games.

Third. Coordinating those cultural exchange and cultural presentations programs carried on with Latin America with the Organization of American States and the Pan American Union.

Fourth. Providing at mainland colleges and universities centers for technical and cultural interchange similar to that at the University of Hawaii which was established with Federal aid.

As to the art competitions which my joint resolution provides, let me say that Pierre Salinger suggested the establishment of such competitions together with an American music and art prize in a speech on March 8, 1961, to a National Symphony Orchestra luncheon in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Salinger said at that time that the President was very interested in establishing an American music and art prize. National prizes are, of course, well known abroad where they have made major contributions to the discovery, encouragement, and advancement of young artists and thus have served important national purposes.

In the spirit of bipartisanship I sent a draft of my proposed joint resolution to President Kennedy's special consultant on the arts and received, under date of December 27, 1962, a letter containing a number of helpful suggestions which I incorporated in the joint resolution which I have introduced.

At the same time some excellent suggestions were made by the Secretary of the Interior; among them, first, that the upper age limitation for award winners should be 30 years of age rather than 25 as I had originally proposed, and second,

that the chairmanship of the President's Special Interagency Committee—such interagency committees are authorized in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act—should rotate among the Secretaries of State, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare. I have adopted these most excellent suggestions in toto.

Encouragement and suggestions came also from Adelyn D. Breeskin, director of the Washington Gallery of Modern Art; Prof. Jack Morrison, of the Department of Theater Arts of the University of California at Los Angeles, a founding member of the National Council of the Arts in Education; and Dr. Carl F. Hansen, Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia.

I have been told that deLesseps S. Morrison, Ambassador Representative of the United States of America on the Council of the Organization of American States, had indicated some support for an enlarged role for the OAS and the Pan American Union in the cultural exchange programs between the United States and Latin America.

I should like to conclude my remarks by recalling the following statement by President Eisenhower, from his speech at Delhi University in India in December 1959, which I regard so highly that I included it in the preamble to my joint resolution:

More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together. In so doing, they will concern themselves with the problems, possibilities, resources and rewards of their common destiny.

Through the centuries nations have sent their youth armed for war to oppose their neighbors. Let us in this day look on our youth, eager for a larger and clear knowledge, as forces for international understanding; and send them, one nation to another, on missions of peace.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., December 27, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for sending me the draft of the proposed joint resolution.

This seems interesting to me. The idea of a festival has been much discussed. The idea of limiting it to young artists is a good one. Would it not be better, however, to plan to hold it biennially rather than annually? An advisory council for the recognition of young artists is a new suggestion. I would hope in any case that the role of the young artist—his training and opportunities—would be one of the important areas which an Advisory Council on the Arts would consider.

Up until now, we have not had the personnel or the organization necessary to create such a festival as you have in mind. The National Cultural Center would seem a normal channel through which this could be done—perhaps working in cooperation with the President's Consultant on the Arts. I do hope that the National Cultural Center will begin activities of this sort even before its buildings are completed.

I hope these comments may be of some interest.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST HECKSCHER,  
Special Consultant on the Arts.

[From Newsweek magazine, Jan. 14, 1963]

#### EXCHANGE EXAMINED

When the United States began shipping out culture on an official level 8 years ago, the purpose, apparently, was to show the world that American musicians, dancers, actors, and athletes were as gifted as their touring Russian counterparts. The keynote seemed to be competition. Now, according to a survey and report released by the State Department last week, the cultural presentations program "is neither designed nor suited to carry on cultural competition with the Sino-Soviet bloc, nor any other country or bloc."

A more realistic appraisal of purpose, the 30-page document continues, "is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture."

The report grew out of an investigation started 3 months ago at the request of Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. Battle's action was prompted by sharp criticism, especially in Congress, of both the purpose and the administration of the cultural presentations program. Battle suspended the program, except for those attractions already committed to overseas contracts, pending the results of the inquiry conducted by Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the executive committee of Time, Inc., and Glenn G. Wolfe, a Foreign Service officer familiar with administrative problems in Government.

#### GUIDANCE

After praising culture as a force in international goodwill, the report made specific recommendations for improving the program itself. The most significant was that the State Department should take over the managerial functions previously assigned to the American National Theater and Academy, ANTA, which has been paid \$110,000 a year as the program's administrator, was "commended" for its past services, but a change was recommended "because of the need to eliminate duplication, to clarify responsibilities, and to provide direct policy guidance."

The report suggested that proper policy guidance might be best obtained through revitalizing the now inactive Advisory Committee on the arts with new membership, and retaining the panels of experts set up by ANTA to screen talent for overseas. It also pointed out that "what seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose, and character of the cultural presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an 'image' with strong appeal to American pride."

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 20, 1961]

#### MOVE FOR ART, MUSIC PRIZES

President Kennedy is very interested in establishing an American music and art prize, according to his press secretary, Pierre Salinger.

Mr. Salinger said the President had asked him to explore the possibilities of such a prize and had put him in charge of preliminary plans.

In a taped interview over WGMS yesterday, Mr. Salinger said that within the next 2 weeks a forming committee will be organized. He said the prize idea had received an overwhelming reaction and pledges of large amounts of money for the project have been received at the White House.

Mr. Salinger first suggested such a prize during a National Symphony Orchestra sustaining fund luncheon earlier this month, together with an idea borrowed from violinist Isaac Stern for a national youth orchestra.



[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1961]  
**MUSIC-ART PRIZE GETTING BIG SUPPORT,  
 SALINGER SAYS**

Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said yesterday there has been overwhelming response to the idea of a White House-sponsored American music and arts prize and the project is going forward.

Salinger said pledges of large amounts of money have been among the many communications received and within 2 weeks a forming committee will be organized. He said President Kennedy is very interested.

Salinger said also in a radio interview (WGMS) that there will be White House representation at the National Symphony Orchestra concerts, including the President and Mrs. Kennedy when their schedules permit.

The idea for such a national prize was first suggested by Salinger at a National Symphony fund luncheon early this month. The press secretary is an accomplished pianist and has played many concerts.

[Press release from the Department of State,  
 Dec. 21, 1962]

**U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION SUBMITS REPORT  
 ON CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS PROGRAM**

Four major recommendations to improve the U.S. program of overseas cultural presentations are contained in a report submitted today to the Department of State.

The report was based on a survey conducted by a nongovernmental commission at the request of Mr. Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Mr. Battle said he accepted the conclusions and recommendations of the report "in general," noting that some points would require further study before being acted upon.

The 30-page report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs was turned over to Mr. Battle by Dr. John W. Gardner, Commission Chairman and president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York.

In laying the foundation for its recommendations, the Commission stressed three points: artistic excellence as the preeminent criterion of the program; the strong roles played by both professionals and amateurs; and the importance of "offstage" activities, such as clinics and student workshops, in gaining appreciation of America's cultural strength. To achieve these and other aims, the report recommended:

1. The role of the Advisory Committee on the Arts be revitalized and expanded to include selection of program attractions.
2. The State Department reassume full responsibility for direct management of all phases of the program, which consists of the sending abroad of American performers in music, drama, the dance, and sports.
3. Long-range planning to meet objectives in various areas of the world be adopted as formal policy and practice.
4. Increased recognition be given those who participate in the program.

Mr. Battle said he concurred in early appointment of members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, with whom he would discuss implementation of the report.

The Commission's 9-week survey was conducted by Mr. Roy E. Larsen, vice chairman of the Advisory Commission and chairman of the executive committee of Time, Inc., and Mr. Glenn G. Wolfe, a veteran Foreign Service officer. In thanking the Commission, Mr. Battle said:

"I am especially grateful to Mr. Larsen, who devoted so much time and effort in spite of his many heavy responsibilities, and to Mr. Wolfe, whose long Government experience was indispensable to this study."

The report, based on interviews with more than 50 persons and study of all available documents on the program since its incep-

tion in 1954, describes the record as "a paradox of inspiring achievement on the one hand and troublesome obstacles on the other."

In recommending reconstitution of the Advisory Committee on the Arts, the Commission said that the Committee, authorized by law in 1956, had not been effectively used by State Department officials in conducting the cultural presentations program, adding: "So greatly had its functions diminished that it has not even been reappointed since the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961." The function of the revitalized Committee would be "to provide overall policy-level guidance and counsel" to administrators of the program.

In a related recommendation, the report says the State Department should assume the functions now discharged under contract by the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA) and a subordinate branch, the International Cultural Exchange Service (ICES).

"ANTA's role," the Commission noted, "was to appoint and bring together panels of experts to pass only on the artistic caliber of performers and, through ICES, to make all tour arrangements with performers selected by the Department."

The report had high praise for the panel members and recommended they be formally reappointed by the Advisory Committee on the Arts and continue their work as consultants to the Committee. To eliminate overlapping and conflicts, the Department of State would take over the job of tour management, including contract negotiation, and continue the present system of overseas management through U.S. diplomatic missions.

The ANTA arrangement, though undoubtedly essential in the early days of the program, proved to have inherent shortcomings, the report said, "not because of a lack of devotion or competence on the part of the people involved, but because of the inadequacy of the organizational arrangement itself." It continued:

"Having fulfilled so well its assignment over the past 8 years, ANTA richly deserves the thanks and commendation of the Government."

Observing that long-range planning could "dissipate a great many complaints and annoyances," the Commission suggested a "3-year forward projection of the program." It said some of the time required to prepare the 3-year plan could be gained by withholding commitment of the balance of fiscal year 1963 program funds until late in the fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1963.

"While this may have the unfortunate consequence of not having any attractions abroad during the spring season of 1963," the report said, "it is our opinion that such a sacrifice at this time will greatly enhance the potentials of the program's future."

As a feature of long-range planning, the report suggested that consideration be given to selection of amateur groups by a system of competitions.

In recommending increased recognition for participating artists and groups, the Commission cited the need for "increased psychic incentives." The existing incentives—travel, opportunity to serve the national interest, monetary compensation, enhancement of professional reputation—are important but not enough, according to the report: "The ideals and aims of the program are such that there should also be about it any aura or greater value, and the distinction that springs from the recognition of excellence."

The Commission reported without comment a suggestion that participants be issued a cultural certificate by the Secretary of State and that an honor award from the Secretary or the President be conferred on those judged by the Advisory Committee on

the Arts to have completed the most successful tours.

The effort to enhance the atmosphere surrounding the cultural presentations program, the report stressed, should be directed "not only toward potential artistic representatives, but also toward their environment—the American public." On this point, it also said:

"Perhaps one of the great weaknesses, as well as a major source of uninformed criticism, is the lack of broad knowledge or understanding by the American people of the program and its purposes. \* \* \* What seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose, and character of the cultural presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an image with a strong appeal to American pride."

As to the purpose of the program, the Commission offered its own appraisal: "It is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture."

**REPORT OF SURVEY, CULTURAL PRESENTATIONS  
 PROGRAM, FOR THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION  
 ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND  
 CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

(Prepared by Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the executive committee, Time, Inc.; Vice Chairman, Advisory Commission; and Glenn G. Wolfe, Foreign Service officer)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
 December 17, 1962.

Mr. JOHN W. GARDNER,  
 Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: On October 9 you and Assistant Secretary Battle requested that the undersigned conduct a survey of the State Department's cultural presentations program for the U.S. Advisory Commission.

The purpose of this survey has been to examine all phases of this important part of the State Department's educational and cultural programs and to submit recommendations for its improvement.

We have concluded the survey and attach our report of findings, conclusions, and recommendations. The survey has provided us with an immense appreciation of the program's accomplishments over the past 8 years and an intense admiration for the many individuals—citizens and Government officials—who have so unselfishly devoted their efforts to this program.

We are deeply indebted to many persons for their assistance in this study, but we particularly wish to thank Mr. Heath Bowman, director of the cultural presentations program, for his patience, tolerance, and helpfulness in this survey of the program for which he has been responsible over the past 2 years.

Sincerely,

ROY E. LARSEN,  
 GLENN G. WOLFE.

**REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF U.S. ADVISORY  
 COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL  
 AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE**

**U.S. cultural presentations—a world of  
 promise**

In a very succinct summary of the U.S. cultural presentations program to date, Assistant Secretary of State Lucius D. Battle said in September 1962:

"I have been deeply impressed by the record of positive contributions this program has made and by the number of dedicated artists and performers who have participated throughout the world. But I have also been increasingly aware of the difficulties inherent in the program and of the criticism these have inevitably produced."

This has indeed been the record of the program—a paradox of inspiring achievement on the one hand and troublesome obstacles on the other.

In the 8 years since it was started, the U.S. cultural presentations program in its best moments has done a remarkably effective job, and the Department of State owes great thanks to all the people who have made it possible. It has revealed to audiences in some parts of the world the breadth and depth and vitality of American cultural achievement. Our great symphonies from the east coast, the west coast, and the Middle West have brought a new and exciting picture of Americans and the American scene to audiences abroad. Student orchestras and chorales have enraptured their peers on the university campuses of many nations. The performers themselves have frequently been real ambassadors without portfolio in an assignment unprecedented in formal U.S. international relations.

But not all of this has been without pain, without unfortunate incidents, or even without occasional basic misapprehensions about the nature and goals of the program itself. At times, we believe, those responsible for the program have erred in seeking to make it all things to all men, and have not always profited from experience. Today, however, we find among those in government—at home and abroad—and among those in the artistic world who have shared responsibilities for the program a considerable measure of agreement on how the program can now go on to achieve greatness in the annals of our foreign affairs.

This study and report was undertaken because of some critical questions that have been raised about the specifics of the program and its policies and implementation. We believe that there has been no important mistake in the program that could not have been forestalled by better organization, which would include a strong functioning Advisory Committee on the Arts, and by proper implementation of policies agreed upon by the representatives of the arts and government.

A strong and respected Advisory Committee on the Arts (a committee called for in Public Law 860 and continued by the Fulbright-Hays Act of September 1961) can do much to insure the maintenance of excellence of artistic performance that this program must always represent, and to insure, as well, excellence in the management of the program.

There is a wealth of artistic talent in the United States, both professional and non-professional, and of institutions and of small groups that make it their function to encourage and foster the growth of such talent. Thus there exist resources that make it wholly unnecessary to compromise at any time the highest standards of quality of performance, both in terms of artistry and of the character of the performers chosen to go abroad.

To this proposition, the subcommittee has found unanimous agreement among all those whose opinions are relevant, and therefore conducted its study on the basis that this was a valid premise. Most of the other points made in this report stem from similar consensus. In fact, the area of agreement among those familiar with the program was found to be extremely widespread.

#### I. Purpose and Objectives

Our study of the operation of the U.S. cultural presentations program to this point suggests that the time is opportune for a clarification and restatement of the program's basic and long-range purpose.

Although the original impetus for the program was a competitive one, the record now indicates that competitive displays of cultural accomplishment tend to be wasteful and inappropriate. Part of the essence of

culture rests in its communication and in its being shared, rather than being regarded as the exclusive property of a limited number of individuals, communities, or nations. From this standpoint, and from the standpoint of what has been demonstrably useful and effective in the program, it is possible to make a more realistic appraisal of purpose: it is to reflect abroad the state of the performing arts in America, both in terms of creative cultural vitality and of the desire and capacity of a free people to support the development of a flourishing national culture. A nation can disclose important aspects of its total character through the manner in which it seeks to develop the highest peaceful arts.

In the words of the congressional legislation, the purpose is to "demonstrate the cultural interests, development and achievements of the people of the United States . . . and the (U.S.) contributions being made toward . . . a more fruitful life . . . (and) to promote international cooperation for . . . cultural advancement."

These are words of the broadest kind of intent, and they evidence the wisdom of the Congress in providing a stage that permits maximum flexibility in carrying out the program. Such flexibility has made possible a wide variety of efforts and experiments, with a great diversity of kinds of attractions, kinds of audiences reached and with broad geographical spread.

This is not to say that the administration of the program has been indiscriminate. However, at the conclusion of 8 years of experience with the program, it is possible to review it in perspective and to attempt to set new patterns from a summation of all the lessons that have been learned.

In demonstrating "the cultural interests, developments and achievements" of the American people, it is obvious that the point of the demonstration is to communicate effectively these achievements to other people. Any demonstration or exhibition communicates, some more successfully than others; the high point of communication, however, can be reached only with the establishment of complete rapport between performer and audience. It is for this reason that the nature of the audiences reached becomes a matter of major concern.

A program designed to reflect cultural achievement often demands a very special kind of audience. In any nation or community, including our own, there are still relatively few people able to appreciate fully the highest cultural attainments, and thus capable of full rapport with and understanding of the performers. But the influence of such witnesses extends far beyond their numbers, in intellect, in leadership, and in the establishment of the highest standards of taste. So audiences of this kind, wherever they can be gathered together, offer benefits in fulfilling the purpose of the program far greater than their size would indicate.

The goal of influencing intellectual leadership abroad presupposes another important aspect of the program: its most telling effects are long range, rather than immediate. The filtering down of impressions from a society's taste makers to the point where they become generally accepted is a slow and painstaking process. Old myths, fictions and stereotypes die very hard. It is, therefore, necessary to convey and re-convey, time and time again, the reality of the American cultural condition, until it finally replaces legend.

The long-range aims of the program readily suggest a second ideal audience: the youth of any nation, or that segment of its youth that shows greatest promise of eventual leadership. The natural place to seek out such youth abroad, even more than in the United States, is in the colleges and universities.

Here again experience has shown how to achieve the greatest measure of rapport.

While the best in our culture can carry a great deal of influence with university audiences everywhere, as well as with the most sophisticated and culturally mature audiences, another effective way to communicate with young people abroad is through our own college students and young professionals who are most talented in the fields of the arts. The sharing of discovery and enthusiasm by youth can do much "to promote international cooperation for . . . cultural advancement."

It is these young people who look for fresh impressions, rather than accept old ones, who are often more prone to pay heed to their peers from abroad than to their older compatriots. As Thornton Wilder said several years ago, in discussing what he had observed about the best young minds of the 20th century:

"The young person today . . . sees himself not as one of many hundreds, not as one of many millions, but as one of billions. . . . He has . . . a realization that the things that separate men from one another are less important than the things they have in common."

Whether the performers are professional or amateur, the purpose of the program cannot be realized unless the quality of the performers is the very best that we can send. The various forms of art are universal communication, whether they are language arts or extralingual; the higher the quality of art, the more complete and lasting is the thing that it communicates. Art breaks down social and political barriers and speaks in a language that can be as forceful as it is unique.

In this sense the cultural presentations program is apolitical, and while the program as a whole does have broad political purposes, these purposes must not be permitted to delimit or to misuse artistic excellence. In discussing "The Role of the Arts and the Humanities," W. McNell Lowry, director of the Ford Foundation's arts program, said this:

"If the arts and the humanities are of any use at all to the Government's objectives, they are of use only to those of the longest range and concerned with the most basic intellectual and cultural currents running among peoples of varying political and economic origins. The assumptions that underlie the international objective we share with Western Europe have to do with the values people live by. And here the arts and the humanities, if not distorted from their own realities, have a role to play."

Finally, in any discussion of the purposes of the program, it is perhaps appropriate to point out what are not its purposes.

The program is neither designed nor suited to carry on cultural competition with the Sino-Soviet bloc, nor with any other country or bloc. The knowledge that the Sino-Soviet nations were making significant headway with their own cultural presentations certainly served as a strong incentive to establish the U.S. program; but such incentive does not translate into a purpose for the program in being. It might well, in fact, act as a denigration of all culture, and of American culture in particular, to specifically assign to it this or any other purely political end.

In another consideration of purpose, we should not lose sight of the fact that the program does assist the development of the arts in the United States by providing a stability and continuity to some artistic groups that they might otherwise not have had. Nevertheless, the program does not exist simply to provide employment to artists. Such encouragement of the arts is an extra dividend. It should in no sense influence the selection of performers or constitute an excuse for compromising standards of excellence. The primary criterion must always be artistic value.



## II. The Record: Achievements and Problems

The cultural presentations program began in 1954 as the President's special international program, with an initial authorization to take part in foreign fairs and festivals. Authorization was also granted to assist privately sponsored attractions in the performing arts to represent the United States in overseas tours.

Although the United States had had long experience in international educational exchanges, it was one of the last of the countries in the free world to engage in a formal program of exporting cultural presentations. This program was one of many new types undertaken in the postwar years by the Department of State—activities that increased as American isolationism diminished.

The President's Special International Program for Cultural Presentations operated on an emergency basis until August 1, 1956. That was the date the 84th Congress passed Public Law 860, the International Cultural and Trade Fairs Participation Act of 1956, giving full legislative sanction to the program.

A series of reorganizations over the years resulted in the establishment of a Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU), directed by an Assistant Secretary of State.

On September 21, 1961, the Fulbright-Hays Act was approved, encompassing all the essential elements of previous legislation, as well as broadening the authority and scope of government sponsorship of the cultural presentations program.

As the stature of the overall program grew, so did the organization for cultural presentations develop from a Special Projects Branch to the present Office of Cultural Presentations.

### Coordination with the arts

The legislation provided for an Advisory Committee on the Arts to advise and assist the Secretary of State in carrying out his responsibilities under the program. We find that while State Department officials have sought the advice of various artistic experts on implementation of the program, they have not effectively used the Arts Committee to secure advice and guidance on program plans and policies. The Arts Committee was in being during the early years of the program, but so greatly had its functions diminished that it has not even been reappointed since the passage of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961. While each of the past six semi-annual reports has stated that "the Committee meets periodically to carry out its responsibility," there is a little indication that the Committee had been confronted with important problems or any request to participate in formulating policies effecting this program.

This failure to give the Committee a major role undoubtedly stemmed from the fact that other arrangements had been made for artistic counsel. In 1954, because the professional aspects of dealing with the arts, artists and artistic directors were strange and unfamiliar to those in the State Department, a group already involved in the arts was invited to become a major participant in the program. A contract was signed with the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA) to provide for the evaluation of performers and through a subordinate branch organized for the purpose, the International Cultural Exchange Service (ICES), to handle arrangements with the performing artists.

ANTA's role was to appoint and bring together panels of experts to pass only on the artistic caliber of performers and, through ICES, to make all tour arrangements with performers selected by the State Department. But in time it became apparent that, in addition to the selection of performers, the State Department had to approve in detail all arrangements made by ICES.

The original arrangement with an outside group was undoubtedly essential to the start

of the program. But over the years it has proved to have certain inherent shortcomings, not because of a lack of devotion or competence on the part of the people involved, but because of the inadequacy of the organizational arrangement itself. One vital element that has been missing throughout has been much needed high-level coordination between Government and the arts.

Instead, there has been a diffusion of responsibilities, along with a minimum of firm policy guidance. This has led to a variety of ad hoc decisions, to the yielding to assorted pressures, and to a failure of effective communication among the several groups concerned with the program.

### Shifts in emphasis

The 8 years of the program have seen many changes in emphasis as new circumstances and new problems arose. The organization of the program proved to be anything but ideal for meeting and resolving the inevitable realities with which the program would have to cope in the field.

Very early in the program it became evident that the original concept of using fairs and festivals as the foci of the program was unrealistic and impractical. With few exceptions, they did not provide ideal settings for demonstrations of culture, and offerings were considered not so much manifestations of American cultural development as they were thought of as entries in a cultural sweepstakes competition.

In a shift away from festivals, emphasis quickly moved toward bringing some of our most notable performing arts to audiences in the great capitals of the world. The New York Philharmonic Orchestra toured Europe in 1955 and Japan in 1961. The Boston Symphony visited Europe in 1956 and the Far East in 1960. The Philadelphia Orchestra has gone to Europe twice, the Cleveland Orchestra once. Latin America has been toured by the National and New Orleans Symphonies; the Far East by the Los Angeles and Symphony of the Air, the Near East by the Minneapolis Symphony. Among those representing the field of the dance have been the New York City Ballet, the American Ballet Theatre, and the Martha Graham and Jerome Robbins dance groups. So enthusiastically have the dance groups been acclaimed abroad that their overseas tours have had an important effect on the reception that the ballet has since had in the United States.

The appearances of these and other fine artists have left behind memorable impressions of American culture. In the case of the symphony orchestras, however, the average cost of an overseas tour amounted to approximately a fourth of the annual budget of the program. This made it impossible to export more than two orchestras a year, so that even major capitals were unlikely to have more than one concert over an interval of several years.

### Response to demands

Jazz groups, which have averaged two tours a year since 1956, represent a musical idiom that is a truly American contribution. For the most part—and particularly where they appeared before the right audiences—they have been enthusiastically received, especially by the youth. In many places, including the Soviet bloc countries, vocal public opinion has forced acceptance of jazz performances. Most jazz performers have been outstanding in their willingness to take part in demonstration and clinic sessions outside of their scheduled appearances. Jazz is certainly no substitute for the great symphonies, but must be kept in its own context in presentations in all the performing arts.

As the program's record of major successful tours mounted, the demand for presentations from other posts increased. Many of these were filled by sending smaller groups or individual performers. Where these were

first-rate artists, their tours were almost uniformly successful.

As independence and nationhood spread to new areas of the world, there was demand for American cultural representation there as well. But musical traffic to these new countries was limited by costs, and sometimes by the lack of a suitable concert hall or other facilities. Meanwhile, pressures mounted from a number of sources, including posts, for attractions with primarily entertainment, rather than cultural, values. There were many requests, for instance, for variety shows, to offset similar Soviet presentations, which had received enthusiastic responses from mass audiences.

In response to field requests, some variety shows were sent on tour. While these were often favorably received by mass audiences and by the local press, some posts seriously questioned this shift away from a supposed policy of presenting only the highest forms of our performing arts. These questions pointed up the need for a clarification of the purpose and philosophy behind the cultural presentations program—a clarification that is still needed for its most effective operation.

There is evidence that some in the newer nations may be offended by the nature of attractions sent them, since a growing number of intellectual leaders, as well as expatriates, are sophisticated people who would appreciate top quality presentations, and "who are being led to believe in some cases that the United States has no such presentations."

### Youth's contribution

While it has been clear over the years that the contribution of high quality professional performers was a vital one, the experience of privately sponsored tours of amateur and academic groups made it evident that they could also achieve significant impact, especially at the youth level. Among the early outstanding successes confirming this were the Juilliard String Quartet (1955), the Juilliard Orchestra (1958), and the Westminster Choir (1957).

In more recent demonstrations of the effective use of amateur performers, the Eastman Philharmonia has toured Western Europe, the Near East, Russia, and Poland. The Harvard-Radcliffe Orchestra not only gave highly successful performances in its 1962 summer tour of Mexico, but reached out in workshop sessions among secondary and preparatory schools, by splitting up into small ensembles, string quartets, wind quartets and quintets, and percussion groups.

The roster of professional and amateur performers who have taken part in the cultural program reads like a listing of a considerable segment of the best American talent in the field of the performing arts.

### Expanding world

Since 1956 the annual appropriation for the cultural presentations program has remained unchanged at \$2,500,000 per year. Meanwhile, there has been a progressive expansion of the number of countries and capitals which the program has attempted to reach, including the U.S.S.R. and Soviet satellites, as well as the growing roster of the world's independent nations.

The program has covered every continent, most of the major capitals, and 192 of the world's 256 major population centers (those with populations of 250,000 or more). Its reach has expanded from the fiscal year 1955, when presentations toured 48 countries and 90 cities, to the most recent fiscal year (1962), when attractions went out to 306 cities in 92 countries.

### Lessons from achievement

To help make judgments as to the kind of cultural attractions that are worthwhile and the kind that are not, there are now available a large quantity of reports from the diplomatic posts about the effectiveness of various

performances for various audiences in their areas.

There is no dissent from any important source to the proposition that the quality of an attraction is a key consideration, or that any second-rate offering does violence to the purposes of the program. This does not, however, exclude all possibility of using presentations with mass audience appeal. The question hinges not so much on the breadth of appeal of an attraction as it does on the intrinsic artistic qualities of the presentation itself. Ice shows, it would appear, have made highly favorable impressions at all audience levels, combining entertainment features with skill, grace, and beauty approaching that of some of the finer dance presentations. The available funds, however, will almost certainly act as a limiting factor on the number and kind of such mass entertainment presentations that can be sent abroad.

It is perhaps a fair generalization that athletic or sports groups touring under the program are among the most universally liked by posts, most widely accepted by audiences and among the least troublesome in making arrangements. But the questions arise of whether a sports demonstration by two teams contributes significantly to the program's objectives, and of whether a poorly matched competition between an American team and a foreign team does not in fact detract from the values of the program. It is difficult to see how sports exhibitions can have a real part in a cultural presentations program, unless they are followed by coaches and groups of athletes to hold demonstration and clinic sessions. And in that event, it may even be that such demonstration groups might be equally valuable without a prior sports exhibition. Careful consideration should be given to the question of whether sports actually belong in the cultural program, or whether they should, instead, be given a larger role in the specialists program.

Another key lesson learned is that it is frequently not enough merely to tailor a program to an area, or even to a country. Each presentation must be regarded primarily as a means of reaching a specific kind of audience. In planning a tour, consideration must be given to the audience level that will be encountered in capital cities, large cities outside capitals, university cities, and even smaller cities and villages.

It has also been learned that there is great value to setting aside enough time for off-stage appearances of the performers. They should be given as much opportunity as possible to engage in such activities in relaxed and leisurely circumstances, rather than in the hurried and peremptory manner often imposed by tight schedules. The great majority of the performers have been willing to give generously of their time off-stage for meeting with local artists, leaders, and students, for workshops and demonstration sessions, for interviews and radio and television appearances. It is obviously their intent to so contribute to mutual understanding, but they have too often been frustrated in their efforts to do so by limitations of time. Without question, this aspect of the program has made an important contribution, and could make a much greater one with better advance preparation.

It has also been learned that there is an added dimension of value when tours have some private financial support. In the "Salute to France," a 3-month exposition of American culture that took place just before the formal start of the cultural presentations program, there were invaluable overtones in the fact that it was made possible largely by private subscription in the United States, and was thus a gift of the American people. Similarly, Mexican citizens were highly impressed when they learned that the Harvard-Radcliffe Orchestra members had not only given up their summer, but were paying a large part of their own expenses.

The original legislation encouraged the extension of commercially sponsored overseas cultural tours. However, the failure to gather available information far enough in advance has kept the program from taking greater advantage of this valuable resource. Such tours most often appear in capitals, and it would be possible to send them out to provincial cities, as well, under government auspices. The expenses involved would be small, compared to the cost of originating a tour in the United States. And sponsoring their appearance outside the capitals would serve as recognition of the intellectual and cultural leadership of other cities, especially where there are large universities.

One of the most important segments of American performing arts is the drama, and certainly no American cultural presentations program would be honest or complete without it. Our discussions with some of those most interested in this field of the performing arts have brought out certain difficulties in connection with drama tours. Much of our most advanced achievement in the field is in the professional theater, and in the New York City professional theater on Broadway, in particular. Producers, however, are understandably disinclined to break a show for a tour in the middle of a successful run. There have been instances where such single performers as Margaret Webster and Hal Holbrook have been outstandingly successful, but, where a large cast is required, it has been necessary to form an ad hoc company to present American productions abroad.

Many in the theater world would look very favorably, as we do, on the greater development of professional repertory theaters across the country, opening up possibilities for the future that we have not had in the past. The very possibility of selection for the program might act as a spur to such development.

The drama, experience shows, can sometimes present very special problems that deserve careful study. Whereas, in most of the performing arts, the performance speaks for itself, the drama speaks in two voices—that of the performers and that of the vehicle they select. For that reason, special heed must be given to both the ability of the dramatic company and to the cultural image given by the vehicle. There is no problem where the theme of a production is universal. But drama is often created as a slice of its background in time and place; for that reason it can be understood best by those fully familiar with the context in which it is presented and, conversely, it can be most readily misunderstood by those unfamiliar or only partially familiar with that context.

### III. The Future: Challenge and Opportunities

The cultural presentations program has already built a reservoir of understanding abroad of U.S. cultural accomplishments and aspirations. Even with no increase in appropriations, there exists a great potential for adding to that reservoir.

The great continuing challenge and opportunity for the program lie in the maintenance of excellence—the selection and use of truly outstanding attractions. To be sure, excellence is not an unlimited commodity, but there are ever-increasing resources of American talent from which an impressive and honest cultural image of America can be reflected. Private funds in this country now support a great many repertory theaters, regional opera groups, ballet companies, creative music projects in schools, and so forth. Their numbers alone are no guarantee of quality of achievement, but numbers in a free society are something of a guarantee of cultural competition as an added stimulus toward the achievement of excellence. The cultural presentations program itself should serve as a further stimulus

through recognition of the most outstanding performers.

The full potential of the presentations program cannot be attained, however, without management and administration geared to make the most effective use of our cultural resources. Because of the need to eliminate duplication, to clarify responsibilities, and to provide direct policy guidance we recommend that the Department of State reassume full responsibility for direct management of all phases of the program, including all services now performed under contract with ANTA and its subsidiary organization, ICES.

Having fulfilled so well its assignment over the past 8 years, ANTA richly deserves the thanks and commendation of the Government. In the hope that the State Department will take full advantage of the talents and experience of the panel chairmen and ICES staff, we recommend that Mrs. H. Alwyn Inness-Brown, president of the Greater New York chapter of ANTA, and Miss Rosamond Gilder, vice president of the International Theatre Institute, be appointed special consultants to the Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs; and that Cultural Affairs give consideration to the retention of the ICES staff with their valuable experience through contract or direct employment.

We recommend that, parallel with the above change in the administration of the program, three major steps be taken, which we believe are vital to the success of the program:

1. Revitalize and expand the role of the Advisory Committee on the Arts: continue panels with revised selection procedure; arrive at administrative decisions leading to better character investigations; policy on ticket pricing, timing of amateur tours, and policy on reverse flow.

#### (a) Committee on the arts

A distinguished group from the arts charged with the responsibility for advising Cultural Affairs on policies and implementation of policies would provide something that has been missing from the administration of the cultural program to date. There have been and should continue to be several Panels of Experts, each concerned with a particular field of the performing arts (music, dance, drama, academic), and each evaluating and recommending performers from its field. This is, of course, a role that should be performed by respected people in the arts rather than by Government officials. But there has been no similarly functioning group from the arts to provide overall policy-level guidance and counsel to Cultural Affairs. This would include advice as to types of attractions that would be most effective in meeting specific objectives in various areas of the world.

This is a function which the Advisory Committee on the Arts was, we believe, expected to perform, and which experience shows is essential. We recommend the reconstitution of the Arts Committee with this important function in mind. With the clear understanding that this is to be its role, there should be no difficulty in securing as members of the Arts Committee a group of highly respected, knowledgeable, and statesmanlike individuals from the world of the arts.

The language of the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 is clear in calling for the continuation of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. The act states:

"The members of the committee shall be individuals whose knowledge of or experience in, or whose profound interest in, one or more of the arts will enable them to assist the Commission, the President, and other officers of the Government in performing the functions described. \* \* \* The committee shall \* \* \* advise and assist the Commission in the discharge of its responsibilities in the field of international educational



exchange and cultural presentations with special reference to the role of the arts in such fields (and) advise other interested officers of the Government \* \* \* in connection with other international activities concerned with the arts."

#### (b) Panels and selection

The committee and Cultural Affairs should get specific information on availability and quality of artists for the program from the present panels of experts, working under the committee's guidance. These panel members should be formally reappointed by the Committee on the Arts, as consultants to the committee. The secretariat functions for the panels should be provided by Cultural Affairs.

In our opinion, the individual members of these panels are deserving of special mention in this report. Four panel meetings have been observed in the process of this survey, and without question the members are dedicated to their work; they are highly respected experts in their field; they have been faithful and hard working, performing their service with a minimum of recognition.

In connection with the panel operations, we find that the practice has been to accept applications from individual performers and groups for participation in the program. This has made it necessary for the panels to pass on literally hundreds of applicants, qualified and unqualified, and has not ensured that some of the very best talent has received consideration. For a number of reasons, it appears advisable that this be changed to a system of nominations, based on first-hand observation of performers encompassing broad search for talent in all fields and regardless of whether applications have or have not been submitted. Especially in view of the need for tailoring the program to specific places and audiences, we recommend also that the panel groups be called upon to pick for the department performers or groups for a known area, country, or pattern of countries. In the few instances where this has been done, it has added an important dimension to the value of the panel's contribution.

In the case of amateur groups consideration might be given to final selection by competition among the highest rated nominations within a specified type of attraction.

It would seem necessary for the Committee on the Arts to hold frequent meetings during the early stages of reorganization of the program—perhaps for the first 6 months or 1 year. Thereafter, its meetings might be held quarterly or oftener. Panels should be asked to meet prior to a meeting of the Committee on the Arts.

#### (c) Administrative decisions

The officers of Cultural Affairs should work closely with the Committee on the Arts in making a number of administrative decisions and setting management policies in connection with the program. Some of these involve screening performers for character, policies on pricing of tickets for performances, seasonal timing of amateur tours and, possibly, the establishment of a reverse flow program for bringing cultural presentations from abroad to the United States.

Inadequate investigations of the character of performers has at times resulted in mistakes that have been both embarrassing and destructive of the program's objectives. Traveling performers whose conduct abroad has been improper or less than exemplary have reflected discredit on both the program and the Government they presume to represent. Fortunately, these have been rare occurrences, but the program cannot afford to have any.

Pricing of tickets for performances, particularly for college audiences, has yet to become the subject of a firm and clear policy. Experience to date has indicated that per-

haps the wisest policy might be to charge no admission for college audiences, or even for all amateur performances.

Among the problems that have appeared to have no easy solution is the timing of student tours. It has been thought that students generally are available for tour purposes only during the summers, which except for subequatorial countries, is the period of smallest interest in tours. However, from our discussions with educators and others, we find that practical solutions can be evolved for touring student groups in other than the summer vacation periods. This, like the solution to so many other problems connected with the program, can be met by sufficient advance planning. There is a well-known trend toward overseas educational programs. Many an institution would welcome the opportunity to have its especially talented students in the performing arts perform abroad under a Government program. We are told that the problem of study programs could be easily handled in connection with such tours.

The advisability of setting up a "reverse flow" cultural presentations program is one that merits further and thorough study. It has perhaps been a fair criticism that the program has been too much of a one-way street. It appears to us that a first step in this direction has been suggested by private sponsors, who have undertaken projects in collecting and exhibiting the cultural heritages in the visual arts of some of the developing countries. In the field of the performing arts, it would seem unwise to initiate such a program without comprehensive planning, consultation with the appropriate private organizations and branches of the Government. The earliest date at which such a program could be begun, even on a pilot basis, would seem to be fiscal year 1964.

2. Establish a formal policy of long-range planning; review by arts committee and posts involved; eliminate ad hoc decisions, minimize complaints, take advantage of commercial presentations, provide adequate briefing of performers, and resolve other policy issues.

(a) The most effective use of our cultural resources in a presentations program abroad requires long and careful advance planning. On the basis of the experience behind us, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest a 3-year forward projection for the program. With the funds available, and with the increased number of areas in which cultural presentations could be useful, 3 years might well be a minimum period for forward planning, in order to insure that the most important areas, or even all areas, of the world will be reached in that time with the best and most appropriate presentations.

Such a plan should certainly begin with gathering all information relevant to the program for the period to be covered. The time is now especially appropriate for a start on this. At the time this survey was announced, Assistant Secretary of State Battle declared a moratorium on any further commitment of fiscal year 1963 funds (except to meet international agreements), pending receipt of the Commission's recommendations. A byproduct of this action has been to provide time for planning ahead. A contribution to advance planning could be made by withholding the commitment of the balance of fiscal year 1963 funds until late in the fiscal year, thus providing additional time for the development of a sound plan. While this may have the unfortunate consequence of not having any attractions abroad during the spring season of 1963, it is our opinion that such a sacrifice at this time will greatly enhance the potentials of the program's future. Moreover, it is suggested that consideration be given to requesting Congress to extend into fiscal year 1964 any unobligated fiscal year 1963 funds.

This would offer an opportunity to begin a 3-year program with a clear statement jointly prepared by State Department and USIA to all diplomatic posts on what it is hoped that the entire program will accomplish, along with a request to supply complete information about their areas in the light of this overall purpose. There needs to be a continuing flow of information from the field about possible audiences and timing, and to the field about American cultural groups and their availability. In addition, all possible information and evaluation on planned commercial tours should be assembled and distributed to the posts.

All this information would need to be digested, analyzed and worked into a 3-year master plan carefully coordinated between the State Department and USIA. It should take into account the priority of areas or countries to be reached; desired audiences; political factors, use of capitals, university cities, provincial cities and possibly non-urban sites; types of attractions best suited for each place; use of professional and amateur groups, anticipated reception of performers; frequency of visits, and logistical limitations. In each case, there should be a realistic appraisal of the total exploitation possibilities and the value of such exploitation; it should then be noted what funds should be earmarked for the purpose of exploitation.

#### (d) Ad hoc decisions

One of the consequences of the failure to operate on such a long-range basis has too frequently in the past been that decisions affecting specific situations and areas have been made on an ad hoc basis, e.g.:

- (a) A repertory group must be sent abroad.
- (b) The Far East wants a variety group.
- (c) This attraction is available. Where can it be sent?

Decisions of this kind are obvious resorts to expediencies, and as such have no validity in the program.

This is not to say that a long-range plan need be so firm as to be inflexible. Political factors, audience characteristics, availability of performers—all these and many other factors are subject to change. Plans for commercial tours may not be known for more than 1 year ahead. A long-range program must have built into it the means and methods of change, thus providing more sense-making flexibility than exists at present.

#### (e) Byproducts of planning

An adequate long-term plan could dissipate a great many complaints and annoyances that have been expressed about the program in the past. It could be the basis of effective two-way communication with the field.

The posts have participated very little in any program planning until now. In fact, posts have many times been notified at such a late date that attractions were coming to their areas that there has not been enough time to make proper provisions for travel and accommodations, not to mention ability to exploit attractions, within the area. Finally, reports have been solicited from the posts and then gone unheeded, or at times even unacknowledged. In terms of effective communication, this amounts to an exercise in futility.

A long-range plan would also make it far easier to take maximum advantage of commercial presentations. The presently little-used technique of financing extensions of commercial tours in a given area might be greatly extended, if it were seen that the commercial group could fulfill the overall plan objectives for that area. This would represent a substantial saving over the cost of sending a completely new tour to the same area.

The posts and the performers alike have repeatedly complained about the inadequacy

of briefings prior to departure from the United States. This problem, like many others, is primarily one of lead time and preparation, and can be solved far more easily through advance planning. Every performer, particularly those touring a country for the first time, needs thorough orientation on the political, economic and sociological background of the country, lists of key individuals he may be expected to meet, and specific conditions of transportation, lodging and food. Where there has been sufficient time in the past to brief performers fully about conditions and customs they would encounter abroad, their reactions, almost without fail, have been exemplary and a credit to their country.

#### (d) Policy questions

Finally, the very conditions of drawing up a long-range plan would confront the committee with questions that need clear policy determination. Some questions have been raised, for example, about the inclusion of Western Europe is already very similar to our program, on the premises that the culture of Western Europe is already very similar to our own and that we are given adequate representation in those countries through a large number and variety of commercial attractions. In 1961 the American Embassy in Denmark raised doubts about the value of the program there, reporting:

"The events which have been staged in Denmark during the past 2 years under this program have been generally successful, but the question remains as to whether the net increment to the United States is worth the expense and the work involved. Established nongovernmental channels afford the Danes a fairly rich diet of comparable events. . . . The time which a USIS mission the size of the one in Copenhagen must devote to President's Fund presentations and the funds expended are not generally justified by the results achieved."

Members of other Western European embassies have made the same point, if less emphatically. Nevertheless, there remain obvious and strong arguments that might point toward an increase, rather than diminution, of cultural representation in Western Europe.

The report of Mr. Lowry called for an expansion of international cultural activities, "and primarily in Western Europe." He pointed out that "now we are beginning to see that the new nations, once they are free, are still in need of Europe and in fact wish to import many of their ideas and values from her, including their evaluation of U.S. culture." This opinion is given added credence by the large number of foreign students attending universities in Western Europe. England has approximately 60,000 such students and France some 30,000, a high proportion of both from the new and newly independent nations, an emphatic sign that these new nations look to Western Europe as the arbiter of modern culture.

Thus, whatever the influence of American cultural presentations in Western Europe, it would most certainly be reflected in time on a wider world screen.

#### (e) Back to festivals?

Another area of inquiry that the committee might well reopen would be the possibility of sending attractions to fairs and festivals, but on a basis different from that originally planned.

It might be useful to grade festivals according to the effectiveness that any presentation sent from the United States might have there. The very best events—perhaps six or eight of them—might well merit our participation as often as funds will permit, which might be no more often than once in 3 years under the present appropriation. Other good festivals might be classified as

"targets of opportunity," to be fitted in either at the beginning or end of an appropriate touring attraction. Certainly a great many of the fairs and festivals could be dismissed offhand as inappropriate to the program.

Another possibility—should the appropriation one day be increased—might be programs patterned on the "Salute to France," which would in effect be cultural saturation of a specific country or area, the effects of which might linger for many years.

3. Increase importantly the recognition given those who participate in the program.

The program's underlying effort to seek greater understanding of the United States abroad may have obscured the need for achieving full understanding here in the United States of the cultural presentations program. Perhaps one of the great weaknesses, as well as a major source of uninformed criticism, is the lack of broad knowledge or understanding by the American people of the program and its purposes.

Where such a vacuum of understanding exists, it is all but certain that the program is foregoing some of the force and efficacy it might otherwise have. What seems to be vitally needed is full knowledge of the nature, purpose and character of the Cultural Presentations program among Americans—knowledge that, properly presented, could result in an "image" with a strong appeal to American pride.

Understandably, those Americans most fully aware of the program are the ones who see some potentiality of taking part in it. And many of these, the amateurs in particular, think of it in terms of an opportunity to make a contribution to their Nation's interests. Some others, however, seem to think of it in terms of opportunities for desired travel, enhancement of professional reputation, and monetary compensation.

All these are values that the performers often do and should derive from taking part in the program. But they are not enough. The ideals and aims of the program are such that there should also be about it an aura of greater value, and the distinction that springs from the recognition of excellence.

Some effort needs to be made to create around the program an atmosphere that would provide such increased psychic incentives for the participants. And that effort should be directed not only toward potential artistic representatives, but also toward their environment—the American public.

The program has at various times come under criticism for the high salaries paid to a few performers. The payment of high salaries to outstanding artists can, in our opinion, be justified on the basis of extraordinary artistic talent and their value to the program. However, such factors as the performer's normal income, the prestige to be gained through participation in the program, and the value to the individual of a guaranteed tour should be taken into account in considering any salary contract. It should also be noted that some of our most highly paid artists have served in the program without salary.

We have stressed that the maintenance of the highest artistic standards is vital to the program, in carrying out its purpose. The reputation for such standards should be able to serve other purposes as well, if properly and fully exploited. All the many means for doing this should be explored.

It has been suggested, for instance, that there might be a cultural certificate issued by the Secretary of State to those who take part in tours, and a cultural honor award from the Secretary of State or the President for those attractions judged by the arts committee to have completed the successful tours.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT S. KERR, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition at this time in order to make a few remarks and to call the attention of the House again to the very sad and distressing loss of the distinguished and able senior Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, on January 1.

The untimely and shocking passing of this great statesman not only is a very heavy personal loss to me and to my colleagues from Oklahoma, as well as to our State, but it is my firm conviction that the Nation and the world also has lost the services of one of its finest public servants.

Senator KERR was born in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The famed log cabin from where he first saw the light of day still stands in my district.

I first knew Senator KERR in 1923 when as a newspaper reporter it was my duty to interview him at a time when his first business venture had been destroyed by fire. As the years went by I knew and watched him in his struggle to achieve his goals in life, and while in his time of great renown and fame here at the National Capitol he was known as a man of considerable wealth, we knew him first in Oklahoma as a man of very strained circumstances. He literally clawed his way up from the bottom in all fields in which he achieved success.

Senator KERR served as the chief executive of the great State of Oklahoma at a time when our country was at war. He made a very distinguished record in that capacity. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948 in the same campaign in which I won my first election to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and pleasure to work with him all these years here in Washington. He had been the senior Senator and head of our delegation for the last 12 years. Of course, there are no words that we can find which will describe the distress and the loss that we have suffered because of his untimely passing.

There is one thing I would like to say that may not be known by many people even though the whole world knows a lot about this great man; that is that all during the time he served in the U.S. Senate he always put more of his own means into the job, by far, than he received in financial remuneration from the Government.

His interest and his zeal to acquit himself, to serve his State and do his job in the very best way it could be done, made him happy that he had the means over and above what the Government made available to pour into his work, so that these successes that meant so much to the land of his origin could be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, Senator KERR was laid to rest in Oklahoma on January 4.



Mr. Speaker, at the funeral services for Senator ROBERT S. KERR at Oklahoma City, January 4, an eloquent and fitting tribute was paid by one of his closest friends, Dr. John W. Raley, chancellor of Oklahoma Baptist University.

For almost 30 years Senator KERR and Dr. Raley was coworkers, building together for the future of Oklahoma and at the same time performing tremendous work for the Baptist denomination.

As Dr. Raley has brought about one achievement after another on the campus of Oklahoma Baptist University at Shawnee, Senator KERR as a distinguished Baptist layman was always in the forefront of the accomplishment.

It was truly appropriate that Dr. Raley was among those delivering tributes at the services when Oklahoma lost its most outstanding statesman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Raley's tribute may be included at this point as part of my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT SAMUEL KERR, SENIOR  
SENATOR OF OKLAHOMA  
(By John Wesley Raley)

ROBERT SAMUEL KERR, son of the red soil of frontier Oklahoma, humbly born, found his way to national leadership through the complex maze of the 20th century.

Caught up in the impatient velocity of our time, he matched his day and climaxed his career by probing the very edges of space.

His lifework and his interests define him in many frames of reference—a school-teacher, lawyer, soldier, rancher, oil man, industrialist, statesman, humanitarian, author, orator, and churchman.

It is my deep honor to speak of him today as I knew him best, Oklahoma's beloved Baptist layman. Senator KERR was not only "Mr. Oklahoma" at home and around the world, he was "Mr. Oklahoma Baptist Layman" as well. Though he did not limit his good deeds to Baptist enterprises, he did earn this title by right of conquest through dedicated service to Baptist causes. The strategy of his religion was also the strategy of his life. He would lock his interest and strength on to something much greater than any resources he could muster alone. By such a process he merged with greatness. Following this basic strategy of sublimating the level of his own interests to that of great enterprises and religious causes, he shared in the rewards of a just providence and increased his strength for yet greater tasks ahead. He possessed the quality of intensity of concentration on any given problem and unrelenting drive toward any given objective. By this discipline he was enabled to serve in many capacities.

While he relied on brainpower and drive, Senator KERR was humble, apt to learn, and dedicated—in the words of his business partner, Dean McGee—"a Christian gentleman." The Senator brought all these personal powers into a beautiful synthesis with his concern for people. All humanitarian causes have been strengthened by his hands; orphaned children have been fed, clothed, and sheltered; the aged, sick, and the unfortunate given care; the education of youth upgraded; and all the resources of Oklahoma enriched because Senator KERR cared. At the present moment the strength of his life is applied to double the facilities of the Baptist Memorial Hospital in Oklahoma City.

On a more personal note, Senator KERR is OBU's greatest benefactor. Most of the buildings on the OBU campus, including the

beautiful Mrs. W. S. Kerr Memorial Dormitory which honors his mother, bear in part the Kerr image. His gifts through the Endowment Fund of the Baptist Foundation make beneficiaries of all the OBU faculty members for all time to come. Our loss can be measured only by the sustaining greatness of the days of his strength. OBU has lost her most generous friend, and I have lost another lifetime partner in dreams and accomplishments.

To conclude this tribute to my old friend and partner in Christian service, I should like to recall his final statement to me after a tour of the new chapel at OBU a little over a month ago. He had studied it carefully—the great auditorium with its beautiful tones of soft colors in brick and wood and the dramatic art windows. Then standing in the foyer, he read word by word the memorial tablet of bronze projecting the dreams of such a building into the purposes of the Baptists of Oklahoma. Having read every word he nodded approval then said, "A worthy dream beautifully stated, happily realized, and though many years of hard work came between the dream and its realization, the chapel is worthy of both the dream and the dreamer and laborer." Then with a twinkle in his sharp blue eyes he said, "Now that you have got the chapel, I suppose you are going to let me in on your next big enterprise at OBU."

My answer then can be repeated today to him and all his loved ones in full Christian faith. "Yes, Senator, you will always be in on every adventure of faith I shall undertake. Your life is forever linked to God's cause at OBU."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on January 1 the new year was launched in a day of tragedy for the people of Oklahoma and the Nation. The most able son of Oklahoma soil took his departure. As a builder of Oklahoma, BOB KERR was a thousand men in one. Oklahoma has produced many men of competence, many men who have added to the sum total of happiness and opportunity of our people, but all of them pale in the shadow of this great man who was born in a log cabin in the blackjack country of Pontotoc County 13 years before Oklahoma became a State.

All in all, Senator KERR was the most remarkable man I have known in my lifetime. He had that rare quality of having absolute confidence that he could achieve as big as he could think—and he always admonished his fellows to think big.

He and his fine partner, Dean A. McGee who recently became a director of the Federal Reserve bank in Kansas City, built a business and industrial empire; he had one of the finest ranches in America in LeFlore County in my own congressional district; he was perhaps the largest individual owner of coal properties in the United States; he was a major producer of uranium and helium; and near the end of his career he became one of the strongest legislative leaders in the United States in this generation.

Senator KERR was at one time a candidate for President of the United States. It was my honor to place his name in nomination. At that time the Nation was unaware of his potential as a national leader. While he was strong in

Oklahoma, he had not attained the countrywide prestige necessary to make him a formidable candidate.

During the past few years I have often thought, as I watched him soar on the wings of his tremendous intellect, that what he had hoped he would do directly might ultimately come to him without a major direct effort. He was a potential President of the United States.

He loved President John F. Kennedy, and I am sure the President himself would be the first to say that Senator KERR had those qualities of mind and character which would have equipped him to perform the duties of the highest office in the land.

Senator KERR was a great friend of the Vice President of the United States. When LYNDON JOHNSON was majority leader working closely with Senator KERR, he learned what an anchor he was in hours of trouble and difficulty.

Senator KERR was my close friend. He has befriended me a thousand times and in a thousand ways. I have had many private conversations with him, the contents of which after his death are known only to me. These moments of consultation and conversation are among the richest experiences of my life.

Some people thought that BOB KERR pushed too hard. He was like a great engine powered by super fuel as he drove to every task. Sometimes he made his own job hard for himself. He never worried about finesse. He could accomplish almost any task he undertook by main strength—by the sheer weight of his intellect, by his rock-like determination, and his vast energy.

He often consulted with me about his political problems. I was always flattered that he generally took my advice.

His great love was the Arkansas and Red River Basins. He set in motion and carried far enough toward conclusion the development of these watersheds that without doubt they will some day be famous in the industrial and commercial life of this Nation.

"Land, Wood, and Water," the slogan under which he campaigned and lived, was not to him just a political gimmick. It was the summary of a determination that he did more about than anybody in the country.

He was preeminent in many, many fields. He probably did more for his church than any layman in Oklahoma.

He was responsible for more worthy young men and women getting through school or into business than anybody in the history of our State, so far as I know.

A product of the frontier of Indian territory, he was an inspiration to little people everywhere, thousands of whom he helped during his lifetime.

He probably built up the greatest business organization and the biggest personal political organization in the history of our State, and was one of its most illustrious Governors.

He was the center of everything that he undertook. Those who worked with and for him were not only coworkers and employees, they were disciples. To be an active part of the Kerr organization was a way of life to hundreds of people.

He commanded the most devoted loyalty from those closely associated with him. Senator KERR's death has brought home to me the frailty of life. So many times he and I had talked of discussing certain things and going more into detail on some of our plans, but we just never did get around to all of them. Often, also, he had said to me that he hoped to ride the first boat to go up the Arkansas when it became a navigable stream. He failed in this but he died at the zenith of his greatest success in this area. He will be there in spirit when the first boat is launched.

To paraphrase Edwin Markham in his great poem on Abraham Lincoln, and to quote almost directly from Senator KERR's funeral oration delivered by his pastor, Dr. Herschel H. Hobbs—when he went down he did not leave just another stump in the forest. He fell like a kindly cedar tree and left a lonesome place against the sky.

To Mrs. Kerr and their fine children and grandchildren, to his brothers and sister, to his friends who are legion, I extend my deepest sympathy. Oklahoma has lost her greatest and most effective advocate. America has lost one of her noblest sons.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion that brings all of us in the Oklahoma delegation to the floor together this afternoon to pay tribute to a man who was great not only in the field of statecraft but great also in the field of industry and finance and in the field of church leadership.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR was appropriately saluted at the services in Oklahoma City last week as the great lay leader of the Baptist Church, which he loved so much.

For Oklahoma he has indeed left many monuments. Of all those great monuments none exceeds in importance in the future of our State the great waterway about which he dreamed for so many years and to which he had given so much of his time and his energy during his public career. The greatest dream of Senator KERR undoubtedly was navigation on the Arkansas River and the great industrial potential which would follow that development.

I think that for him a real milestone was realized last fall when in separate meeting at Muskogee and at Catoosa in Oklahoma further historic steps were taken to advance the cause of navigation on the river.

Senator KERR was there to break the ground for the first port to be located in Oklahoma on the Arkansas River at Muskogee. He was at Catoosa to help celebrate the progress that had been made on the river leading to the establishment of the great terminal port of that system in Oklahoma on the Verdigris River.

I think that when the final measuring stick is applied to the lives of the men who played a part in the history of our State, there will be no challenge to Senator KERR in the role that he has played as a leader of our State, in devel-

oping its great resources and in helping to make possible a brighter industrial future for the people of our State.

Because this navigation system was so close to the Senator's heart, I introduced yesterday as the first of the measures which I will sponsor in this Congress, a House joint resolution which would authorize the naming of the navigation route on the Arkansas River as the Robert S. Kerr Seaway. I earnestly hope that measure will have united support in both the House and the Senate from all who are interested in the development of that great river because no man did more to earn this honor than did Senator KERR.

Senator KERR was always kind, always considerate, always helpful to his colleagues. His strong arm was available to help the poor and the unfortunate just as it was available to help friends and colleagues. I feel I have lost a dear friend, a constant and helpful colleague. My wife joins me in sending to his lovely wife and to his brothers and his sons and daughter our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

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

Mr. STEED. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved by the passing of my dear, close and valued friend, the late Senator BOB KERR. Between BOB KERR and me there existed for years a close relationship that I treasured very much and which I shall always treasure in connection with his memory.

Senator BOB KERR was one of the great Americans of all time and one of the outstanding legislators in the Halls of Congress. He was a man of commanding views; a man of definite mind; a kind man always, as the majority leader well stated, doing good things for others. Senator BOB KERR was not only a great man but a good man. He was a leader in business, a leader in government in his State, a leader in Government on the national level. BOB KERR possessed the qualities of leadership. He was as others of our colleagues have said—a man of deep faith. He was a man who lived up to the spiritual truths that he believed in. He had an intense love of country and an intense love of his fellow man. His life was like a Horatio Alger story. The story of his life shows what can be done in America, the land of opportunity, if one has the will, the ambition and the determination to carry out their ambitions. BOB KERR always used his wealth as a trust. He always served his State and his country as a trust.

The country could ill afford to lose the services of BOB KERR at this time, but God has acted. We, his friends, will always remember that great man. The memory of his life, his deeds, his actions, his contributions on the State and Federal level are a permanent part of the record of the Nation and the State.

I extend to Mrs. Kerr, her sons and daughters, and to the other loved ones left behind my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, New Year's Day was a bleak one for Oklahoma. We were shocked to learn of the unexpected death of Oklahoma's greatest Senator, ROBERT S. KERR, affectionately known to his friends as "BOB."

His death shocked all of Oklahoma, as well as the Nation. We were indeed hopeful and praying that the Senator would recover from his illness of the previous weeks and continue his powerful role in the U.S. Senate and the 88th Congress, in many fields of successful private enterprise, as well as his work as a Baptist leader and guiding light.

Reports of the past few days had indicated he would soon be back in the Senate ranks. His death confused and stunned his followers in Oklahoma, the Nation, and admirers in Congress.

BOB KERR rose from a humble beginning to become the most powerful man in the U.S. Senate because he was a human locomotive, a driving man. Time after time he demonstrated his capacity to handle great responsibilities. He roared into debate with his Senate colleagues like an Oklahoma tornado, with effective results.

BOB KERR lost only one major political battle, his drive for the presidential nomination. After he gave up hopes of ever being in the White House he continued his upward move into power.

In committee he was powerful because he carefully studied each move and arrived prepared for action, armed with information about the problem at hand. Public works, space, finance—all controlled by the hand of BOB KERR.

For Oklahoma, his death came at a time when the State is really beginning to move forward. BOB KERR was the captain of the Oklahoma congressional team. He called the signals and helped to bring home one-tenth of the total public works appropriations in the last Congress.

His work greatly benefited Oklahoma, yet Tennessee, Arkansas, Kansas, and other States can attest to his work with glowing pride. Senator KERR took the lead in the development of land, wood, water, and space. His greatest dream was the completion of the Arkansas River development project, a program that is now far enough along so that completion is assured.

Yes, BOB KERR was a great man, an ideal family man, a most outstanding church layman, and a true Christian gentleman. We shall miss him.

I wish to take this opportunity to once again express my deepest sympathy to his entire family.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the delegation from Oklahoma and other friends of Senator KERR in paying my humble tribute to him for his great accomplishments in the Congress of the United States.

It was my privilege to work rather closely with Senator KERR in my capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics since he



was chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. We were frequently together in conferences and exchanged ideas relative to the space program. He was always kindly, he was always considerate, and you could approach him with confidence, because you knew that you were going to be well received. I never remember a time when he became dictatorial or refused to listen to reasonable arguments.

The great space effort of this country which he helped to initiate will miss the drive and the force that he brought to it. I, for one, appreciate what this loss means to our space effort.

Mr. Speaker, I join with others in extending to his wife and family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Senator KERR started from such humble beginnings and during his busy life achieved so many successes in so many fields in so many ways with so many people that it is almost impossible to write a true eulogy of the man.

I think he wrote his own epitaph in his own lifetime when he adopted as the motto and the guiding principle of his whole career of public service a slogan he chose to call land, wood, and water.

So long as there remains any interest in this land, and in the world for that matter, in the field of conservation and natural resources, I know the name of Senator KERR will always rank in the highest of its missionaries.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and I extend to the Kerr family, our warm and dear friends, our deep and heartfelt sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of one of Oklahoma's most distinguished sons, the late Senator ROBERT S. KERR. The Senator's untimely death is a tremendous loss to our Nation and our State. Our Oklahoma congressional delegation has lost a great leader.

Senator KERR was an unusually able man with boundless energy. He was a great American and a champion supporter and developer of his native Oklahoma. He took pride in his heritage and few men have worked so unceasingly to serve their State and her citizens. His keen intellect and sound judgment were demonstrated in all his decisions—a mark of a great statesman. The people of Oklahoma and the Nation are most fortunate in having had a man of such high character and outstanding ability to represent their interests in the Congress of the United States.

Senator KERR's colleagues already miss him and will continue to miss him for a long time to come. The people of the State of Oklahoma will never forget him.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy today at the untimely loss of a friend and a colleague, ROBERT S. "BOB" KERR who was Bob to all of his friends. He was a Democrat; I a Republican. My respect for him as an individual and as a U.S. Senator transcends those party lines.

Although at times we differed on national issues, these differences never af-

fected our friendship or our working together for the interest of our constituents and the State of Oklahoma.

The life of BOB KERR is the great American success story. Starting from absolute scratch as the son of a man who worked hard to support six children, by his own drive, ability and intelligence, he rose to be one of the most successful businessmen in America, one of the outstanding Senators of the U.S. Senate, and one of the greatest supporters of his beloved church, the Southern Baptist Church.

It was my privilege to work with BOB KERR rather closely for the past 12 years. In all of these years never once did he fail to fulfill his promises to the fullest extent. He was my friend and I was his friend; we admired and respected each other. BOB KERR loved Oklahoma and was one of its greatest boosters. He fought with a passion to see that Oklahoma secured those things that were rightfully hers.

A test of a man's character can usually be judged by the attitude of those people who work with him day by day. I have known many of his employees for a couple of decades; I have never heard of one that did not admire, respect and love him, and usually remain in his service. He had the ability to select good, capable people; and he loved and respected them as part of his family.

I have heard BOB say on many occasions, "Do not be afraid to dream big dreams, but be careful of what you pray for, as your prayers might be answered." BOB dreamed big dreams; most of them through blood, sweat, and tears came true.

Oklahoma and the Nation are going to miss him. I am going to miss him.

BOB KERR is gone. He died in the harness, in the service of his beloved State and his country. He has left a mark which will never fade but will continue to be a monument to his hard work and strenuous effort.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Belcher joins me in extending to Mrs. Kerr and the Kerr family our heartfelt sympathy. We share with them their great loss.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Senator ROBERT S. KERR lived in surroundings in the true tradition of the pioneer. He was born of humble parentage in a log cabin, in what was then Indian Territory, at Ada, Okla. Throughout his life he never forgot the religious teachings of his youth and the inherent compassion for those striving against great odds to gain success in life—whether in the business, educational or vocational fields. He later made it financially possible for hundreds of the citizens of his native State to realize their life's ambition.

He learned at an early age that, in order to become successful in life, one must receive an education. Even though his problems were many—he completed his liberal education, at Shawnee Baptist University, and was graduated in law at Oklahoma University.

As a man of decision which marked his entire life—he started prospecting for oil as a drilling engineer. His success in this field was attested to by the expansive

Kerr-McGee Industries, Inc., one of the largest oil companies in the Nation. With the increase of his wealth, this great humanitarian expanded the finances supporting his many charitable, civic and educational programs.

Senator KERR was a very religious man and, as a true Christian, endeavored by example to influence the lives of his many followers. He was considered to be one of the leading national churchmen of the Baptist Church.

As a leader in the civic and business affairs of the State of Oklahoma, and his humanitarian interest in the life attainments of its citizens, it was inevitable that he would enter the political lists to press his progressive ideas and mold public opinion in order to insure legislative enactment.

Through these efforts he was selected as Democratic national committeeman. And, later, he became the Governor of his State, January 1943 to January 1947. In 1948, he was elected to the U.S. Senate, reelected in 1954 and 1960.

As a Senator, KERR became a powerful force in the enactment of legislation. He was respected by his colleagues for his keen and resourceful mind. His honesty of purpose was never questioned. His word was never broken. He was blessed with a great foresight for predicting the future problems of the Nation. His analytical mind, together with a fondness for meticulous research on a question, gave him the factual knowledge required to determine the core of the problem. His indefatigable persistence to arrive at a solution gained for him a reputation for being able to settle highly controversial matters affecting legislation of national importance to future generations.

He was active in American Legion affairs, serving as State commander in 1925. He received many honors for his serving, including the Legion's Distinguished Service Award. He served as a second lieutenant in the 1st Field Artillery in World War I.

He was the perfect American of his time—a product of a true democracy—of humble birth, schooled under adverse conditions, and trained in the business world by experience, seasoned in his high sense of Americanism in the service of his country, and lived to serve in the highest tribunal of the land—a man loved by his neighbors and colleagues and feared by his enemies, and respected and honored by the people of his State and Nation.

We, the members of the Illinois delegation, regret his passing and extend to his dear wife and sons our heartfelt condolences. May the good Lord bless him for the many kindnesses he extended to his fellow man during his lifetime. May his family glory in his fine record.

For he that followeth the path of kindness and giveth to others happiness follows the sacred footsteps of Him that bringeth good tidings that publisheth peace.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the profound shock which came to all of us on learning of the sudden and tragic passing of ROBERT S. KERR cannot be ex-

pressed in words. This sad and distressing news reached us as the new year was dawning, but the impact of the tragic event will be felt for years to come.

From the wellsprings of the earth of the Oklahoma frontier a towering oak arose. This giant of the forest was Bob KERR. He arose from humble beginnings to great heights. From the log cabin of the western frontier to the highest councils of State and Nation ROBERT S. KERR blazed a trail of leadership which few have ever matched. In conflict and in peace, on the battlefields of World War I and during the cold war of these last decades, he rendered devoted service to his Nation.

BOB KERR's passing is a profound personal loss to me. He was my close friend. I came to know him quite intimately, particularly so in recent years. I have worked with him on literally hundreds of legislative projects, both large and small. The most recent of these was the Revenue Act of 1962. The extent of his contributions to the public interest cannot be described here today. Who can, in the metes and bounds of a few words, show how this great man labored over the minute details of legislation and refused to face even the possibility of defeat? I can with sincerity and vigor offer my testimony wholeheartedly to all those qualities and characteristics which have been associated with him by those who have spoken before me. Above all, I can testify to his character, his complete dedication and singleness of purpose in accomplishing great objectives, and the enormous capacity for successful leadership which was his.

The tremendous power of his intellect and innate brilliance of mind, combined with his driving energy, his diligence and great strength of character, propelled him to the forefront of every endeavor which he ever undertook. His legislative talents and his enormous capacity for reaching solutions in the public interest—matters to which he had devoted himself especially since coming upon the national legislative scene in 1948—are known to all his colleagues and especially those of us who were privileged to work with him on particular projects of great significance and importance to the Nation.

The loss to the Nation in the passing of BOB KERR can only inadequately be described by those of us who speak today. Historians will, I am confident, accord him a very large place and high stature in the account of these years in the life of our great Nation.

To his family I offer sincere and heartfelt condolences. They can take solace from the abiding knowledge that his life and works contributed great and good gifts to the lasting service of mankind.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of Senator KERR in the RECORD today, and that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHWENGLER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, Wednesday, January 23.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. STAFFORD), today, for 1 hour, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. HERLONG and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that the extension exceeds the limit of two printed pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$480.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. RYAN of New York.

Mr. BRADEMANS.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas.

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

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. POWELL in five instances.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. SLACK.

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

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. QUIE.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

168. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the reports and the proceedings of their national gathering, held in Atlantic City, N.J., August 19 through 24, 1962, pur-

suant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 35) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 1575. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 1576. A bill to provide an elected commission form of government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 1577. A bill to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1578. A bill to change the name of the Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Francis Case; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 1579. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1582. A bill to prohibit the granting of military decorations to civil or military officers who are employees of foreign governments except with the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend the act of August 21, 1935, to provide for a determination of whether certain sites, buildings, or other objects are of national historical significance, and to prohibit the use of Federal funds for highway purposes which damage or destroy national historical sites, buildings, or other objects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1585. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1586. A bill to provide a 1-year moratorium on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages, with the Federal Government assuming the required mortgage payments (both principal and interest) for mortgagors in economically depressed areas who are unemployed and unable to make such payments through no fault of their own, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.



H.R. 1587. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that certain provisions of liability insurance contracts entered into by air carriers shall be null and void; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1588. A bill to amend section 744 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran has paid in premiums an amount equal to or greater than the face value of a policy of U.S. Government life insurance, the policy of such insurance shall be paid up; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 1589. A bill to increase the maximum amount of an insured deposit under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act from \$10,000 to \$25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1590. A bill to increase the maximum amount of insurance applicable to accounts in savings and loan institutions under title IV of the National Housing Act from \$10,000 to \$25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 1592. A bill to prevent the use of stop-watches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relative to taxes on property subject to redeemable ground rent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1594. A bill to establish within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion, and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 1595. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 1596. A bill to repeal the authorization for the furnishing of foreign currencies in connection with local currency expenses of Members and employees of the Congress traveling outside the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 1597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for payment of redeemable ground rents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit loss of goodwill to be taken into account in computing the amount of the relocation payment which may be made to a business concern or non-profit organization displaced by an urban renewal project, and to increase the maximum amount of such payment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1599. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1600. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1601. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the

amount of outside income which a survivor annuitant may earn without deduction from his or her annuity thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 1603. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct two modern stern ramp trawlers to be used for research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1604. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 1605. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to grant retirement credit for certain service in the U.S. merchant marine in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1606. A bill to provide for stabilization and orderly marketing in the poultry industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act with respect to the determination of monthly pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1608. A bill to amend section 308 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that aircraft engines and propellers may be exported as working parts of aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1609. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$900 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 1610. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the amount of a deposit which may be insured under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1611. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address at Gettysburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1612. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to eligibility for special pension in the case of individuals awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 1613. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize relocation payments in the case of certain parts of a business concern located outside an urban renewal area where they are interdependent with parts of such concern displaced from within such area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1614. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1615. A bill to provide that the President shall designate one agency of the Federal Government to conduct all security investigations of civil officers and employees of the United States, and of persons who apply for employment as such officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1616. A bill to provide for the establishment of rates of compensation for positions in the Federal Government in appropriate relationship to local prevailing rates for similar positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1617. A bill to create the Freedom Commission for the development of the science of counteraction to the World Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1618. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and related items used in bagpipe bands shall be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1620. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1621. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1622. A bill to provide for a joint study by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Secretary of Defense of the disposal and future use of military airports found to be surplus to the needs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 1623. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1624. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1625. A bill to provide a program of technical and financial assistance to communities to help effectuate desegregation of schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis, and to authorize loans to cooperatives under such program for replacements, improvements, and repairs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1627. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to authorize the creation of mutual mortgage funds for the FHA premiums paid by cooperative corporations established under the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1628. A bill to authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1629. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1630. A bill to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addiction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1631. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1632. A bill to create a Community Relations Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1633. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to threats or injury to Federal officers in the discharge of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1635. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1636. A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1637. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1638. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1639. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1640. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 1641. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid for the education of the taxpayer, his spouse, or his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1642. A bill to provide for the sale of the U.S. Animal Quarantine Station, Clifton, N.J., to the city of Clifton to provide for the establishment of a new station and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 1643. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1644. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for the protection of classified information released to or within U.S. industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1645. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1646. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1647. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide that any Federal officer or employee who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to Communist activities or national security, when summoned to appear before any Federal agency, shall be removed from his office or employment; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1648. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide for a procedure under which certain final orders of the Subversive Activities Control Board with respect to Communist organizations may be made applicable to successor organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1649. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 with respect to the granting of bail to defendants in criminal cases pending appeal or certiorari; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1650. A bill to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1651. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 1652. A bill to amend section 1651 of title 28, United States Code, so as to require the concurrence of not less than five Justices in the granting of writs of certiorari by the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1653. A bill to amend section 1108 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit certain foreign air carriers from operating aircraft within the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend section 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 1655. A bill to amend section 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to extend beyond 8 years the period within which veterans may pursue education and training where the pursuit of such education and training has been interrupted by reasons beyond the control of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 1656. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1657. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work-measurement programs or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to define the terms "manufacturer" and "producer" for purposes of the excise tax on automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 1660. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 1661. A bill to establish a Commission on Research and Development; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 1662. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1663. A bill to permit the construction of certain public works on the Great Lakes for flood control, and for protection from high water levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTAÑA:

H.R. 1664. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 1665. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to confine within a conduit a portion of Dunlap Creek in Brownsville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 1666. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1667. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1668. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 1669. A bill to make the civil service retirement and disability fund available for annuity benefits authorized by law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1670. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1671. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1672. A bill to extend health benefits to the survivors of retiree annuitants who died before April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1673. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1675. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 1676. A bill to require air carriers to inspect for destructive substances all articles taken aboard certain aircraft operated by them in air transportation; to permit persons injured by failure of an air carrier to so inspect to bring an action for damages against the air carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1677. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend the provisions of title II relating to cancellation of loans under such title to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1678. A bill to provide wage standards for persons engaged by Federal contractors or subcontractors to furnish services or maintenance work to Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1679. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the establishment, expansion, and improvement of programs of technical education at the college level; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1680. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to improve the act's overtime standards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an amount equal to the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles shall be paid to persons who purchase such automobiles during periods of high unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1682. A bill to amend section 4063 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from tax in the case of mobile homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 1683. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations upon



consent of employee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1684. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1685. A bill to amend provisions relative to overtime in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1686. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the designation of individuals to receive survivor annuities under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1687. A bill to create a presumption that certain impairment of health caused by hypertension or heart disease of a Federal or District of Columbia employee is incurred in line of duty for purposes of certain retirement and disability compensation laws or systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1688. A bill to provide for certain survivors' annuities in additional cases under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 1689. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, to increase the annual and sick leave which may be earned and accumulated by officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1690. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 1691. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1692. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age eighteen, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1693. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 1694. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Poverty Point National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 1695. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for the duty-free entry of certain kinds of limestone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 1696. A bill defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 1697. A bill to provide that any Federal employee who refuses to answer a question of a committee of the Congress with respect to Communist, Communist-front, or subversive affiliations, shall be removed immediately from the position or office held by him; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act so as to authorize the President to establish boards to resolve jurisdictional disputes in the air transportation industry,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1699. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1700. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1701. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1702. A bill to provide that the Department of Defense shall enter into contracts for air transportation with air carriers as defined by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the identification of a military airlift command as a specified command, to provide for its military mission, and to eliminate unnecessary duplication in airlift; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1704. A bill to make certain exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States and of the U.S. courts of appeals and to the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in actions relating to the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1705. A bill to require that all agreements and understandings respecting the importation of foreign goods, entered into with foreign countries or their citizens, shall be reduced to writing and made public; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 1706. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 1708. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 1709. A bill to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 1710. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1712. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1713. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1714. A bill to authorize civil actions for the review of certain administrative determinations as to the use of lands of the United States for grazing purposes to be instituted in judicial districts in which such lands are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1715. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1716. A bill to amend section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to suspend certain rates relating to foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board of certain schedules of foreign air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1718. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1719. A bill to provide that compensation of an individual for services performed while engaged in commerce, or as an officer or employee of the United States, shall be subject to State and local income taxes only in the State and political subdivision in which such individual is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items or provisions in appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the offering of prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the development and use of productivity standards should be extended and applied to as many

Federal activities as may be practicable; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress as to a study and investigation concerning a nationwide program of remunerative occupational training for youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all of our U.S. naval shipyards and facilities be maintained on a fully manned operational basis performing essential Navy or other Department of Defense work in the interest of our national defense, and that the President of the United States be urged to instruct the Secretary of Defense to take all necessary steps to insure this end, including the immediate cancellation and withdrawal of any and all instructions or orders issued or contemplated by the Department of the Navy incompatible with this purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 80. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 81. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the location of activities of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 82. Resolution opposing the seating of Communist China in organs of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 83. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives so as to restore the 21-day rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 84. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. Res. 85. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the need of Point Roberts in the State of Washington for Federal assistance to combat its economic problems; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 1720. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia H. Tucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clorinda (Frattini) Iacangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 1722. A bill for the relief of Stephen and Simone Grignet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1723. A bill for the relief of Agnese Brienza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1724. A bill for the relief of Vita Maria Colucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1725. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 1726. A bill for the relief of William H. Woodhouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1727. A bill for the relief of Richard G. Green, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1728. A bill for the relief of Sayhan Husnu Bilbasar and Suheyra Bilbasar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1729. A bill for the relief of Almerinda Tedesco Bernardo, Adella Bernardo, and Grace Bernardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 1730. A bill for the relief of Yin-Chio Ton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 1731. A bill for the relief of Eva Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 1732. A bill for the relief of James Hubert Rhoden and Marjorie Joyce Rhoden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1733. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chen-Tsuan Su and Angela Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1734. A bill for the relief of Luba Siedlecki Simon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1735. A bill for the relief of Maria Nessim Djeddah De Aides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1736. A bill for the relief of Assunta DiLella Codella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 1737. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefina V. Guerrero Leauxmax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 1738. A bill for the relief of Maria Giuseppa Fantauzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1739. A bill for the relief of Elsa H. Walkowiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1740. A bill for the relief of Maria Marcella Tang and Maria de Fatima Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 1741. A bill for the relief of Filippa Fucarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 1742. A bill for the relief of the Wetzel County Hospital, New Martinsville, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 1743. A bill for the relief of Mary M. Kawas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1744. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Aboud and her children, Samuel Eliahou, and Rahamin Aboud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Dr. John P. Chlason and his wife, Alice Chlason, and their minor children, Louis, Marc, Marina, and Nicole Chlason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1746. A bill for the relief of Bahira Sutton, Ovadia Sutton, and Ruth Sutton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1747. A bill for the relief of Elias Oeder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1748. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ingrassia, his wife, Alfonsa Monteleone Ingrassia, and their minor son, Salvatore Ingrassia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 1749. A bill for the relief of Mary Barbadian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 1750. A bill for the relief of Rahmi Sengul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Gino Fanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1752. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Franciszka Andres Beregsasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1753. A bill for the relief of Brother Antonio Testori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1754. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mamdouh S. Younes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Augustina (Teresa Cattaneo), Sister M. Francesca (Rina Tagliaferri), Sister Maria Silvia (Natalina Da Dalt), and Sister Maria Angela (Rosa Colombo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1756. A bill for the relief of George Zammit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Mario Ruggiero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 1758. A bill for the relief of Selma Gokhan and Selcuk Gokhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 1759. A bill for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1760. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude L. Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 1761. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1963

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 9, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, hallowed be Thy name. Give us to see that if the radiance of that name above every name does not touch with luster and reverence the tasks Thou dost give us to accomplish as we deal with our fellows, our lip professions of faith are futile and vain. With the assurance of Thy undergirding, O Lord, deliver us from the sullenness of temper that clouds the sunshine from other faces and from the gloom that makes life harder for those who walk by our side. In all the national deliberations that loom in the days that hasten, keep our motives clean, our vision clear, our patriotism undefiled, our speech guarded, our judgments fair, and our consciences unbetrayed. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 9, 1963, was dispensed with.