their own individual energies is to cut the power of the government to its smallest degree."

The answer was simple, once it was found by our Founding Fathers. The head of a state is a human being, and a human being's thinking and deciding and acting and judging are inseparable. But, in this new American Republic, no top official would ever be permitted to act as a whole human being. The function of government would be divided into three parts:

1. The first part was to think and decide, and it would be called Congress.

2. The second part was to be responsible for getting action. It would be headed by the Chief Executive, the President.

3. And the third part was to serve as a judge or a referee, known as the Supreme Court.

Each of these three parts was to act as a check on the other two, and over the three was set a written statement of political principles, intended to be the strongest check on them all. There was to be government by law, with clearly defined rules of the game, rather than government by whim—the Constitution. The dangers of dictatorship must be avoided for all time to come. No one person or small group of persons must ever be permitted to get too much power, and the minority, even down to the last individual citizen, must be protected against oppression by the majority, or by any organized pressure group.

And these objectives made it possible for our American Revolutionary leaders to draw the blueprints for this new and completely different political structure—our unique form of government, not only in the world of today, but in all time.

I said when I began this that all I would even try to do this afternoon was to offer you a few guidelines to follow on your search for words to sell the truth. My mission is accomplished if I start you on that exciting journey. It is accomplished if I have succeeded in getting you to look at your country and your birthright of freedom with new eyes—eyes that are both critical and understanding, because it is very important that you know that America is far from perfect.

And, I'm sure you do. Otherwise, we wouldn't get from your generation what our country must always have to keep progressing—ideas for a much better world. But, as you find our shortcomings, and think of plans to overcome them, be sure you always ask to what degree are our shortcomings traceable to the form of political structure under which our country was founded—are they due to having drifted away from that concept, and how does our record compare with the records of countries which have tried to operate under the opposite philosophy?

Godspeed you, graduates of 1960, in your world of tomorrow. As students seeking more knowledge, as successful career girls, as happy wives and mothers, and as enthusiastic ambassadors for freedom. If you understand, and believe because you understand, you will find the words, and I guess I don't have to tell you how very important it is for you and the young people of all free world nations to find those words. Because it may well be that, in your generation, this great war for men's minds will be decided. Remember, your battleground is wherever you go. Use your voice, with your heart and beliefs behind it, among your fellow citizen and fellow workers, family and friends, and—very importantly—on the children you raise.

Thank you again for giving me the privilege of sharing this important day with you. You have my congratulations on winning your diplomas, and my very best wishes for your future.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our fathers, help us to be spiritually aware that when Thy voice was heard in ages past it did not cease to speak. Give us to know that for those who become quiet enough to listen, Thy word for this day resounds clear and sure above all the tumult and shouting of the confused babel of human folly.

In all our deliberations and appraisals of the affairs of state having to do with the tangled relationships of men, forbid that we should be insensitive to voices other than our own, and which make the world about us a whispering gallery telling of divine realities that surround us.

Give us open ears, alert and quick to hear each whisper of Thy word.

With hearts tuned to the unseen presence which enfolds our days with a love that never forgets, a light that never fails, and a life that never ends, may we face life's changing scenes with the radiant faith that—

> This is my Father's world,
> He shines in all that's fair.
> In the rustling grass
> I hear Him pass—
> He speaks to me everywhere.

To that glad truth our hearts respond, "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 14, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections, and to enfranchise the people of the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6597) to revise the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument and provide an entrance road or roads thereto, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, early today we hope to complete action on the NATO joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170), on which we have a unanimous-consent agreement.

Then we expect to proceed to consider the Kennedy-Clark loyalty measure.

We have ready the Department of Defense appropriation bill. It is a very important measure, and we want to get to it as early as we can. We shall meet early and shall remain in session late, if necessary, in order to take action on that bill this week.

We also would like to proceed with consideration of the housing bill, and the postal and classified workers pay increase bill.

Then there is the proposed constitutional amendment relating to the District of Columbia, which will be before us.

So I should like to say to all Members of the Senate that I think they can count on long meetings for the remainder of this session and much hard work, including Saturday sessions and early morning meetings and late evening meetings, if necessary.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

At this time I am not prepared to set forth to the Senate any long list of bills, because, in the first place, it would be presumptuous on my part to try to say what the collective judgment of the Congress would be; and Senators will have to determine what measures will be reported by the committees, and what measures will be passed; and, in the second place, I have never found that we could expedite the work of the Congress by displaying mimeographed lists of so-called must bills. I think that merely deters us and delays us.

Nevertheless, I think most people know that Congress is going to face up to the issues, and that we are going to pass a substantial number of very important bills between now and the time when we leave for the conventions. There is a great deal of important work to be done; and we shall have to work long and hard in order to finish it before that time.

Therefore, I plead with each Senator to examine very carefully his schedule and try to arrange his personal appointments so that he can take part in the consideration of the various measures which will be before the Senate. If he is unable to do so, I hope he will not ask that the consideration of these measures be held over until he returns to town. By way of illustration, let me say that as regards one of the very important bills we shall take up this week, I was told this morning by one Senator that it would not be convenient for him to be here either Friday or Saturday. Of course, that would mean postponing the consideration of that measure until Monday. However, we cannot afford to postpone for one or more days the consideration of important bills in order to accommodate any Senator. I do not think we can properly set aside the consideration of any bill so late in the session. I shall not ask the Senate to do so, and I hope other Senators will not ask the Senate to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was called out of the Chamber just before the Senator from Texas began his statement. Do I correctly understand that he said that after the NATO joint resolution, the pending business, is disposed of, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the proposed legislation relating to the loyalty oath?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; we would like to do so if we can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am especially interested in the schedule for consideration of the Department of Defense appropriation bill, because I was assured by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] that that measure would not be brought up today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot say. Perhaps Senators will talk at length; I do not know. That bill is available, and it is important, and it has priority; and we should take it up as soon as possible.

We also had word from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that they wish to have the Senate take up the loyalty bill on Wednesday.

I wish to be as accommodating as I can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All I can say is when the Senator from New Mexico comes in, be prepared.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I try to be prepared, because we have these measures outlined, and we have said to the authors of the bills that we shall take up the NATO joint resolution, and then the loyalty bill, and then the Department of Defense appropriation bill. I made no commitments otherwise. Of course, if there were to be extended debate on those bills, we would have to adjust to it.

Our big problem is the seeming necessity to get all the work of the week done on Wednesday and Thursday. I am trying to get away from that. I believe it important that we realize that at this time in the session there are always a number of very important major measures which must be considered.

We shall have conference reports, and we shall have the Japanese Treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will request be made that the Senate take up the Japanese Treaty on tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to talk to the Senator about that. I want to be agreeable to anything the Senator wishes. We have a difficult problem, because we have commitments which have been made prior to the time when we had any commitment on the Japanese Treaty. But I understand the Senator's problem, and I shall try to meet it.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONTRACT WITH UNION CARBIDE NUCLEAR CO., URAVAN, COLO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission contract AT(05-1)-36 with Union Carbide Nuclear Co., Uravan, Colo., for the procurement of uranium concentrates, December 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

WITHDRAWALS FROM THE PUBLIC DOMAIN OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command Training Site, Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958 (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the South Carolina State Association of Life Underwriters, remonstrating against the use of insurance terminology in the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Two petitions signed by Eugenia Vasiliev, and sundry other anti-Communist American citizens of Russian descent, relating to amendments to Public Law 86-90, concerning the Week of Subjugated Nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when our good friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] announced his plans for retirement, both the Members of this body and the press of the Nation extolled his record of yeoman service to the Nation.

They were unanimous that he had made a great contribution to the welfare of his country, just as we are unanimous in the realization that next year we shall be most aware of his absence from this floor and the committee rooms where he accomplished so much.

But I think that perhaps nowhere were these thoughts more aptly expressed, and the affection and esteem of his home State more singularly demonstrated, than by a group from the Fort Belknap Indian Community. The community council at Harlem, Mont., unanimously approved a resolution thanking—as they put it—their "great and true friend."

I ask unanimous consent that this significant and welcome resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

"RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE FORT BELKNAP INDIAN COMMUNITY, AN INDIAN-CHARTERED CORPORATION

"Whereas the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, senior Senator from Montana, has served the people of the State of Montana and the people of the United States of America for 24 years; and

"Whereas on the 28th day of April 1960, he announced his intention not to seek reelection; and

"Whereas the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY has for his entire period of service in the Senate of the United States shown a special

interest in the problems of the Indian people of his State and of his Nation; and

"Whereas there is on the statute books of the United States, hundreds of laws benefiting the Indian people of the United States; and

"Whereas through his entire service in the Senate of the United States, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY has been a friend of the people of the Fort Belknap Reservation and always attentive to their needs; and

"Whereas the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY has given unselfishly of his time to assist the individual members of the Fort Belknap Community and the Tribal Council of the Fort Belknap Community: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Tribal Council of the Fort Belknap Community, representing every member of the community, go on record as expressing their appreciation for the services rendered to this community and their love and affection for a great Senator and fellow Montanan; and be it further

"Resolved, That the tribal council, expressing for themselves and their people, wish to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, senior Senator from Montana, their hope that he will live long and well and that he will forever remember that the people of this community will carry him in their hearts and their prayers and remember him forever as a great and true friend."

CERTIFICATION

I, the undersigned, as secretary of the Fort Belknap Indian Community Council of the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, hereby certify that the Fort Belknap Community Council is composed of 12 members, of whom 10 members, constituting a quorum, were present at a meeting thereof, duly and regularly called, noticed, convened, and held this 4th day of May 1960; that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at such a meeting by the affirmative vote of 10 for, 0 against, 2 absent, 0 not voting; and that the said resolution has not been rescinded in any way.

J. MATT BELL,
Chairman, the Fort Belknap Indian Community.

JAMES HAWLEY,
Secretary-Treasurer, Fort Belknap Agency, Harlem, Mont.

The following are the members of the Fort Belknap Community Council and hereby endorse this resolution: J. Matt Bell, chairman; Frank Kirkaldie, vice chairman; Gilbert Horn, council member; David J. Hawley II, Jr., council member; Preston Bell, council member; Rufus Warrior, council member; James Hawley, secretary-treasurer; George J. Fox I, sergeant at arms; Marguerite Cole, council member; Herbert Fish, council member; Andrew Gray, council member; Richard King, council member.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 3485. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1584); and

S. 3579. A bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1583).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 2712. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey all lands comprising Fort Dearborn, Rye, N.H., and Rye Air Force Base, Rye, N.H., to certain former owners of such lands (Rept. No. 1586);

S. 3487. A bill to amend the "Anti-Kickback Statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts (Rept. No. 1585); and

H.R. 766. An act to amend section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, relating to penalties for the use of Government-owned vehicles for other than official purposes (Rept. No. 1587).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 2919. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall study and investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden (Rept. No. 1589).

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3278. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas (Rept. No. 1591).

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 2917. A bill to establish a price-support level for milk and butterfat (Rept. No. 1592).

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES (S. REPT. 1590)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reported an original bill (S. 3672) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon; which bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

REPORT ENTITLED "GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH BUSINESS: LIQUID OXYGEN PRODUCTION" (S. REPT. 1588)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Small Business Committee, I send to the desk a report entitled "Government Competition with Business: Liquid Oxygen." This is based upon hearings held on May 12 and 13 by our Subcommittee on Relations of Business With Government and is a unanimous committee report. I ask that the report be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be submitted to the Senate today, from the Committee on the Judiciary, a report entitled "Juvenile Delinquency" pursuant to Senate Resolution 54, as extended.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be held open for the filing of individual views until midnight a week from Friday, which will be June 24, in order to make possible the printing of the report and the individual views in one document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY" (S. REPT. 1593)

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 54, as extended, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Juvenile Delinquency" and ask that it be printed subject to the unanimous consent agreement, previously agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement previously entered into.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Eighty-eight postmaster nominations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3671. A bill to facilitate the administrative operations of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3672. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when it was reported by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3673. A bill to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3674. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3675. A bill to establish a Peace Corps of young men to assist the peoples of underdeveloped areas of the world to learn the basic skills necessary to combat poverty, disease, illiteracy, and hunger; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3676. A bill for the relief of Sirkka Terasvuori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3677. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to redefine the term "new drug" and to provide for the licensing of persons engaged in the propagation, manufacture, or preparation of drugs dispensed only upon prescription, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3673) to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., June 6, 1960.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for legislation, to provide for emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation would authorize a system of ship warrants. It is based upon previous experience in World War II under Public Law 173, 77th Congress, approved July 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 591), and repealed July 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 449). The bill is strengthened in the light of certain shortcomings of the World War II law, which were met by administrative action and provision for which should be incorporated in the frame of the legislation.

The Department recommends enactment of this legislation. In addition to being an important authority as part of the readiness program in the interest of security, the legislation is desirable to meet the commitments on the part of the United States for exercising this authority in coordination with authority already adopted by various member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the event that coordination efforts of these nations become necessary.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The draft bill would authorize the President, during any period in which vessels may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1242), whenever he deems and proclaims it to be in the interest of national security or the maintenance of essential supplies and services, to prescribe regulations for the issuance and revocation of warrants and governing the use of services and facilities under the act with respect to any vessel using or seeking to use such services or facilities. Whenever the warrant system is prescribed, it shall terminate upon proclamation of the President to that effect, or as Congress by concurrent resolution may provide, and in any event the act itself will terminate 5 years after date of enactment.

The system of warrants for merchant vessels under the act is designed to enforce priorities in congested ports to those vessels of greater importance to our national security, to secure the maximum economic use of available vessels and port facilities and services, to prevent the waste of scarce materials and supplies in servicing vessels which might be engaged in activities harmful or less essential to the interest and programs of the United States, and to prevent unreasonable increases in charter hire and freight rates for ocean transportation. Such coordination in time of war or active mobilization is of high critical importance to the United States and to its allies or associates who will be exercising similar controls in the event that coordinated efforts of nations become necessary. Under the bill, vessels desiring to use the shore and port services or facilities or marine insurance services of this country would be required to secure a warrant or similar document as a condition to the use of such facilities or services. The use of these facilities or services would be prohibited to any vessel not having such a warrant.

As a condition on the receipt of a warrant, the vessel operator would be required to enter into undertakings with respect to the trade in which the vessels of the operator are employed, the voyages undertaken thereby, the passengers or cargoes to be carried, and to abide by fair and reasonable maximum charter and transportation charges. In determining such rates and charges, the President is directed to give due consideration to the valuation principles prescribed in section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1242). A breach of any undertaking would subject the operator to the forfeiture of his warrant and thereby the loss of use of port and shore facilities and services, as well as insurance for ship and cargo.

In considering applications for warrants, the President is authorized to consider certain circumstances, including the origin and previous operating history of the vessel, the price and terms upon which the vessel may have been sold or transferred, as well as the operating practices of the applicant. Such provision for withholding of warrants in cases where there is a history of failure to assist the Government or of activities hampering the Government's programs and objectives, has the objective of securing the most tonnage for services contributing to the purposes of the act.

The regulations under the act may be made applicable to the use of any facilities for loading, discharging, lightering, or storage of cargo, any facilities for the furnishing of oil, coal, or other fuel, supplies, stores, or food, or any facility for the overhauling, drydocking, reconditioning, or repair of vessels, or furnishing marine insurance. The President may except from the regulations types of vessels the control of which he determines not to be required for the purposes of the act.

The proposed system of ship warrants for use in war or national emergency is not new or untried but is based upon previous experience in World War II under Public Law 173, 77th Congress, approved July 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 591), and repealed July 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 449). The bill is strengthened in the light of certain shortcomings of the World War II law, which were met by administrative action and which should be incorporated in the frame of the legislation.

In any emergency period requiring mobilization of the Nation's shipping and other resources involving great acceleration of the use of supply and repair facilities for shipping, ports will be subject to congestion and strain. In such times it will be vitally important to carefully control the use of vessels in the movement of cargoes. The international character of shipping makes special provisions of law desirable in order to prevent deterioration in the situation of our country and any allied or associated countries. To have statutory authority available will have the ultimate advantage of securing for the United States and cooperating nations the use of tonnage from the world's supply. The existing large Government-owned reserve fleet of merchant vessels is now 12 to 18 years old and is not in itself a guarantee of national safety so far as shipping facilities in time of war or defense emergency are concerned. No matter how well maintained a reserve fleet may be it takes at least some days to move it into operation. Tonnage and control of operating tonnage will be immediately vital in the event of attack which, it must be assumed, will be sudden and sweeping in scope.

The bill contains several sections of a supplementary or administrative character which will be noted section by section.

Section 3 provides that operators of listed facilities in the United States and places within its jurisdiction shall be governed by the regulations regardless of existing contracts.

Section 5 provides that it shall be the policy of the United States to coordinate the authority granted by the act with the exercise of similar authority by allied or associated nations.

Section 6 defines the word "person" so as to include any entity capable of entering into a contract.

Section 7 is an interpretative provision to prevent the imposition of any condition, that a vessel owner relinquish the care and supply of his vessel to any other person.

Section 8 is designed to preserve the coastwise laws of the United States from modification, but does not exempt vessels engaged in coastwise trade from the provisions of the act. This section also provides that the act is in no way to affect authority already granted by the Defense Production Act (extended in part until June 30, 1960). A severability clause is included.

Section 9 authorizes the President to delegate any power and authority conferred on him by the act (except the issuance of proclamations) to the Secretary of Commerce or the head of a department or agency deemed appropriate by the President, and authorizes redelegation of such authority to

appropriate officials in the department or agency. Provision is also made for interdepartmental coordination in carrying out programs under the act in relation to other programs of the Government.

Section 10 exempts the functions exercised under the act from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (except as to section 3 thereof, which contains requirements as to notice to the public, and provides also that no secret matter need be published).

Section 11 provides penalties for violation of the act, the regulations, or orders issued, with a maximum penalty of $10,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment. U.S. courts having territorial jurisdiction are given jurisdiction over offenses.

Section 12 relieves persons who comply with rules, regulations, or orders issued under the act, from damages or penalties resulting from compliance, notwithstanding that such rule, regulation, or order may be declared invalid by judicial or other competent authority.

The Department recommends early consideration and enactment of this legislation. In addition to being an important emergency authority as part of the readiness program in the interest of national security, the legislation is desirable to meet the commitments on the part of the United States for exercising this authority in coordination with authority already adopted by various member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the event that coordinated efforts of these nations become necessary.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JACKSON (for himself, and Senators AIKEN, ENGLE, ERVIN, THURMOND, and CANNON) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11998, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

DETENTION OF MAIL FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill—S. 3654—to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes, introduced by me on June 9, 1960.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 14, 1960, the names of Senators HUMPHREY, CLARK, and BUTLER, were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. KERR (for himself and other Senators), to the bill (H.R. 11390), the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, 1961, submitted on June 14, 1960.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL ENTITLED "REFUSALS TO THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE OF ACCESS TO RECORDS OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES" (S. DOC. NO. 108)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit herewith a report prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States on "Refusals to the General Accounting Office of Access to Records of the Executive Departments and Agencies," and ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The information contained in this report was compiled by the Comptroller General in order that interested committees of the Congress might be fully informed relative to certain difficulties he has encountered in obtaining information from agencies of the Federal Government required in exercising his statutory responsibility to provide the Congress with information relative to the fiscal operations of Federal departments and agencies.

The report, consisting of only 13 pages, has been approved unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a hearing has been scheduled for 10:30 a.m., Thursday, June 23, 1960, in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nominations of Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1960, vice R. Lockwood Jones, resigned, and a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1965.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested may make such representations as are pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

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

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address entitled "The Fullness of Life," delivered by Senator FONG of Hawaii, at Tufts University commencement exercises, Medford, Mass., June 12, 1960.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1185. An act to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be lost as the result of the construction of a dam;

S. 1358. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes;

S. 1892. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Norman project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 2327. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

S. 2439. An act to authorize certain teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to count as creditable service for retirement purposes certain periods of authorized leave without pay taken by such teachers for educational purposes;

S. 2954. An act to exempt from the District of Columbia income tax compensation paid to alien employees by certain international organizations;

H.R. 10000. An act to amend further certain provisions of the District of Columbia tax laws relating to overpayments and refunds of taxes erroneously collected;

H.R. 10183. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10684. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10761. An act to provide for the representation of indigents in judicial proceedings in the District of Columbia; and

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to establish an objective for coordinating the development of the District of Columbia with the development of other areas in the Washington metropolitan region and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes.

NEEDED: MORE EFFECTIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AS "ANTIDOTES" TO DELINQUENCY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee issues its annual report. As a member of that subcommittee, I am particularly concerned with the revelation of the report reflecting a regrettable waste of human resources—in this case, youth, the Nation's most precious asset.

For the past 10 consecutive years, for example, there has been an increase in juvenile crime.

There are, of course, different views on the cause and cure of problems in this field. However, I believe there is a greater need for public understanding, as well as interest in and action toward resolving the problems confronting youth.

Overall, the report, I believe, will help to serve this objective.

Fundamentally, the study represents a factual, comprehensive report on the multitude of complex problems in this field. It is a unique assemblage of information, and includes coverage of:

The broad scope of complex problems of juvenile delinquency and the need for more comprehensive programs to deal with them;

A compendium of techniques now being utilized in communities throughout the country for coping with differing situations;

Recommendations for the care and feeding—that is, the handling and rehabilitation—of juveniles;

Of great significance, a review of youth development programs serving as antidotes to the spread of delinquency; and other invaluable information.

In reviewing the national picture of juvenile delinquency, legislative history, survey of current programs, and making recommendations for the future, the report, I believe, will helpfully serve Members of Congress in their efforts in this field.

In addition, the study will serve as a handy guide-manual for the many individuals, organizations, State and Federal agencies, and others of the general public who are attempting to cope with and resolve the difficult challenges.

Overall, the report reflects the far-reaching efforts of the subcommittee to obtain a comprehensive picture of the field through hearings in Washington and across the country; consultations with authorities on delinquency; broad research effort, including analyses of studies previously undertaken in the field; questioning of interviewees, including a great many youth out of step with society, falling into the category of delinquents; surveys through questions to obtain the views of judges, social workers, and other authorities in the field; and other efforts.

All of us realize, of course, that a study such as the annual report, issued, then perhaps forgotten and buried in file drawers or the archives, does not help Congress or the youths involved in this problem or the general public.

Recognizing these important factors, I wish to commend the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the staff director of the subcommittee, Mrs. Frankie Childers, for a splendid annual report, as well as an outstanding job of focusing the public eye and mind on the report and its value.

By an enterprising technique of prereleasing major findings of the subcommittee—data now highlighted in the annual report—it has been possible to bring to public and nationwide attention the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee. The objective—to a remarkable degree successfully achieved—has been to maximize interest in and, we hope, encourage and inspire efforts to deal with these great challenges.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a 10-point program for better meeting the problems of juvenile delinquency.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the following articles reviewing constructive efforts in Wisconsin to deal with problems of delinquency:

First. An article, published in the Janesville Daily Gazette, written by Bernice Warner and entitled "Probation Officer Says Juvenile Delinquency Is 'Product of the Times.' "

Second. An article, from the Green Bay Press-Gazette, written by Leigh Caldwell and entitled "Committee Studies Problems of Youth."

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

TEN-POINT PROGRAM FOR MEETING PROBLEMS OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(By Senator WILEY)

The Nation cannot afford to waste its most precious asset—youth. To the contrary, constructive, creative programs are needed not only for dealing more effectively with delinquency but also for sponsorship of more youth development programs as antidotes to delinquency.

Fundamentally, and most fruitfully, I believe we must take a positive, not a negative-approach to the challenges in this field. Among other objectives, these include more effective programs designed to challenge the talents, energies, imaginations and ingenuity into creative—not destructive—activities.

As President Eisenhower stated at the recent National Youth Conference:

"We must beware of a tendency to generalize pessimistically about our youth—to attribute to the many, the failures of the few. Such terms as 'lost,' 'misguided,' or 'offbeat,' each have had their counterpart in earlier generations.

"Civilization is a matter of spirit; of conviction and belief; of self-reliance and acceptance of responsibilities; of happiness in constructive work and service; of devotion to valued tradition. It is a religious faith; it is a shared attitude toward life and living which is felt and practiced by a whole people, into which each generation is born and nurtured through childhood to maturity."

In our earnest efforts to deal with the problems of delinquency, we must not be so concerned with the problem child or youthful offenders that we forget that the great majority of our youth is devoted to the pursuit of positive values—to self-improvement, the betterment of education and the fuller exploitation of human and spiritual resources.

Recognizing that there has been a regrettable increase in delinquency, however, the Nation—at local, State and, as necessary, Federal levels—must take action to deal with this problem. Basically, I believe that a constructive approach includes the following factors:

1. First and foremost, antidelinquency efforts are the responsibility of the home—of parents of America;

2. If the problem gets beyond the home on a broad-scope basis, then naturally the social forces in the community should take hold of the situation. These include churches, schools, parent-teacher associations, fraternal services, and veterans groups and other organizations, many of which are already doing a fine job in this field.

3. Local-State social services—in delinquency-struck communities—should undertake further efforts not only to deal with the delinquent child but also to provide counsel for the parents, in necessary cases.

4. Our courts and penal and correctional institutions need to be modernized, modified, and adequately staffed with judges and other trained personnel, in order more effectively to meet the unique problems of youth in a fast changing age.

5. As necessary, Federal laws need to be strengthened, to prohibit traffic of materials—including weapons, narcotics, obscene literature, and other items—that contribute to delinquency. In addition, tougher laws need to be enacted to punish violators of laws.

6. Call a halt to "adult delinquency" which often results in abandonment, if not in all cases, of the children themselves, or at least of a portion of their physical, psychological, and emotional needs.

7. The children of today—contrary to the popular concept that society owes them a living—should have instilled in them the realization that they, themselves, have an obligation to their parents and to society.

8. Delinquency knows no social, economic, environmental, or other boundaries. Consequently, there is a need for each community to analyze its own special needs and to design special programs to cope with the problems.

9. As a nation, we need to encourage high standards of presentation by our information media, including television, "funny" papers, "funny" books, radio, and other mediums, which, if presenting the wrong kind of "stuff," can adversely affect the youthful mind.

10. Our society, too, must not fail to stress in its news reporting and community-recognition programs the fact that more than 95 percent of our youth are conducting themselves dutifully, constructively, and creatively as keystones in home and community life.

Overall, it is highly important for us to create the kind of environment in which our youth—the most precious asset of our Nation—can have opportunity to fulfill a great, promising destiny.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette]

PROBATION OFFICER SAYS JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IS "PRODUCT OF THE TIMES"

(By Bernice Warner)

A "razor strop" approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency in the era of the electric razor just doesn't make sense to Robert MacMaster, who has been county juvenile probation officer long enough to know what he's talking about.

"The same men who recommend using the razor strop and the old-fashioned woodshed to reestablish much needed parental control are the ones who have bought the latest model electric razor and are heating their modern homes with gas or oil," MacMaster says.

Yet, while he decries the use of old-fashioned solutions for a modern problem, MacMaster's own personal prescription for curing juvenile delinquency ills is probably the oldest on record: "Live up to the 10 Commandments." Which, he admits, is much easier said than done.

Much of MacMaster's adult life has been spent working with the youth of the area, both in an official and unofficial capacity. County juvenile probation officer since July 1, 1944, he sees the present situation as a reflection of the times, with its tensions, its insecurities—and its prosperity.

BLAMES PROSPERITY

It's the prosperity, he feels, that is one of the greatest villains in the case.

The depression had its own problems, but it had the saving virtue of knitting families closely together, he points out. There was no money to spend on going out to find amusement, so many families made their own fun at home with the result that parents not only knew where the children were, they knew what they were doing.

That's just one of the angles which MacMaster likes to explore as a contributing cause of juvenile delinquency. There are many more, but they're all interrelated. In his opinion, other factors, not necessarily in the order of their importance, are:

Lack of parental control.

Failure of parents to accept total responsibility for their children.

Modern transportation.

"Easy" money.

Mental and emotional instability among young people.

Working mothers.

Fathers who work the night shifts.

Lack of strong religious principles, accompanied by a general lowering of moral standards.

The lack of parental control, which MacMaster puts high on the list, is an adult problem rather than a juvenile one. Those parents who teach their children a healthy respect for authority—and for property—whether in the home or outside it—almost automatically reap the benefits of parental control, he says. He is shocked by the general disrespect with which many young people treat those in authority, a disrespect which is often shown even in the courtroom.

"If a child doesn't learn respect at home, where will he learn it?" MacMaster asks. He himself learned it the hard way, he admits, but the habit of courtesy became so ingrained that to this day he uses the term "sir" automatically when talking to those in authority.

Orphaned at the age of 5, MacMaster was raised by an uncle and aunt, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Greene, in Chicago. His late uncle, associated with the Chicago Tribune for many years, was a stickler for courtesy and demanded that his young nephew address his elders as "sir" and "ma'am."

FORMER SALESMAN

As a boy, MacMaster attended Senn Technical School in Chicago and sold newspapers on the streets of Chicago to earn spending money. He attended Dunwiddie Institute, a technical training school for engineers, in Minnesota. Because of his health, he was advised to seek work that would allow him to be out-of-doors, and as a young man, MacMaster went on the road as a factory sales representative for the Maytag Co.

His traveling days came to an end when he married the former Elizabeth Caaps of Galesburg, Ill., and settled in Beloit. Always interested in young people, MacMaster soon became active in the YMCA and other organizations working with youth. He got into his present line of work through the side door directly as a result of his interest in young people. While MacMaster was bailiff of the Beloit Municipal Court, Judge Chester H. Christensen, then municipal judge, became familiar with his youth activities and asked if he would volunteer to help with the growing juvenile problem in Beloit. He sat in on conferences with the judge, met with the young people, heard their problems, and made suggestions to the court.

Soon he was devoting more and more time to working with juveniles who had gotten into trouble with the law. Eventually he was named probation officer and took over those duties on a full-time basis.

Then, with the outbreak of war, there was an alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. Mothers left their homes and families to work in defense plants, often earning more money than their husbands; fathers began going into service; there were many hasty war marriages with resultant divorces and broken homes, often involving children.

That, MacMaster feels, marked the period when family responsibility began to deteriorate. In an effort to keep up with the Joneses, many parents began seeking amusement away from the home, attempting to make up for their neglect of the children by giving them material advantages.

"Some of the worst parents are those who were children during the depression and had to get along without a lot of the things they thought were important," in MacMaster's opinion. "They make up their minds that their children are going to have all of the things their own parents couldn't afford to give them. They just don't seem to realize that children would rather have love, attention, and a sense of security."

By 1944, the Rock County Board of Supervisors, alert to the growing situation as to juvenile delinquency, voted to establish the post of juvenile probation officer to act as an arm of the Beloit and Janesville juvenile courts. MacMaster was appointed and for the next 6 years hundreds of delinquents, most of them boys, came under his guidance and jurisdiction.

MacMaster prefers to think of his work as coming under the heading of guidance rather than under its official name of county juvenile officer and spends much of his time working with the youthful offenders for their rehabilitation.

DEPARTMENT EXPANDED

By 1950, the number of girls placed on probation had grown to such an extent that the county authorized hiring an assistant, Mrs. Natalie Lyons, who is still with the department, in order to deal more effectively with that problem. The department now has another assistant, Peter Reese, an office secretary, Mrs. Priscilla Hamilton, and a student from Beloit College, Kay Kaminski. Under a recently inaugurated program, a college senior is selected by the department and by the college for a year's intraining service and this has worked out exceptionally well, the student receiving credit for his work and the department having the advantages of the student's services and youthful viewpoint.

"The students seem to be able to make contact with the youngsters very readily, probably because the age difference is smaller," MacMaster observes. "They can meet the boys and girls on their own ground and often succeed in gaining their faith and confidence. That's the important thing in working out their problems."

Often a juvenile must be removed from his own home and placed in new surroundings before anything can be accomplished, and in this area MacMaster finds his early training as a salesman comes in pretty handy. Finding foster homes for the youngsters constitutes one of the more difficult aspects of his job. It is also one of the most important, for often a youngster can be guided back into good, useful citizenship with the proper training and environment. MacMaster feels that Rock County has some wonderful people who have opened up their homes and their hearts to boys and girls who might otherwise never have the opportunity of knowing normal family relationships. In addition to private homes, juveniles from Rock County have been admitted to such institutions as the Lutheran home in Milwaukee, the Norris Farm School for Boys at Big Bend, the House of Good Shepherd, Milwaukee, and St. Michael's at La Crosse.

STRESSES INDIVIDUALISM

Rock County has an unusually low number of juveniles committed to State institutions, primarily because MacMaster feels that commitment is a "last ditch" measure. With State institutions overcrowded and understaffed, MacMaster thinks the situation is better handled on the local level whenever possible; as a matter of fact, he feels that each individual case must be solved individually and that there is no such thing as a mass answer to the problem.

Right now, MacMaster is concerned with detention facilities for juveniles, now quartered in the Rock County jail. When the old jail was declared unfit for the juvenile purpose by State officials, a detention home was established in a private home in Milton Junction and became such an outstanding project that it was widely publicized as being an effective means of rehabilitation. However, when the new jail was completed, separate quarters were provided in it for juveniles and the detention home was discontinued.

MacMaster would like to see a four-county detention home supported and used by Rock, Green, Jefferson, and Walworth Counties where juveniles could be given training and where rehabilitation work could be done effectively. Neither is possible under the present setup.

MacMaster is also perturbed about the increase of delinquency in the villages, small towns, and rural areas and with the indication that emotional and mental instability is becoming more apparent. Diagnostic center facilities are being used more frequently now than in the past, MacMaster says, laying the blame again on "the times" with the stresses and anxieties being transmitted to the young people.

PLENTY OF HEADACHES

While he admits that the department has had its failures, it has also had some successes in dealing with boys and girls under its jurisdiction and these are the cases that more than make up for the many headaches of being juvenile officer. And there are plenty of headaches, MacMaster admits, explaining that the only way one can continue in the work is to "leave the problems in the office."

Mondays he spends in the county at large; Tuesdays and Thursdays at Beloit, and Wednesdays and Fridays in his office in the Rock County Courthouse. His assistants also follow a varying schedule that provides complete county coverage.

An enthusiastic member of the Rotary Club, MacMaster was named governor of District 210, Rotary International, in 1954. Mr. and Mrs. MacMaster have three children, two daughters, Mary Elizabeth, 20, in her second year of nurses' training at Madison; Ruth Roine, 18, who will graduate from Beloit High School in June; and a son, John, 10, a fourth grader at Cunningham School in Beloit, where the family lives.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette of June 7, 1960]

COMMITTEE STUDIES PROBLEMS OF YOUTH—EIGHT OCONTO COUNTY PEOPLE CONSIDER FUTURE CITIZENSHIP

(By Leigh Caldwell)

OCONTO—"How can the youth of today be given the opportunities they deserve which will best prepare them for the future?"

That was the question uppermost in the minds of eight Oconto County citizens when they organized an advisory committee for youth in January 1959. "Can we as citizens make a better community for our children?" the committee asked itself.

Attacking the problem were these members of the committee: Herb Buseman Gillett, chairman; Pat Gauthier, Suring; Art Odau, Robert Shellman and E. A. Moede, Oconto Falls; Bernard Stodola, Coleman; Janice Heineman, Pulaski, and Mrs. Reuben Timm, Gillett.

The committee sought to establish what problems existed, what alternative solutions were available, and then to suggest procedures for solving the problems.

An early demand was to know the present situation by the use of facts. The Welfare Department was called upon to establish the degree of delinquency in the county. The Rev. Merlin Sasman, child welfare worker, and James Leschke, juvenile probation officer, gave background information on the national, State and county situation.

MAJOR PROBLEMS LISTED

After thoroughly discussing how important each youth opportunity is, and their varied reactions in the lives of young people, these major problems were identified:

1. Parents need education on the needs of youth and how to effectively satisfy their needs. (The youth situation in Oconto County is to be used to alert parents to the problems.)

2. Delinquency has increased and the number of cases requiring court action has increased in Oconto County as well as the Nation.

3. Teenagers have too much money to spend and not enough guidance in the use of their money. Advertising is suggested on such problems as drinking, smoking, and automobiles.

4. Teenagers are not given enough recreational opportunities that are wholesome and appealing.

PARENTS ARE LAX

5. Parents are lax in setting standards for youth.

6. Parents lose control of their children when the children are too young.

7. Youth are not properly informed about the reasons for a law being stated as it is.

8. Society has encouraged conformity among groups which has discouraged the "brain" as well as the correction among problem groups.

9. There is not enough parental leadership for youth groups.

10. Prospective members and parents of prospective members as well as parents of members of youth groups are not properly informed or convinced of the values of youth organizations and the role that they must assume.

PANEL IS PLANNED

The youth committee gained a good understanding of problems as viewed by people in different areas of the county. A panel discussion is being planned to discuss such questions as the part parents can play toward building good citizenship, public service and improving community activities that help to mold the future of their children and how are parents delinquent.

The panel to discuss these and similar questions will include a teacher, youth leader, church representative, welfare worker, and youth representaives. The panel will get the facts, compile the information and offer the program to any interested groups.

SERIES OF CLASSES

A second recommendation was to plan a series of classes on understanding the needs of youth. Topics for which training would be given include: How can parents, lay people, citizens and educators help improve the community, how can youth inform their parents of their failings, how do we understand youth, and how do we sell them on the fact that we are trying to help them.

Another suggestion was for the forming of study groups with references and bibliographies for studying child development.

The youth committee has made known that its sincere desire is to help parents and to build a better community in which Oconto County children can grow up.

PROBLEM OF OUR FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the May issue of the Atlantic, Prof. Edward S. Mason, of Harvard, has written an article entitled "Foreign Money We Can't Spend." This article deals with one of the most abstruse and difficult subjects with which this body has to deal, that is, the problem of our foreign currencies, especially those accumulating under the operations of Public Law 480. I believe there is much misunderstanding of this subject, and I urge my colleagues to take the time to read this article, which is the best I have seen on the subject.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

FOREIGN MONEY WE CAN'T SPEND

(By Edward S. Mason)

During the early days of the Marshall plan in Europe, a comforting belief developed that a way had been found to make one dollar do the work of two. American dollars appropriated by Congress to promote European recovery were spent for U.S. exports of food, petroleum, and other goods to supply Europe's needs. When these goods arrived abroad, they were sold for pounds, francs, or lire, and the proceeds of these sales accrued to the governments in question as additional revenues. Thus, the countries being assisted acquired American goods, and their governments received the dollar equivalent of these goods in the form of local currencies that then became available to finance reconstruction and recovery.

The currencies received by foreign governments as a result of these transactions were called counterpart funds, and although they were owned by the governments in question, the United States retained a veto on their use. The support in this country for the veto power arose in part from the belief that the United States should participate in determining not only the use of the first dollar, spent for American goods, but also the use of the second dollar generated from the sale of these goods. If $2 worth in recovery was being accomplished for every dollar spent, why should the United States not participate to the full in what was, after all, a mutual recovery program?

Now it does not take much reflection—nor did it then—to discover that, in fact, one dollar cannot do the work of two. The only addition to European resources was the receipt of goods from abroad financed by the Marshall plan appropriations. To be sure, the sale of these goods increased the revenues of governments in pounds, francs, or lire. But the receipt of these currencies added nothing further to available resources. Moreover, these governments were, in general, free to acquire additional quantities of their own currencies by taxation, by borrowing from their citizens or from the central bank, or by printing money.

The most conspicuous exception was Germany. The havoc of war had so disrupted the fiscal and banking system that the German Government, initially in the hands of the occupying powers, was unable by taxation or borrowing to acquire control of adequate quantities of its own currency. The proceeds of sales of Marshall plan deliveries provided a useful supplement.

In Britain the fiction of double-duty dollars was from the beginning recognized as a fiction. The United States wisely never attempted to influence the use by the British Government of its revenue receipts. Elsewhere, and particularly in France and Italy, attempts to influence the Governments' use of counterpart were easily circumvented, and usually resented.

It is worth recalling this early experience with Marshhall plan counterpart funds because, in its current programs of assistance to underdeveloped areas, the United States seems to be engaging in a colossal piece of self-deception. The double-duty dollars are back on the scene in a big way, and as American holdings of rupees, kyats, rupias, and rials accumulate around the world, all sorts of grandiose schemes for saving humanity through the use of these currencies are being concocted.

Counterpart funds, whatever their basic irrelevance to the problem of European recovery, had at least the merit of being self-liquidating. Although the United States possessed a veto power with respect to their use, once an agreed use was found they were spent and thus were written off the books so far as we were concerned. By the end of fiscal year 1958, counterpart funds held by European countries had been reduced to $255 million and were declining rapidly. And although counterpart funds held by Asian countries were substantially larger, their disposition represents no insuperable problem.

This is not true of U.S.-owned foreign currencies, which in some countries are accumulating at a devastating rate. Currently we own slightly more than $3 billion in local currencies, mainly Asian, and our holdings are, or will shortly be, increasing at the rate of $2 billion a year. In another 4 years we shall probably own $10 to $11 billion, and if our aid program continues at the present rate for another 25 years we may well own all of Asia. Of course, this ownership is as phony as a $3 bill, but the potential political repercussions are not at all phony, either in Asia or the United States.

The large-scale accumulation of U.S.-owned local currencies may be said to have begun in 1954 with the enactment of current legislation to dispose of our agricultural surplus. This enactment more or less coincided with a rather pronounced shift in our foreign aid programs away from grants in the direction of loans. At present, Public Law 480, which governs the disposal of agricultural surpluses, and the Development Loan Fund are the principal generators of local currencies. Public Law 480 currently generates about $900 million a year, and the DLF generates $500 to $600 million more. But this is not all. Local currencies once accumulated by the United States are lent and re-lent to the receiving countries at 4-percent interest. Moreover, until recently Public Law 480 loans were accompanied by a maintenance-of-value clause, which said, in effect, that if the borrowing country depreciates its currency, the amount owed to the United States shall be increased proportionately. DLF loans still carry this provision. This combination of large annual accretions plus interest payments plus maintenance of value may be expected to increase American holdings of foreign currencies at an extremely rapid pace.

The insistence on selling agricultural surpluses and the shift in economic assistance from grants toward loans represented a rather strong political reaction in this country against giveaway programs. Once political leaders who recognized the importance of economic assistance to the foreign policy of the United States became convinced that appropriations could be most easily maintained and increased by accenting loans and sales rather than grants and gifts, the line hardened. By now Public Law 480 and the Development Loan Fund are, speaking generally, the most acceptable parts of our economic assistance policy. And strong political forces have coalesced around them.

It may be useful at this point to reflect for a moment on the meaning of "giveaway." The sale abroad of American goods for currencies that can be used to finance American imports is obviously not a giveaway. But the currencies now being accumulated by the United States in connection with economic assistance cannot be so used. A loan abroad in expectation of repayment of interest and principal in dollars is clearly not a giveaway. But DLF local currency loans are made with little hope of dollar repayment. Whether Public Law 480 sales and DLF local currency loans are giveaways

in the economic sense of the term depends on whether the local currencies acquired have any economic value to us.

In fact, we are lending and selling for currencies which, in a number of countries, are of little present or potential future value. Regardless of the words used or their political connotation, we are still, in the economic sense of the term, engaged in a giveaway program. And in pursuit of the impossible economic quid pro quo, we are adopting measures and pursuing methods that inevitably sabotage the real objectives of foreign assistance. We continue to lend at a 4-percent return in currencies that have no value to us, while the Russians lend at 2 or 2½ percent for currencies they can use. We are piling up our unusable holdings of these currencies on a scale that will inevitably cause alarm and resentment in the countries affected.

Rupees, kyats, baht, rupiah, and the like look like money and feel like money, but in the form of U.S. holdings abroad and under the conditions on which they are held, they are, in the main, not money for our purposes. We can use this money for Embassy expenditures, the local costs of economic and military missions, the acquisition of additions to our already redundant raw material stockpiles, and loans to American firms operating abroad. This may account for 35 percent of our holdings. What about the other 65 percent? American holdings of Indian rupees are now approaching the equivalent of $800 million. In the course of the next 3 years, these holdings can easily approach $2.5 billion. Now $2.5 billion in relation to the Indian national income is roughly equivalent to $35 billion in this country. Imagine the reaction in the United States if a foreign country, no matter how friendly, held $35 billion in our currency. The inevitable reaction to the currently much smaller holdings is already in evidence in Asia, not necessarily from governments, but from the Communists and from opposition parties.

Faced with this reaction, American representatives abroad make every effort to get these holdings off the book by lending them to the local government. It may be suggested in Delhi that, if the Indian Government does not borrow the local currency proceeds of surplus crop sales, agricultural commodities may not be available for local currency purchases next year. The Indians must know, considering the anxiety in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to get rid of these surpluses, that this is a fairly empty threat. But the representatives of Asian governments in Washington are generally aware of the necessity of playing the game. If they borrow what they are told to borrow, then current American holdings of local currencies will not be so embarrassingly large.

It should be obvious that, at best, this is a temporary expedient. Why, apart from playing the game, should a country having an adequate fiscal and banking system want to borrow its own currency at 4 percent and have to listen to American advice on how this currency should be used in the bargain? In Burma, a recent request that the Government borrow from the U.S. holdings that were getting uncomfortably large met with the reply that the Burmese Government could borrow from its own Central Bank at 1 percent.

The accumulation of American-owned local currencies not only causes anxiety abroad; it is the source of difficulties at home. When the administration goes annually to Congress for foreign aid appropriations, the question is invariably asked: Why do you need more, when you already have $2 billion plus uncommitted and unspent in foreign parts? Then begins the difficult task of unsaying what has been said on another occasion. It is explained that, although the agricultural surpluses were sold and not given away, the money acquired by the United States cannot be used to assist in further development. Local currencies accumulated are no substitute for dollars.

If we attempt to use our stock of, say, Pakistani rupees for a world health program, in effect it means that the very scarce supply of resources available for Pakistan's economic development is diverted to other purposes. This sort of diversion is tolerable within the context of a foreign assistance program only if it takes place on a very small scale, as, for example, in the Fulbright program. Here, small amounts of local currencies are used to cover the costs of American students and scholars abroad or the local currency expenses of foreign students coming to the United States, to purchase foreign books for American libraries, and for other purposes. This diversion of a country's resources is tolerable because it is small, but any attempt to use our currencies on a large scale for these or other worthy purposes would be a serious negation of a development program.

The disposal of agricultural surpluses abroad can, and frequently does, make a highly important contribution to maintaining minimum standards of living and promoting economic growth. Development programs in many countries are inflationary, and the injection into the economy of food shipments from the United States can have a moderating influence on the upward movement of prices. Countries like India and Pakistan which are deficient in food production find it possible, because of the U.S. disposal program, to save for development purposes scarce foreign exchange that would otherwise have to be used for food imports.

If we wish to make a further contribution to the development of the receiving country, we have a choice between financing, through local currency loans, either projects which the receiving country planned to undertake in any case or projects which lie outside the country's own development program. If we do the former, we may, it is true, permit the receiving country to retire some of the domestically held debt in favor of increased local currency obligations to the United States, or perhaps to moderate the level of taxation, but so far as real resources are concerned, the picture is unchanged. If, instead of supporting a planned development project, we insist that our local currency loan be used for purposes outside the development program, we are probably promoting inflation as well as diverting scarce foreign exchange away from uses that the receiving country considers more important.

The development programs of almost every underdeveloped country are large enough to produce inflationary consequences. Almost all of these countries are attempting to invest more than voluntary savings plus tax receipts will permit. There is therefore a continuous upward pressure on prices. If we were content to supply goods under our foreign aid programs without spending the local currency proceeds, we could exercise a helpful moderating influence on this upward movement. If we lend these proceeds for purposes to which the receiving country is already committed, the moderating influence is still exerted, though we will in time accumulate large volumes of local currencies. If we lend for purposes outside the development program, we not only overaccumulate but we prevent our assistance from moderating serious inflationary tendencies.

All things considered, the best disposition of the vast bulk of local currency accumulations would be for us to grant them back for debt retirement or any other purpose deemed proper by the receiving country. Alternatively, we could burn them, though this would involve the country in the additional expense of printing new currency notes. A recent suggestion by Undersecretary Dillon that U.S. counterpart in Greece be used for debt reduction met with a storm of protest. Why, it was implied, should currencies held or controlled by the United States be used for debt retirement abroad when the American Government is forced continually to add to its debt at home? This attitude is one of the consequences of treating local currency holdings or counterpart as something of value, as real money. Whether the Greek Government uses American counterpart to retire debt or not, the American debt position remains the same.

There are, however, two matters of legitimate concern to Congress and to American citizens that frequently arise in local currency discussions. Since political objectives are of primary concern in our foreign aid policy, it is both legitimate and important that we make what political capital we can from our assistance. And since the chief route to all our objectives in the underdeveloped world is economic growth, we have a deep interest in ensuring that our assistance is reasonably related to economic growth. There is every reason that the citizens of these countries should know about our assistance and, for far as possible, be permitted to see its tangible results.

This does not, however, seem to be the way we go about it. Instead, we make every effort to convince ourselves and everyone else that we are not giving assistance at all but are engaged in a hard headed program of sales and loans for value received. And we kid ourselves into the belief that with the local currencies we receive from these loans and sales we are in a position to exert great and favorable influence on public opinion and on economic growth.

Why can't we, it is asked, use our local currency holdings to build a series of up-to-date hospitals throughout southern Asia? This would be tangible evidence for all to see of American concern with the well-being of the downtrodden, a great propaganda gesture. Certainly Asia needs hospitals. But more considerations impinge on a decision of this sort than meet the eye. First, the resources required for the building and equipping of modern hospitals are not all available in most Asian countries. A substantial part of these requirements would have to be imported, and U.S. local currency holdings are, by agreement, not convertible into foreign exchange. Second, although Asia needs hospitals, it needs everything else too, and a large hospital program, desirable as this may be, does not necessarily represent the best use of resources. Third, the construction of hospitals, and of almost everything else, originates a continuous requirement for maintenance and staffing that the host country may be unwilling or unable to assume. Examples are not lacking in Asia and elsewhere of U.S.-encouraged enterprises that have fallen into disuse because the receiving country was loath to assume the burden of continued operation.

The point of all this is not that the United States should refrain from insisting on a use of its aid which is considered to be politically advantageous to us. But the assistance and the proposed direction of use should be manifested at the time that the host country is receiving something it considers of value. Furthermore, the bargaining position of the United States is likely to be better if our aid is recognized as aid and not disguised as a phony sale. In any case, the occasion on which the United States attempts to lend the receiving country its own currency is not the appropriate time for us to begin to throw our weight around.

We can, of course, refuse to lend for what we consider to be undesirable purposes, through the Development Loan Fund, Export-Import Bank, and such influences as we have on the International Bank. But it is always possible for the country in question to use our loans and grants for mutually agreed purposes and divert its own resources

into channels considered by us to be inappropriate. If we are to exercise any substantial influence on the overall direction of a development program, it can only be through the process by which goods and services are provided via loans, grants, or "sales." The local currencies accruing from these loans and sales provide us with no additional bargaining power.

Finally, the lending of local currencies is accompanied by legal restrictions that are frequently a source of extreme irritation. Since the fiction is maintained, at least in the United States, that these currencies have value, loans are made with all the usual conditions laid down by Congress and applied by the General Accounting Office. A sizable percentage of these loans are made to finance publicly owned enterprises. And since these enterprises are tied in closely with Government departments and ministries, a close exercise of the auditing functions is likely to lead U.S. investigators rather deeply into the affairs of the borrowing government—a situation which engenders further resentment.

It has been implied so far in this discussion that the United States can make little use of the local currency generated by aid shipments, either to help countries receiving assistance or to help us. In general, this is true. But there are exceptions. In a number of Far Eastern countries lacking adequate fiscal and banking systems, the local currency generated by the sale of U.S. goods is the principal support of government services. In Vietnam, for example, approximately three quarters of the minimum import requirements are covered by the shipment of U.S. goods. And the sale of these goods for Vietnamese currency provides the local government with about two-thirds of its revenue receipts. In the absence of this source of funds the government would collapse, with serious consequences to our security position in southeast Asia. The situation in Laos and Cambodia is roughly similar.

Assistance to these three countries and to certain others mainly takes the form of defense support. Here the local currency generated by the sale of assistance imports is granted as counterpart to the countries in question. But defense support, as a category of foreign aid, is meeting increasing resistance in Congress. The predilection for loans, even when repayment is out of the question, continues to grow. If its own currencies were lent rather than granted to the Vietnamese government, its source of revenues would be the same as at present. The only difference is that the United States would accumulate these currencies at the rate of about $250 million a year, with no hope of repayment now or in the future.

At the other end of the development scale are countries to which local currency loans offer some—albeit remote—prospect of repayment in dollars. These countries are few, and the amounts involved are small. Yet these highly untypical situations tend to be used as the general justification for local currency loans. The advantage of such loans, the argument runs, is their flexibility. Developing countries, it is true, are unable to service loans in dollars at present, but with development their ability to do so will increase. At some future time, the argument runs, we can reassess the whole situation, take our repayments of principal and interest in dollars where it is possible to do so without checking development, and write off the rest.

This might be a plausible course of action if the continuous accumulation of massive local currency holdings had no adverse repercussions at home or abroad, if the fiction of loans and sales were not an obvious impediment to the attainment of our political and security objects, and if the persistent process of lending and accounting for local currencies could be carried on without irksome intervention and surveillance in the borrowing countries. As it happens, however, none of these conditions can be fulfilled. The fact that certain small quantities of local currencies in certain countries can perhaps be recovered in dollars can no longer be used as a justification for the accumulation now looming on the horizon.

The first and most obvious corrective step that needs to be undertaken is to eliminate the phony sales of agricultural surpluses. Although this form of economic assistance needs to be used with careful regard to the interests of other exporting countries and to its impact on agricultural development in receiving countries, there are enormous opportunities here for an effective contribution toward meeting the problems of the underdeveloped world. A wise use of our agricultural surpluses can contribute not only to our long-run objectives, but can yield more immediate political capital. But a sale of these surpluses, followed by attempts to lend the local currency receipts, goes far to cancel most of these potential advantages while piling up large stocks of unusable money.

The other principal generator of U.S.-owned local currencies, the Development Loan Fund, can lend both for dollars and for local currencies, but four-fifths of the loans made to date are of the latter character. And they should be, if the Fund is to make its proper contribution to economic development. The Development Loan Fund is a relatively new institution, and, therefore, the process of repayment and relending of local currencies at 4 percent, which will inevitably accentuate our excessive accumulation, is not yet well under way. Consequently, if we take immediate steps to cancel the effect of the sales of Public Law 480 surpluses, we shall have time for a serious reconsideration of the terms on which economic assistance through the DLF can effectively be provided. But unless and until this is done, Uncle Sam's foreign funny money will continue to expand like a tub full of Asian steamed rice.

TRIBUTE TO FOREST SERVICE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is easy to criticize, and finding fault with the different bureaus of Government and with their employees seems at times to gain the proportions of a national pastime. It is, therefore, very pleasant to be able to extend accolades to a division of our Government, and particularly to the people who run it. It is with great pleasure that I rise today to salute the Forest Service, and in particular a number of its officials who have by their understanding created, with the cooperation of a group of citizens in Arizona, a very unique playground out of land that was of little value to either the citizenry or the Forest Service prior to this venture.

Early in 1950 a group of individuals living in McNary and Pinetop, Ariz., two very small communities in northeastern Arizona, seeking to diversify the recreational attractions of that area, attempted to promote a golf course there. Because of lack of transportation, communication, and definite knowledge of requirements, they gave up this project, and it lay dormant until 1953. Again in that year these same people contacted one of Arizona's greatest sportsmen, Mr. Milton Coggins, of Phoenix, for his advice on reviving this idea. Mr. Coggins met with Mr. Hollis Palmer, of the Forest Service, and looked over a triangular area of approximately 1,000 acres, bordered on the south by the Apache Indian Reservation and on the east and north by the highway between Pinetop and McNary. This was forest land that had been cut over many times and was of very little commercial value. Because of the terrain and the tremendous amount of rock, the undertaking looked almost impossible, but the group was assured by the Forest Service of complete cooperation.

Late in 1953 another meeting was held with Mr. C. K. Spaulding and Mr. Hollis Palmer, both of the Forest Service, stationed in Holbrook, and Mr. John A. Sierker and Ed Cliff, out of the Washington office. They again assured the group that they would more than cooperate in any manner possible to promote this golf course and a summer home area.

It is well to point out that this area was generally known as the back country and while it has always offered fine fishing and hunting, there has been nothing for the fisherman's or hunter's family to do and no golf facilities for the attraction of the general public. This area, I might say, has a delightful summer climate, as one would expect it to have, nestled 7,000 feet above sea level on the slopes of the White Mountain. This feature alone, if facilities were available, would attract thousands of people from the hot dry deserts 150 miles to the south.

After the full cooperation of the Forest Service was assured, a nonprofit corporation was formed, known as the White Mountain Country Club. Some 300 memberships were sold, and early in the spring of 1955 construction began. With the full cooperation of the Southwest Lumber Mills, local residents, and several Arizona contractors, the club completed a nine-hole golf course estimated to be worth some $80,000. Homesites were surveyed around the course, and by the end of 1956 there were approximately 100 summer homes constructed and being occupied. By 1957 the number of homes exceeded 200, and in 1958, with the continuing assurance of the Forest Service, in the form of a visit by Mr. Fred Kennedy, the regional forester, and Mr. Zane Smith, of his office, further homesites were developed. So popular had this cooperative development become by the end of 1957 that the small nine-hole golf course was accommodating 12,000 rounds of golf a season, the season lasting roughly from May 1 through Labor Day.

In the interim, contributions from the members of the club had made possible a swimming pool and the clubhouse facilities had been increased. The club facilities, however, were badly overcrowded, and in 1958 a group of the members agreed to borrow the money necessary to complete the second nine holes of the course. The Forest Service arranged to lease 35 acres for the first 9 holes at 50 cents an acre, and the second 9 holes, or 50 acres, is leased on a percentage basis, which will give one an idea of how the value of the land has increased due to the development of this recreational area. Of course, being constructed on forest land, it is

semipublic in nature in that it is open to the people who are not members of the club.

My purpose in complimenting the Forest Service on this fine example of cooperation is to point out that if this same attitude prevailed throughout the United States, many acres of less valuable timberland could be similarly developed to the overwhelming benefit of those directly concerned, the public in general who will flock to these areas, and to the immediate towns located in the areas. This has been the stimulus that is developing the White Mountain region of Arizona into one of the greatest recreational areas in the entire United States, and I wish to express the satisfaction of Arizona citizens for the help, consideration, and cooperation of the U.S. Forest Service, and in particular those men in the regional and local offices who made this possible.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL CARE HOPES NOW REST SOLELY ON SENATE ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, letters continue to pour into my office asking what has happened to congressional action on medical aid for aged—and I must give these constituents a simple and honest answer, one that all of us in the Senate must face.

Adequate legislation for health insurance for the aged, on which millions upon millions of our senior citizens have pinned their hopes for adequate medical care in their declining years, has been seriously endangered by committee action in the House.

The last chance of all these people, and, indeed, the great and unavoidable moral responsibility for early and effective action now rests squarely with the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a typical letter expressing the desperate hope of our senior citizens be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEAR SENATOR: With hospital rooms costing as much as $20 a day and doctors charging all the traffic will bear, what happened to the Forand bill which was to add medical and nursing compensation to social security.

If the Government can allot billions for foreign aid why should the American taxpayers be given only a few crumbs at a time when they are no longer wanted by industry or commerce, nor do their children want to share the responsibility of their care if they are unfortunate enough to get sick. Many oldsters face abandonment, neglect and despair at a time when they are no longer able to fend for themselves.

Don't forget most of them paid taxes for more than 50 years.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

MASS DEPORTATIONS OF MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN FROM BALTIC NATIONS A CRIME OF GIGANTIC MAGNITUDE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the year 1940 there occurred a crime of such magnitude that its full dimensions have never been grasped by the people of the world. I refer to the mass deportations of many thousands of men, women, and children to Siberia from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Only for a short time in the course of their modern history were the unhappy peoples of the three Baltic countries allowed to live in peace and relative prosperity in their homelands. After suffering under alien yokes for centuries, at last they regained their freedom and independence at the end of World War I. Then for about two decades they lived at peace, seeking happiness in their work of rebuilding their war-ravaged homelands and in strengthening democratic institutions there. But international forces over which they had no control brought tragedy to the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples.

Soon after the outbreak of the last war Stalin's Red army treacherously attacked and occupied these three countries, and then deported hundreds of thousands of the inhabitants, in June of 1940, to desolate parts of the Soviet Union. It is the sad anniversary of that event that is being observed today, and I join these brave peoples in the commemoration of that tragic event, the forced deportation of the Baltic peoples by the Soviet authorities from their historic homes.

FLAG DAY, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks which I prepared for delivery yesterday and was unable to present, be incorporated in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FLAG DAY 1960—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

While Flag Day rightfully is an occasion for colorful orations, I would like to confine myself for a few moments to a discussion of a portion of the history of the American flag.

Our Continental Congress appointed a committee to design a banner for the then young Republic, and a member of that committee is credited with writing the following description of the significance of the different parts of that flag.

It would do us all well in these troubled times and at a period when our President is in the Far East, to ponder over the words which that gentleman wrote back in 1777:

"The stars of the new flag represent the new constellation of States rising in the West. The idea was taken from the constellation of Lyra, which in the land of Orpheus signifies harmony. The blue in the field was taken from the edges of the Covenanter's banner, in Scotland, significant of the league—covenant of the United Colonies against oppression, incidentally involving the virtues of vigilance, perseverance, and justice.

"The stars were disposed in a circle symbolizing the perpetuity of the Union; the ring, like the serpent of the Egyptians, signifying eternity. The 13 stripes showed, with the stars, the number of United Colonies, and denoted the subordination of the States to the Union, as well as equality among themselves. The whole was the blending of the various flags of the army and the white ones of the floating batteries.

"The red color, which in Roman days was the signal of defiance, denoted daring; and the white purity."

It is small wonder then, that, as senior Senator from Kansas I take great and justifiable pride in the knowledge that the star of Kansas, my native State, has been a part of this flag for nearly 100 years.

Kansas became a State on January 29, 1861, and the star was added on July 4, 1861, at a time when our Nation was in the throes of internal conflict.

Today we are a united Nation, not an aggressive one, but ready at all times to defend the right.

Let us all thank God that we have prospered as we have and that, because of our constant belief in the true principles of Christianity, have been able to withstand the pressure that would wreck not only the United States, but the civilization of the world.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

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

RECENT TRIP TO MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for several years I have sought an opportunity to visit the Middle East.

Long an admirer of the many religious, cultural, intellectual, and scientific contributions of the peoples of this area, I have searched my mind for explanations of why it is that today so many citizens of the Atlantic Community consider the Middle East an underdeveloped area, a tinderbox, a ripe ground for the growth of communism or other totalitarian forms of government.

My interest was kindled again in 1955 when the United States offered to assist Egypt in the construction of the high dam at Aswan. The subsequent withdrawal of that offer, the seizure of the canal by the Egyptians, the attack on Egypt by the French, the British, and the Israeli, and the enactment of the Eisenhower doctrine, led me to propose a thorough examination of our policies in the Middle East.

Some colleagues will recall that at the end of that examination, I presented my views to the Senate.

Having recently reviewed those conclusions, I believe they have stood the test of time; and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the principal conclusions set forth in my remarks in the Senate on August 14, 1957, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

On the basis of the secret and top secret documents which the Department of State has provided—which, as I have said, apparently provide a satisfactory basis on which to judge U.S. policy—I have reached the following conclusions:

First. The Aswan Dam project was a sound project from the point of view of engineering feasibility, and it was a reasonable risk for economic development loans. Sources of capital other than those involved in the offer which was made to Egypt, both private sources and other Government sources, were definitely interested in pursuing the project.

The reason the United States first offered to make a contribution to the project was because it was recognized that the Aswan Dam or some other Nile River development program on a comparable scale was vital to the future of Egypt. The Aswan Dam is a symbol of Egypt's potential development. Without such a development, Egypt, with its increasing population, may be expected to suffer a constantly lowering standard of living. This is likely to cause much social and political unrest in Egypt and may endanger the unstable peace of the Middle East.

Second. After many surveys and long negotiations, which were participated in by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the United Kingdom, and the United States, a comprehensive plan for financing the Aswan Dam was substantially agreed upon with the Government of Egypt. This plan was based on estimates that the dam would cost $1.3 billion, a sum which would include the cost of irrigation and drainage works, powerlines, and other accessorial costs. The plan contemplated that Egypt, from its own resources, would pay for the full cost of the dam except for $400 million in foreign exchanges. The International Bank was willing to lend Egypt $200 million. The United States and the United Kingdom jointly were to grant Egypt the remaining $200 million, of which the United States was to contribute 75 percent and the United Kingdom 25 percent. These payments were to be made over the period of construction of the dam, which was estimated to be between 10 and 15 years.

For the United States this offer would have meant making contributions to the project averaging $15 million a year for 10 years. On December 16, 1955, the United States offered to furnish $54.6 million toward the first stages of construction of the dam and to consider sympathetically additional financial support later. It was this offer which was withdrawn by the administration 7 months later on July 19, 1956.

Third. The administration's decision to withdraw the offer to Egypt was made against the advice of the U.S. Ambassador to Egypt, and the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. President Eisenhower appears, according to the State Department documents to have participated very little in the decision, except to approve Secretary Dulles' recommendation. There was apparently no consideration of the question by the National Security Council.

Fourth. The reasons given to the public for the withdrawal of the offer were not, in my opinion, valid reasons. They were as follows:

First, that other Nile riparian states had not agreed to the project. The fact is, however, that there is no evidence that such agreement was not possible, or even probable. Moreover, the lack of agreement on this score was not a valid reason for withdrawing the American offer because Egypt itself had agreed with us not to go forward with construction until agreement was reached with the Government of the Sudan, the principal other country involved.

The second reason given for withdrawing the offer was that the ability of Egypt to devote adequate resources to the project had become uncertain since the time of the offer 7 months before. The fact is, however, that the major drain on Egypt's resources—namely, the mortgaging of part of her cotton crop in exchange for Communist arms—had occurred prior to the time of the United States offer on the dam. Contrary to the statement of the Department of State, there was no substantial evidence of a radical worsening in Egypt's economic condition at the time of the withdrawal of the offer. Certainly the International Bank had not urged that the arrangement be called off. Furthermore, there appears to have been no consideration of the imaginative use of U.S. surplus food supplies to counteract the inflationary effect which the commencing of construction would have had in Egypt.

Fifth. In public statements made subsequent to the announcement of the withdrawal of the offer to help with the Aswan Dam, Secretary Dulles has given as an additional reason the fact of congressional opposition to the project. There is no evidence, however, that the administration ever made any serious effort to persuade the few Members of Congress, who had expressed opposition, that the Aswan Dam project was sound. On the contrary, the evidence is that the administration itself began to reconsider the offer only a few weeks after the offer was made.

Sixth. The administration's judgment, based on facts known to the administration at the time of the withdrawal of the offer, seems to me to have been faulty for the following reasons:

First, the Russians had made an offer to help finance the Aswan Dam on terms more attractive than those offered by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the International Bank. There was no evidence that the administration believed that the Soviet Union was not prepared to follow through on its offer. The Secretary of State was nevertheless willing, by withdrawing the U.S. offer, to take the risk of massive Soviet penetration in Africa with no compensating advantage to the United States in taking such a risk. I might say here parenthetically that it is not possible to be sure, on the basis of the documents furnished by the Department of State, whether Secretary Dulles deliberately sought to force a showdown with the Soviet Union on their offer. In this connection, we do have the evidence in Mr. Beal's biography of Secretary Dulles in which Mr. Beal states: "It was necessary to call Russia's hand in the economic competition."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks two newspaper items discussing John Robinson Beal's treatment of this question in his biography of Mr. Dulles.

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

"[From the Washington Post of April 1, 1957]

"MATTER OF FACT—THE DULLES WHITE PAPER

"(By Stewart Alsop)

"It is not the usual function of a political reporter to review books, but occasionally a book comes along which is also important news. Such a book is John Foster Dulles: A Biography, by John Robinson Beal of Time magazine.

"The book is news for two reasons. First it contains a fascinating account of what had previously been only rumored or suspected—a calculated decision by Secretary Dulles to force a showdown in the Middle East. The account of this startling episode is undoubtedly based on interviews with Dulles himself. Second, the book will no doubt have important international repercussions, since it not only opens all the old half-healed wounds caused by the Suez crisis, but also pours great dollops of salt in them.

"The Beal book is thus likely to cause as much uproar as the account based on an interview with Dulles of the Dulles brink-of-war theory, by another Time man, James Shepley.

"In his introduction Beal, while absolving Dulles of responsibility for the book, states that 'it benefits from personal interviews with him which provided insight into his official actions, for which I thank him.'

"Repeatedly, Beal described Dulles' views with an authority which could only have come from such personal interviews. The book will certainly be regarded, therefore, as a kind of personal Dulles white paper on his Middle East policies, unofficial but authentic.

"Beal confidently describes the manner of Dulles' withdrawal of American offer of aid to Egypt in building the Aswan Dam as a calculated slap in the face for Egypt's President Nasser, consciously designed to bring on a showdown. The Beal account should be read in full, since it is an authoritative report of one of the most amazing exercise in diplomacy in recent history. But the following excerpts give the gist:

"For Dulles, a moment of cold-war climax had come. It was necessary to call Russia's hand in the game of economic competition. It was necessary to make the demonstration on a grand scale. Nasser combined the right timing, the right geography and the right order of magnitude for a truly major gambit in the cold war. Why did (Dulles) turn down Nasser so brutally, without a chance to save face? Since the issue involved more than simply denying Nasser money for a dam, a polite and concealed rebuff would fail to make the really important point. It had to be forthright, carrying its own built-in moral for neutrals in a way that the ormolu of applied propaganda would not cheapen.

"In short, Dulles withdrew the American offer as insultingly as possible, not in a moment of temporary aberration, as many thought at the time, but because he planned it that way.

"Beal's version of the Dulles decision to force a showdown parallels almost word for word the version of the decision previously offered by still another Time-Life man and Dulles admirer, former Presidential Adviser C. D. Jackson.

"When the Jackson version of the Dulles decision was made public, it was widely assumed that it was in fact the Dulles version. Now there can be no reasonable doubt of it—an experienced reporter like Beal could not conceivably describe the Secretary of State's reasoning and motivation in such authoritative detail simply by guesswork.

"Beal makes it clear, moreover, that Dulles was aware of the dangers involved in forcing a showdown: As a calculated risk the decision was on a grand scale, comparable in the sphere of diplomacy to the calculated risks of war in Korea and Formosa. But his experience at sailing in diplomatic waters convinced him that the breeze would be better if he took a new and independent tack.

"The chapters which follow, which also clearly benefit from insight into his official actions, are designed to prove that the Dulles

decision to force a showdown was a brilliantly successful diplomatic coup. This proves a trifle difficult, even for so able an advocate as Beal, since it is uncomfortably obvious that the Middle Eastern breeze has not been better, but a great deal worse since Dulles forced his showdown.

"The difficulty is overcome by the simple device of blaming everything that has gone wrong on our allies—while the Dulles policy was moral, and consistent and purposeful, our allies' policies were both stupid and dishonest. This theory of the crisis, which deserves further examination, will be studied with pained attention abroad, in view of the authority with which the author clearly speaks."

"[From the Washington Post of April 2, 1957]

"OVER THE BRINK

"Just when you begin to think that Mr. Dulles has moderated his brinkmanship, along comes another article or book based on conversations with the Secretary of State to prove you wrong. There are many passages in John Robinson Beal's adoring biography, John Foster Dulles, that will cause heated controversy and indignation through the free world, but the most provocative is the assertion that Mr. Dulles carefully planned the manner in which last summer he withdrew the offer to help Egypt build the Aswan Dam. As Mr. Beal describes the situation. 'It was necessary to call Russia's hand in the game of economic competition. * * * Nasser combined the right timing, the right geography, and the right order of magnitude for a truly major gambit in the cold war.'

"This is a shocking indictment, although Mr. Beal patently did not intend it as such. Communist arms going to Egypt in large quantities, and an increasing number of anti-Western moves on the part of Colonel Nasser, made the decision to withdraw the aid offer logical enough in itself. Yet up until recently the general assumption had been that Mr. Dulles' insult to Nasser in his conversation with the Egyptian Ambassador was more or less accidental, and that the Egyptian reaction was not anticipated. The British, for example, knew of and supported the decision to cancel the offer; they understood, however, that the dam project would merely be indefinitely postponed.

"But no. According to Mr. Beal:

"'Since the issue involved more than simply denying Nasser money for a dam, a polite and concealed rebuff would fail to make the really important point. It has to be forthright, carrying its own built-in moral for neutrals in a way that the ormolu of applied propaganda would not cheapen. As a calculated risk the decision was on a grand scale, comparable to the calculated risks of war taken in Korea and Formosa.'

"It is of course always possible that Mr. Beal overstates the case, if not as to the facts, at least as to motivations (no one would quarrel with the basic judgment that Nasser was intractable). Nevertheless, the account squares with a recent speech by C. D. Jackson, also of Time and Life and a former White House special assistant. It fits into the pattern of Mr. Dulles' three other brinks in Korea, Indochina, and Formosa. Mr. Beal adds a significant footnote to Formosa policy by telling of a hitherto secret letter from President Eisenhower to Chiang Kai-shek 'satisfying him that the United States would help defend Quemoy and Matsu'—a tacit commitment in which Congress ought to be intensely interested.

"All of this serves to paint Mr. Dulles as the most reckless sort of gambler. Always before it has been possible to regard the Aswan-Suez episode as an accident. Now Mr. Dulles is portrayed as the champion of purposeful irresponsibility, the inventor of the calculated blunder. The tale places on Mr. Dulles an additional share of the blame, not only for Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal Co., but also for the increasing desperation in Britain and France, the Suez invasion and the drastic erosion of Western interests.

"It is hard to believe that Mr. Dulles could be so totally Machiavellian. But he will have a difficult time climbing out of this hole; and there will properly be increasing demands for a white paper on the whole story of relations with Nasser. If the Beal account is correct, is it any wonder that Mr. Dulles is mistrusted abroad?"

The second reason why the administration's judgment was poor, even on the facts known at the time of the withdrawal of the offer, was that it did not appreciate the significance to the United States of the vigor of the nationalist and neutralist drive in Egypt. I believe the Secretary of State confused Egyptian nationalism and neutralism on the one hand with communism on the other. Despite the judgment of able State Department career officials indicating that Nasser had some appreciation of the dangers of dealing too closely with the Soviet Union, Mr. Dulles seemed to believe that Nasser had become a Soviet puppet. He did not recognize that Egyptian nationalism was a powerful force which could, if recognized for what it was and carefully handled, be directed toward political freedom instead of communism.

Thirdly, the Secretary of State failed to appreciate the importance of the Aswan Dam to the economic future of Egypt. He also failed, in my opinion, to appreciate the tremendous emotional importance which all Egyptians attached to the building of the dam. He did not appreciate the effect the building of the dam would have had upon the entire Arab world as an example of our willingness to help them help themselves. The Secretary of State failed to appreciate these facts, although he had adequate reports on these points from the field.

Seventh. The administration's decision to withdraw the offer to help with the Aswan Dam was not, in my opinion, in the best interests of the United States for the following reasons:

First, the withdrawal of the dam offer was the direct cause of the seizure by Nasser of the Suez Canal. This action led, in turn, to the Israeli-United Kingdom-French attack, to the serious deterioration in our relations with our leading allies, to the severe oil shortages in Europe, and to economic dislocations in other parts of the world. So far as cost is concerned, it was recently reported in the press that $174 million has been spent under the authority of the Eisenhower doctrine, more than our contribution to the dam would have been in 10 years.

Second withdrawal of the offer served to increase the influence of the Soviet Union. The Soviet toehold in Egypt has become a hammerlock on a country which otherwise might well have stayed relatively free from influence by the Communist orbit.

Third, settlement of the conflict between the Arab States and Israel, without which no peaceful economic and political progress in the Middle East is possible, has been rendered much more difficult. To have helped Egypt concentrate on internal development instead of foreign adventures would have helped to create stability throughout the area.

Fourth, the withdrawal of the Aswan Dam offer has created an impression which is hard to erase that we as a nation are interested in the economic development of other nations only if that assistance serves to put the recipient nation under the political bondage of the United States. It suggests we are not interested in the economic and political freedom of other peoples unless they are willing to adapt their policies to suit our political needs.

Fifth, withdrawal of the offer has foreclosed what may be the primary salvation of Egypt's economic problems in the long run. The Aswan Dam—an essential element of stability in the Middle East—has been indefinitely postponed. The day when the Egyptian people might seek to build a democratic government on a solid economic base has been delayed.

Sixth, withdrawal of the Aswan Dam offer and the consequent war in the Middle East diverted world attention from the revolution in Hungary. This, of course, is a second guess. Nevertheless if the world had not been absorbed by the danger in the Middle East and if the Western Powers had not been on opposite sides in that conflict, the Soviet Union might never have intervened in the Hungarian revolution, or the response of the West to the Soviet intervention might have been more effective. We lost a golden opportunity to promote freedom in the world of the Communist orbit and we handed communism a key to the Middle East.

Mr. President, these are my conclusions. I believe that the documents which have been supplied to the committees of the Senate by the Department of State support these conclusions.

PROBLEMS OF MIDDLE EAST

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the situation in the Middle East is a matter of deep concern for us.

There is the problem of the refugees from Palestine, now over 1 million men, women, and children, living in poverty and dependent upon continued grants—mostly from the United States. There is the situation in Iraq, where President Kassim walks a tightrope between Communist influences that have penetrated his government and forces of pan-Arabism which likewise threaten his rule. There is the situation in Jordan—a country so nonviable that its very survival is dependent upon annual foreign subsidies. There are the occasional clashes between the forces of Israel and those of neighboring states. There is an uneasy truce, but no peace, with the consequent impact on transit through the Suez Canal with economic penalties hitting hard at Israel, but scarring relations with all seafaring nations with interest in the untrammeled use of the canal.

Despite these problems, I could not but be impressed to see the real and substantial efforts being made to improve the living conditions of the people—Arab and Jewish alike. It is in this simple fact—that peoples and governments in the area are working hard for a better life in the future—that I find my basic hope. Given time, as well as assistance and understanding by the developed nations, there may be a gradual improvement in economic conditions in the area. And on that base, there may be created political institutions capable of promoting peaceful settlement of the many problems that plague the Middle East.

NATURE OF MY VISIT TO MIDDLE EAST

Despite my long and deep interest in the Middle East, it was not until late this spring that I had opportunity for a short visit to the area. I had expected to visit the United Arab Republic last January, but the press of Senate business prevented that until Senate action

had been completed on the Mutual Security Act.

I might add that had my interest in the area tended to slacken because in recent months there had been a detectable improvement in relations between the Arab States and the United States—without at the same time a corresponding worsening of our relations with Israel—the *Cleopatra* incident and the action of the Congress in adopting the Douglas-Keating amendment to the Mutual Security Act, once again roused my interest.

Colleagues will recall that during consideration of the Mutual Security Act I expressed myself on the dangers to which the conduct of our foreign policy was exposed when private groups in the United States sought by economic means to force the United Arab Republic to change its policies with respect to transit of the Suez Canal. Furthermore, although I expressed my support for freedom of transit through the Suez Canal, I strongly opposed adoption of the Douglas-Keating amendment on the ground that it constituted taking sides in a bitter strife between Israel and the United Arab Republic. I felt that by tying a political string to our economic aid program to the United Arab Republic, we would exacerbate antagonisms and render even more difficult a rational and peaceful settlement of the basic conflicts of the area.

Needless to say, despite my opposition to the picketing of the *Cleopatra* and to the Douglas-Keating amendment on a basis which I felt served the foreign policy interests of the United States, my views had an impact upon my reception in the Middle East. I was viewed somewhat as a hero in the Arab countries and somewhat as an opponent in Israel. I am sure that Senators DOUGLAS and KEATING would have found the situation reversed had they visited in the area with me.

During my visit to the Middle East I spent 4 days in the United Arab Republic, 1 day in Jordan, and a day and a half in Israel. In the United Arab Republic I visited the site of the high dam at Aswan, the power station and new fertilizer plant near the old Aswan Dam, Port Said, and portions of the Suez Canal. I also held lengthy conversations in the United Arab Republic with President Nasser, Foreign Minister Fawzi, and with other officials there. I was favorably impressed by the vigor and determination of these officials, and by the magnitude and difficulty of the task they have undertaken. In Jordan I met briefly with Foreign Minister Nasir and with the Governor of Jerusalem. I also visited refugee camps in Jerusalem and its vicinity in the company of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency Director, Mr. John Davis.

In Israel I visited the Lahish colonization area, Kirya-Gat—a new immigrant area—and training center at Kalmania in which technical assistance is being given Burmese families in Israel. These projects appear to be intelligently planned and vigorously directed. I also had lengthy conversations with Prime Minister Ben-Gurion and with Foreign Minister Golda Meir, intelligent and dedicated leaders of their people.

I am under no illusion that short visits of this kind provide one with information adequate to reach profound and assured opinions. At best, such visits may simply confirm opinions reached on the basis of information gained in other ways, or may, on the contrary, create doubts about one's earlier conclusions.

Nevertheless, in the hope that my observations and comments on U.S. policy in the Middle East may be of interest, I make this oral report.

BASIC U.S. ATTITUDES

It seems to me that as Americans consider the multitudinous problems of the Middle East it is important that we try to set forth basic facts upon which most of us could probably agree. With that thought in mind, I suggest the following:

First, although we recognize that there is a basic conflict between Israel on the one hand, and the Arab States on the other, we desire to have friendly relations with all states in the Middle East.

Second, we do not seek relationships with any state in the area on any basis other than that of mutual respect. We recognize the right of each state to determine its own policies, domestic as well as foreign. In other words, we do not believe that any action of the United States should seek to put any nation in a dependent status. We do not seek satellites. We believe peace in the area is dependent upon political independence.

Third, in our relationships with states in the Middle East we do not ask that they adopt political or economic forms of organization similar to those that have developed in Western Europe or the United States. We recognize that forms of government or economic concepts that flourish in one environment may perish in another.

It is our hope, however, that the economic or political concepts developed in this area may promote maximum individual freedom and dignity.

Democracy as a political concept originated in the Mediterranean area. Given time, stability, and economic development, it is our hope that the peoples of the Middle East will decide that democratic forms of government are more suitable for their development than totalitarian forms of government.

Fourth, and in summary, as stated in the Mutual Security Act, we recognize "the basic identity of interest which exists between the people of the United States and the peoples of other lands who are striving to establish and develop politically independent and economically viable units and to improve ways of living by methods which reflect the popular will" and we have declared it to be a "primary objective" of the United States and consistent with our "tradition and ideals, to share these strivings by providing assistance, with due regard to our other obligations, to peoples willing to work energetically toward these ends."

U.S. policies cannot, however, be formulated solely on the basis of generalities in which we believe. Equally important are the situations in the Middle East with which we must deal.

Without doubt the most all-pervasive situation which influences the formulation of U.S. policy in the Middle East is the conflict between Israel and her neighbors. Many of the citizens of Israel are convinced that the Arab nations will not rest until Israel has been destroyed, and frequent statements in the Arab States provide basis for such fears. On the other hand, many of the citizens of the Arab States are convinced that Israel contemplates expansion at the expense of her neighbors, and the continued influx of refugees into Israel and her attack on the U.A.R. in 1956 provide a basis for such fears.

Until there is acceptance on the part of the Arab States that most of the nations of the world could not stand idly aside if world peace were endangered by any attempt to drive the Israeli into the sea, and until there is acceptance on the part of Israel that efforts to expand her borders by forceful means will not be tolerated, the main ingredients of peaceful economic or political development of the Middle East will be lacking.

Furthermore, so long as this condition exists, U.S. relations with states in the area will be most difficult. With Middle East emotions closely bordering those which exist in time of war, almost any positive act of U.S. foreign policy, or, for that matter, almost any statement of individual Members of Congress relating to the Middle East, will be tortiously interpreted by one side or the other as evidence of support or opposition.

I was frequently amazed, during my short visit, to find some statements I have made in the United States torn out of context to prove that I was partisan in my views or magnificently lacking in objectivity. Statements by other Members of Congress with whom my views have not coincided have also been misunderstood or given an importance totally unwarranted by their tenor and context.

While I have suggested that the emotional overtones of the Israeli-Arab conflict have affected the ability of governments and peoples there to understand our policies, one of the ironies of U.S. policies in the Middle East is that, over the last decade and a half, our relations with the area have been characterized by extremes, sometimes, I fear, more motivated by emotion than by logic. While our relationships with Israel have been relatively constant and friendly, except for the brief period during the attack on the Suez Canal, our relations with the Arab States and with Egypt in particular have not been nearly as constant and friendly.

RECAPITULATION OF U.S. RELATIONS WITH THE MIDDLE EAST

Consider, briefly, the ups and downs of our relations.

The intense anti-American sentiments that ran throughout the Arab world for a period after the United States supported the creation of the State of Israel, and in May 1948 recognized Israel—as did the Soviet Union—gradually waned until shortly after the Egyptian revolution and the election of President Eisenhower. In 1951, technical cooperation

agreements were signed with various Arab States, and, all in all, a genuine rapprochement with Egypt seemed in the making when Secretary Dulles in early 1953 presented Colonel Naguib with a silver pistol from President Eisenhower. In September of 1954, Egypt's Revolutionary Command Council issued a policy statement emphasizing its support of the West and declaring that the only major threat to the area would be an invasion by the Soviet Union. An agreement was signed for economic assistance.

In August of 1955, however, Secretary Dulles announced that he had heard of Soviet arms offers to Egypt, and in September, after the United States had refused to supply arms to Egypt on terms deemed equitable by the Egyptians, a cotton-Czech arms barter arrangement was agreed to by Egypt.

Despite arms shipments from bloc countries to Egypt, negotiations for Western assistance in construction of the high dam at Aswan continued through late 1955, until July 19, 1956, when the United States withdrew its offer to assist Egypt in construction of the high dam. The grounds for withdrawal were that other Nile riparian states had not agreed to the project and that Egypt apparently would not be able to devote sufficient financial resources to it.

The withdrawal of this offer was, in my opinion, the proximate cause of President Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal on July 26, 1956.

At this point, U.S. influence in Egypt reached an all time low.

Three months later, in October and early November 1956, there occurred the attack on Suez by French, British, and Israeli forces. The United States, honoring its earlier commitments to oppose any aggression in the area, took the lead in encouraging United Nations intervention to bring about a cease-fire and to force withdrawals from Egypt.

By this action, U.S. prestige in the Arab States rose appreciably, but not for long. Adoption of the Eisenhower doctrine in early 1957, continued blocking of Egyptian funds, Radio Cairo attacks on the United States, and the virtual isolation of the U.S. diplomatic community, all attested to the fact that our relations with the United Arab Republic were on the downswing.

Soviet commitments to assist in the construction of the Aswan Dam, the fall of the pro-Western Government of Iraq, and the landing of Marines in Lebanon, all contributed again to a decline of U.S. prestige in the Arab countries.

During the past year, however, our relations with the Arab States seemed gradually to improve, despite apparent United Arab Republic unwillingness to be more accommodating in permitting canal transit. A temporary setback in our relations developed as a consequence of the *Cleopatra* incident and the adoption of the amendment to the Mutual Security Act, which was construed in the Arab world as Israeli-inspired.

I am under no illusion that the ups and downs of our relations with the United Arab Republic, in particular, over the last decade are solely attributable to fluctuations in U.S. policies toward the area. Certainly the United Arab Republic has not always been temperate in its press and radio comments. Certainly there have been instances when reactions to official or unofficial expressions of U.S. views have been less than understanding. Arab obsession with World Zionism has on occasion distorted Arab reactions toward U.S. policies.

At the same time I would be less than candid were I to fail to note that censorship in Israel, as well as in the United Arab Republic, and a less than balanced coverage of Middle East news, may color U.S. public opinion.

NEED FOR CHANGED EMPHASIS

Having said these things, however, it does seem to me that U.S. policies toward the problems of the Middle East have not always been characterized by clear vision, tempered by understanding, and uninfluenced by economic and political forces interested in the Middle East.

Take, for example, our fear of Soviet military intervention in the Middle East which gave rise in 1951 to an abortive attempt to establish a Middle East Command—with Egypt—to the creation of the Baghdad Pact in 1955—without Egypt—and to the promulgation of the Eisenhower doctrine in 1957. It seems to me that our overemphasis on the dangers of Soviet military intervention in the area tended to blind us to the dangers of Soviet economic penetration.

We had opportunity to supply arms to Egypt, and hence orient her needs for spares and replacements toward the West. We had a genuine opportunity to assist in the construction of the Aswan High Dam, with the consequent economic impact on Egypt. We failed to grasp these opportunities for a variety of reasons—a failure to distinguish between communism and nationalism, a failure to appreciate the possibility that states can be neutral without being anti-United States, an obsession with the necessity of military pacts, a lack of understanding that the failure of a country to develop immediately in a democratic pattern, or to promote a capitalist economic system, does not mean friendship is not possible, and last, but not least, we failed to understand that Egypt faces toward the West.

We have had tendencies in the past to confuse nationalism with communism, neutrality with anti-Americanism, and to believe that the regimes with which we may currently have relations are better than anything different. These tendencies have led us into unnecessary troubles in the Middle East, and unless we check them, they may serve us ill in the future.

In this connection, it would do us no harm, and it might be good, if we were to cogitate a bit on our own historic past. Our brand of 18th century nationalism, which culminated in the Revolutionary War, was viewed by England as pure and simple revolution. Our brand of American neutrality provoked the War of 1812 and the burning of this Capitol Building, led to the enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine, and found legislative expression as late as the Neutrality Act of 1937.

I leave it to my colleagues to apply these lessons to the concepts of nationalism and neutrality which often affect our relations with newly developing nations in general, and with the countries of the Middle East in particular.

I cannot help but believe that a marked improvement in our relations with the Middle East would result from some changes in attitude. A greater recognition of the dignity of newly independent nations and a small dose of humility would be deeply appreciated by most new nations.

Perhaps as a southerner I am in a better position than some of my colleagues to appreciate the need for such qualities. We of the South have, until recent years, been the undeveloped portion of the United States. In my own State of Arkansas, as late as 1940, our annual per capita income was approximately $250, a figure which has now risen to about $1,300—still well below the national average.

We in the South were an occupied territory for a time, and the scars of war are still found in the emotions of the American people—in the widely held conviction, for example, that no man from the Deep South can aspire to the Presidency, no matter what his qualities or virtues.

I refer to these facts only to make the point that our experiences in the South give us some background for more than a national average insight into the sensitiveness of the states of the Middle East to feelings that they have been exploited by foreign ownership of the canal, by oil and mineral concessions, by absentee ownership of means of production, and suspicion of foreign capital.

We have felt a deep resentment when the changing mores of our communities have been violently disrupted by attempts to fix the beady eye of sanctimonious charges of discrimination on the South, as if discrimination existed nowhere else in the Nation. We would indeed have appreciated a bit more humility in dealing with the problems of the South just as, I am sure, the peoples of the Middle East would appreciate less preoccupation on our part with assertions of our own righteousness and fewer self-judging conditions tied to our aid.

REFUGEES FROM PALESTINE

I turn now, Mr. President, to one problem in the Middle East that has occupied the attention of the Senate annually for more than 10 years; namely, the plight of the Arab refugees from Palestine.

Most students of Middle East affairs are in agreement that if some progress could be made toward the settlement of this problem, which is a source of constant irritation to international relations in the area, there might then be movement toward the economic and political stability essential to peaceful development in the Middle East.

As long ago as 1953, the Committee on Foreign Relations created a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the late Senator Taft to examine the problem of Arab refugees. At that time, over $150 million had already been authorized for assistance.

Senator Taft concluded his report with these words:

> The American people are moved by strong humanitarian motives, but they cannot be expected to bear indefinitely so large a share of the burden involved in this situation when Israel and the Arab States show so little initiative in helping to settle the matter among themselves. There is a very real danger that the longer the United States continues to supply relief money, the less desire there will be on the part of the states in this area to make any real efforts on their own to liquidate the problem.

The facts show that Senator Taft was absolutely correct in predicting our contributions would continue. We have now provided nearly $300 million of hard currencies—enough to have provided the hard currency component for construction of the Aswan Dam, or enough to have developed the basin of the Jordan River to bring water to vast areas of the desert.

Despite these expenditures, the number of people on relief has increased. The problem seems no nearer solution today than it was 10 years ago.

The basic reason no progress has been made is that neither the Arab nations nor Israel have been willing to take the first step. The Arabs insist that every refugee has a right to return to Israel or to receive compensation. The Israeli have argued that the refugees left Israel voluntarily and fear that, if repatriation offers were made, there might be such an influx of Arabs as to constitute a security threat to Israel.

I do not propose to examine the refugee problem with all its ramifications, since the subject recently received careful and objective treatment in a study prepared by the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

What is needed now is less recrimination about the past, and more planning for the future. To get the problem in proper perspective for settlement, it is essential that the Arabs reconsider the view that the refugees are a political asset to be used against Israel, but an economic liability in Arab lands. The Arabs must realize that to seek to make refugees serve a political purpose will in time become counterproductive. Moreover, to continue to view these refugees as an economic liability is to ignore their potentialities as human resources for the cultivation of the land and for help in the economic development of the Arab countries. The start now being made in training some of the younger generation in trades and handicrafts is a move in the right direction.

So far as the Israeli are concerned, it is essential that they realize the very existence of refugees from Palestine will appeal to the humanitarian instincts of peoples all over the world—just as did the Jewish refugees from Hitler. I cannot help but feel that the longer this problem remains unsolved, the greater the likelihood that responsibility for the problem will be viewed as resting on Israel, regardless of what one may conclude with respect to the facts.

The time has come for real political sagacity and leadership to be evidenced by both Arabs and Jews. I am hopeful, because my conversations led me to believe that leaders on both sides of this issue are considerably more rational in their private statements than they are in their public pronouncements.

I know the refugee problem has been studied to death. I cannot help but wonder, however, whether it might not now be possible for quiet, off-the-record conversations to be held so that some agreement might be made which would move the problem off dead center. Perhaps the Israeli could agree to repatriation or compensation, as the United Nations has recommended, with the understanding that the numbers who might accept repatriation would be of manageable size over a period of years. Perhaps the Arabs could indicate a willingness to help resettle those who might decide against repatriation if reasonable compensation is agreed upon.

If states within the area can make no progress on this problem, they might enlist the assistance of neutral, nonpolitical elements in the world community, agreeing in advance to give most serious consideration to such settlement proposals as might be submitted. Might it not be possible, for example, to seek the aid of competent social scientists, economists, retired diplomats, and educators from countries having no political or economic interest in Israel and the Arab States?

Mr. President, I have not begun to exhaust the Middle Eastern subjects which merit consideration by the Senate—the canal, oil, water, cotton, Communist penetration, propaganda—almost every subject of this kind has aspects of controversy. Yet if one returns to what I described as the most pervasive situation which influences U.S. foreign policy in the area, he will find that the present state of conflict between Israel and the Arab States is crucial.

The most hopeful aspect of our relations with the area is found in the statement in the recent Senate study on the Middle East:

> In their present mood, neither the Arab nor the Israeli leaders desire war. On both sides, there is preoccupation with economic matters, recognition that armed conflict could—probably would—militate against all concerned.

The two most powerful potential antagonists in the area are the United Arab Republic and Israel. President Nasser and Prime Minister Ben Gurion are both able, dedicated men, who command respect within their own nations. Probably each would object to my audacious or indelicate inclusion of their names in the same sentence. Nevertheless, I do so because I believe that each of these men has the ability to lead his own people, as well as those qualities which enable true statesmen, by reason, to overcome irrational emotion.

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CITIZENS FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY NATIONS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement 2 hours have been allotted for debate on the joint resolution and 1 hour on each amendment, to be divided equally.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the collapse of the summit conference, toward which many millions in many lands had looked with hope, makes it more imperative than ever that we take effective action to strengthen and unify the Atlantic Alliance.

Mr. Khrushchev has blocked the progress in negotiation which many had expected at the summit. He has the power to halt negotiations, to vituperate, and to threaten. But Mr. Khrushchev is quite powerless to prevent us and our NATO allies from reinforcing the solidarity of the West. Indeed, since a central policy of the Communists is to bring about the disintegration of NATO, immediate action to solidify NATO will demonstrate conclusively to Mr. Khrushchev that the kind of summitry he pursued at Paris has boomeranged against this central Communist policy.

The Congress of the United States can take such action to strengthen and unite NATO by passing Senate Joint Resolution 170 this session. Although the Convention of NATO citizens to explore means by which the greater unity, for which it provides, can be developed, and careful preparation will be required before it can meet, the passage of this resolution alone would be a telling answer to Mr. Khrushchev. And this new initiative toward greater unity within NATO will encourage our allies and strengthen our ties with them as well as exert a far-reaching psychological influence throughout the free world. Too often has it been said that our action is usually a reaction to the moves of the Kremlin. Here we have an opportunity to initiate action that is both positive and constructive.

Mr. President, a year ago I served as one of the delegates from the United States to the Atlantic Congress. This meeting of 650 citizens from the NATO nations was unprecedented in the history of the Atlantic community. Though it met for only 5½ days, it accomplished much good, as has been widely recognized.

I came away from the Atlantic Congress convinced of the great value of such meetings of NATO citizens. And I am convinced now that the smaller convention provided for in this resolution, which would meet not just for 5 days, but for as long as necessary to

perform its task, has exceedingly great potentialities for good. The more extended its consideration of our problems, the sounder its recommendations will be.

One of the main resolutions of the Atlantic Congress, one considered so important by the delegates that it was added by action from the floor to the short final declaration of that body, called for a meeting similar to the convention. It requested the NATO governments to bring about "a special conference composed of not more than a hundred leading representative citizens, directed to convene for as long as necessary in order to examine exhaustively, and to recommend as expeditiously as possible, the means by which greater cooperation and unity may best be developed within the Atlantic Community."

Mr. President, last November I served on the U.S. delegation to the fifth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference here in Washington. The original recommendation for such a conference or convention of NATO citizens "directed to convene as often as necessary in order to examine exhaustively and to recommend" how greater unity may best be developed had been unanimously adopted by the third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in 1957. Last November the fifth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference renewed this recommendation. Referring to the action of the Atlantic Congress and to this joint resolution as originally introduced into the U.S. Congress, it unanimously recommended "that this special conference be brought about as early as possible in 1960."

This resolution has wide bipartisan support. The administration strongly supports it, as was indicated in the following statements in the testimony of the Department of State before the Foreign Relations Committee:

> The Department considers that meetings such as the one proposed in this resolution might well serve a good purpose. We in the Department of State would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas which might emerge * * *. We particularly welcome the thought expressed in the resolution that the delegates to the proposed convention should be free to explore the problem fully as individuals.

Mr. President, this resolution would carry out these three unanimous requests of representative bodies of legislators and citizens of the NATO countries. As I have indicated, it is one constructive step we can take immediately which Mr. Khrushchev is powerless to block. It is also a step where the cost is insignificant but the potentialities for good are exceedingly far reaching.

In recent weeks every American, of every degree of political difference, has joined forces behind our President in a show of moral strength and national unity seldom witnessed in any other nation of the world.

Let us pass this resolution, Mr. President, and extend the fiber of this moral strength and unity to the entire Atlantic Alliance.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator suggest that the time for the quorum call be taken from the time of both sides equally?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; from the time of both sides, on the joint resolution.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR THE SENATE TO MEET AT 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

After the Senate completes action on the NATO resolution, we will proceed to the consideration of S. 2929, the loyalty oath bill.

Immediately after we finish consideration of the loyalty oath bill, we will proceed to the consideration of the Defense appropriation bill.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has asked the leadership to schedule the Japanese treaty for consideration tomorrow.

Because of these important bills, the leadership would like to inform all Senators that we must come in early and stay late for the balance of this week.

The housing bill will follow the Defense appropriation bill.

I ask unanimous consent that when we meet tomorrow, we meet at 9:30 o'clock in the morning.

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

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CITIZENS FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I heard much of the testimony in support of Senate Joint Resolution 170, calling for a convention of delegates from the Atlantic countries.

First, I wish to commend the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his active work in behalf of this resolution.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee heard many witnesses on the proposed resolution, and wrote into it many changes from the original resolution. After hearing this testimony, and after much discussion in executive session, the committee has reported a resolution which would create a United States Citizens Commission on NATO, consisting of not more than 20 private citizens.

This Commission would invite legislators of other NATO countries to appoint their own corresponding delegation to meet and discuss ways of achieving greater cooperation among these nations on matters that are important to their security as well as their economic welfare.

The selection of the delegates from the United States participating in this Convention would be made on the suggestion of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, in consultation with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Commission appointed to represent the United States would not in any way officially speak or represent the U.S. Government. It would be a Commission appointed for the purpose of meeting with other like commissions from other NATO countries to discuss programs of vital interest to these nations and report informally to their respective governments.

This would be strictly a meeting of what might be recognized as a citizens' group, and in my opinion could be helpful in making suggestions that would be important if we are to protect ourselves against the Communist threat.

It will be argued that there are, presently, many organizations, official and unofficial, that are meeting on these problems.

The State Department in testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee stated:

> The Department considers that meetings such as the one proposed in this resolution might well serve a good purpose. We in the Department of State would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas which might emerge * * *. We particularly welcome the thought expressed in the resolution that the delegates to the proposed convention should be free to explore the problem fully as individuals.

In these difficult and trying times, it seems to me that we should secure the services of citizens who are willing to devote some of their time in behalf of the welfare of our Nation and other nations who have similar problems. It is for that reason that I am supporting this resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I always regret the necessity of opposing the position of many of my good friends, especially those on the Committee on Foreign Relations who see otherwise than I do on some of our problems. However, I am definitely opposed to the pending joint resolution.

It is all right to be for peace, and it is all right to seek methods of establishing peace and perpetuating peace. We are all for that. Nevertheless, it seems to me that in the last few years there has developed a great flood of pressure groups that want to get on committees; that want to get some kind of official standing; that want to get Federal appropriations in order to have their meetings here, there, yonder, and everywhere else, but which really, in the long run, have no official standing, accomplish no

particular concrete result, and spend substantial amounts of Federal money in the aggregate.

I have been familiar, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with this joint resolution in its various lives. It has had about nine lives. It has been altered, changed, amended, and substituted so that the resolution we are at present considering is in no real way like the original resolution which was proposed. This leads me to the opinion that all that was wanted, in the first place, was a resolution, because the contents have been changed so definitely and so substantially.

The resolution provides for an unofficial board of persons—some 20 in number—to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Then they are to consult with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. It is to be called the United States Citizens Commission on NATO.

Well, we have the NATO Parliamentarians Organization, which meets every year. It has some official standing. No doubt it produces some beneficial results. Also, there are various NATO consultative groups. We have officials in our diplomatic corps, and elsewhere, who take care of the NATO situation.

But now comes a proposal for the United States Citizens Commission on NATO. The joint resolution provides that the commission cannot bind the United States; that is stated in the resolution. It will not, of course, bind the United States. However, regardless of what is said, this so-called unofficial group, meeting abroad with unofficial groups of other nations, can indeed, in the eyes of many people of the world, commit the United States to a moral position, which is not an official position or which is not a calculated or studied position of the United States.

The purposes of the Commission are altruistic; yes. They are to seek for peace and to seek formulas on which peace can be based. But a citizens' committee can do this without spending $300,000 or $400,000 of public funds, and without consulting under the guise of an official commission, when it is not, in fact, an official commission. A citizens' committee can now go to Europe or anywhere else it wishes to go, under its own steam, without benefit of this particular resolution.

Mr. President, I believe we are simply piling up committees, piling up groups, piling up unofficial organizations of people who, in the long run, will probably confuse the issue—because the committees are created by a resolution of this sort—rather than clarify it.

Citizens' committees can do much good if they operate truly as citizens' committees. I do not object to a group of 20 or a group of 40 private citizens doing everything they can to assist in achieving peace, or to the formation of 50, 100, or any other number of groups.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think such groups may be able to bring people closer together. I think groups like International Rotary and International Lions have done much good and have assisted in creating international understanding.

What I object to is putting the stamp of official approval on an unofficial group and sending them abroad at Government expense to discuss international affairs. In the eyes of many people of the world, such a committee will commit the United States to a course of action which is not, indeed, an official course of action, and is not, indeed, a course of action sponsored by Congress, by the Department of State, or by the administration, but is purely the action of a private organization.

I have been opposed to the resolution in committee for these reasons. I think it is unwise. I do not think we should adopt it. I hope the resolution will not be passed by the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding time to me.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. Do I have control of the time of the proponents of the pending measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the terms of the unanimous consent agreement, the majority leader and the minority leader have control of the time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the time in the control of the majority leader to the Senator from Idaho for him to use as he sees fit.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I do not suppose any Senator would rise on the floor and state that he is opposed to the NATO alliance. I do not suppose there is a Senator who would not willingly admit that the NATO alliance is a greater protection to the free world in general, and to the United States in particular, than any other international agreement now in existence. So I take it that the only question before the Senate is whether the joint resolution will help to strengthen the NATO alliance. If it will, it is clear that we must pass it. If it will not, we should reject it.

I am quite confident that every Senator wants to strengthen the NATO alliance. What is the purpose of having a citizens' group meet to discuss with other citizens' groups, from other NATO countries, how our alliance can be strengthened? The purpose, I take it, is very clear. It is to help to hammer out, on the anvil of discussion, through the workings of the democratic process, ways and means of strengthening freedom. It ill behooves those who live in a democracy to suggest that citizens have no role to play, either in our foreign policy or in strengthening our alliance.

What are we afraid of? Are we afraid of the workings of democracy? Why are we concerned to have distinguished citizens, appointed by the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, meet with distinguished citizens of other countries in order to devise ways and means of strengthening our most precious alliance?

Are we afraid of the processes of democracy itself? Who are the pressure groups which, it is alleged, would attempt to convert to their own glory the convention called for by the joint resolution? Do my friends on the other side of the aisle not trust the Vice President, or do we on this side of the aisle not trust the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to assure that our representation at the convention will be composed of dedicated and distinguished citizens who are concerned only with the good of the country? It is difficult for me to believe that there would be such doubts.

Some seem to be afraid of the results of the meeting called for by the joint resolution. Mr. President, the sponsors of the resolution want to have a meeting of interested citizens held, and the sponsors of this measure have been ready and willing to amend the terms of the original joint resolution in order to meet any legitimate objections which might have been raised to it. Their purpose is to make possible the holding of the proposed meeting.

Mr. President, are we so sure that all wisdom resides in the parliamentary groups of NATO? Are we so sure that all wisdom resides in the State Department and in the foreign offices of our allies?

Some who oppose the joint resolution say that all such matters should be handled only through the United Nations; and they prefer to have action through the United Nations to meet the challenge which NATO is the greatest bulwark in resisting. Mr. President, we need more than governmental action; we also need an informed citizenry. This is the entire basis of our exchange program, by means of which the brains of the free world are exchanged and ideas are fertilized.

I suggest that the opposition to the joint resolution—impliedly, of course, not explicitly—stems from a feeling that we cannot trust the best brains of the free world to go to work on free world problems.

Mr. President, it is impossible for me to conceive how anyone can seriously contend that the representatives of the United States at the proposed convention would represent anyone except themselves—free, dedicated, distinguished citizens of the United States of America.

In the joint resolution itself and in the speeches which have been made in support of it, it has been made abundantly clear that the proposed body will not be an official one. The world is full of unofficial bodies. Every NATO country has them. We have scores of them.

Mr. President, again I say that the proposed group is to be a civilian group to help select the best brains of the free

world to strengthen our most important single alliance; and this group cannot do an adequate job if it is not adequately staffed. The members will serve without compensation.

They will donate, without charge, the most valuable thing they can possibly donate—namely, they will give to the meeting the benefit of their excellent, highly trained minds. Cannot we at least provide an adequate appropriation, in order to make sure that they will be adequately staffed, housed, and fed? In my judgment, the requested appropriation is indeed modest.

So, Mr. President, I shall conclude as I began: What are we afraid of? Do we not believe in the processes of democracy? Do we believe that the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives will let our country down? If be believe that, then this is a sad day for the United States.

I hope very much the pending joint resolution will be passed by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. President, let me inquire how much time remains under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I believe it would be appropriate at this time for one of the opponents of the resolution to speak, in order that not all of the time available to our side will be used at once.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am in favor of the joint resolution, but I am in control of the time in opposition to it.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to yield now to the Senator from North Carolina whatever time he may require.

Mr. ERVIN. I shall need perhaps 7 minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I realize that any person who opposes a joint resolution of this nature renders himself subject to the charge that he is not in favor of using all methods of promoting peace. Nevertheless, I cannot refrain from rising in opposition to the joint resolution, notwithstanding the fact that I readily concede the good motives which prompt those who favor it.

Mr. President, when I became a Member of this body, I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I find it impossible to reconcile this joint resolution with my oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I have reached this conclusion for two reasons. The first is based upon clause 7 of section 9 of the first article of the Constitution, which provides:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

It has been well settled by numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that under this section of the Constitution Congress does not have the power to make appropriations of public moneys, save and except for public purposes.

The proponents of the joint resolution say the group of people, who would travel and act under the terms of the joint resolution, would not be public officials, but would merely be private citizens, and would not be representing the Government of the United States. If that be true, then the joint resolution conflicts with the constitutional provision I have just now read, because the joint resolution would undertake to authorize the appropriation of tax moneys to pay the private expenses of private citizens engaged in a private mission; and I cannot reconcile this joint resolution with that constitutional provision.

Furthermore, I cannot reconcile the joint resolution itself with the interpretation placed upon it by its proponents. Notwithstanding the language of the joint resolution and the arguments of its proponents, the Congress has no authority under the Constitution to name agents to represent the private citizens of the United States. The persons proposed to be appointed under the joint resolution would have no authority from the private citizens of the United States to do anything for them. They would receive all their authority from the Congress of the United States. When we consider that interpretation of the joint resolution—and it is the only interpretation I can give to it consistent with the truth—we run into another constitutional provision.

Clause 2 of section 2 of article II of the Constitution provides:

> He—

That is, the President—

> shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he—

That is, the President—

> shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls.

Under this provision of the Constitution, the sole power to conduct the foreign affairs of the United States belongs to the President of the United States. The Congress is aware of that fact. The Congress is so aware of that fact that it has passed what is popularly known as the Logan Act, which makes it a crime for any private citizen to attempt to carry on negotiations with any foreign country.

The pending resolution provides that private citizens—so its proponents say—deriving no authority from any private citizens of the United States, but deriving whatever authority they have from the Congress of the United States, shall consult at public expense with persons of other NATO nations to see whether or not they cannot make arrangements for an international convention to the end that the United States may get greater unity between those countries and itself by economic and political means.

Here is a group of persons, having no political power under the laws of the United States, who are to be sent abroad by the Congress to try to bring NATO allies closer together by economic and political means. So we have this situation: Although the Constitution of the United States provides that the only person who has charge of the foreign affairs of the United States is the President of the United States. The pending measure constitutes an effort to bypass the constitutional authority vested with the power to deal with the foreign affairs of the United States and to permit some private citizens to receive authority to do so from the Congress, which itself has no power, under the Constitution of the United States, to deal with matters of this kind.

Mr. President, I believe in peace. I believe that we should strengthen the NATO allies. But I believe we should strengthen the NATO allies by procedures which conform to the Constitution of the United States. And the pending measure is an effort—call it what you may, Mr. President, call these persons to be appointed by congressional authority private citizens, which they are not, and say they are representing other private citizens, which they are not—call it what you may, Mr. President, this is an effort on the part of the Congress of the United States to appoint its own Ambassadors, its own foreign ministers, to deal with the foreign affairs of the United States, insofar as they relate to the NATO countries.

And all of the sophistry and all of the talk about peace cannot wipe out the plain fact that this is an effort on the part of the Congress of the United States to take charge of the foreign affairs of the United States, in violation of the plain letter and the living spirit of the Constitution. All it can do is to cause confusion and cast doubt in the minds of Europeans upon the authority of those who are now in power to represent the United States, both diplomatically and militarily, in connection with the NATO treaty.

Although the resolution has a high-sounding name, and although its proponents have lofty motives, I cannot reconcile the resolution with the Constitution of the United States; and for that reason I shall vote against it.

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

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, does the Senator from Idaho now desire to have someone speak in the time under his control?

Mr. CHURCH. I had made a commitment to the Senator from Connecticut to yield 5 minutes to him, in order that he might speak in support of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Idaho, and I thank him for affording me the privilege of speaking on this important resolution. I thank him

more particularly for his interest in this matter and for his leadership on behalf of it. I was not able to be present last night when he spoke on the resolution. I am sorry, because I always like to hear him speak on any subject, and particularly on matters of this kind. I have been in the Senate just long enough to observe his great interest in international affairs, and I have always known him to make wise, sensible, and thoughtful comments. I had an opportunity this morning to read hurriedly the remarks he made yesterday. I wish to say publicly and in this forum that I think he made a great speech in support of the resolution, and he deserves our gratitude for that speech and for having sponsored the resolution.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution. In the few minutes I have, I should like to make clear why I support the resolution, and why I hope it will pass.

The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who has just spoken, and for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration—as a great lawyer and as a great legislator—made reference to the Logan Act, which hits a very sensitive place with me, because I made some reference to it not too long ago, in relation to another individual who I thought then, and I think now, was and is in violation of the Logan Act, because of his meddling in foreign affairs. I refer, of course, to Cyrus Eaton. However, I say, with the greatest respect to my colleague and friend from North Carolina, that I think he misunderstands or misapplies the concept of the Logan Act as related to this resolution. I should like to explain why.

The Logan Act, in my judgment, prohibits anyone not authorized from carrying on negotiations or discussions of any kind with officials of foreign governments in matters having to do with the foreign policy or foreign relations of the United States. Under the pending joint resolution, private citizens, who would make up the U.S. delegation, would be authorized by Congress and selected by the leaders of Congress to meet only with private citizens of other NATO countries, and they would not, in any sense, be unlawfully interfering in foreign affairs. I do not think the Logan Act applies to the present situation; and I say that with great respect to the Senator from North Carolina.

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

Mr. DODD. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I did not say that the Logan Act applied in this instance. I cited the Logan Act as being a recognition by the Congress that the power to deal with foreign affairs of the United States belongs to the President and to no one else, not even to the Congress itself.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for clarifying a misunderstanding in my mind.

In any event, I think the Senator will agree with me—that the spirit of the Logan Act really is not involved in considering of this resolution. What we are trying to do is to make some progress toward the attainment of an ultimate ideal situation in the world.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me 2 more minutes?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am glad to yield 3 more minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what we are trying to do is to take a small step toward that situation we must reach, and which I am confident we shall reach, when all of the peoples of the world, through their properly selected representatives, can meet together and decide disputes in the world, without recourse to the violence of war or aggression of any kind. That is what we are trying to do. We cannot do it all at once, for a number of reasons. The Church resolution provides a means to further this kind of process among our friends and allies of the free world.

I have no hesitancy in saying to my colleagues that I am a world federalist. World federation at the right time and on the right basis is the answer to peace or war. I do not think world federation is now attainable because of Communist deceit and treachery and because of uncompromising Communist hostility to the free world and its institutions. But I think it is ultimately the only sensible solution to the problem of peace and war in the world.

The resolution we are considering seeks to take another step forward in that direction by at least getting people together, by getting private citizens of the NATO countries to get together to talk about common problems and to find out how we can strengthen the alliances we now have, which are not worldwide but which are really regional and founded on free world principles. We can succeed here because we start out with a broad area of shared common principles. That is all we are trying to do.

This will cost a little money, $300,000 or $400,000. I know the value of the dollar, but $300,000 or $400,000 in these days of millions and billions of dollars is a drop in the bucket. If we can make any progress at all toward the ultimate goal of peace on earth, because men are able to sit down and talk out their problems rather than fight them out, then I say we ought to be willing to spend this small sum and to devote our time and the time of our representative citizens in that effort.

We do this at home. We have citizens' committees for all kinds of activities, as the Senator from Idaho pointed out last evening. The Hoover Commission is an outstanding example, and there have been many others, in all of which private citizens organized into committees have frequently led the way forward. I hope the joint resolution will be passed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, regardless of what the result is with regard to passage of the joint resolution, I wish to take this occasion to commend and to congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho for the initiative he has shown and the responsibility he has undertaken.

I wish to point out that in the hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, in the first instance, and later Senate Joint Resolution 170, there are statements by various Members of this body in favor of this proposal. As to whether the Department of State is in favor of the passage of the resolution, I would suggest to the Members that they should read the communications from the Assistant Secretary of State, William B. Macomber, Jr., to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution also has the support of a good number of outstanding citizens, such as Gen. William Draper, W. L. Clayton, of Houston, Tex., and our former colleague in the House, Robert Hale, of Maine, as well as others too numerous to mention.

My purpose in rising at this time and in asking for this brief minute is to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and to again commend and to congratulate him for the initiative he has shown and the responsibility he has undertaken.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his remarks. I appreciate them more than I can say.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has long been associated with this proposal, and who has sponsored it in previous Congresses, as well as in the present Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join the acting majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] in commending the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for his diligence in pursuing the objectives of the joint resolution and in obtaining the concurrence of a majority of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, thereby having the resolution reported to the Senate favorably.

It has been my privilege over several years, along with a number of other Senators, to sponsor a resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 17—with the same objective. I believe this resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 170—is a better one. It meets many of the objections which were raised to previous resolutions.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that in March of 1959, along with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New

Jersey [Mr. CASE] I sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, and the sponsorship was later joined by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and other Senators. That resolution contained some flaws in language, I believe, which have been properly corrected, as the result of hearings, in the resolution which is now before the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 170 is Senate Joint Resolution 17 revised and amended.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that Atlantic unity, the North Atlantic Community, is vital to the security of the United States. In fact, the NATO alliance has been properly termed our most significant alliance.

There have been many expressions of thought to the effect that NATO ought to be expanded. It not only should rest upon the military features of the alliance, but also should be undergirded, strengthened, and expanded in terms of the possibilities of other cooperation among the NATO nations. There could be economic cooperation and scientific cooperation, as well as greater cooperation on trade. There could be cooperation in the development of underdeveloped areas, economic assistance overseas, and a host of activities which are presently being carried on by the independent nation states. These programs could well be carried on by the alliance called NATO.

The failure of the summit conference has made more effective unity within NATO more urgently necessary than ever.

Passage of this resolution by Congress—one forward step which Khrushchev is powerless to block—would immediately create new solidarity and hope for the future among the NATO peoples.

The NATO governments have sought more effective unity since 1949, but with only partial success.

A fresh and independent survey of this problem is now urgently needed.

In fact, I have considered it to be needed fcr several years.

When we want such a fresh and independent survey of a national problem, we appoint a national commission of experienced citizens—such as the Hoover Commission or the Harriman Commission.

The Hoover Commission and the Harriman Commission performed their work well; the Hoover Commission in regard to reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, and the Harriman Commission in respect to the foreign aid program, at that time the Marshall plan.

The convention provided for in the resolution would be similar to a national commission operating on an international NATO basis.

Its members would similarly be officially appointed yet act as individuals, free to express their views but unable to commit their governments.

Its function—inquiry, report, and recommendation—would be the same.

Like a national commission also, the convention would meet long enough to conduct a serious examination of our problems.

Such a serious examination has not been possible in meetings of NATO citizens—like the Atlantic Congress—lasting less than a week.

While the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference serves a valuable purpose, it also meets for less than a week each year.

I wish to underscore the fact that we do have a NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, which, despite the few days of its meetings, has produced recommendations and results that have been beneficial to the Congress. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has studied carefully the recommendations of the NATO parliamentarians, and those recommendations have been helpful to us in designing our foreign policy. In some aspects of foreign policy, the Congress of the United States is a coordinate or cooperative branch.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield 2 minutes further to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A convention of NATO citizens for this purpose has twice been unanimously recommended by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, in 1957 and 1959.

It was recommended unanimously in 1959 by the approximately 650 NATO citizens at the Atlantic Congress.

It is welcomed by the executive branch of the Government, which stated in its testimony on this resolution:

> The Department considers that meetings such as the one proposed in this resolution might well serve a good purpose. We in the Department of State would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas which might emerge.
>
> We particularly welcome the thought expressed in the resolution that the delegates to the proposed convention should be free to explore the problem fully as individuals.

This resolution would carry out these three unanimous requests of representative bodies of NATO legislators and citizens.

I conclude my plea for the passage of this resolution on the basis that while it is indeed a responsibility of the President of the United States and the executive branch to conduct foreign policy, there is no prohibition in or out of the Constitution against the citizenry advising and consulting on the formulation of foreign policy. In fact, the Congress has a special responsibility in this day and age, in which economic assistance, trade, tariffs, scientific research, education, and information are so much a part of foreign policy. The passage of the resolution creating a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO can strengthen our security and foreign policy.

Therefore it seems to me the Commission that is recommended fulfills a long-needed aspect of congressional activity. The Commission will report its findings and recommendations to the Congress, and therefore the funds that are proposed to be allocated under the resolution are within the spirit of the Constitution. The proposed function of the Commission surely meets the requirements of the Constitution.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in order that the opponents of the resolution may have a full opportunity to present their arguments, and inasmuch as considerably more of the time allocated to the proponents has been consumed than is the case of the time allocated to the opponents, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Idaho withhold his request for one moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CHURCH. I withhold the request in order that the Senator from New York may make a statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere in any way with the plans in reference to the resolution, but I should like to speak for approximately 7 or 8 minutes on another subject. I ask unanimous consent to proceed on another subject without reference to the time element on the resolution, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, that is very satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH Reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether the distinguished Senator from New York has placed his request in such form that the time he consumes will not be charged against either side in this debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that his request has been placed in such form.

Mr. CHURCH. I have no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am shocked at the recent action of the House Appropriations Committee in slashing nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars from the mutual security bill.

The air is still ringing with Khrushchev's offensive attacks on this country and on President Eisenhower. The shattering collapse of the summit conference has revealed with painful clarity how deeply hostile, how dangerously unpredictable are Russia's leaders.

Yet, at this moment of renewed crisis for the whole free world, the House Appropriations Committee is cutting away at one of the pillars of its defense. This action will come as a shock to America's allies all over the world. It will weaken the influence of pro-American leaders the world over. It will strengthen the voices of neutralists and professional anti-Americans who claim that this country is not sufficiently responsible for world leadership. If these cuts are not restored, either here or by the House, then American prestige as well as free world security will take a nose dive.

The cuts that have been made in the President's program seem to be deliberately chosen to injure U.S. long-term aims most deeply. I am particularly disturbed by the arbitrary elimination of any U.S. assistance for the Indus River development project. For 10 years the United States and U.S. citizens have been struggling, both officially and unofficially, to bring India and Pakistan together in cooperative development of

the Indus waters. It was the supreme achievement of World Bank President Eugene Black that agreement had been reached on a program which will play a crucial role in the economic growth of India and Pakistan.

The project is important because it will bring India and Pakistan together on a matter of vital concern to both, which is of supreme importance to the entire free world. The tensions which exist in that area can be realized only by those who have lived in the area of India and Pakistan, as I did for 3 years. It is extremely important that those two nations be brought closer together and that the tensions between them be relaxed.

The project is important also because it provides for cooperative financing by six other nations of the free world and by the World Bank. Australia, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, and Britain had planned to participate as well as the United States. American aid to the billion-dollar project would have amounted to about half spread over 10 years. But only a small portion of that, only $177 million, would be in grants, the rest in interest-paying loans.

In other words, the Indus River project as envisaged by the State Department and as approved in the original authorization bill, is one of the most hopeful steps in international economic development that has emerged for a long time. It would strengthen the position of the whole free world in Asia and it would pave the way for a wider sharing among industrialized nations of the costs of helping less developed countries. All this the House committee has chosen to disregard.

Elsewhere the cuts seem to be aimed at those parts of the world that are already most vulnerable to Communist infiltration. In a meddlesome and wholly unwarranted interference with the conduct of foreign affairs by the executive branch of the Government, the committee is trying to require advance congressional approval of every single project. This could easily hold up U.S. aid to the newly emerging countries of Africa for over a year.

Meanwhile, flocks of so-called Soviet experts and technicians are arriving in Africa every day, full of promises for unlimited Russian help.

Incomprehensibly, the committee has put another restriction on assistance to Africa. None of the $20 million appropriated for technical assistance in Africa south of the Sahara is to be used for construction purposes. Thus while the Soviet Union is boastfully constructing a big new school in Guinea, United States experts are expected to teach the Africans outdoors under the trees.

Altogether, it is clear that the committee's action, either unwittingly or wittingly, will hamstring the administration in the conduct of foreign aid. By requiring advance congressional consent before any project is undertaken, the committee would make it almost impossible for the country involved to make any suggestions of its own for development aid. ICA negotiators would have no flexibility whatever in the negotiating of project contracts. They would be terribly handicapped in efforts to meet sudden crises like floods, earthquakes, and harvest blights. And, still a further obstacle is put in their way by refusing to allow the use of contingency funds to make up some of the cuts.

The committee's cuts represent a false economy if ever there was one. By eliminating flexibility from the program, they make waste and inefficiency almost inevitable. The committee has even cut to the point of seriously handicapping the budget of the office of comptroller of the foreign aid program. This office was only set up last year at the insistence of the Foreign Affairs Committee to keep an eye on the very type of extravagance that the Appropriations Committee is attacking.

Moreover, a word about the committee's cuts on the military side of mutual security. If we do not help our allies to maintain their own defenses now against the advancing technology of the Russians, we will have to pay a whole lot more later to defend them ourselves. The Korean war should be a grim reminder of what happens when we do not make it clear that we mean business in the defense of our allies. The money spent now on mutual security within our alliance system will mean a future saving not only of dollars and cents but also and, even more important, of the precious lives of American servicemen. As President Eisenhower pointed out, our own security as well as the defense of the free world is jeopardized by these cuts.

I am as anxious as anyone to save the American taxpayers money. And I agree that there is a certain amount of waste and inefficiency in the aid program that can and should be cut out. There have been some indications that the procurement processes of the military are not all they should be. Military transportation policies appear to allow a good deal of unnecessary extravagance. And some of our diplomats are developing an expensive habit of substituting easy giveaway deals for the more arduous negotiations of diplomacy. In all these areas there is room for improvement. And congressional vigilance is the proper way to cut down on many such excesses.

But, and I cannot emphasize the point too strongly, the House Appropriations Committee has substituted for the careful pruning which is desirable, a policy of axing away at the whole concept of mutual security. We must not play politics with the Nation's safety. Just because the mutual security program has no constituency within the country, because it serves the country as a whole and does not bring particular benefits to any one state or region, it is vulnerable to political hacking.

This attempt to loosen American bonds with the free world at the very time that the President may be facing Communist-inspired mobs in Asia who have the same object, is extremely dangerous. In the words of an editorial in this morning's New York Times, it is a "knife in the back" of our President. It is also a cruel blow to our allies. It will undermine our future security as a great Nation. I hope the Senate will repudiate this sabotage of the mutual security program and restore the drastic cuts that have been made.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his penetrating and persuasive speech. I associate myself with him utterly. The action taken by the committee in the House, if it prevails in the House and substantially affects the final outcome of the appropriation bill, will be disastrous. The Senator from New York is to be commended very highly indeed for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey.

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CITIZENS FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 170) to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is ready to proceed. I shall be glad to yield to him such time as he may desire.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-three minutes remain on the Senator's side.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall not need anything like that amount of time.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. To start with, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I voted against Senate Concurrent Resolution 17. In the casting of that vote, I joined other Senators in declaring that the adoption of the joint resolution would not be in the best interest of our country. The vote finally cast was eight in favor of the resolution and seven against it.

That division very clearly demonstrates the doubt that exists in the minds of the members of the committee about the possibility of making the concurrent resolution effective in law.

I directed a number of questions to the witnesses who appeared before the committee. At the very beginning, my thinking in opposing the resolution was rooted in the proposition that under the resolution there would, in effect, be created a third agency which would participate in the formulation of foreign policy. The resolution contemplates the creation of a commission made up of private citizens, who would meet, would analyze what NATO was doing, and then, if it so desired, make recommendations of courses of action to be followed by NATO other than the courses of action it was

following. That statement of fact immediately threw me into a quandary concerning the situation that would exist in the event the President and the State Department felt that one course of conduct was necessary to best promote the national interest of the United States, and the commission of private citizens declared policies and made recommendations which were in conflict with the position taken by the Government.

On page 28 of the hearings I asked Mr. Draper this question:

Now, let us assume that our U.S. Government at NATO dissents while the other 14 agree. Assume that you have this agency in existence, and they meet, and the delegates appointed by this legislative body of the United States, take a position contrary to what our duly constituted authorities under the Constitution took in passing on a question. You believe that will be healthy?

Mr. DRAPER. I do not know that that would happen, but that would be an expression of their own views. I would not think that that would be harmful if they gave their views publicly and the American people and Congress can draw their own conclusions.

Senator LAUSCHE. Our Constitution contemplates that the foreign relations shall be conducted by the President of the United States, through his duly appointed officials, subject to whatever restrictions the Constitution places upon that power, and vests in the Senate; is that correct?

Mr. DRAPER. That is correct.

I then posed the question:

Are you not proposing now the establishment, for the first time in the history of our country, of a separate citizens' group that will begin conducting foreign relations and which may conduct them in a manner that will be completely inconsistent with what the President contemplates the foreign relations should be?

Those questions and answers are reflective of the reasons why I believe the joint resolution should not be passed. I care not whether the appointees to the commission are of the best and most prudent in the Nation. The fact is that they are to be responsible to no one. They will owe no responsibility to the President or to Congress. When once they are appointed, they, in assembly, can make declarations of what ought to be done, and make recommendations, even though such declarations are hopelessly and indefensibly in conflict with the course which the duly constituted authorities are following.

In a democracy, nothing is more essential than to have public officials answerable to the people. The members of the proposed commission will not be answerable to the people. In accordance with the answers given, they will be responsible only to their consciences. Consciences are very elusive things. Some are good; some are bad.

I remember when I was studying the subject of equity, in the early history of the law of equity the query was made: "How does a chancellor decide issues?"

The counsellor before the court said: "He decides them on the basis of conscience."

One of the chancellors declared: "That is a peculiar law. The consciences of individuals differ just as do the size of toes. Some are large; some are small."

The primary point at issue is to make certain that whoever is attempting to declare policy and make recommendations shall be answerable to the people of the United States. I am quite certain that none of the proponents of the joint resolution will challenge my statement that after the commission enters upon the performance of its duties, it will not be limited in any degree in what it does by a power or authority exercised over it, either by Congress or by the President. When once the members of the commission are appointed, they will continue in office. The President cannot remove them; Congress cannot remove them; nor will the people have anything to say about the matter.

At the risk of repeating, if my arguments are disregarded, there can be no indifference shown to the fact that seven members of the committee voted against the favorable recommendation of the joint resolution. While I am not certain, there is a strong possibility that one member of the committee voted in favor of the resolution solely to get it before the Senate for final disposition.

Mr. President, I believe it would be a mistake to create the commission. I can see no useful purpose it would serve. Already there is too much confusion with regard to our foreign policy. The creation of the advisory commission would merely contribute further to it.

I pose this question: The President declares one course to be the policy. The commission advises a different course. How do we stand before the world? How do we stand in the minds of the people of our own country?

I think the safe thing to do is to adhere to the traditional approach, as declared by the Constitution; namely, that the foreign policy shall be conducted by the President and by the officials of the State Department. If there is to be a change in the manner in which our foreign policy is to be conducted, it should be done, in my judgment, only through a change in the Constitution. It should not be done by the backdoor method you proposed.

I urge Senators to vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] 5 minutes from the time available to the proponents of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I desire to speak in support of the joint resolution.

Perhaps I will be pardoned if I say that I have had very considerable experience with the operations of NATO, especially inasmuch as I had the honor to be a representative, designated by the Vice President, to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference. This is the 3d year I have served in that capacity. I also had the privilege last year of attending the Atlantic Congress, which has been prominently mentioned in this debate.

Mr. President, I believe the world has entered a new era, following collapse of the summit conference in Paris and the exacerbation of international tempers. There is also the great concern of the entire world over the violence of the language and the approach which accompanied the blowup at Paris.

What has caused singular unanimity of opinion in our country, regardless of party, has been a realization of the fact—which Khrushchev has proved—that today the free world must combine and unify to a far greater extent than previously had been considered as necessary.

It seems to me we are witnessing an extremely effective reaction to that situation. For example, I noticed with very great interest that in the long and detailed speech made in this Chamber yesterday by a leading Democratic Senator, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is very prominently mentioned in his party for possible nomination to be its candidate for President of the United States, he emphasized that very point—namely, that whatever may be the differences of opinion between the administration and himself in regard to what should be done, or whatever may be the differences of opinion and the differences of approach between the two political parties, certainly it is agreed by all that we must increase our cooperation with the rest of the free world.

Economic matters are also of great importance in connection with this situation, Mr. President, because it appears that the gross national product and productive power of the 15 other NATO countries amount to approximately 15 percent of the gross national product and productive power of the United States. In fact, the gross national product of those 15 NATO countries amounts to approximately one-quarter of a trillion dollars.

In addition, enormous trade responsibilities are now being considered and negotiated among the NATO countries. For instance, all of us are familiar with the problems being reconciled between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven.

I believe I can state authoritatively, as chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians, that, in the immediate future, economic cooperation of the most intensive character between ourselves and our European allies is absolutely indispensable in order to achieve real success in the cold war. For instance, we are faced with very grave problems in connection with the kind of economic warfare the Soviet Union could wage upon the free world, especially in individual primary commodities, including such items as tin,

flax, and fuel oil. We are familiar with many of those problems, especially in connection with the new underdeveloped countries of Africa. All of these problems will have to be handled in a collective manner between ourselves and the European countries which are the principal consumers of the commodities.

In addition, the Atlantic Community controls the overwhelming proportion of the world trade, and certainly must take steps to deal adequately with the problems of trade competition. We are beginning to realize in a very definite way, in all branches of our economic system, the importance and the effects of the problems presented by both imports and exports, insofar as the United States itself is concerned.

The proper handling of all these problems requires far more in the way of contacts and interrelationships with our European allies than has heretofore been accepted as the norm; at this time we are considering membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, to replace the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, which was the European organization for cooperation in regard to the Marshall plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, these developments will result in greatly increased intimacy of relationships as regards trade, aid, prices, and other economic problems between ourselves and the European countries.

Finally, Mr. President, we are looking forward to partnership with the European countries in order to help aid the less developed areas of the world—areas which, despite all we have done, including the work of the International Development Association, are still insufficiently developed to meet what everyone concedes to be the legitimate desires of their peoples to improve their standards of living. All of us recognize that the extent to which we take action to meet these needs will be the gage as to which way these underdeveloped countries will turn—either to the free world or to the Communist bloc.

Mr. President, under all these circumstances, it seems to me that a technique as beneficial as the one called for by the pending joint resolution, which employs the grassroots spirit—which is the way I define the joint resolution—will definitely help in connection with the desire to attain world peace. It is necessary in terms of the security of the United States, the security of the entire free world, success in the cold war, and success in the post summit period, when such great emphasis is placed upon the necessity for coordination and unification of the free world to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the joint resolution offers us an ideal approach, as a first step in dealing with what must be—if we are to succeed—the greater role of the entire NATO organization in enabling the entire Atlantic Community to cooperate more closely, and yet in practicable and completely constitutional ways.

So I hope very much the Congress will not forgo the opportunity to support this measure given by our colleagues who sponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the able Senator from New York for his fine presentation.

Mr. President, at this time I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], such time as he may require. He has long been associated with this cause, and he is well known for his outspoken support of the objectives of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my distinguished colleague very much for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. President, I rise to add my voice in support of Senate Joint Resolution 170 to create a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO and to authorize its members to participate, on an international basis, in meetings with similar conventions from other countries, to explore means of promoting greater cooperation among NATO countries.

The events at the summit conference have convinced me that the No. 1 goal of Khrushchev is to destroy the North Atlantic alliance. This would seem quite natural on his behalf, as this alliance stands as the most potent defense against the U.S.S.R. today.

Mr. President, most of us have long been engaged in seeking out ways to strengthen our NATO alliance. We know this to be most necessary for peace and security. Along with a number of other Senators on both sides of the aisle, I sponsored the resolution which made the United States a member of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference. I have served as chairman of one of the major committees of the Conference.

I joined in writing and working for the resolution in the NATO Parliamentarians Association which brought about the Atlantic Congress in London last year. I have served as chairman of one of the major committees of the conference. I believe that a great deal of good came of this meeting of citizens of all of the free nations.

Both the NATO Parliamentarians and the Atlantic Congress have strongly recommended the establishment of a smaller body which can meet for longer periods of time, and which can give intensive study to the possible means of strengthening our NATO ties.

To this end, I joined with a number of other Senators, in 1959, in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 17. Hearings were held on this resolution early this year, and the final decision was to replace this resolution with Senate Joint Resolution 170.

The purposes of this resolution are summarized clearly and succinctly in the following paragraph which is taken from the report of the Foreign Relations Committee which accompanies this resolution:

> Senate Joint Resolution 170 would create a Commission of not more than 20 private U.S. citizens to be appointed jointly by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House after consultation with the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees. The Commission would be directed to seek to arrange and participate in a convention attended by similar citizens' commissions from the other NATO countries for the purpose of developing paths toward greater political and economic cooperation within the alliance. Members of the Commission would serve without compensation, but would be authorized to employ and remunerate a staff of not more than 10 members. While in no way enabled to represent the United States officially, the Commission would report, and account for its expenditures, to the Congress. Not to exceed $300,000 would be authorized to be appropriated for the resolution's purposes; not more than $100,000 of that sum would constitute the Commission's share of expenses in any international conference. The Commission would cease to exist on January 31, 1962.

It has been argued that a convention of national commissions on NATO would mean duplicating the work of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and the Atlantic Congress. I believe that this argument is without merit.

The NATO Parliamentarians' conferences, as valuable as they are, consist only of legislators, last only a week at a time, and lack a certain amount of continuity.

The Atlantic Congress, as valuable as it was, consisted of a single session, and had an unwieldy membership of 650 delegates.

The proposed NATO Convention of National Citizens' Groups would consist of approximately 100 leading citizens, who would confer together for whatever period of time might be necessary to study NATO problems and to develop new solutions for them.

In my view the Convention would serve, in the international field, a purpose very similar to that served by the Hoover Commissions and similar commissions with respect to national governmental organization.

I think it should be emphasized again that the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO would not speak for or represent the U.S. Government, and that its members would be appointed from among leading private citizens.

Such a commission would possess a most varied background and would bring a most valuable experience to bear upon the questions of what is sound and what is possible.

During its early years, NATO was held together primarily by the Soviet military threat.

We all know that that threat still exists, but the best military arrangements depend on political and economic

discussions and agreements. The machinery for holding such discussions and making such agreements must be perfected.

The nature of the Communist effort for world domination has shifted to a considerable extent to the economic, political, and propaganda fields. The democracies can meet this new challenge with success only if they have workable mechanisms for consultation.

They must also have community of action. The adoption of this resolution will be a vital step in the creation of this action.

The continued success of the NATO alliance may very well depend on what we do here today.

The United States, and particularly the Senate today, is called upon to take the lead in this step for which other NATO nations have shown their support.

The President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman and most of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee think that we should take this forward step.

I hope that the Senate will give it enthusiastic backing.

I wish to commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for reporting this resolution. I also congratulate Senators on both sides of the aisle who have joined so wholeheartedly with the Senator from Idaho and the sponsors of the resolution in presenting it so effectively to the Senate today.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I doubt that I can add anything to the discussion which has been going on now for some time, but I am in favor of the joint resolution which is under discussion. This proposal is not something new. It has been around here for a long time. Certain suggestions were made by the administration. It has been worked out in its final form in a way that was acceptable to the administration, and, in fact, to me.

For several years I have felt we needed something to bring together more closely the NATO countries. I have heard our military leaders in NATO say that one thing badly needed was a greater underpinning, politically and economically, of the countries; that they are very well unified from a military standpoint, but that they could never attain their full strength until they were brought together more closely with better political and economic understanding.

There is another thing that impresses me. Over the last year or two there has developed some talk of a trade war. I do not know whether it is right to call it a trade war, but certainly it is correct to refer to trade conditions as between two different groups of European countries. Anything we can do to help prevent a trade war, which could be destructive to the well-ordered trade of the world, as well as the good understanding which prevails among the various NATO countries, we ought to do.

After all, the resolution simply provides for an exploratory role, and it comes on the heels of recommendations made by those who have attended the various NATO parliamentarian conferences. The people who attended got together last year in London. The proceeding is exploratory in nature. It would utilize the service and thinking of some of the best brains in the country. I think it is a good undertaking and that the Senate ought to approve it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, how much time remains to the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes remain to the proponents.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, how much time remains to the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-one minutes remain to the opposition.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in view of the fact that so much more time remains to the opposition, I would ask, if it is agreeable to the opposition, that the time for the quorum call be taken from the time remaining to the opposition.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I want to be fair. I have had no additional requests for time in opposition. Therefore, I accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Idaho if he intends to use any more of his 12 minutes?

Mr. CHURCH. It is my understanding the Senator from Kentucky desires to speak in support of the resolution; and then I should like to make some concluding remarks.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio 1 minute from the time of the opposition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. How much time now remains to the proponents of the joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] 3 minutes to speak on behalf of the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as one of the original sponsors of the resolution, I am glad to support it today in the Senate. We must recognize that it is indispensable that members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and their peoples should be more closely bound together than ever before. This is not a new interest. It has existed since the formation of NATO.

But certainly the events surrounding the summit conference make it imperative that the people of the NATO countries understand the policies of the NATO and that they support them.

In 1950 I had the unique experience of attending two meetings of the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in company with the then Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson. I remember the debate which occurred at the second meeting of the Council, held in London, with respect to the means by which Germany might be brought into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The process was commenced by making Germany a member of the OEEC.

At the third meeting, in Brussels in December 1950, the decision was made that it was necessary that American troops should be committed to the defense of Europe, and General Eisenhower was chosen as supreme commander of the NATO forces. The Brussels meeting was followed by the great debate in Congress in 1951 on the issue of committing troops to Europe. I believe that if such an organization as is contemplated by the resolution before us had been in existence at that time, and the questions to which I have referred could have been discussed by private citizens of the NATO countries, the governmental decisions could have been made more quickly and accepted and understood by the peoples of the countries which are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I see this Organization as one in which there can be established a better understanding of the policies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But my chief reason for giving the joint resolution my support is that from the discussions and considerations of able men and women who will be delegates there will be brought to bear upon the countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization new ideas and the best thoughts of their people.

Those who were delegates to our Constitutional Convention were not bound by the views of any political party. They were free to bring to bear upon the Convention their best thoughts, their ideas, and their genius. Governments by their very nature are limited. We should not be afraid of the full scope and the best ideas of the peoples of our countries. The resolution will give opportunity to the best minds of our country and of other countries which make up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to advance ideas, perhaps better ideas than may be held by those who are in power at a particular time—to join our countries more powerfully—economically, militarily, and in values which affect the opinion of the world.

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

Mr. COOPER. May I have an additional minute?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. I was interested in reading the speech of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I direct my remarks to those who are on this side of the aisle. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] said:

> A number of us have been working on this problem. Among them is the Vice President of the United States, who, when he was in the Senate, had a great interest in this whole area, and still retains it. I am authorized by him to say that he welcomes this initiative on the part of Members of the Senate; that he strongly believes it is extremely desirable for the countries of the Atlantic Community to engage in cooperative efforts of every sort to draw closer together.

I concur in Senator CASE's statement. I earnestly hope that the joint resolution will be passed.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the views expressed by the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the able senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. The subject before the Senate is one I have discussed on and off over a period of the past 10 years with a very distinguished citizen of my own State, Mr. Elmo Roper, who testified in support of the joint resolution before the Foreign Relations Committee. I believe that it would be well for us to pass this joint resolution today. I believe that a good case has been made for it.

The Senator from Kentucky has made a good case for it. I was very much interested to note in Mr. Roper's testimony before the committee that the much-maligned Director Emeritus of the Budget Percival Brundage is quoted as saying: "I support enthusiastically Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, consider very important budgetwise."

I believe that our friends on the other side of the aisle should, when the Budget Bureau is not opposed to it, give the Bureau of the Budget a little round of applause.

I was very much impressed by the fact that the Vice President of the United States has firmly and enthusiastically endorsed the resolution.

As I say, having considered the subject generally over a period of 10 years, I believe the resolution has now gotten into the shape where the Senate should adopt it. I therefore join the distinguished sponsor, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in urging the Senate to adopt the resolution this afternoon.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, may I inquire whether there are further speakers to be heard in opposition to the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair knows of none.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That being so——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey for such comments as he desires to make.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. There being no request pending for time in opposition, I am glad to yield back the time in opposition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey refrain from doing that at this time?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I shall be glad to suspend my request.

Mr. CHURCH. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opponents have 3 minutes. The proponents have 7 minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I should like to ask if the Senator from Ohio wishes me to yield to him some time now?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. There may be some assertions made that ought to be answered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the reason why the Senator from New Jersey made his suggestion was to permit the sponsor of the joint resolution to conclude the debate, which is a legitimate request.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. That indeed was the purpose. If there is no objection, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be necessary to summarize the arguments in favor of the adoption of the resolution.

The arguments which have been raised against the pending resolution seem to me to fall into two categories. There have been those who have said that the joint resolution somehow interferes with the constitutional power vested in the President to conduct American foreign relations. I believe that, with all due deference to those who have made this argument, the facts simply do not support it. Certainly, if there were any shred of substance to this contention, the joint resolution now before us would be opposed by the President, who is naturally jealous of the powers of his office, and there would be objection to it also by the State Department. Yet the very contrary is true. The resolution has the blessing of the administration and the approval of the State Department.

Why does the resolution constitute no interference with the power of the President to conduct American foreign relations? It seems to me that the answer is simple. It is because no power is conferred upon the delegates who will attend the proposed convention. They merely will be sent to exercise their prerequisites as free citizens of the countries which comprise the NATO alliance, to deliberate and to reach conclusions with respect to how this alliance can be strengthened and how the unity of the free nations can be enhanced. This is a fundamental right of free citizenship.

The delegates cannot bind the governments which send them. The resolution states that our delegates will not represent, nor speak for, the Government of the United States; they may merely deliberate and bring forth recommendations which seem to them to be suited to the objective sought, the strengthening of the NATO alliance. Then those recommendations, carried back to the respective governments, can and will be evaluated on their intrinsic merits, and accepted or rejected as the governments see fit.

The State Department, in commenting upon the resolution, has made it clear why it feels that recommendations emanating from a convention of this kind might be very fruitful. I quote the language of the Department of State:

> The Department considers that meetings such as the one proposed in this resolution might well serve a good purpose. We in the Department of State would certainly welcome any constructive and practical ideas which might emerge * * *. We particularly welcome the thought expressed in the resolution that the delegates to the proposed convention should be free to explore the problem fully as individuals.

Therefore, I submit there is no support for the argument that the resolution in any way interferes with the constitutional prerogatives of the President to conduct our foreign affairs.

The second argument which has been advanced is that the resolution is somehow unprecedented, that it opens up new doors, and therefore we should be cautious about approving it. I submit this is not so. Citizens' commissions are precedented, and we have used them to good advantage right here in the United States. The Hoover Commission was a citizens' commission. It made recommendations that were highly useful and productive. The Government of Great Britain has used royal commissions with excellent results.

All we do in the resolution is to lift our sights and apply the precedent that we have used so well in other fields to the common problems faced by the NATO nations in strengthening the NATO alliance.

I submit that the resolution is in the best tradition of free societies. Our individual citizen is the finest product of Western civilization. Let us use him to the best advantage. Let us remember that the most important advances which have been made in our long quest for freedom have not been the acts of duly constituted governments, but have been the actions taken by free citizens in conventions assembled. Therefore, inasmuch as the joint resolution is supported by the administration, the State Department, the Vice President, and has been endorsed by the NATO parliamentarians' conference, and unanimously endorsed by the Citizens' Atlantic Conference in London last year, and has the majority support of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it ought properly to be approved by the Senate as a whole. I hope it will be so approved in the coming vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If no amendment is to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. RUSSELL. I withhold it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 217]

YEAS—51

Bartlett	Hartke	Magnuson
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bush	Hill	Morse
Carlson	Humphrey	Morton
Carroll	Jackson	Moss
Case, N.J.	Javits	Murray
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Muskie
Clark	Keating	Pastore
Cooper	Kefauver	Proxmire
Dodd	Kennedy	Randolph
Douglas	Kuchel	Scott
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Fong	Long, La.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lusk	Symington
Gore	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McGee	Yarborough
Hart	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NAYS—44

Aiken	Dirksen	McClellan
Allott	Dworshak	Mansfield
Anderson	Eastland	Martin
Bennett	Ellender	Prouty
Bible	Ervin	Robertson
Bridges	Frear	Russell
Brunsdale	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Green	Schoeppel
Byrd, W. Va.	Hickenlooper	Smith
Cannon	Holland	Stennis
Capehart	Hruska	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Thurmond
Chavez	Jordan	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Kerr	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—5

Butler	Mundt	Wiley
Hennings	O'Mahoney	

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 170) was passed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, about a week ago—I think it was a week ago today, or yesterday—I gave notice that on tomorrow, at 10 o'clock, the Subcommittee of the Judiciary, to which Senate bill 3548, to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act, had been referred, would begin a series of hearings on that bill. I did not know at that time, of course, that it was contemplated—if it was contemplated then—that the Senate would go into session tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. In view of that development, it appears necessary for the subcommittee to get consent of the Senate for it to proceed with hearings tomorrow, if the hearings are to proceed.

I may state this is a bill of considerable interest to many people, both those supporting the measure and those opposing it. I had hoped we could make a little progress in the hearings.

For reasons stated, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to which I have referred may proceed tomorrow with the hearings as scheduled, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate will convene at 9:30 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

DEVELOPMENT OF WILDLIFE, FISH AND GAME CONSERVATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2565) to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations.

ELIMINATION OF AFFIDAVIT OF DISLOYALTY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1411, Senate bill 2929.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2929) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate has just voted to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2929; and I hope we may be able to act on that measure before we conclude our deliberations this evening. I would expect the Senate to stay in session this evening, if necessary, in order to vote on that bill.

I expect our consideration of Senate bill 2929 to be followed by consideration of the Department of Defense appropriation bill, Calendar 1614, House bill 11998. It is a very important bill, and it will need to go to conference. If there is any unreasonable delay, we might have to set aside any pending business in order to proceed to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of House bill 11998, the Department of Defense appropriation bill—and let me say that I have talked about this matter to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ], to the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and to other members of the Appropriations Committee—there be a time limitation of not to exceed 40 minutes, on each amendment and not to exceed 3 hours on the bill, to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it expected that the Department of Defense appropriation bill will be called up yet today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; unless we proceed much faster than we anticipate. But we do not think so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Texas has requested unanimous consent that the time available for debate on the Department of Defense appropriation bill be limited to a total of 3 hours, and that there be a limit of 40 minutes on each amendment, with the time available to be equally divided?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. The chairman of the committee suggested a total of 2 hours on the bill and 30 minutes on each amendment. We talked to various members of the committee, and we thought that if we provided more time on the bill, we would be able to yield some of the time available on the bill in order to provide additional time for the consideration of certain amendments for which further time might be desired.

So, at the suggestion of the members of the committee, we propose to increase to 3 hours the time available for debate on the bill, and to increase from 30 minutes to 40 minutes the time available for debate on each amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I correctly understand that the bill calls for appropriations of approximately $41 billion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. $40,384 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not believe we should enter into a time limitation in regard to debate on that bill before we see what Senators will offer amendments and before we understand what the amendments amount to. I do not have any amendments in mind, but at this time I feel constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ELIMINATION OF AFFIDAVIT OF DISLOYALTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2929) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has Calendar 1411, Senate bill 2929, been made the pending business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand it is the so-called loyalty oath repeal bill, to repeal the disclaimer provision in connection with the loyalty oath under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that measure is now the pending business, and I also understand there is no time limitation on the debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say that we hope to conclude our action on that bill this evening, if we can do so, or as early as we can.

There is no certainty we shall not lay it aside from time to time for any conference report that might come before us, if it is urgent, or any matter of the highest priority, but we do want to get to a discussion of this bill as soon as possible.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might say, insofar as my own information goes, there are at least a half a dozen speeches to be made, several of them rather extended, and this debate may run on for quite a while today, and, depending entirely on how late the Senate works tonight, could extend into tomorrow.

While I am about it, I should like to ask the majority leader whether an hour for convening tomorrow has been set.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An order has been agreed to that the Senate meet at 9:30 in the morning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Defense Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has been working practically from the first of February until now on the Defense Department appropriation bill. It is the largest appropriation bill that ever comes before the Senate. As chairman of the subcommittee, and I believe I have the support of the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, I wish to say it is necessary that we pass this bill at the earliest possible moment. It is a national security bill, and no other bill that comes before this body has more to do with our security than this appropriation bill. So I should like to beg the indulgence of the Senate to get to work on it. I do not care how long it takes, or how many Senators want to speak on it, but I should like to have the Senate start on its consideration.

I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will support me in my statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct. The sooner we get to it, the better.

MEDICAL CARE AND THE PRIVATE ECONOMY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, an address by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], at the centennial commencement of the New York Medical College and Flower Fifth Avenue Hospital on June 7.

I wish to call attention to this fine presentation for two particular reasons:

The senior Senator from New York has seized an excellent opportunity to tell an important segment of the medical profession the facts about and the need for legislation on health insurance for the aged. It is necessary that we have the understanding and cooperation of the medical profession in working out a solution to this problem.

It also gives me an opportunity, as one of the cosponsors of S. 3350, the Javits health insurance bill, to repeat my plea, from the floor of the Senate, for hearings before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The eight cosponsors of S. 3350 have repeatedly asked for hearings so that we may have an exploration of the different proposals and their relative merits.

I trust this request will be granted by the distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has assigned these bills to the subcommittee chairman, my friend the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], who has so well demonstrated his devoted interest in the welfare of our senior citizens.

The Senate should have its own bill up for discussion, particularly in view of the fact that the revised House bill for such purpose is tied in with social security amendments legislation, although in themselves the health insurance features have no connection with the social security tax. What the prospects for this proposal are in the House, or before the Senate Finance Committee, are conjecture at this point.

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

MEDICAL CARE AND THE PRIVATE ECONOMY

(Address by Senator JAVITS)

We stand on the threshold of a revolution in health care not only for our senior citizens but also for all adult Americans. I believe we are on the way to the highest medical standards on earth. We can achieve that objective by the expansion and extension of our country's medical school and hospital facilities to keep pace with the growth of our population; by increasing the size and scope of our medical research effort; and by Government-private cooperative action to achieve effective health care for our older citizens.

Part of this revolution is being brought about by the Federal Government's recognition of its share of the responsibility for the well-being of the people. In the last 30 years public spending for health care has risen to more than 13 times the 1929 level while private spending has increased only 5 times.

Today $1 out of every $20 in the Federal budget is allocated for health and health-related purposes; the total amount of Federal funds in this for fiscal 1961 is $3.8 billion. Out of this total, $531 million is being spent for medical research, and 12 Federal agencies are engaged in this medical research. In addition to this activity on the home front, the United States is also a member of three intergovernmental organizations which have major worldwide health programs and a member of 11 other organizations with limited health programs. In these international efforts the United States spends a total of $130 million a year.

These are startling statistics, but they represent only a beginning on the job we must do if we are to provide for the health care requirements of our country and establish a level of health services in keeping with our standard of living and our national goals.

Chief among these needs is a health care program for our senior citizens. This is "must" legislation that Congress must adopt before the close of this session. The voluntary plan which I have introduced with Senators COOPER of Kentucky, SCOTT of Pennsylvania, AIKEN and PROUTY of Vermont, CASE of New Jersey, FONG of Hawaii, and KEATING of New York, is the only bill now before the Senate on which it can take action because it is not a tax measure like the bills which use the social security approach and therefore must be initiated first in the House of Representatives. My bill is before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare ready for action.

Never before has there been such widespread recognition that support from the Federal Government is essential for any adequate program of health care for the older citizen. I do not believe that this inevitably leads to socialized medicine or Government domination of the doctor-patient relationship. On the contrary, I have demonstrated through my bill that it can be accomplished on a voluntary basis by the use of existing cooperative health plans, group practice units, prepayment insurance and other private plans with full accommodation to the doctor-patient relationship.

The needs of the people can best be met by cooperative programs between the States and the Federal Government and the beneficiaries. This is the sound principle espoused by the administration's program as proposed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming. I prefer my bill because it makes possible greater benefits and practically no deductibility due to subscriber participation more in

accord with subscriber's means. My health insurance bill provides for the establishment of State programs to which the Federal Government will contribute on a matching basis and the benefited individual will also contribute if financially able to do so. It puts the emphasis on preventive care, as sound medical practice dictates, and thereby offers a way out of the danger of overutilization of hospital and other institutional facilities by making physician's care practical and simple to obtain. The bill does not compel physicians to send their patients to hospitals in order to get the benefit of the law.

Let me cite for you briefly the reasons why I believe the bill which I have introduced with my seven colleagues can become law at this session of the Congress:

First, my bill provides medical security rather than social security for persons 65 years of age and over—as well as their spouses no matter what their age. It is based on the differing medical facilities available in each of the 50 States. Availability of doctors, nurses, hospitals, nursing homes, laboratories and other health facilities varies greatly from State to State—compare medical costs and facilities in New York with Oklahoma, Arizona or Mississippi and you will readily understand why it is impossible to specify by law in Washington, D.C., exactly what medical aid should be equally available in the necessary quantity and quality in all the States from coast to coast. The bill, therefore, gives to State agencies—and they know local conditions—the primary responsibility for health care provided that the State plan includes certain minimum services and standards subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Second, there is no other proposal before the Congress which meets all the desirable conditions and would provide all the benefits to as many people and as quickly as this bill. It is estimated that good basic coverage of health care for people over 65 can be provided on a nationwide group basis annually for not more than $156 per person even in the high-cost parts of the country. At least one-third basic health coverage under this program will include care in the physician's office or in your own home. This is the kind of coverage senior citizens need more than any other, because modern medicines can do a great deal preventively to keep aging persons well enough to make institutional care unnecessary. Doctors can treat many conditions better and less expensively in the home.

Moreover, hospitalization or the equivalent cost care in the nursing home or homes for the aged, surgery, laboratory tests, diagnostic X-rays, drugs, visiting nurse service, and other benefits will also be available under this bill.

Third, this is a voluntary plan—no one is compelled to take just one plan of insurance coverage or to participate in any plan at all. This freedom of choice is the American way and we should guard it zealously in all that we do. Moreover, this plan permits the State to become its own insurance carrier or to build on existing agencies, companies, and facilities within each of our 50 States or any combination of these—and it does this without establishing a large bureaucracy to do the job. By permitting the State itself as well as private groups, nonprofit cooperatives, group practice units, and prepayment health insurance companies—all under State supervision to come in under the plan, it makes use of the practical experience and existing facilities developed to deal with this problem.

Now, there has been a good deal of talk about how difficult it will be to get 50 States to set up their health care plans, and how long it will take to get the program going. These critics ought to take a good look at the record of Federal-State cooperation. What this bill proposes is nothing new. It is patterned on the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act of 1946, one of the most successful health programs we have had. The record shows that within 2 years after it became law, all but one of the States were operating within the program under their own plans. You can't do much better than that with any program of this size and scope. The record of the new health care program for over 2 million Federal employees and their estimated 2 million dependents is also a major illustration of the practicality of my bill and of the Flemming program.

Where a program is so urgent, and the emergency so generally recognized, how can anyone assume that the individual States will not be as responsive to the needs of their citizens as the Federal Government?

Since the founding of the Public Health Service in 1798, the Federal Government has recognized its responsibility toward promoting the health and welfare needs of the general public. Through the Public Health Service the Federal Government has pioneered in many areas of research, hospital construction and other areas where major needs could not have been met without such assistance. Today, however, we face an emergency situation which calls for accelerated action based on hard facts and considered judgment.

With the enactment of a major health care bill by the Congress, almost immediately an enormous burden will be placed on this Nation's medical resources and its personnel, no matter what safeguards against overutilization are included. Congress will have to anticipate and make provision to meet this situation.

My bill to establish a Health Services Study Commission, which is pending before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would study our health service needs, determine the effect of health care insurance on our medical personnel and facilities and pinpoint the areas which must be expanded. For example, there is need for a continuing study of hospital costs and hospital utilization. Medical science has made tremendous strides in the last decade, there is greater availability of various specialized services, and our medical institutions have kept pace. At the same time, however, costs have gone up and in spite of the fact that hospital salary levels are notoriously low, payroll expenditures have increased substantially. Despite all efforts to reduce the cost of illness to patients, we can expect that the per diem cost of hospital care will continue to increase in the years ahead.

There is also great need for more professional personnel. We need more doctors, we need more nurses, and we need more money for construction of medical facilities of all kinds. The growing recognition of this is attested to in a report issued by the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Medical Education, entitled "Physicians for a Growing America." It calls for a $1 billion, 10-year program to expand and extend our country's medical school facilities. At least 20 to 24 new medical schools are contemplated under this program, and at least 22 new dental schools are also recommended. The cost of this program would be met over a 10-year period with the Federal Government providing $500 million and the remainder to come from States, industry, private foundations and other philanthropic groups.

I have introduced legislation in the Congress to provide an additional $250 million in loans for construction of college, student-nurse, and intern housing. The Federal college housing loan program has been enormously popular, and under my bill, $25 million would be earmarked for new housing facilities for nurses and interns and another $25 million for related facilities.

In addition to Federal and State efforts to close the gap in medical needs, concerted drives must be made to raise the present level of individual giving and private philanthropy to support hospitals and related facilities. About 3 percent of our total medical bill is paid for by voluntary contributions, but that represents an increase of less than 1 percent in giving from these sources in the three decades since 1929. There have been vast changes in the construction of our society since that time and a tremendous increase in our standards of living. But it is obvious that the awareness of the need to support voluntary health organizations has not kept the pace. This awareness must be increased in every segment of our population, and a much larger share of the responsibility must be assumed by the community if we are to sustain our traditional practice of relying on local and State agencies as well as private groups for the largest part of the Nation's health needs.

The rich benefits which the health, medical, and related sciences can provide toward a better life should be made available equally to all ages of people and all economic groups. Top priority should, of course, be given to the prevention of disease and disability, but we must also make medical care and hospital care of the highest quality available to all who need it.

For more than a decade, I have been vitally interested in health legislation which would provide adequate health care, medical research, and construction of facilities to keep pace with the growing needs of our population. I have supported sound planning to increase the effectiveness of our health service system and to improve and expand public health services and research.

I strongly believe that the three major areas which I have outlined in this address call for urgent action at this session of the Congress. I want a Federal law that will help provide health care for our older citizens—not a political issue.

I want a Federal law that will step up our building of new health service facilities and provide more medical personnel to meet the need which our population will face in the immediate future.

And I want a Federal commission to be set up which will have the responsibility of making a continuing study and assessment of what we have and where we are going in health care so that our people will be provided with health services compatible with a nation that enjoys the highest living standards in the world.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Peace Corps of American young men to assist the peoples of the underdeveloped areas of the world to learn the basic skills necessary to combat poverty, disease, illiteracy, and hunger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3675) to establish a Peace Corps of young men to assist the peoples of underdeveloped areas of the world to learn the basic skills necessary to combat poverty, disease, illiteracy, and hunger, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I realize that the introduction of this bill is very late in the session. I wanted the bill to be printed and appropriately re-

ferred so that it could be the subject of discussion and the subject of intensive study during the coming months, prior to the convening of the first session of the 87th Congress. It is my hope I may be here to further the objectives of the bill.

The purpose of this bill is to develop a genuine people-to-people program in which talented and dedicated young American men will teach basic agricultural and industrial techniques, literacy, the English language, and other school subjects, and sanitation and health procedures in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

A respected American diplomat said recently before the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery that the Soviet Union does not understand words at diplomatic conferences quite so easily as it understands situations. In other words, the specific situation of the United States enjoying good relations with non-Communist countries and helping them along to economic self-sufficiency is much more persuasive to the Soviet Union than the most articulate statement prepared for a foreign ministers' or summit conference.

One of the most explosive situations today is that the rich nations are getting richer and the poor nations are getting poorer. Communism is nurtured not so much by poverty as it is by frustration. The peoples of the underdeveloped countries have seen our magazines and our movies, and they say, "Why cannot we live like that?" They see the gap growing greater rather than less, and they desperately desire to break through the sound barrier of modernization. In this type of a situation, communism can often look attractive. It is for this reason that we must offer them a suitable alternative.

And yet, Mr. President, I wish to make it very clear that the bill I am introducing is not meant primarily as an anti-Communist measure. If Marx and Engels had never lived, there still would be just as much need for action to develop the potential of the underdeveloped nations. We in the West must not only think about negative policies to stop communism—but also about creative efforts which reflect our own elevating visions of the kind of world in which we would like to see mankind live.

We are living in the most revolutionary epoch in the history of mankind. Events which used to take centuries to develop are now taking place in a few years. The imagination and boldness of our plans must be consonant with the greatly accelerated pace of our age. It is with this in mind that I have introduced this bill.

Before discussing the bill's provisions, let me say that a Peace Corps is something that I have discussed publicly for 2 years. Whenever I have mentioned the proposal, it has received an overwhelmingly favorable response. I have received a steady flow of letters on this subject, and I have yet to receive one letter in opposition to this proposal.

Several months ago, Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, and the late Senator Richard Neuberger introduced a bill, which has subsequently been passed as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, which calls for a study looking toward such a Peace Corps. I applaud their vision and statesmanship in introducing such a bill. I am in complete accord with its principles. My bill differs in that, instead of asking for a study of the Peace Corps, it asks for the Peace Corps itself. There is sufficient evidence now in hand to justify moving directly to the formation of such a corps now, rather than waiting for a study to be made.

As to the provisions of the bill, the Peace Corps will be a separate agency, but will work in the closest cooperation with the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and especially the International Cooperation Administration. Discretionary provisions are included so that the President could place the agency within an existing department or agency for administrative purposes. This would allow the President flexibility in the administration of our overall foreign aid program. However it is administered, I wish to emphasize the fact that the whole orientation of the corps and Director must be toward the people-to-people approach. The basic people-to-people orientation is sometimes missing in the way our foreign aid program is carried out.

A maximum of 500 would be enlisted into the corps the first year. Thereafter, the corps would be gradually increased so that there would be no more than 5,000 the fourth year.

It is desirable to begin with the smaller number of 500 so that the inevitable kinks can be worked out the first year. If, after 4 years, the Congress deemed that the corps could usefully be expanded, then the Congress could amend the act.

The term of enlistment would be 3 years. The first year would consist of an intensive area and language-study program. Members of the corps will learn from Government officials, foreign lecturers, and members of the academic community about the economic, social, cultural, and political factors of the particular areas where they will be stationed. Further, they will receive a thorough grounding in American public policy and contemporary thought. If our young people are to be good representatives of the United States, they must have a sound knowledge of American policy and the principles which underlie that policy. Finally, the members will undergo an intensive language training in the particular tongue of the area in which they are to serve. It is of the utmost importance that our people be able to communicate, if this is to be a people-to-people program in the best sense of the word. Approximately the first 6 months of the orientation course will be in the United States. The second 6 months will be in the areas where the particular members will serve. During the second 6 months, the Youth Corps member will concentrate more on language study and practical field training.

The administrator of the corps should endeavor to gain the cooperation of institutions of higher learning in granting academic credit for participation in the orientation course.

The year's orientation is a most essential part of the whole program. It would be better not to have the program at all than to send out people who are ill-prepared and unfamiliar with the job which lies ahead. The necessity for a 3-year enlistment should also be clear. As the orientation takes a year, they should spend at least 2 years in the field.

Entrants into the corps would be chosen with great selectivity.

Every bit of evidence at hand suggests that there will be many applicants for every one opening. The International Voluntary Services, a private organization with somewhat the same type program—but on a more limited basis—can only take 1 out of 10 applicants.

Aspirants selected must not be less than 21½ years of age at the time of induction. They must be highly qualified in a particular skill and must demonstrate enthusiasm and dedication to the objectives of the Peace Corps program. They should be willing to serve in relatively primitive areas. They must be essentially adaptable persons, be physically fit, and emotionally and intellectually mature.

For every team of Peace Corps members, there would be an older and more experienced group leader.

One of the critical projects the members would undertake would be to teach literacy. Surely, there is no greater need in the world today than that of teaching people to read. Over two-thirds of the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are illiterate. There is no nation on the face of the earth which can compete in today's world without a literate population. One cannot read the simplest instructions on a seed packet or directions on how to run an uncomplicated machine without being literate. The half of the world today which is in poverty and hunger and disease also happens to be the illiterate half.

Further, democracy itself rests upon the premise that there is a literate, well-informed electorate.

There is a terrific hunger all around the world to learn how to read and write. Thus, many of the Peace Corps members could teach literacy. Nine-tenths of the world's languages are easier to teach than English, and it is an established fact that one need not even know a particular language in order to teach people how to read it.

Another great need is for English-speaking teachers. School systems in, for example, former British colonies in Africa need qualified American college graduates to teach until such a time as those countries educate enough of their own people to be teachers. Especially, there is a burning need for teachers to instruct in the English language. For example, the former French colony of Guinea is the one country in Africa in which the Soviet Union has made substantial incursions. The only ace we have in the deck is that the Guinean Government wants to make English the country's second language, and they desperately want English teachers. As of this moment, the American Government has been able to supply exactly one English teacher for the whole country. The

country of Liberia has asked us for 60 English teachers.

Besides the necessity of supplying teachers and literacy instructors, there is also, of course, the compelling need for training in basic agricultural and industrial techniques. This is so manifestly obvious that I do not think the point needs elaboration. I should only point out that our helping the people to help themselves can have dramatic effects on their increase in industrial productivity and agricultural yield.

There are other programs on which the Peace Corps could embark, including community development, youth organizations, social welfare, vocational education, and sanitation and health programs. Members of the corps who had obtained degrees in public health or who had graduated from medical schools could suggest ways in which even simple improvements might drastically reduce the disease rate of particular areas.

A 3-year term of service in the Peace Corps would be considered as fulfilling peacetime military obligations except for Reserve requirements. And, of course, corps members would be liable to the draft in times of war or national emergency. A comparatively small percentage of the men of selective service age are now being inducted into the armed services, and since, at the most, 1,650 a year would be inducted into the corps, this would be no great drain on the available manpower reserve of the military.

Anyone seeking to avoid peacetime military service would be further discouraged from joining the corps, because: First, the term of service is 3, instead of the normal 2 years for the Army; secondly, there are no veterans' benefits involved; thirdly, members will often live in primitive areas and have more arduous tasks than they normally would in peacetime service; four, if the members are discharged from the Peace Corps for disciplinary reasons, they are then liable to the provisions of selective service; and, fifth, salaries would be roughly equivalent to those paid the enlisted rank.

Members of the Peace Corps would only serve in a particular country on the invitation of a foreign government. A bilateral commission consisting of persons from the United States and the host government would be established so that the participating nation could advise the United States of the major needs of the country. In this way, the other country would be participating in this program as a partner, not as a charity case.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I wish briefly to allude to the International Voluntary Services, the organization which has the experience most directly relevant to the proposed Peace Corps. IVS is a private nonprofit organization, and it takes contracts from ICA and foundations. IVS employs young men 22 years or older to work in agricultural and other projects in the newly developing areas. These idealistic, talented young men are oriented toward the people-to-people approach, and according to every account, they have enjoyed extraordinary success. Two examples will suffice.

A team of eight IVS agricultural specialists set up an experimental station in Laos. In a country where the per capita annual income is less than $100 a year, they developed a fiber which would bring in $1,500 per acre. The Lao Government was so impressed that it has requested 11 more teams just like that one, one for each province.

Two IVS young men operated a 33-acre experimental farm in Egypt. When the Suez crisis broke out in 1956, our Government evacuated them. One of the first requests that the Egyptian Government made of ours after the crisis had subsided was, "Get those 2 men back there, and give us 10 more just like them. Their fame has spread up and down the Nile."

The IVS men, being young and without families, spend most of their spare time with the local populaces. In most cases, they have been invited to participate in community cultural affairs. In their off hours, they have been besieged by people to teach them the English language. In short, they have been goodwill ambassadors of the best sort.

IVS has been able to operate at a cost of $6,000 per man, including overhead, as compared to a cost of $25,000 per man in ICA. This is partly because of the lower salaries. Thus, there is every assurance that the Peace Corps program would get a maximum mileage from a minimum amount of cost.

I conclude with these thoughts, Mr. President. There is a great body of idealistic and talented young men in this country who are longing to have their energies harnessed. The Peace Corps would tap those vital resources. There is nothing which will build greater people-to-people and government-to-government relationships than to have fine young American men helping the people of the emerging countries to help themselves. They will not only act as instructors but also will show that they are not afraid to dirty their hands in their common endeavor.

There is also the fact that the graduates from the Peace Corps will form a large pool of experienced young men, trained in some of the more remote languages and knowledge of the emerging areas, from which our Foreign Service, ICA, and USIA can draw.

Mr. President, in this turbulent decade of the 1960's we need imaginative and constructive plans for action which are consonant with the greatness and humanitarian ideals of this Nation. It is for this reason that I have proposed the Peace Corps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a commentary by the noted radio commentator of the American Broadcasting Co., Mr. Edward P. Morgan, in his analysis of the proposal made by Representative REUSS and my own proposal to establish the Peace Corps.

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

In a Senate speech last week, Chairman WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee described the administration's mutual security program, on which final action is pending in Congress, as a "plate of warmed-over grits." Defending the principle of foreign aid as being as necessary to the country as a life insurance policy to a family, FULBRIGHT scored the administration for lack of initiative and long-range planning which he held essential to the program's successful continuity. Still, he conceded, there is nourishment in warmed-over grits and reluctantly he endorsed the legislation as better than nothing.

In this package, however, there is at least one germ of a promising idea. It is to give eligible young Americans a chance to work on foreign aid projects in the field as an alternative to the military draft. The Senate bill includes a $10,000 item to study the feasibility of recruiting 10,000 youths for a 2-year hitch on technical assistance jobs. This approach was cosponsored by Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, and the late Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, both Democrats. Minnesota's Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY argues a study is unnecessary, says we already know what the problems are, and he is preparing a bill for direct action—a 3-year tour (a year longer than the draft but at basic Army pay without veterans' benefits) beginning with 500 the first year and building eventually to 10,000.

The response on various campuses which have caught wind of it has been enthusiastic but the unofficial State Department and International Cooperation Administration reaction so far is something as follows: "It's a nice idea but, gee, we already have all these other problems."

Interestingly enough, the exciting experiences of a small private outfit in this field called International Voluntary Services, may eventually bring the bureaucrats around. IVS, run largely by ex-missionaries on a nonsectarian basis, has contracted with foundations and ICA to man such projects as agricultural experiment stations in Laos and Egypt. Already both Governments have requested more of these young unugly Americans. The two trying new crops along the Nile are beseeched by Egyptians to teach them English in their spare time. Apparently this person-to-person contact on the grassroots level is one of the secrets of success for IVS, whose candidates are carefully selected not only for their skills but for a kind of pioneering spirit; only 1 in 10 qualifies.

In an article in the current issue of Commonweal magazine on his plan for a "Point 4 Youth Corps," Congressman REUSS writes that "too often we seem to emphasize military alliance with corrupt or reactionary leaders; furnishing military hardware which all too frequently is turned on the people of the country we are presumably helping." (Shades of Turkey and Korea.) REUSS speaks of "grandiose and massive projects" and hordes of American officials living aloof in enclaves in the country's capital." And he asks: "Would we not be farther along if we relied more heavily on a group of some thousands of young Americans willing to help with an irrigation project, digging a village well, or setting up a rural school?"

One of the things which steamed up Senator HUMPHREY's enthusiasm originally was this kind of modern pioneering concept. Applicants would have to have three main assets: real skill, real enthusiasm, and a certain political and social maturity with a minimum age of 22. The recruits would take a 1-year training course, half in the United States, half in the country where they were assigned. Their jobs? Teaching literacy, teaching English, basic agricultural and industrial skills, sanitation and health techniques and many other functions.

Carefully applied, this approach to foreign aid could do a great deal to transform the program from a plate of warmed-over grits to a large nourishing helping of frontiersmanship in a rich American tradition.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is an excellent proposal. It is constructive. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota some questions in regard to the proposal. I think it raises some interesting questions.

As I understand the proposal, it would provide an alternative for a few very carefully selected young men, who would be otherwise subject to the draft, who would be enabled to serve for a period of time instead in the Foreign Service of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Only for peacetime service. It would not exclude anyone from military service in case of national emergency or in case of hostilities, nor would it exclude anyone from Reserve requirements.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator from Minnesota mind repeating what are the provisions which would prevent this proposal from becoming an opportunity for young people to dodge the draft, to obtain a softer service and escape their obligations to their country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed. I shall read from the description of the bill.

First, I point out that there is a 3-year term of service in the Peace Corps, instead of the normal 2 years for the Army.

The participants would be liable for the provisions of Selective Service in time of war or in time of national emergency. Likewise, they would be liable for Reserve requirements upon completion of their service in the Peace Corps.

There are no veterans' benefits involved.

Members might be required to live in primitive areas.

If these men were discharged from the corps they would be immediately liable under the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

Finally, the salaries would be roughly equivalent to those paid to enlisted men in the armed services.

In other words, we are proposing to take only 1,650 men a year, which is a very limited number, in Selective Service. If the need were stepped up and if there should be a national emergency, then these men in the Peace Corps would be immediately liable for any call of their country for military service, as well as anyone else.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator please indicate what kind of a specific need there is for the services these young men would perform in the underdeveloped countries such as in Africa and in Asia?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, one great opportunity we have is to let these young people go particularly into the areas where there is a great degree of illiteracy, as teachers and trainers, so to speak, of the native populations, at a cost which does not encompass the figures involved in the present ICA program.

As I have indicated, it requires approximately $25,000 a year now to support a person in the ICA in the technical service program. The proposed program is estimated to cost about $6,000 a year per person, which is a saving of a substantial amount.

Additionally, the program is designed as a people-to-people program, and one that has limited functions to perform, such as in public health, education, and in community development, and not in the broad economic aspects, such as the ICA.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is then saying the proposed program cannot in any sense replace or displace what the ICA is doing; it would supplement that program; is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The proposed program does supplement the ICA program, and it should not be looked upon as something to supplant. It is not something "in place of." It is something to add to what we are presently doing. In the first year of operations 500 trained men would be selected from the entire United States. They would be trained in public health, trained in education, or trained in some skill. They would be selected on the basis of qualifications. Those 500 men would be told, "If you are willing to give 3 years of your time, we are willing to assign you to certain areas of the world."

Such a program of long-term commitments to certain areas of the world is exactly what is needed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The quid pro quo would be that for this service of 3 years they would discharge their obligation to the Federal Government to serve in the Armed Forces.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Subject, however, to serving in the Reserve.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. During a national emergency or wartime, however, they would be subject to being called up for active duty just as other young men are. If there was any disciplinary action taken, those disciplined would be immediately liable for military service.

At present a young man in college is exempt from military service for the period of time he is in college. Many students are relieved from military service because of the limited calls under the current Selective Service program. So, for all practical purposes, the proposed program would not remove the obligation of military service. Members of the corps, upon completion of 3 years of service, would in time of peace still be subject to serve in the Armed Forces Reserve. And in time of war they would be subject to the call to duty under Selective Service the same as anyone else.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that there is a great deal of enthusiasm for this kind of opportunity on college campuses all over the country, and that there are literally thousands of young people who are very eager to have an opportunity to serve their country in this particular way? As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, the bill would not eliminate their obligation to serve their country in the event of war or in the event of emergency. They would still be liable for that kind of service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand, the proposed legislation provides that instead of peacetime training in the military forces, or peacetime service, young men under the program would have 1 year of training, particularly in foreign languages, or a specific language, which would give them a particular kind of usefulness abroad. Then for the wage of any Army private they would serve as teachers or in other vitally necessary jobs in some underdeveloped country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I complete the thought which I started by saying that I have found the desire on the part of young people to engage in such a program as is proposed to be great. Idealism is common to youth. This kind of idealism and desire to serve one's country, to do so in a practical way, to do so in a way which would permit them to return to America, to marry, to settle down, and to engage in the kind of career that most Americans have, is a great national resource. The bill provides an unusual and wonderful opportunity to tap and use this resource by permitting our young people to serve their Nation and mankind. It seems to me the idealism we have is not being tapped. It is seeking an outlet in a constructive, practical, and economical way. It seems to me that the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota very usefully and sensibly takes advantage of this desire for and on behalf of our country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My observation is that young people are very desirous to obtain this program and to engage in this kind of work. However, the number involved is minimal. We would not have a peace corps of 2 million men, such as we have in the armed services. The total which is contemplated in the first year would be only 500. The proposed legislation would increase that number to as high as 5,000. Those who would come under the program would be highly selected. I limit the number because I think the Congress will wish to review the program no matter what may happen under the terms of the proposed legislation.

The bill would in no way weaken the military security of our country. It would strengthen it. It in no way would remove the obligation of military service in time of critical need for the participants. The bill merely provides that in peacetime we would wage war on disease, hunger, illiteracy, and poverty, and that to do so we enlist a certain number of talented, capable, trained young people to wage war on the real enemies, the real enemies being ignorance, fear, prejudice, hatred, hunger, and disease.

We say to those young men, "We offer you a program with an obligation for 3 years. You are under strict discipline. You have to prepare yourself. You must be over 21 years of age. You must have a skill that is needed. You must be willing to go into the primitive areas of the world and live under native conditions. You must fulfill your full term of service. If you do not complete such term of service, you will leave immediately for peacetime military service, and even after you have fulfilled your term of service overseas in the peacetime corps, you are

placed in the Reserve and subject to active military service in time of national emergency or war."

I suggest to the Senator that such a program would put manpower to work in the real war, in the struggle that we need to win in Indonesia and elsewhere.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield on that point, I shall conclude my part of the colloquy by saying that the purpose of serving in the Armed Forces, of course, is to help us achieve peace. The pursuit of peace, a just peace with freedom is the reason these young men in the Armed Forces are being trained. The Senator from Minnesota is proposing a direct way for some young men to serve exactly the same purpose by working for their country by seeking peace with justice and freedom in foreign service. If we talk to young people, we discover that this kind of program is what they feel we should have, that we should maintain America's strength so we can provide for peace.

The Senator from Minnesota proposes that our young people be provided an opportunity to work positively, constructively, and directly for peace, eliminating the ignorance, poverty, and misunderstanding which are the causes of war, and in doing so, to provide colonies of dedicated, idealistic, young Americans who can be the best possible kind of missionaries or salesmen, depending upon one's viewpoint, for this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct, and I thank him.

ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, I have received many letters from physicians in Kansas and elsewhere who are protesting a Federal Aviation Agency regulation, effective June 15, 1960, requiring private pilots to take their qualifying physical examinations only from physicians designated by the Agency. This very matter is one of the subjects considered in hearings just completed by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, recently, I have been receiving a barrage of communications protesting the requirement of the Federal Aviation Agency that during in-flight inspections of jet operations, the FAA inspector sit in the seat immediately behind the pilot and copilot. Some of the pilots on Eastern Airlines, in particular, assert that by contract, that particular seat must be occupied by a third pilot, even though the aircraft is certificated for operation without him.

The communications I have received from the physicians and pilots have certain qualities in common. They are unusually well written. They are carefully reasoned. They express genuine woe about activities of the FAA's Administrator, Elwood Quesada. But they also contain evidence that they have been cleverly inspired by sophisticated lobbyists. Those lobbyists have slanted the information furnished to the people who have been in touch with me.

No man's opinion or judgment can have higher quality than the information from which that opinion or judgment rises. In consequence, I expect to find bias in communications from people whose principal information about the FAA comes from biased sources.

I regret that I have not been able to attend all of the hearings of the Aviation Subcommittee during its review of the Aviation Act of 1958. However, the transcripts of the hearings have been available to me and I know the points made by the various witnesses. In my judgment, the hearings have failed to demonstrate that Administrator Elwood Quesada is an arrogant tyrant, as so many of my correspondents claim. Neither have they shown that he is lawmaker, prosecutor, judge and jury, as is likewise asserted.

What the hearings have shown is that the Administrator of the FAA, as head of an Agency with some 36,000 employees, has used them well in carrying out the mandate of the Congress. That mandate included a direction to make flying safe—for passengers, for people on the ground, and for the air crews themselves. It implied support for whatever action might be necessary to control the flier who thinks it is nobody's business if he wants to risk his own neck. If Administrator Quesada has erred, it is in a public-relations way; he has hurt the feelings of the executives of certain organizations by declining to accept them as exclusive spokesmen for all who fly or as the sole arbiters of the public good.

I have been disappointed that organizations with an honorable record of dedicated service to aviation now present a public image of churlish resentment against constituted authority. They are entitled to consideration and redress of sound grievances, but they ill prepare the way for such consideration when they engage in vest-pocket revolts against Federal authority or snipe at Federal officials.

The Aviation Act of 1958 was a major undertaking designed to meet the needs of an aviation industry that has grown almost explosively. The act gave the Federal Aviation Agency a single head because decisiveness was and is a prime requirement. As a result, actions have come fast. But there has been nothing to indicate that any regulation has been promulgated solely to harass, punish, or annoy anybody, or that bureaucracy needlessly has been throwing its weight around.

There may be ways in which the Aviation Act of 1958 needs amending. Our Aviation Subcommittee hearings have revealed some rough spots on which our committee may want to work next year. Unfortunately, the hearings have also revealed a studied effort on the part of a few people to propagandize their way to domination of the Agency that is supposed to regulate them. In the process they have been intemperate to the point of abusiveness and have sought to badger Administrator Quesada into resigning. Fortunately for all of us, he has had the courage to resist and to answer calumny with reason.

THE 1959 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD TO SENATOR YOUNG, OF OHIO

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Saturday evening, June 11, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] received the 1959 Citizen of the Year Award from the American Veterans Committee. In what seems to me to be one of the very best speeches I have read in at least a year, Senator YOUNG outlines his views about patriotism, about America of today, and about some of the foibles and fancies which a number of our so-called patriotic organizations are only too apt to fall into. I ask unanimous consent that Senator YOUNG's speech may appear at this point in my remarks. I commend it to all my colleagues in the Senate.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR YOUNG, OF OHIO

This evening I meet with you feeling a happy glow over the magnificent honor you have given me.

This organization is a very special sort of association. Every man in this room has worn the uniform of his country in time of grave national peril. There is reason to hope that future generations of Americans will receive a greater impulse of patriotism because of the loyalty and sacrifices of men such as you, who left comfortable homes and loved ones and responded to a national duty.

We hope, as a result of your war service, shared with millions of other fine Americans, and of your continuing service for your country in time of peace, coming generations of Americans may more zealously safeguard the free institutions you defended.

Some of you men participated overseas in great offensives that will be long remembered.

Many of us lived through days and nights when we thought the last vestige of decency, humanity, and kindness had disappeared altogether from the face of the earth.

People from far places will remember those who helped turn back the forces of dictatorship aggression and restored to oppressed people the world over their simple dignity as creatures of God.

On occasions like tonight, it is well for us as citizens to rededicate ourselves in the determination that there must be a good future for everyone. There was no future in the combat zone. However, oversea service gave perspective. The shortcomings of our Government stood out in bold relief.

With your background, experience and training it would be well for each of you to participate aggressively in all things to promote the general welfare of our country, and to help provide for all our people—freedom, security, contentment and permanent peace.

In this space, missile and jet age of challenge, there is need for all Americans to protect and assert their civil liberties. We must manifest the pioneering spirit of free and courageous men and women intent on maintaining our way of life and adhering to the guarantees of our Constitution.

There is need for reawakening of sound judgment and courageous action to preserve American institutions and American ideals.

Late last year, a county council of the American Legion of Ohio had the effrontery to issue a news release in the following offensive language:

"The Hamilton County Council of the American Legion of Ohio expresses its disapproval and censures Stephen M. Young for his scheduled appearance as guest speaker

in New York City on December 15 under the sponsorship of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee."

The jerk who evidently took leadership in formulating this un-American resolution, signed his name "Neil E. Wetterman, Americanism chairman." His concluding statement is as follows: "We strongly urge the Senator from Ohio to reconsider and withdraw from such participation so as not to become a tool of the Communist apparatus."

I don't like people who seek to play God with other people's patriotism. Also, I don't like it that these self-proclaimed super-duper professional veterans secured widespread publicity on their resolution on December 3d, but failed to have the decency to furnish me a copy until December 9th. I wrote Wetterman as follows:

"I repudiate your resolution, Buster, and your pompous, self-righteous, holier-than thou title of 'Americanism chairman.' Why don't you as 'Americanism chairman' read and try to understand that cornerstone of our liberties, the Constitution of the United States?

"If, in your press release, you asserted, or implied, that I am likely to become a tool of the Communist apparatus, you are a liar.

"Another thing—why don't you puffed up patriots write my American Legion post demanding my expulsion? Or, do you self-appointed vigilantes demand that I submit list of speaking engagements for clearance by your outfit before I, as a Senator of the United States, open my mouth in public?"

Well friends, these fellows have, in fact, submitted a resolution to the Department of Ohio demanding that I be expelled from the American Legion. If they succeed, I hope I receive back $6 of the $8 I recently sent my post as dues.

Of course, I made that speech in New York.

Also, at about that time, Congressman GORDON SCHERER, of Ohio, jumped into the act, saying that he "could not understand how any loyal American could address a group such as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee." Congressman SCHERER in another reckless statement, accused Representative JIMMY ROOSEVELT of following the Communist line. JIMMY ROOSEVELT was second in command of Carlson's Raiders and was in sticky situations in the South Pacific while GORDON SCHERER was safe as safety director of Cincinnati.

Incidentally, friends, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee is not listed on the Attorney General's list of 306 organizations as being Communist-front, or subversive.

Frankly, although I do know that some Fascist-minded directors of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are, in reality, enemies of our free enterprise system and our way of life, I would accept, if invited, an opportunity to address one of their banquets.

May I read also the concluding paragraph of an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune? The editorial stated: "Not only did YOUNG deliver the speech, which included a denunciation of the evils of communism, he also called his adversaries 'loud-mouthed publicity-seeking veterans,' 'puffed up patriots,' and 'self-proclaimed super-duper 100 percent America-firsters.'"

The editorial concluded: "Whatever other significance may be found in this little episode, it means that a U.S. Senator has spoken out sharply for the right of a citizen to speak his mind when he pleases and to whom he pleases. And if the Bill of Rights means anything, it certainly means that."

The Berkshire, Mass., Eagle stated: "The Senator's outburst was on target. It cleared the air. It drew attention to the vestiges of McCarthyism still abroad in national life. And it served as a warning to name-calling 'puffed-up patriots' that with YOUNG around, they would get as good as they gave."

The Toledo Blade stated editorially: "It is rare that a U.S. Senator resorts to such blistering rhetoric in communication with constituents. Senator YOUNG'S choice of words may have been intemperate, but in this case there is justification. The Legion's resolution was not only uncalled for, but was insulting."

Friends, unfortunately, the debris of the witch-hunts, the so-called McCarthyism, still is with us. Much of the debris of that period has been cleaned up, but it may take a generation to remove all this rubbish. We have recovered somewhat from that era, which we should like to forget, of pointless suspicion, fear, character assassination and ruined careers.

However, some practices of this period are still in existence.

Just recently we learned of the existence of an Air Force training manual linking communism with our churches and among the clergy, and questioning the right of Americans to know, and I quote, "What is going on." This outrageously false manual went so far as to say that Communists have successfully infiltrated our churches and that clergymen, unnamed of course, of certain of our churches are card-carrying Communists.

It is disturbing to learn that the technique of condemnation by innuendo is still with us.

Friends, we must be always on guard that none of our liberties granted to us in the Bill of Rights is sacrificed for the sake of unreasoning fears.

We must repudiate the fearmongers, those men of little faith plotting the inquisition, investigations into our schools, colleges, and even churches—into all institutions of a free society.

Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled.

It may be dangerous to permit certain opinions to be expressed, but it is more dangerous to attempt to suppress the expression of such opinions.

To attempt to prevent an explosion in a boiler by sitting on the safety valve is obviously foolish. It invites disaster. That was the method of the Czars of Russia and the Bourbons of France. They failed miserably. You cannot exterminate ideas with clubs; you only scatter them.

Fear of speaking our minds can do much more harm to our Nation than the Communists or Fascists could ever hope to do.

Communists form one-twentieth of 1 percent of the people of the United States. The odds, therefore, are 1,999 to one in favor of free institutions. Assuming the Cleveland stadium was filled with 80,000 people witnessing a football game, on this basis 40 would be Communists and 79,960 would not. What should we do to prevent these 40 from destroying 79,960 of us who have on our side also the city and State police, the FBI and the entire Armed Forces of our country—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—shades of Valley Forge and Normandy Beach. Are we no longer the land of the free? Are we no longer the home of the brave?

Without free speech—without free debate—all other liberties which Americans cherish would be in jeopardy. Let us protect all the people all the time in the exercise of all their right; and if we do that, eye hath not witnessed nor finite mind conceived the future grandeur and glory of our country.

While we must be ever vigilant to protect our civil rights and liberties at home, we must pursue every means to assure permanent peace and liberty abroad. Today, the issue of peace towers over all others.

It is a fact that man has outgrown war. He has made it both impossible and impractical. The wonders of science have made it worse than folly, worse than calamity, worse than tragedy. They have made it insanity.

Disarmament is the only answer.

The leap-frog game of the arms race—where first one nation is ahead, then another—certainly cannot be the answer indefinitely.

History of the 20th century to this good hour demonstrates that armaments races between nations led to World Wars I and II. We must end the armaments race with the Soviet Union and Red China by definite agreement with adequate safeguards, else the most terrible of all world wars might be precipitated.

Despite the collapse of the summit conference in Paris, we must continue to pursue every possible means toward disarmament and peace by diplomatic negotiation and face-to-face conferences with dictators of the Soviet Union and Red China.

My view is that the common people everywhere seek peace and want disarmament. They hope to devote energies and resources to improving their own condition.

But to speak disarmament is easier than to achieve it. We must be prepared for long, tedious — often discouraging — face-to-face negotiations, as well as protracted diplomatic conferences. Years of negotiations, if they achieve the goal, will repay us with relief, with security, with safety, and with the comforting assurance that mankind will endure and will not commit the final and irrevocable insanity of total self-destruction.

Friends, until and unless an effective disarmament program with adequate safeguards is agreed to between this Nation, the Soviet Union, and Red China, we in America must live in a war economy and spend billions for our Armed Forces.

The Soviet Union has been outstripping us in production of operational intercontinental ballistic missiles and rockets with nuclear warheads, and in space exploration.

We must close the missile gap with the Soviet Union. We must go forward with the greatest urgency. Being second best in a cold war, or in a shooting war, is costly and dangerous. You who are poker players know that a second best poker hand leads to trouble.

It is a fact that our Government is not made great by those comparatively few of us in positions of authority in Washington. Our Nation is made great by the intelligence, courage, enterprise, and industry of you from whom that authority comes.

Today there is a pressing need for all of us to be aware of the problems which confront us in this space age of challenge.

As we enter the 1960's, America is adrift. Much of our enormous reservoir of energy, power, and good will is untapped. We must release that energy for the benefit of our people.

We must direct our efforts not only to the production of consumer goods to make our lives more comfortable, but to enterprises that will make our lives more fruitful.

Our so-called present prosperity is a trickle-down affair which has fattened the few, with the leftovers going to the many. In the midst of this so-called prosperity, nearly one-fourth of our people are living at, or near, the poverty level—unable to afford good health care, good housing, good food, or good clothing.

These are the facts about personal poverty. They must be faced and dealt with. We must deal, too, with the poverty affecting all Americans—the poverty reflected in inadequate schools, highways, housing, medical care, and social service programs; our blighted cities, our depleted and abused natural resources, our polluted rivers and streams.

Is it unreasonable to assume that the first duty of the Federal Government is to provide for the general welfare of our people, and to encourage our country's growth and progress?

Americans today are restless because they know that America cannot stand still and

continue to grow. We may honor the monuments of the past, but we must build beyond them to an ever-expanding future.

We must proceed with the greatest urgency and devote our strongest efforts to the grave tasks which lie ahead. This is a time of privilege and dedication.

You, and all of us, are trustees of the confidence of free men and women the world over.

America has an abundance of scientific talent. We have the pioneering spirit to take leadership in this space age of challenge. We also have the wealth, but we must use it wisely.

We want to get on with forward-looking programs. We want America to breathe again, to advance mankind's hopes for justice and peace.

The graveyard of history is crowded with the remains of nations that had good intentions but lacked the imagination and drive to transform them into reality.

It is not enough for a nation to wait for events to happen and then react to them. A truly great country must march at the forefront of events and, by foresight, produce all the events that it wants.

We look forward to the day when men and women the world over live in peace, dignity, and comfort.

The winds of freedom are blowing throughout the world in a manner and to an extent almost beyond belief. Across the China Sea, in Indonesia, on the African Continent, and everywhere the toiling masses and the underprivileged are striving to achieve economic and political freedom—just as in generations gone by we achieved political and religious freedom.

Though Senators of the United States are not technical men, it is fair to say this: in our own way, a very large part of our membership has sensed the revolutionary character of the times and the great role which scientific research and development are to play in determining our fate.

It is not enough that scientists, engineers, and the people of government are concerned about our future. In this age of space, missiles and rockets, you, from whom our strength flows, must also be concerned and must be fully informed.

We are only at the threshold of a new world age. Years will come and go before there will emerge a world civilization based upon the eternal principles of law, justice, brotherhood, and human rights.

We are seeking that sense of direction and skill to carry to fulfillment a policy to provide economic security and contentment, and to maintain permanent peace.

We seek to preserve the fundamental concept of America and to improve upon the structure of government.

Friends, your public officials must have the courage to be liberal when the public well-being requires it.

We must have the courage and integrity to be conservative when responsibility demands it.

For the tomorrow of America, we must all speak our purposes plainly, for Americans are eager to hear again the straightforward language of a confident, prepared America.

We seek peace through vigilance, and to maintain our freedom through strength.

We respect our allies.

We cherish our neighbors.

We stand for an America at work; an America marching forward.

We seek expanding opportunity for all; a nation where farmers, businessmen, and working men and women may trust and love their Government and be trusted by it; a nation where no one is forgotten, where the young have faith and the aged have hope; where all stand equal without discrimination and possessed of all civil liberties.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA AT LINCOLN UNIVERSITY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 7, 1960, the distinguished Governor of Pennsylvania, David L. Lawrence, delivered the commencement address at Lincoln University, Oxford, Pa.

Lincoln University, an integrated institution of learning but founded and to a very large extent supported by members of the Negro race, is one of our fine educational institutions.

Governor Lawrence made an outstanding address with respect to the problems which will confront us in this year of decision, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the Governor's address may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DAVID L. LAWRENCE AT THE LINCOLN UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, OXFORD, PA., TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1960

Let me begin today with a confession. In some measure, I am guilty of that common transgression to which we all succumb at one time or another, and that is envy.

I envy you, the class of 1960. I am envious of your splendid record of intellectual achievement here at Lincoln University, of your proud heritage which boasts the company of such great alumni as Thurgood Marshall, Langston Hughes, Hildrus Poindexter, and Solomon Hood.

Most of all, I envy you for the great adventure each one of you is about to undertake.

This is a great year in which to graduate. Never before, I would say, has college training held out so many expectations. Seldom has a baccalaureate diploma taken on such meaning—not only to yourselves and your family but to your countrymen and to the world at large.

Barely 5 months gone, the year 1960 has given us a series of dramatic happenings that might challenge the imagination of our most daring thinkers.

I leave the chronicle of events to the official record but generally we may concede that 1960 bears the marks of both pain and promise.

The pain is derived from the timeless struggle of oppressed against oppressor. For us there has been the severe shock of learning that such struggles are not taking place entirely in that half of the world where oppression is a natural condition, nor solely in countries of doubtful devotion to democratic principles but, worst of all, in regions of our own homeland.

The war in Algeria, the massacres in south Africa, the rioting in Turkey and Korea, the sitdown demonstrations in the South are all part of a reaction against a way of life that is becoming increasingly intolerable for millions of human beings.

As a result, America's role or, in a remote sense, her moral attitude toward each of these situations serves to complicate and disrupt an already complicated world situation.

The question continually emerges: By whom do we stand?

When the Middle East, where I recently visited, continues to divide into warlike camps, Jew against Moslem and Moslem against the world, do we continue to seek favors from both, holding spiritual kinship on a par with crude petroleum?

Day by day, as the tension between Washington and Moscow grows, a side issue such as this has a ponderous bearing on the eventual outcome.

There can be no doubt that the collapse of the summit conference in Paris has struck into the average American an awareness of his international responsibilities such as he has never known before.

The man in the street no longer blurts out, "I don't know," when asked how he feels about the State Department's handling of the U–2 incident. In either support or condemnation, his answer is direct and forthright.

At one time or another in the quiet of his thoughts he must ask himself the question: "How close are we to going over the brink?"

This, then, is a most pivotal year. Between now and the end of December we will have judged the wisdom and ability of two men and have chosen one of them to be our next President.

I venture to declare that for a great number of you this will be your first occasion to cast a ballot for a President. Once again I say I envy you. In most cases you will come to the task of selecting your man without an excess of prejudgment.

Few segments of our citizenry are better prepared to make that selection than the class of 1960 now emerging from campuses like Lincoln's. After 4 years of higher education, you should be in an intellectual position to think—carefully, thoroughly, purposefully. Even when that education has been directed toward mastery of a vocation, it has failed if it has not trained the intellect in the making of important decisions.

It is this core of intellectual responsibility, sometimes called judgment, that led philosopher Mortimer Adler to define "liberal education" as "the education of free men."

As free men—and free women—the class of 1960 has some very serious decisions to make between now and the time it steps behind the curtains of a polling booth in November.

There is certainly no want of issues. Platform carpenters in both political parties will be kept hammering well into dawn's early light in an attempt to cover all the points. But regardless of the numerical count, the issues fall into three major categories.

The first I have touched upon a moment ago. It is America's role in world affairs.

To my mind there is no issue of greater importance now than the U.S. conduct toward the other nations of the earth. Failure in any quarter of our dealings, whether with our adversaries or our allies, can mean swift and unrelenting catastrophe.

This is the deadly game. This is the pistol at the heads of us all. Whatever the outcome of the confusion and the furor, the United States of America, in the eyes of her adversaries and her allies, is not the same Nation it was a year ago. To whatever degree you wish to measure it, our ability to inspire confidence has been diminished.

I have often said that disagreement on America's foreign policies should stop at the water's edge. And I still say it. But I do not agree with those who hold that this issue should not be debated at all. Most certainly it should be debated—loud and clear, with fervor and energy.

This is the year when Americans make their choice, not only of a man but of his plans and his hopes and his philosophy. We want to know in sharp and precise terms what are the principles by which our Nation shall be guided in her relations with others; with whom we stand and why. I am sure that you young men and women, soon to resolve this issue in your minds, want to know these things. And you, with the largest stake in the future, have every right to know.

The second great issue to weigh upon our judgment is the direction we shall take here at home. There are two aspects of our domestic policy. One affects the economy; the other affects our society.

Swirling around the Nation's domestic economic policy is a quiet but nonetheless highly important debate. It involves what the economists like to term "the public sector" and "the private sector." The public sector is that area of economic responsibility assumed by Government; the private sector, that assumed by corporate enterprise. The issue of the debate is simply this: "How much of its present wealth should our prosperous Nation dedicate to public service?"

Here is how the question applies: Today it costs just about the price of a medium-size automobile to give a Pennsylvania child a basic education through high school. If we cannot have both, to what extent do we want to sacrifice the one to foster the other? For the simple fact of the matter is this: Our public plant is falling into a deplorable state of disrepair. Older portions of our center cities are becoming dilapidated and in danger of becoming the home of those rich enough to afford it, or those too poor to escape it. Municipal and urban problems which strike at the vitals of society go unsolved.

As our hospital waiting list grows longer, our supply of nurses and technicians grows shorter.

Our roads are choked and overused and our public transportation is rusted and underused.

Our schools are overcrowded and understaffed.

We are faced with dwindling water resources and inadequate recreation facilities.

And we are plagued by juvenile delinquency, depressed areas, and slum growth.

If we can't solve these problems when the horn is full, when can we?

The promise of prosperity goes unfulfilled. Its challenges clamor for solution and go begging for response. We may have learned how to sustain prosperity, or at least its trappings. We certainly have not learned how to use it well. We have produced consumer goods with reckless abandon and made the private sector of our economy fat and sleek. But we have neglected the public sector until it has become lean and hungry.

There is an increasingly unequal allocation of resources between the private and public sectors of our economy. If it continues, we shall inevitably dribble our plenty away until we are once again brought face to face with want, depression, and despair.

These are the problems of the sixties, just as want, privation, and economic insecurity were the problems of the thirties. These are the problems of prosperity, or better, of the fuller yield of prosperity.

Thus I would say to the class of 1960 that one domestic issue on which every presidential candidate must stand revealed is precisely that: How to balance our economy between the public sector and the private sector. It is an economic question. It is intricate and infinitely complicated. It requires much thought. Fortunately, you are used to thinking.

The other aspect of our domestic issue concerns moral values, which are at the very core of our national conscience. Just as 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln was elected to office in the conviction that this Nation could not survive half slave and half free, so we Americans must resolve whether this Nation is to continue half free and half "almost" free.

It is a bitter and disgraceful fact that 6 years after the Supreme Court ruling on the integration of public schools, only 3 percent of all such schools in Southern States have been integrated.

It is a bitter and disgraceful fact that millions of native-born Americans, with a heritage and culture extending into colonial times, are still unable to vote.

It is a bitter and disgraceful fact that millions of Americans are systematically exploited through their labor, through their housing facilities, through their opportunities for self-improvement and education.

These facts are not America's skeleton in the closet. They are known the world around—in Asia, in India, in Africa, in the Latin countries. So long as our movement to correct these moral wrongs is even slower than the present rate of "all deliberate speed," we are subject to charges of hypocrisy by those we seek as friends and allies.

In this year of 1960 the American people will make their decision on the course our Nation will pursue, not for just 4 years, but for decades to come. It is a year like 1932 when new and vital economic measures brought us to maturity. It is a year like that just one century ago when America found its soul and set the principles of union and justice and freedom higher than any it would seek to attain.

I envy you, class of 1960. I envy your spirit of adventure, your courage, your enthusiasm. This is your year and you shall make the best of it, strong in the liberal education you have been given, the education of free men. Use it, as your college mate Langston Hughes has suggested in his poem, "Freedom's Plow," to make a furrow across the field of history:

"Into that furrow the freedom seed was dropped.
From that seed a tree grew, is growing, will ever grow.
That tree is for everybody.
For all America, for all the world.
May its branches spread and its shelter grow,
Until all races and all people know its shade."

REDEVELOPMENT OF EASTWICK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we will shortly be dealing with the housing bill which was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday. I believe it is pertinent to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, in connection with the urban renewal program, which is a part of the bill, the redevelopment of the Eastwick area in Philadelphia. This is the Nation's largest urban renewal project. It is about to go into construction. The development of Eastwick will be one of the greatest developments in Philadelphia's history.

Most of the credit for this development should go to the present mayor of Philadelphia, Richardson Dilworth, for his inspiring leadership in putting flesh on the bare bones of the Eastwick plans, which were barely apparent while I was mayor of Philadelphia. The result will be a very fine public improvement indeed.

A modern community of 60,000 will replace an area which has long presented problems to the city of Philadelphia. Much of the area was swampland; many structures were little more than shacks; junkyards and auto graveyards abounded, not to mention sewage-laden streams running through the area because it was too low for an underground sewage system.

Last June, hydraulic fill began to be poured into large sections of Eastwick. In August the first demolition contracts were let, and work on razing existing structures began. Only a handful of buildings in stage I are left to be cleared.

Philadelphia's Redevelopment Authority has just announced that it has chosen an aluminum company, Reynolds Metals, and two Philadelphia builders, Samuel and Henry Berger, to undertake the redevelopment. They will have the responsibility of translating into brick, mortar, and metal the plans for this community.

There will be more than 10,000 homes in the new Eastwick—carefully placed in settings of parks, boulevards, greenways, shopping centers, schools, churches, and playgrounds, as well as an industrial park covering more than a third of the 2,506-acre tract, but shielded from it by a green belt. The redevelopment plan was produced by Dr. Constantinos Doxiadis, one of the world's great community designers.

The Doxiadis plan envisions a series of residential sectors of "superblocks" connected by a central greenway along which community facilities will be conveniently spaced. Pedestrians will be able to travel on foot to all parts of their "superblocks" without running the danger of heavy traffic. Spine streets will carry major traffic around the residential sectors, and small streets will lead into the interior. The smallest streets along which residents will drive to and from their homes will end in cul-de-sacs, thus effectively keeping out through traffic.

The first new houses in Eastwick are expected to be built in 1961. It may be a decade before all 10,000 new homes are completed, and the community reaches its estimated total population of 60,000.

Eastwick represents a gross cost of $96 million to the city and Federal Governments, with private investment expected to bring the total outlay to more than a third of a billion dollars. The city of Philadelphia expects to recoup its $35 million share of the initial cost through the creation of new tax sources returning millions of dollars annually in real estate, mercantile and wage taxes, in addition to benefits arising from the well-being of its citizens through good living conditions and jobs in the new industries. It is estimated that the city can ultimately expect an increase in revenue of more than $4 million a year in real estate taxes alone, and a boost of nearly $3 million a year in school taxes. Industrial, commercial, and institutional enterprises are expected to provide about 23,000 jobs with an annual payroll of more than $105 million a year. This does not take into account the increased revenue resulting from general stimulation of business.

Contrast this outlook with the fact that in 1958 there were so many tax-delinquent properties in this area that the city collected only $200,000 in tax revenues.

The redevelopment of Eastwick will be one of the greatest achievements in Philadelphia's history. Future generations of Philadelphians will have cause to be thankful for the foresight and courage of the city government in conceiving and undertaking the task.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we will shortly be dealing with appropriations for the mutual security program.

The comment has been made that our mutual security appropriations adversely affect the balance-of-payments question. I do not believe this to be the case. A group of distinguished citizens in Pittsburgh, Pa., known as Action for Foreign Policy, comprising business and professional men and educators, of both political parties, who meet regularly to study current issues in the foreign policy field where legislation is projected, have sent me a memorandum on the subject, which I feel is so helpful that I commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the signatures of those who concurred.

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

Appropriations bills for the mutual security program will soon be considered by the Congress. Opponents of these bills argue that these programs should be curtailed because of a dangerous increase of the imbalance of payments. They point out that in 1959 the imbalance rose to $3.7 billion from the 1958 high of $3.4 billion.

We respectfully submit that the balance of payments problem is being adjusted by other appropriate measures and that reduction of the mutual security program, in any event, will not in fact substantially reduce the U.S. payments imbalance.

Without any substantial change in the mutual security program for the fiscal year 1959–60, the Commerce Department reports that during the first quarter of 1960 the deficit was cut by about $400 million. It is estimated that the deficit in the balance of payments may be reduced this year to approximately $2 to $2.5 billion, a sharp drop from $3.7 billion in 1959 and $3.4 billion in 1958.[1]

Even if there were the prospect of no alleviation of the problem of the balance of payments we believe that the mutual security program should be supported for reasons of national policy independent of the current balance of payments deficit situation. MSP is a vital instrument of U.S. foreign policy in strengthening and developing the free world, and it should not be emasculated for fiscal reasons short of a national emergency which in itself will threaten national security.

Significantly, the contribution of the mutual security program to the deficit is relatively minor. The vast portion of foreign aid which is recorded under the balance of payments accounting system as foreign payments returns in the short-term as receipts to the United States. For fiscal year 1960 it is estimated by Mr. John O. Bell, of the State Department's Office of Deputy Coordinator for Mutual Security, that only $150 million of the nonmilitary part of the MSP payments abroad will fail to return as balance of payments receipts to the United States in the short term. The reason for this is that foreign beneficiaries of MSP funds buy substantial quantities of goods and services in the United States and remit MSP funds or credits created in turn by those funds, in payment.

One of the reasons for the balance of payments deficit has been a decline in U.S. exports. Realizing this, President Eisenhower and the executive branch announced on March 17, 1960, the establishment of a national export expansion program by which the Departments of State, Commerce, and the U.S. Export-Import Bank initiated a series of coordinated measures to enlarge American export business and thus to overcome the balance of payments problem by the affirmative steps of increasing the amount of American business overseas and amount of American jobs thus created. Over the long term it should be noted that the MSP develops foreign markets and thus should increase American exports and thereby our payments position.

Another aspect of the balance of payments deficit should be noted in the words of Mr. Carl P. Blackwell, Director, International Economic Analysis Division, U.S. Department of Commerce, who says that "It is essentially a matter of short-term deficit for long-term gain."[2] Thus in 1958, $1.1 billion in U.S. direct private investment abroad was recorded as outgoing payments. Actually this amount classed as an expenditure is a long-term capital investment abroad which will some day return substantial dividends and royalties to the United States as balance-of-payments receipts. Meanwhile, this outflow of capital is of great strategic and humanitarian value to the United States and the free world.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons we urge that the Congress take all appropriate action to reduce the balance of payments deficit by measures designed to strengthen and enlarge American exports; and we oppose as unwise and shortsighted alleged solutions of balance of payments problem by curtailment of the mutual security program.

Respectfully submitted.

Stanley Ruby, Stephen Blickenstaff, Robert E. Mertz, Oscar S. Gray, William J. Barton, Chandler G. Ketchum, Thomas M. Kerr, Samuel K. McCune, Putnam B. McDowell, Stanley Shep Ungar, John K. Tabor, John B. Henderson, Kenneth S. Smith, Albert M. Pitcher, Jr.

THE SIGNERS

Stanley Ruby: Fellow scientist, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Radiation and Nucleonics Laboratory.

Stephen Blickenstaff: Program director, program Instep (Indian steel training and educational program), Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Robert E. Mertz, Esq.: Attorney, Buchanan, Ingersoll, Rodewald, Kyle & Buerger.

Oscar S. Gray: Secretary-treasurer, Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp., Apollo, Pa.

William J. Barton: Assistant to the president, Alcoa International, Inc.

Chandler G. Ketchum: Partner, Babb & Co. (insurance brokers).

Thomas M. Kerr, Jr., Esq.: Attorney, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Samuel K. McCune, Esq.: Partner, Kirkpatrick, Pomeroy, Lockhart & Johnson.

Putnam B. McDowel: Vice president, Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co.

Stanley Shep Ungar: Personnel manager, Fashion Hosiery Shops.

John K. Tabor, Esq.: Partner, Kirkpatrick, Pomeroy, Lockhart & Johnson.

John B. Henderson, Esq.: General attorney, Aluminum Co. of America.

Kenneth S. Smith: Staff reporter, Wall Street Journal.

Albert M. Pitcher, Jr., Esq.: Attorney, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

The above individuals speak only for themselves, and they do not purport to express the views of the businesses and firms with which they are associated.

---

[1] Forbes magazine, Apr. 15, 1960; Journal of Commerce, Mar. 21, 1960; New York Times, Apr. 28, 1960.

[2] Address, World Trade Council, Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, Mar. 9, 1960.

THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a little while ago the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] made some comments in the RECORD about the activities of Prof. Louis B. Sohn, of Harvard Law School, who has been active both in support of the repeal of the Connally amendment and in support of the principle of world peace through world law. He, with Mr. Grenville Clark, a distinguished New York lawyer, are the authors of a book entitled "World Peace Through World Law," which I have had the pleasure of recommending to many people throughout the country and also to my colleagues in the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland took a rather dim view of this work and also Mr. Sohn's activities.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from Professor Sohn, commenting on what Senator BUTLER said, and on his views with respect to the international situation, may appear at this point in my remarks.

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

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., March 24, 1960.

The Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Thank you for sending me a copy of the statement by Senator BUTLER about my efforts to advance the rule of law.

I doubt very much that I have had any influence on the decision taken recently by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. On the other hand, I support wholeheartedly that resolution and, in general, the repeal of the self-judging clause in our declaration accepting the obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

While I have rendered some assistance to the special committee of the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association, this assistance was limited to the historical background and the conclusions of the committee are entirely its own.

As far as my personal views on the subject are concerned, they are stated in an article entitled "International Tribunals: Past, Present, and Future" published in the American Bar Association Journal in January 1960. I enclose a copy of that article and a copy of the editorial in the same issue which comments upon my article. Both seem to indicate, I think, that my influence was a moderating one and did not give support to any radical approach to the subject.

As for Senator BUTLER's references to my book with Mr. Clark entitled "World Peace Through World Law," I would like to point out that this book relates to an entirely different situation. It envisages an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union that the dangers of the rule of law are smaller than the dangers of a continuing armament race. In the long run, the security of the United States requires a disarmed Soviet Union and China, even if the price to pay for it is disarming the United States at the same time. But any such agreement must provide for strict supervision and control, and such supervision would require the establishment of special United Nations courts able to enforce the disarmament regulations against any offenders. I am sure that anyone who thinks the matter through would agree that special international tribunals would be necessary to ensure that, on the one hand, any vio-

lators of the disarmament agreement are properly punished and that, on the other hand, proper protection is granted against any abuse of power by the international disarmament authority. We would need a bill of rights to protect the individual against any such abuse and we would also need courts to enforce this guarantee.

My book with Mr. Clark is not a blueprint for utopia. It is a realistic appraisal of the requirements for the survival of the human race. Many thinking men in the United States and abroad are now trying to analyze the problem and to find an adequate solution. Our book is intended to stimulate further discussion, but we would be the first to admit that it is not intended to be the final text. What we need now is not a complete disregard of these problems but a thorough investigation of them by the most competent people in the country. For that reason, I endorse wholeheartedly in the proposal made by Senator HUMPHREY (S. 2989) for the creation of a national peace agency. The problems of peace are even more complicated than the problems of war and we need even greater efforts to win the peace than we are making in preparation for a future war. For if this war ever occurs, it will not be won by any one nation, but will be lost by the human race as a whole.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS B. SOHN,
Professor of Law.

U.S. RELATIONSHIPS WITH RUSSIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles which I believe to be pertinent to and to contain stimulating comments on the present debate with respect to our relationships with Russia. One is entitled "Mr. K. and the Democrats," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 9, 1960. The other is entitled "Some Folks Spying Just Isn't Cricket," written by Art Buchwald, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 12, 1960.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1960]

MR. K. AND THE DEMOCRATS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Mr. Khrushchev's sustained fury against Mr. Eisenhower is more than a case of bad temper and bad manners. It is, it seems to me, a calculated campaign, addressed primarily to the Communist world. Its object is to destroy the image of President Eisenhower—of the benevolent Ike who is the bringer of peace to mankind—and to purge Mr. K. himself of his association with it.

The President's own image of himself has been that of the victorious general who became a peacemaker. Until May 16 this was also Mr. NIXON's and the Republican Party's image of the election campaign of 1960. The outlines were sketched in a year ago beginning with Mr. NIXON's visit to Moscow. The full picture was to be completed this month, when it would become incandescent with a triumphal tour of peace and good will to Moscow and to Tokyo.

To the making and the promotion of this image of Ike the peacemaker, Mr. K. has during the past year been a powerful contributor. The Soviet Union is at a point in its internal development where it has a vital interest in a detente. Mr. K. chose to base the tactics of his policy to achieve the detente on the belief that he could reach a personal understanding with Mr. Eisenhower. And, in the face of skepticism, criticism, and opposition from the orthodox Communists, he played Eisenhower as his trump card.

His prolonged fury against Mr. Eisenhower personally must be related directly to the size of his investment in the personality of Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. K. had done something which is most un-Marxist, something that no other Communist leader has ever done before. He had staked his prestige upon the personality of the anti-Communist head of an anti-Communist state, a deeply conservative general presiding over a highly capitalistic administration. After the U–2 affair—when the President had justified the overflights as necessary national policy—Mr. K. was in a position which is intolerable for a dictator. He had been made to look ridiculous, gullible, and weak, in the presence of the Communist world.

Accordingly, I do not share the view of those who say that the U–2 was merely a pretext, that the Western decision to stand pat in Berlin was the real reason why Mr. Khrushchev broke up the summit meeting. For him the U–2 affair was a far more serious threat to his power and his prestige than would have been an inconclusive negotiation about Berlin followed by an agreement to continue the negotiation at another summit meeting. In my view, after the U–2 affair, Mr. K. did not dare to negotiate with Mr. Eisenhower. He had been his chief sponsor to the Communist world, and without an enormous loss of face, he could not sit down with him and negotiate.

Strictly speaking, what Mr. K. has done is to break relations with President Eisenhower personally, and to suspend serious negotiations during his term of office. Mr. K. has done nothing about Berlin except to proclaim a moratorium good at least for another 8 months. He has refused to accept the President's personal assurance that the overflights are suspended. He has delivered an ultimatum to all our allies that he will attack any base from which an illegal flight takes off. He has focused his quarrel on Mr. Eisenhower personally and on his heir, Mr. NIXON.

Mr. Khrushchev's quarrel with the Republicans is embarrassing to the Democrats. For he has said that there can be no serious negotiation until there is a Democratic administration. No political party likes to be endorsed by a foreign government, least of all by a Communist government. No party likes to be endorsed during a propaganda campaign in which by the insults to the man, the office which he holds is defamed.

But the embarrassment of the Democrats at being preferred by Mr. K. is superficial and of no consequence. For the basic position—as defined by Stevenson, Kennedy, Symington, and in some measure by Johnson—is quite invulnerable to the charge that they are "softer" on communism and more "appeasing" than the Eisenhower Republicans. The thesis of the Democrats in this election is that the Eisenhower administration, because of a false economic philosophy, has been failing to meet the Soviet challenge in national defense and in all the main elements of national power.

The promise of the Democrats is that they intend to meet the Soviet challenge. They mean to increase the Nation's military power. They mean to invest more heavily in the Nation's vital and neglected public needs, in education and in the specialized training of scientists and technicians, in the advancement of research, in the protection of health, in the redevelopment of the cities, in the use of natural resources. To support all this, they intend to promote and encourage an increase in the rate of growth, which is now much too low, of the national production.

An administration which has that purpose will in relation to the rest of the world, primarily the Soviet Union and China, be able to negotiate from a position of growing strength. It is the weak, those whose relative power is declining, who find they must choose between surrender and standing pat. The strong, having confidence in themselves and commanding respect, can negotiate. For to negotiate it is necessary to be firm, and it is necessary also to be flexible.

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 1960]

SOME FOLK'S SPYING JUST ISN'T CRICKET

(By Art Buchwald)

We were sitting in the Sun Ya Restaurant in Hong Kong last week nibbling on bear claw, when a man in a tweed suit, smoking a pipe, sat down at the next table. He ordered a bowl of bird's nest soup, and when it arrived he started to develop a roll of microfilm in it.

When he saw us staring at him, he said very quietly, "Beeswhipple, British intelligence."

We stuck out our hand. "Buchwald, Lockheed Aircraft."

"I knew you were one of us the minute I sat down," he said confidentially.

"How could you have possibly known?"

He smiled. "Your oxygen mask is sticking out of your undershirt."

We looked down and hastily shoved the mask back in.

"I see where one of your chaps got his hand caught in the cookie jar the other day," he said.

"Yup," we said. "But it could have happened to anybody."

He ordered a bowl of braised fish lips. "I dare say not. It could have never happened to us."

"Why not?" we asked, sticking a chopstick into a shark's fin.

"We have a different attitude toward such things. You Americans don't seem to understand too much about this business. If one of our chaps had been caught, we would have played it entirely different."

"How's that?"

"Well, the first thing we would have done is announce that somebody stole one of our weather planes from a Turkish airport and Her Majesty's Government was offering 100 guineas reward for the return of the plane and the pilot."

"But that would be lying," we said, trying to keep the shock out of our voice.

"Precisely, my dear fellow."

"But, we're not allowed to lie in the American intelligence system. It encourages bad character. The State Department would never stand for it."

Beeswhipple poured some jasmine tea on the tablecloth and the linen suddenly turned into a map showing every military airfield in southwest China. He pocketed the tablecloth, popped a tuna fish eyeball into his mouth and said, "We're not saying you should lie. We're not saying you should say anything. But after all, you could show a little indignation when someone steals one of your aircraft."

"But he didn't steal it," we said. "He was told to fly over Russia and take pictures. We've been doing it for 4 years. Frankly, we were afraid no one would ever hear about it. Now the air is cleared. All of this is part of President Eisenhower's open spies policy."

Beeswhipple picked up a fortune cookie and when he broke it open he took out the order of battle for the North Korean Army. We couldn't help feeling a pang of jealousy.

"My dear fellow," Beeswhipple said, "no one admires candor more than the British, but we treat the stealing of unmarked airplanes as a very serious offense. And we certainly take a dim view of someone making his escape over the Soviet Union."

"You just don't seem to understand," we protested. "Lying in spying is the coward's way out. If we tell lies, then the Russians will tell lies. You've got to call a spy a spy.

"This is only the begininng. It's our hope that in the not too distant future we'll have spy exchange fellowships, and the Russians will send us their spies and we'll send ours on a Fulbright fellowship. Until this exchange can be worked out, we'll just have to keep flying over their territory."

Beeswhipple unscrewed the top of the soy sauce bottle and pried out a blueprint of the latest Russian spaceship.

"I can hardly agree with you," he said. "If the chap was really working for the CIA, as the Russians ridiculously claim, how do they explain the candy bars they found on him? It's obvious he was mixed up in a lollipop racket and this was not a case for the State Department but for Interpol."

We were becoming angry. "There is no sense talking to you. You just weren't brought up in the American tradition of fair play. When we get caught doing something, we believe in making a clean breast of it. Charles Van Doren has showed us the way."

We gave the waiter our CIA Diner's Club credit card, paid the check, and left Beeswhipple trying to get a model of an atomic submarine out of a sweet and sour lobster. What he didn't know about espionage could fill a book.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY JOSEPH RUSSIN, OF LARAMIE, WYO.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this month marks the conclusion of the annual series of commencement appearances, commencement addresses, and programs recognizing the attainments of scholarship around the country. Many of us have participated in all forms of these very fascinating and rewarding ceremonies. Sometimes it is the custom to assume that pedestrian remarks are related on such occasions, particularly if those remarks are invited from the students themselves, and more especially if they come from high school students.

I call the attention of the Senate to the address of a high school student on a commencement occasion which is the most perspicacious I have had the privilege of listening to and then of reading, so far as I can recall. This address was delivered at the commencement exercises of University High School, in Laramie, Wyo. I was in attendance at those exercises because my son was among the graduates that night. It is the address delivered by the outstanding scholar of the class, a young man named Joseph Russin.

Joe Russin has been back to Washington at almost regular intervals this year because of his attainments in the realm of competitive academics, in provocative speech promotion, in spelling out new ideas for our youth, and in other ways recognized by many of our national organizations. But of all the dissertations characteristic of Joe Russin, I know of no set of remarks so worthy of the attention of the Senate as his on that commencement evening.

I believe the most penetrating thought to be derived from his remarks is that they made his elders uncomfortable on the night of the ceremonies; uncomfortable because one does not expect deep-rooted thought on a commencement occasion, all too often. Yet here was a young lad who raised questions which his elders sometimes found it convenient not to raise, or else to sweep under the rug.

For the scope of his remarks and the depth of the ideas they contain, I commend his address to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

KNOWLEDGE—NOW OR NEVER

(By Joseph Russin)

Recently, an unarmed American plane was shot down over the territory of the Soviet Union. The plane was flying an espionage mission to detect any preparations for a surprise military attack on the free world. An attack to world peace came, but in the form of a volcanic eruption at the summit, the plane being only a convenient catalyst for the eruption.

The summit explosion and the subsequent tidal waves of threats were in some way to be expected. We live on an earth that is neither safe for democracy nor for peace. Instead of floating simple minefields in the oceans, we now contemplate portable nuclear missiles on floating launching pads. Twenty years ago, the American President had over 2 years from the time that Hitler fired his first shot in which to prepare the Nation's course of action. Today we may have a vast span of 15 minutes in which to act to save our world.

We feel all the tensions of the world acutely. Because we are so aware of these troubles, it is sometimes felt that trouble is unique to our age. I do not think this is so. The human forces that do trouble us today—nationalism, totalitarianism, dictatorship, desire for world domination, poverty, prejudice, and ignorance—have been with us for a long time. We have never been forced to be so concerned with them. No, the problems are not basically different—just the urgency for their immediate solution.

The world that we, the class of 1960, grow into is a troubled one; and one which cannot sustain itself in this condition much longer. We literally cannot afford many more blunders by today's world leaders, leaders who have shown an inability to cope with the problems which confront them—many of their own creation. More than ever in history, effective diplomacy, imaginative leadership, an informed public, and, most important of all, a genuine application of the principles of democracy all over the world are necessary. We maintain that no detection system or bomb will ever be as effective in solving the problems that face us as these more important human resources.

An appropriate question then might be: Are we preparing ourselves in these vital areas? Peace is too important to be left to the generals of the world. The president of Columbia University, Dr. Kirk, says he has the "haunting feeling that our educational system is not now producing men and women adequately equipped to maintain in the future the leading position in world affairs that we have had in the recent past."

As a fresh graduate (and fortunately no longer a freshman) of one of the better secondary schools, I must confess that I tend to agree with Dr. Kirk. My views are, of course, conditioned by intimacy, but perhaps for this reason they are also somewhat pertinent.

During my high school years I have been privileged to go to Washington four times and participate in national and international conferences of student leaders. These leaders felt that they and their contemporaries were not receiving the challenge they needed, in fact, wanted. These students were uncertain as to whether the training they were receiving was really sufficient to prepare them for the problems they would have to solve. Nearly all of the young people to whom I talked said that they had noticed a marked improvement in their school since the first Soviet sputnik, but they all felt that there still was much to be done. Most of the improvement was in the sciences.

While science is certainly important to our well-being, science is not necessarily a guarantee of peace. The Nazis and the Communists have been tragically proficient in the sciences. Obviously more is needed. The high school leaders of today want curriculums with significant depth and scope. They want classes that will give them the tools to understand and handle the complex machine of democracy. This plea was the strongest of all. As leaders, it seemed clear to them that our schools' weakest areas—the humanities and social sciences—were precisely the ones that are most needed to obtain the knowledge for true peace.

At a time democracy must fight for its life, many students amazingly are quite apathetic about such things as civil liberties. A recent Purdue University poll has shown that, while most students say they believe in the Bill of Rights, they really do not endorse its guarantees in day-to-day life. Large percentages see nothing wrong with strong-arm police methods. Many advocate strong restrictions on the freedoms of speech and religion.

But what else can be expected? How can students be expected to practice real religious freedom when many schools violate the doctrine of the separation of church and state? Some students have never even heard of the concept. It sounds like a radical notion to them. And why not—it is not always practiced in the realm of their experience.

The poll further showed that many students favored some kind of censorship of political thinking for the so-called average man. To me, the danger of our citizens' losing sight of the true values of our democracy through ignorance and misuse is a far more dangerous threat to our society than any Soviet propaganda.

We, the youth of our Nation, feel it is imperative that our schools become real teachers of democracy and the values that ideally operate in a democratic community. It is in the schools that our society must develop its basic strengths.

We want schools where everyone is allowed to attend. We do not think, for example, that color is a just criterion of intelligence. We want schools where academic excellence is held above all else in emphasis, expenditure, and real importance.

We want schools where the Bill of Rights makes sense, so, for example, the meaning of the first amendment is truly understood in a real separation of religion from the school.

We want schools where a love of democracy is fostered by the encouragement of student government organizations.

We want schools that offer curriculums that can prepare us to meet the challenge of the world. We do not quite see the place of such course work as table setting and studies of "One Handed Push Shots in the High Schools of Southern Indiana."

We want schools where individual study and thorough reading are considered of prime importance.

We want schools where students may gain an acquaintance with the fine arts and music, so that they may live richer lives.

We want schools where the humanities are encouraged on a par with, if not even more than, physical science; for it is in the humanities where the arts and techniques must be learned for the obtainment of real peace.

In short, we want schools that emphasize the values of democracy, and provide us with the skills to practice it.

With our limited experience, we of the class of 1960 can offer no sweeping solution or way to achieve these objectives; we can only pose the problem. The answer is as difficult to reach as it is simple to postulate; unless the human race learns sufficient wisdom to really practice democracy, it will vanish from the earth in the spiraling cloud of a thermonuclear bomb.

The great hope of the world is the example of the practice of true democracy by America. Where better can America build democracy than by constantly observing and practicing it in its schools? America and the world can no longer afford the luxury of mistakes; the price of error has risen beyond the ability of mankind to pay and survive.

ELIMINATION OF AFFIDAVIT OF DISLOYALTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2929) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the issue before the Senate is the repeal of that portion of the National Defense Education Act which requires every student who applies for a loan under that act to sign an affidavit declaring that he does not believe in and does not support any organization that believes in the overthrow of the U.S. Government by illegal or unconstitutional methods.

The bill before the Senate would continue the requirement that the student take the usual oath or affirmation to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States. This is the oath we all take when entering upon public service.

The bill would eliminate the disclaimer affidavit, or, as it is sometimes called, the affidavit of nonbelief. There is little reason for its inclusion in the law. The colleges of the contrary, through their representative organizations are virtually unanimous in opposing its inclusion in the National Defense Education Act. The President of the United States has recommended its repeal. Both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Budget Bureau have reiterated the President's recommendations. And the committee has found that the provision offers no protections not already in other statutes.

No one can quarrel with the principle that all Americans should be loyal citizens and should be willing to swear allegiance to our country.

But the disclaimer affidavit singles out students—and only those students who need to borrow money to continue their education—as a group which must sign, in addition, a rather vague affidavit as to their beliefs.

There is a very real danger that this unnecessary, futile gesture toward the memory of an earlier age will defeat the purposes of the National Defense Education Act. Twenty-one universities—and they are some of the most outstanding colleges and universities in the United States—feel so strongly about it that they refuse to participate in the program. Unlike the Soviets, we cannot take steps to keep our brightest minds in scientific careers, but we might take steps that keep them out. Surely this is not the way to "catch up" with the reputed Russian excellence in education, science, and research.

Finally, this requirement imposes an intolerable burden upon the institutions which must administer it. They are responsible for its enforcement. And few, if any, are equipped to assume this responsibility.

I hope the Senate will support the repeal of this provision.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Does not the Senator believe that the mere fact that the universities have refused to participate in the program has prevented many persons who wish to abide by the law from taking the oath and signing the affidavit, persons who would be entitled to an education in those institutions? Is not that in itself an abridgement of academic freedom?

Mr. KENNEDY. This is their judgment, because very special responsibilities are placed upon universities under the law, in the first place.

In the second place, this provision has placed universities in a very difficult situation. On the one hand, they are reluctant to deny students the opportunity to participate in the program, as the Senator from Vermont has suggested; on the other hand, they regard this provision as totally obnoxious; as really a limitation on the purposes of a university and the purposes of free education.

That is because they feel it is against scholarship by singling out students, from all Americans who receive assistance from the Government, requiring them to take an oath before a notary that they are not members of the Communist Party or do not hold disloyal beliefs or opinions. I think the colleges and universities regard that requirement as obnoxious. They have, therefore, refused to participate in the program. They are operating within their rights.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I intend to offer an amendment later, and to develop my position at some length. I shall try to prove that under the Senator's bill a bona fide card-carrying member of the Communist Party can qualify under the National Defense Education Act. I shall not discuss that matter now, but I shall develop it later. I feel certain the Senator does not want that kind of activity to happen.

Mr. KENNEDY. No. I think the problem before us is to weigh the courses of possible action we might take. One is to continue the law, and possibly—although there is some disagreement on the question—make it more difficult for a Communist to enter a college as a freshman and receive a loan. It might be very possible that the Senator from Vermont is correct.

On the other hand, there are already at least 21 distinguished universities, including Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, stretching all the way across the United States, which refuse to participate in the program.

I believe hundreds of students who are loyal Americans are not participating in the program because of the strong feeling on the part of universities and faculties. It is very possible that Communists—card-carrying Communists—are participating in other programs which the Government sponsors. They may be receiving assistance under programs of Federal grants in aid; they may be dependent mothers; they may be farmers who are receiving subsidies; they may be newspaper publishers. There may be thousands of Americans who are receiving subsidies and who are members of the Communist Party. But I do not take the view that the United States is soft on Communists.

Mr. PROUTY. This provision is a part of the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. KENNEDY. I speak today with the full support of this statement by the President of the United States:

> This affidavit requirement is unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels that it is being singled out for this requirement.

The repeal of the affidavit has been recommended by the Vice President of the United States. Its repeal has been recommended by the Republican Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. They are loyal Americans, as are all of us.

I hope the Senator from Vermont will consider the effect which this provision is having. If he will turn to page 4 of the report, he will see the list of the colleges which have already withdrawn from the program. They are some of the most outstanding colleges in the United States—Amherst, Antioch, Bennington, Brandeis, Goucher, Grinnell, Harvard, Oberlin, Radcliffe, Reed College in Oregon, St. John's College, Maryland, Sarah Lawrence, Smith, the University of Chicago, Wilmington College in Ohio, Wesleyan University in Connecticut, and Yale university.

Then there are institutions which have declined to participate in the student loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit. They are Beloit, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, Mills, Princeton, Swarthmore, the University of Richmond, Va., and Wellesley.

Then there is a list of institutions whose presidents or boards have publicly stated their disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit, but which continue to participate in the student loan program, for reasons which were stated by the Senator from Vermont. The list is almost endless. It continues for several pages. It includes the University of Washington, the University of Pittsburgh, Notre Dame, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of North Carolina, the

University of Hawaii, and universities and colleges stretching across the United States.

I believe the weight of opinion and the responsible course of action call for continuing the oath and repealing the affidavit.

Mr. PROUTY. I intend to cover the entire situation very thoroughly, insofar as it relates to the security program generally and as it confronts such students individually. My amendment will not require the taking of the loyalty oath or the signing of an affidavit. However, I believe my amendment will be much stronger than the existing law.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator is to offer an amendment which he believes will be stronger than the Security Act, why does not he favor applying it to all Americans who receive assistance from the Government?

Mr. PROUTY. I shall point out how many Americans are subject to that requirement at the present time. The Senator voted for the Labor-Management Act the last time; and that act provides that a Communist cannot hold office in a union, and that a person who has been a Communist in the past cannot hold office in a union. However, union officials are not involved in the Federal Government in any way, shape, or manner.

At the proper time I shall point out several examples.

The pending measure is a national-defense measure. The ROTC students sign a loyalty oath during their first 2 years of college; and during their junior and senior years they are required to answer very detailed questions which are much stronger than the affidavit.

I may say to the Senator that without the affidavit now in the law, the present law would be meaningless. I shall point that out in some detail at the proper time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly.

Mr. BUSH. Was there any substantial opposition to inclusion of the affidavit in the labor-management bill, to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. PROUTY. Not that I recall.

Mr. BUSH. But there is a great deal of opposition to its inclusion in the education bill, is there not?

Mr. PROUTY. I am afraid that too many of those in some of our schools and colleges are so much engaged in philosophic abstractions, perhaps, that they seem to feel—although I do not think they mean it—or they seem to suggest that they are actually proposing the destruction of the Bill of Rights, and of doing so in the name of freedom. The Bill of Rights is not a national suicide pact; and I think we must recognize that fact.

Mr. KENNEDY. I doubt that the purpose of those in the academic field to whom the Senator has referred is to destroy the Bill of Rights, in the process of engaging in philosophic abstractions.

Mr. PROUTY. I do not think that is their purpose; but I think that is the effect.

Mr. KENNEDY. But let me say that it is exactly the suspicious attitude the Senator expresses, as reflected in the affidavit, that is causing such discontent and division, whereas there should be unity and harmony. Certainly our universities and our citizens who are active in the academic world will grow in importance during the next 10, 20, and 30 years. I believe it would be inimical to the national interest to continue this affidavit, which has caused such great concern among so many patriotic Americans in our academic institutions; and I believe that the national defense effort and the national interest would not be served by continuing the oath. The Senator from Vermont thinks otherwise; and he will have to make his own presentation.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say that my amendment will not outlaw the Communist Party. But my amendment will prevent any person who is knowingly a Communist or any person who supports the purposes or the objectives of the Communist conspiracy from receiving one cent of money provided by the American taxpayers.

I believe the inclusion of such a provision is wholly justified.

In due course I shall submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if this matter had been presented in its present form when the bill was originally before the Senate, I am frank to say that I would have thought the oath that is provided in the pending bill would have been adequate. However, conditions are not the same now as they were then. Since the original bill was proposed this matter has been widely discussed throughout the entire length and breadth of the United States. It is one of those things that cannot be taken back to the American people, in an ordinary news article or in a radio broadcast or in a brief television appearance or news release, and be explained in detail.

In the last analysis, Mr. President, the vote we shall cast on this bill will be understood by the American people as action by the Senate of the United States on the question of repealing a loyalty oath which is required of students who participate in a loan program financed by appropriated funds. That is the way the issue will stand before the American people.

Mr. President, in the light of that circumstance and that fact, I shall not undertake to split hairs here today in dealing with the difference between this Kennedy bill and the original Kennedy bill, which the Senate considered last year and recommitted to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

In this critical hour of American history, I shall oppose the taking of any affirmative action by the Senate of the United States which could be considered anywhere on the face of the earth as constituting a protest by the young people of this country against reaffirming their faith in the American system and against stating their abhorrence of the system of collectivism and communism that prevails behind the Iron Curtain.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator from Georgia inadvertently stated that this bill would repeal the loyalty oath.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not state that.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator did not mean to.

Mr. RUSSELL. And I did not do so.

Mr. CLARK. But I believe he did. Of course the record will speak for itself.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure it will. But I made no such statement. I said it would be construed as action to repeal the loyalty oath.

Mr. CLARK. But surely the Senator is aware that if this bill is passed, each student who participates in the program will have to take, and to subscribe to, an oath or affirmation as follows:

> I do solemnly swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all of its enemies, foreign and domestic.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I am well aware of that.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill now is in substantially the shape it finally reached last year, after it had been amended, and just before it was recommitted, as I recall.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I recall the point the Senator made last year—and he has covered it in his first statement—it was that it was extremely important that we include in the bill the oath which we now have included in it.

Regardless of how it may appear—of course anything may appear to be something it is not—in weighing the difficulties which this provision has encountered among the academic institutions in the United States, as opposed to the danger that Communists will obtain such loans for education, where does the Senator feel the national interest lies?

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say that I have not undertaken to weigh that on any scales, and I have not considered that. The academic community, the leaders of some of the colleges—though not all of them—the college faculties of the country, are not in any wise unanimous in this opinion. Undoubtedly great institutions like Harvard, where the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts trained, and Princeton, if the Senator from Pennsylvania may have graduated there——

Mr. CLARK. I object.

Mr. RUSSELL. I apologize, but not to any Princetonian who might be present. I regret I made the error. But the Ivy League, let us say, has headed a movement which has caused other colleges to discontinue taking these loyalty oaths. But, in answer to the Senator, I have not weighed it. I do say this: I do not believe any considerable number of young Americans who might receive fi-

nancial assistance to help them in their college training—under a program that is officially designated as a national security measure—and that is the title of the act which provides these loans, it is the National Defense Education Act—feel that they are being imposed upon by being required to reaffirm their faith in the American system or their opposition to the Communist system. I do not believe they have any objection to reaffirming their loyalty to this Nation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware, is he not, that among the associations which have protested the disclaimer affidavit is the National Student Association, which represents student councils in the universities across the length and breadth of the land?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I was not aware of that. I doubt that the action was in any wise unanimous. Despite the fact that students seem to be running governments of a great many nations today—some of them to their great detriment—I do not think that is any expression of a last-ditch opposition to this requirement by students. It is more or less of a reaffirmation of their confidence in the presidents of the institutions which inaugurated the attack upon the so-called loyalty provision.

Mr. President, at one time, as I have said, I was inclined to go along with the so-called compromise bill that was brought to my attention, I believe, during the latter days of the last session dealing with this question; but I have repeatedly stated that I cannot, for the life of me, see any substantial objection to either one of these oaths. The more I have thought about it, the more I have begun to wonder, indeed, to marvel, at some of the arguments that have been advanced for the repeal of all or part of the oath requirement.

I cannot understand, and I totally reject the idea, that there is any impropriety in asking a loyal American to affirm his allegiance and to avow his loyalty to his country. I say that whether it be a benefit to a farmer, a doctor, a merchant, or a small loan to a manufacturing enterprise.

Mr. President, in today's world, it behooves all of us who believe in the American system, which has given us the greatest culture and the highest standard of living the world has even known, to welcome the opportunity to express our faith in that system. And it will be a sad and sorry day in this country if it ever becomes generally considered improper for one not only to pledge allegience to the Stars and Stripes, but to avow one's faith in the American system.

I hope, Mr. President, that I never see the day when the majority of the American people believe that it is improper for an American citizen to denounce the Communist system and to extol the American system of government. If that day ever comes, we will have certainly lost the contest which is being waged today for the minds and hearts of men and women all over the world.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. It seems to me, if I may say so to the Senator from Georgia, that the bill in its present form does extol the American system when the oath that is suggested says:

> I solemnly swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I do not know how one can pledge his devotion to the American system in any better language.

Mr. RUSSELL. What, then, is the Senator's objection to the other part of the oath?

Mr. BUSH. The objection is that thousands and thousands of educators and students in universities are being singled out on the basis that their devotions is questioned, and that they, in the field of education, as distinct from all others who receive a subsidy from the United States in one form or another, or a handout in one form or another, through the social security system, through the farm handout—which, Heaven knows, is very big—should be singled out. That is the principal source of objection to this requirement.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not the case at all. It should be pointed out here that for almost 10 years the National Science Foundation Act has operated under the identical loyalty oath provisions that are contained in the Defense Education Act. It is my understanding, in fact, that these provisions were lifted bodily from the Science Foundation Act and placed in the Defense Education Act.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. In just a moment.

I understand that about 50,000 applicants under the Science Foundation program have taken the oath of allegiance and have filed the non-Communist affidavit since the program was inaugurated in 1952. Nothing is heard about that being unfair. Nothing is heard about this being an undue imposition on those who are seeking benefits from the National Government. A large number of scholars, many of whom have already obtained their degrees in the ordinary arts and sciences, have applied for advanced study and research in scientific fields. I have not heard, of all those who have written to me, from one who feels he has been placed under the pall of suspicion or who feels he has been singled out for all kinds of unequal treatment or has had advantage taken of him because he was compelled to comply with the loyalty oath requirements. Doubtless some of them have come before the committee, but I know of none from examining my own mail.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator, of course, is correct that this disclaimer affidavit still remains——

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator is going to make this change, why not reach into the National Science Foundation Act and do the same thing there? It is because those who direct the universities did not raise the issue. The applicants did not have to come to them to handle the oaths or affidavits; they were filed with the Government instead of with the university officials.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot, of course, agree with the reasoning of my friend, but this is something on which we can agree to disagree.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope in good temper.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure it will be in good temper, as is always true with my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that the National Science Foundation affidavit can hardly be considered a precedent for extending a similar disclaimer affidavit, which I personally think is unwise in that instance, to the entire student body of the United States, who, by and large, with some exception, represent the best brains of young America. We should not single out these students as against the farmers of America, the mortgagors of America, the borrowers at the banks of America—all those who get every other kind of Federal handout and Federal funds. We do not ask all of those people to subscribe to the disclaimer affidavit. Why do we require the disclaimer affidavit only for the brains of the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I for one do not agree that all of the brains of this country are found either in the faculties or in the student bodies——

Mr. CLARK. Nor did I say so——

Mr. RUSSELL. Of all the educational institutions in the country.

Mr. CLARK. Nor did I say so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say to the Senator, if I had my preference I would apply the loyalty requirement to all of them, instead of repealing it in this instance and sending the word around the world that the young men and young women of America are ashamed to take this position and to stand back of the American form of government as opposed to the Communist system.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to point out that the members of the committee had an opportunity to vote for such an amendment—namely, an amendment to make this apply to all groups—and that amendment was turned down.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have that information from the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may reply to that statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not intend to become involved in extended debate on this matter. I merely wished to make a brief statement of my views. However, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I promise the Senator I shall not interrupt again.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from Vermont to say that the extension of this provision to everybody else was turned down by the Senate last year?

Mr. PROUTY. I think the amendment required an affidavit on the part of everybody who received Federal funds.

Mr. CLARK. I happen to be the author of that amendment, and I proposed it in a lighter vein, more than in any other way, because it was so obviously silly. The proposal was debated upon the floor for a substantial amount of time, and then I asked the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] whether he would accept my amendment, and the Senator said "no," so I withdrew it, having, I thought, made the proposal seem a little silly.

Mr. PROUTY. I am not talking about the Senator's amendment. I am talking about the amendment offered in the committee. I believe the Senator was there at the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was not in the committee, and I do not recall the Senator's amendment. But I will say that before I sound the retreat and make even the slightest confession of doubt, on the part of large numbers of our people, that the American system is the best on earth, I will vote to apply this to any person receiving any kind of benefit, be it silly or not. I think that would be a better precedent.

I have great respect for the leaders of our academic communities, the administrators and members of the faculty of our institutions of higher learning. I have known many of them over many years. I have seen them as mistaken and as wrong in their positions time and time again as even a Senator of the United States can be. [Laughter.] They can be mistaken, exactly the same as anyone else can be.

Some of these arguments against the affidavit I think are almost specious. We are told that students are being singled out and set aside and made to avow their allegiance to this country. It has already been said that this provision is found in an act which is supposed to be one of the pillars of our national defense. I see no reason why any student should hesitate to take the oath in either one of its forms, though I admit, as I said at the outset of my remarks, if the original bill had contained only the oath which is required of officers and those going into the ROTC and programs of that nature, I think it would have been adequate. However, I do not propose at this time and under these circumstances to undertake any action by my vote which will indicate not only a lack of faith in the American system, but also a lack of faith in the constancy, fidelity, and patriotism of the thousands of young people who will avail themselves of these loans.

Mr. President, I cannot see that this oath in any wise interferes with academic freedom. If I did, I would stand foursquare in favor of repeal of the entire provision of the law.

I must confess that academic freedom, while it is not specifically mentioned in the Constitution of the United States, is undoubtedly involved in all of the freedoms which are spelled out in the Bill of Rights, as a part of them.

I regret that some 20 institutions—universities and colleges—have already announced their refusal to cooperate in the student loan program. I think, Mr. President, those institutions are the ones which are wronging the young people of this country. I say that in full knowledge of the fact that within this list of 20 we find some of the most renowned and distinguished institutions of learning in this Nation. These are names which have been connected with education over a period of time. I recognize the greatness of these institutions. I accept it as their full right to refuse to participate in the student loan program, if that is their desire. However, I find it very difficult to square their refusal to participate in this program with their devotion and dedication to the principles of academic and intellectual freedom.

I say that, Mr. President, because of these impecunious students of whom we hear so much. We will find a lower percentage of students in those circumstances on the campuses of these institutions than on the campuses of other institutions in this country. There is not a large number of impecunious students wandering around the halls of Harvard, of Princeton, and of Yale. Those institutions all have great foundations and benefactors of tremendous wealth who can help them with their scholarship programs.

Mr. President, I say this with respect even to those institutions: By their arbitrary action, these schools have denied to their students the right to decide for themselves whether they wish to participate in this loan program and whether they find the loyalty provisions of this program offensive. When the president of Harvard calls together his executive committee and says, "We refuse to participate in the program," what has he done to the few impecunious students who are on his campus? He has told them, "I take away from you the right to decide whether you are willing to or welcome the opportunity to sign both of these affidavits."

This action has created a double standard in these institutions. On the one hand they defend the freedom of thought; and on the other hand they deny to their students the right to exercise that freedom of thought and to apply it in the case of these loans. If that statement can be successfully controverted, I should like to have someone do so. It is a strange contradiction. It has shocked some members of the academic community, including no doubt some of those who conscientiously are opposed to the present loyalty requirement of the law.

I was very much impressed by a letter to the New York Times magazine from Dr. Richard Martin Lyon, of Notre Dame University. I do not recall whether Notre Dame is one of the schools which has withdrawn from the program.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Notre Dame has not withdrawn, but it is one of the institutions which has protested and has advocated repeal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to know that Notre Dame respected academic freedom enough to refuse to deny its students the right to apply for loans if they wished to do so, and not to follow in the footsteps of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, which have taken away from impecunious students the right and opportunity to apply.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. It may be interesting to note that the president of Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh, was one of the three college presidents who waited on the Vice President in Chicago in February and asked the Vice President his position on the affidavit, and it was on that occasion that the Vice President announced that he opposed the continuation of the provision in the bill. So I say for the Senator's information that at least the president of the University of Notre Dame, speaking in his authority as president, opposes the affidavit.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that Notre Dame was not opposed to the affidavit. Likewise I am not particularly impressed, may I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, in respect to the position of the Vice President of the United States. I am speaking now of a double standard of academic freedom that is being applied in Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and other institutions that have said to their students, "We will not even permit you to exercise your desire to sign these affidavits and apply for the loan." Any impecunious student, as referred to in the report, would be required either to depart from those halls or else to obtain a loan elsewhere.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has been gracious indeed in the publicity he has afforded my alma mater—Harvard.

Mr. RUSSELL. They may claim no notoriety from me.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that as he continues his remarks he will include among those universities which refused to permit students to engage in the program because of the disclaimer affidavit of the Interdenominational Theological Seminary of Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I heartily condemn each and all of them, and their decision in this matter. I think it is unwarranted. I think it is a denial of the freedom of any young man or woman who may be in any of these schools of their rights as American citizens to say, "I do not object to either of these loyalty requirements, and I wish to obtain a loan."

The institutions that have taken this action undoubtedly think it would be their one last chance to get into the Ivy League, and to be able to join the class of Yale, Harvard, or Princeton.

Mr. President, the letter from Dr. Richard Martin Lyon to the New York

Times magazine is important enough to be read and not merely printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to ask him about his apprehensions regarding the effect that a repealer might have upon Europe and other countries in the world. As the Senator from Georgia stated the matter, would it not appear that we were backsliding in our loyalty? I ask the Senator if he does not consider this point of view a valid one. In other countries, notably in Europe, respect for education and for educators is at a high level, probably at a higher level than it is in the United States.

I believe that there is better discipline in their schools, generally speaking, and in general greater respect for education and all that goes with it. Such respect is very high in friendly countries of the free world.

Accordingly, I rather incline to the view that the action which I hope the Senate will take on this bill will increase our stature in the eyes of the educators in the free countries of the world. Far from demeaning us, our stature would be enhanced if we recognized the tremendous emotional and spiritual interest which the educators of this country have in the pending measure. I feel the Senator is a little harsh on us when he feels that the proposed measure would demean us in the eyes of the world. I rather hold to the view that it would increase our prestige.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator says our prestige would be increased in the minds of the members of the faculty of foreign institutions.

Mr. BUSH. They are the opinion makers and the thought leaders of the great countries in the free world to a very large extent.

Mr. RUSSELL. I doubt very much if there is any educational institution in any country of Europe which plays as large a part in the affairs of the government of those nations as certain institutions in this country play in the Government of the United States. However, that is a question which is beside the point here.

Mr. BUSH. I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am talking about what people in the streets, in homes, and on the farms think, not merely what the members of the academic communities think.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I did not attend Princeton, Yale, or Harvard. The first words of English that I learned were taught to me at a Presbyterian mission school in New Mexico. They taught me about America, and I believe that is what the Senator is now talking about, our system of government. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Georgia is trying to continue the system of government as it is. Likewise, I am happy with it.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is what I had in mind. A great struggle between communism and the American way of life and the American system has been greatly accentuated by events of the past few months. The tragic collapse at Paris of the summit meeting to which peoples of the world had looked with hope to bring about an end to the threat of the destruction of civilization has brought instead an intensification of the cold war.

In the face of these developments we have now laid aside the Defense appropriation bill, which we should be considering, and are debating the measure before us because of the clamor that has arisen in these halls. We are told that we must repeal a provision that requires a person who applies for a loan under the National Defense Education Act to take a loyalty oath.

Mr. President, I now desire to read the letter from Dr. Richard Martin Lyon, of the faculty of the University of Notre Dame. It appeared in the New York Times Magazine of January 10, 1960:

> President Griswold ably defends the position of many universities and colleges which have refused to participate in the Federal scholarship program under the National Defense Education Act. University opposition is based on the loyalty affidavit required of the applicant for an educational loan. It may have been arbitrary, discriminatory and unwise for Congress to insert this condition in the act. Is it not equally arbitrary, discriminatory and unwise, for university administrators to deny the individual student the right to decide for himself whether he desires to apply for Federal aid under the conditions provided by the act?
>
> For university officials to make such a fundamental decision on the tenuous ground that under the law the university is required to invest 10 percent of its scholarship funds—normally contributed by alumni—in each loan, raises two questions: (1) Whether it is proper for university administrators to act as a superlegislature and deny qualified students the opportunity to seek the benefits under a public law designed to aid them individually; and (2) whether such officials are not by administrative fiat depriving the students of the very freedom they seek to preserve.

Senators who are content to accept the argument that is made, which would deny to the impecunious student the right to decide for himself whether he will subscribe to such an affidavit should ask themselves whether they are not adopting a dual standard in striking down one academic freedom, in the name of establishing and defending another academic freedom.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. It seems to me that the writer of the letter which the Senator has quoted makes it clear that in the opinion of the writer the affidavit itself was unwise, not that the universities were unwise.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Massachusetts can get that impression out of the letter, if he wishes. I do not get it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Did not the writer use three adjectives?

Mr. RUSSELL. He said it may have been arbitrary, discriminatory, and unwise. Oh, yes, of course, that is his fear. I do not say that the man is not opposed to the affidavit. Perhaps the Senator knows this gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not know him.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator travels among intellectuals much more than I do.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am in the company of one now.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I am totally disarmed. [Laughter.]

I have respect for these great educators. I have respect for Dr. Griswold and all the other college presidents.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has twice mentioned Dr. Griswold.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. He wrote this article. He has been the leading spokesman of his point of view. I did not mention him in any invidious manner.

Mr. BUSH. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe he is from Yale, which is located in the Senator's State.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to ask a favor of the Senator from Georgia. Inasmuch as the Senator has twice referred to President Griswold, I should like to know if he would object to my asking unanimous consent to insert President Griswold's statement on this subject, which appeared in the New York Times book review section some months ago, at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks, and after he has yielded the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be quite all right. I should think the Senator would wish to use it in his own statement.

Mr. BUSH. I intend to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it will reassure the Senator to do it twice, I shall be very glad to have the Senator make that insertion.

Mr. BUSH. I believe that those who will read the Senator's eloquent remarks and his references to President Griswold of Yale University should have the benefit of Dr. Griswold's statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. President Griswold has been the spokesman of those who feel as the Senator feels. I congratulate the Senator. Yale has not been doing too well with Harvard and Princeton, and Yale has naturally put its man out front.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator, I believe, is talking about a mundane thing called athletics. The faculty of Yale has always been at the top.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of the greatest claims to fame of some graduates of these institutions have been based on their athletic prowess while they were students at those institutions.

Mr. BUSH. That is probably correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope no one will charge me with a lack of respect for education or for Dr. Griswold. Dr. Griswold has been the principal spokesman for those who have advocated the program of denying to impecunious students in educational institutions the

right to decide for themselves whether or not they will apply for these loans. Dr. Griswold did it in the name of academic freedom. I care not what his name may be or what institution he may preside over. I say that it is inconsistent to deny, in the name of academic freedom, a student in an institution the right to decide whether he wishes to take the loyalty oath, and thereby perhaps deny a poor student an opportunity to receive an education in those hallowed halls.

As much as I respect these great educators, I have even more respect for the future that I believe lies with the hundreds of thousands of young men and women who comprise the student bodies of our colleges and universities.

It is they, after all, who are directly affected by the program and by the refusal of some educational institutions to participate in it. I am advised that approximately 125,000 individual loans have already been made during the brief time that this program has been in operation. It is quite obvious that there have been large numbers of young people who have not felt that it was any imposition on them to say: "I swear that I will not try to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence." When it is boiled down, that is what this amounts to.

I cannot believe that a majority of the young manhood and young womanhood of America have joined the cult of cynicism of those few who deplore old-fashioned patriotism. I believe that the heart of our youth is sound. I believe that the majority of our young people are ever ready to prove their patriotism again and again, as they have done in the past, and to cement their loyalty to the Nation with their own blood. I do not believe that the great masses of our young people are disturbed by or are resentful of these provisions of law.

I do not believe the great majority of them are demanding that they be relieved of this provision. I think they consider it an honor to express—on any occasion—their love, devotion, and allegiance to the flag and to the Constitution, and to declare their abhorrence of any cell, group, or organization which professes to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

Mr. BUSH obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was trying to get recognition so that I might ask a question or two of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Connecticut object to the Senator from Arizona asking me a question?

Mr. BUSH. I do not object, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Had I been a little more attentive, I would have observed that the Senator from Georgia was preparing to end his remarks.

I simply wish to ask the Senator from Georgia if he recalls that last year the identical bill was recommitted to committee for further study.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I adverted to that fact earlier in my remarks.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not recall saying, on July 23, of last year, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14097:

> The bill should be recommitted, to give the committee an opportunity to bring back to the Senate a bill which will more adequately deal with the subject.

Does the Senator further recall, on the same day, July 23, the following statement by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14098:

> I, for one, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would welcome the opportunity for the further consideration of the pending matter. There is always an area of understanding and effective compromise by which Senators can create a new awareness of citizenship responsibility which is in no manner offensive to our youth or to our people as a whole.

I further ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not recall the following statement by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on July 23, 1959, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14098:

> I should think that we could make no mistake—rather that we would have all to gain and nothing to lose—by recommitting the bill and letting the committee study it further, in the hope that if they report it to the Senate again it will be in a form in which Senators will not be in confusion as between making a selection between chains and fetters which do not exist, and preserving our country, which I know is the determination of every Member of the Senate.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not recall, on the same day, July 23, 1959, a statement by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the same effect, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14099:

> So I urge my colleagues—and I urge it with all the force at my command—to vote to recommit this measure, so that the committee will be able to reexamine it and, if the committee so decides, it will be able to report the measure to the Senate at a later time, when the Senate will be able to vote on it with much better information at hand and with more specific facts before it.

The last statement I shall read was made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I ask the Senator from Georgia if he does not recall this statement, made on July 23, and reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14100. The Senator from Louisiana made the motion to recommit, and said:

> I submit that if the bill is recommitted, thereafter the committee will be able to report to the Senate a better bill than this one, and certainly one with which we would be better satisfied when we passed it.

My purpose in reading those remarks was to ask the Senator from Georgia, who certainly has no peer in this body as it relates to the intent of motions to recommit—in fact, the Senator's entire knowledge of the parliamentary procedure in this body is unsurpassed by anyone—if it would not be his clear understanding that it was the absolute intent of the Senate that the bill be recommitted for further study.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said earlier in the day that when the bill came before the Senate originally—last year—it proposed to repeal both the loyalty oath and the non-Communist affidavit—the disclaimer of intent to overthrow the Government by force and violence; that it was then amended so as to strike out the repeal of the ordinary oath which is required of ROTC students and others; and then was recommitted to the committee for further study.

I may say that, having made a few remarks when the bill was on the floor last year, a compromise bill was brought to me toward the end of the last session. I had thought that that was what the committee was to consider. But the bill now before the Senate is substantially the bill which was recommitted last year.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator from Georgia has recognized that fact, because that would have been my next question.

I do not know whether the Senator has read the minority view. If he has, he will find, on page 13 of the report, the statement of the minority. I shall read it in part now and shall discuss it more fully later.

> It is interesting to note that the new bill was introduced on January 28 of this year, and only 5 days later, on February 2, without any hearings being held or any other consideration being given to it, the full committee, after limited discussion, ordered it favorably reported.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret to say that I had not read all the committee report or the minority views, but I certainly accept the statement which the Senator from Arizona has made. The Senator is an outstanding member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has been handling the bill. He should be familiar with it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I desired to bring to the attention of the Senator from Georgia, early in the discussion, the fact that the committee totally disregarded the instructions of the Senate, instructions which, to me, were so clear that we could not avoid seeing the intent.

The bill as it has been reported to the Senate is substantially the bill which was recommitted last year for further study. Yet not one witness was called, and no hearings were held. There was no discussion other than a very limited discussion within the committee 5 days after the bill was introduced.

I suggest to the Senator from Georgia that this is, indeed, a rather peculiar byplay upon the prerogatives of the Senate and upon its rules. It was the desire of the Senate to have a further study made of the bill, so that we might be able to act intelligently upon it. I am at a loss to understand why the majority and minority members of the Senate committee were denied the right to interrogate witnesses.

I simply desired to bring this matter before the Senate, so that we might have a very clear understanding of the instructions which the Senate issued on July 23 of last year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had thought that perhaps additional hearings might be held. However, the Senator from Arizona understands the embarrassment which would have come to those who were promoting the bill if hearings had been held. This is an inspired bill, and a demand has been made that this provision be stricken because it is an infringement on academic freedom in this country. The overwhelming majority of the Senate was determined not to strike both provisions. So the committee, I suppose in order to permit just a little infringement on academic freedom, decided to strike the disclaimer and to leave the loyalty oath. Some of those who generated the fight against the requirement perhaps were demanding that both go down—the loyalty oath and the disclaimer of Communist sympathy or the determination to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Georgia for permitting me to ask these questions, and I thank the Senator from Connecticut for having allowed me to interrogate the Senator from Georgia at this point, so that there could be continuity in the debate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I may say, in the light of what has just been said about the hearings, and so forth, that I, too, wish hearings had been held. I do not know why they were not held; but I feel very confident that if there had been hearings, the bill would be in better favor before the Senate than it is right now. I believe the weight of opinion which would have been brought to bear in favor of the bill would have been very great, indeed, and that there would be a much better understanding among Senators who are opposed to the bill as to why educational institutions and the great leaders in the field of education feel so deeply and strongly about the matter. Unfortunately, they cannot come to the Senate floor. So I agree with the Senator from Arizona that we would be better off; but I agree with him for different reasons.

I agree that we would be better off if hearings had been held so as to point up the matter. But the subject has been rather widely debated in the public press during the past 6 months. It is not as though we were taking up an issue with which the Senate has not been familiar; because, as has been pointed out, the subject was very fully debated last year.

The other thing I should like to say is that the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in his remarks, paid many tributes to the Ivy League and to the great colleges which are endowed as private institutions.

I am glad there are some institutions that are so endowed, so that all the educational institutions will not have to be sustained by the taxpayers.

But among the institutions whose presidents or boards of directors have publicly declared their disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit, even though they continue to participate in the student loan program, are those listed on page 6 of the report—some 20 State universities; and I now read from the list: Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina.

The University of Notre Dame is also listed, but I presume it is not included in that group.

Also in the group are Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh—the University of Pittsburgh—Rhode Island, the University of Rochester, the University of the South—in Tennessee—Washington, and Wisconsin.

So it is hardly fair to reach the conclusion—and possibly the Senator did not mean to do so—that this is an Ivy League bill or anything of the sort, because it is not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think I used the expression more than once. The Senator said I used it a number of times, and it is possible I may have.

But this movement had its beginning in the colleges which are referred to as the Ivy League colleges. I do not understand the term "Ivy League" to be a term of opprobrium; I regard it as an appellation of reverence. The Ivy League institutions are supposed to be the last word in academic institutions of very high standing. I did not know there was any sensitiveness at all about the use of the term "Ivy League."

Mr. BUSH. No; and evidently I did not clearly express my meaning. Possibly that is my fault.

But the bill is not sponsored chiefly by the privately endowed institutions, by any means, because I have just read from the long list of State universities whose heads are in full agreement with the position taken by President Griswold, of Yale, and other university presidents, all of whom strongly support the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Why did the Senator decide to give them only half the loaf they requested? They wanted both repealed; but the Senator's bill repeals only one of them. They felt that both the loyalty oath and the disclaimer of Communist Party membership or membership in an organization dedicated to overthrowing the Government of the United States by force or violence were an infringement upon academic freedom. Certainly the Senator from Connecticut, who is a product of one of the great Ivy League universities, one of which is located in his own State, would be expected to support the position taken by those universities.

Mr. BUSH. Of course the whole issue is why is there objection to the Communist disclaimer. It is offensive because it says to the universities, "You are suspect, and you are singled out, from all others who receive benefits from the United States. You are singled out because you are educational institutions and because you teach students and because the educational institutions in this country are suspect." They do not like that, and I do not blame them for not liking it.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the decision to include both the loyalty oath and the Communist disclaimer was a political decision which was made in the Senate, by the Members of the Senate who hold political office. On the other hand, some of those who hold educational office have denounced both the requirement for the taking of the loyalty oath and the requirement for the Communist disclaimer, and they wish to have both of them removed from the law. But the decision to include both of them in the law was a political decision which was made on the floor of the Senate after the bill was brought before the Senate. However, at this time the Senator from Connecticut favors letting one of them remain in the law, but deleting the other one from the law.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's inquiry, let me say the universities' position is fully stated by President Griswold in the insertion which I have received approval to make in the RECORD. But the point is that one is an affirmative statement that "I will defend the Constitution of the United States," whereas the second is an affirmation that one has never been subversive and never has been a member of the Communist Party, and never has engaged in any enterprise favoring the overthrow of the Government of the United States. Those are two very different things.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Connecticut has stated his position very clearly. But if the two requirements are separate and distinct, why did the same group favor striking both provisions from the first bill, S. 819, which we recommitted last year? When S. 819 was first before us, as sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], it called for striking out both of these requirements; and it was said at that time that the proposal to eliminate both the oath and affidavit had the support of several Ivy League colleges and a handful of other institutions.

Mr. BUSH. My answer is that they consider both unnecessary, because each singles out educational institutions for this treatment. However, they do not find objectionable an affirmative declaration of loyalty. They do find the anti-Communist affidavit objectionable, because it singles them out as possible suspects of having been members of the Communist Party or members of an organization dedicated to the overthrow of the Government of the United States. That is the difference.

Mr. BRIDGES. How does it single them out? The Senator from Connecticut takes an oath, and so does every employees of the U.S. Government.

Mr. BUSH. But the farmers do not take it, and those who receive the social security payments do not take it, and the airlines who are subsidized do not take it.

Mr. BRIDGES. But the farmers and the airlines are not being educated for the defense of the United States of

America. This measure is the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. BUSH. Certainly the airlines are helping to prepare for the defense of the United States; and the farm bill is represented as having a defense angle to it, in order to get it by this body.

Mr. BRIDGES. This measure is the National Defense Education Act, and it is so labeled. In view of this why should not an oath of allegiance and a disclaimer affidavit be included in an act, the purpose of which is stated in its title. Why did the opponents of these provisions of the National Defense Education Act wait for a year before they began to find fault? And when they began to find fault, they wanted to do away with both the loyalty oath and the antisubversive affidavit.

I think they received such an unfavorable reaction from across the country regarding their opposition to the loyalty oath that they now feel it is wiser to favor the loyalty oath. I think they were wrong then, when they opposed both provisions; and I think they are wrong now, when they oppose only one—the disclaimer.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator asked me why we should make the change. I think the best reason is that the affidavit is highly offensive to a highly responsible group of thousands of educators, the heads of many of our great institutions, clear across the land. To me, that is a very good reason.

Mr. BRIDGES. But more than 1,300 colleges and universities have accepted these requirements and are participating in the student loan program. Why should a few educators be so sensitive when the great bulk of the educators of the country have accepted these requirements.

Are the Ivy League colleges particularly sensitive?

Mr. BUSH. No. There are 26 State universities, as listed in the report, that strongly object to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. They are wrong, too.

Mr. BUSH. But they do object to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In all good conscience, what is wrong with requiring such persons to take an oath that they are not against the government of their country? What is fundamentally wrong with that?

Mr. BUSH. There is nothing wrong with it, and the bill contains a requirement for the taking of the oath of allegiance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the Senator from Connecticut objects to a requirement that such persons take an oath that they do not favor the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. What is fundamentally wrong with the requirement that such persons take that oath, when they seek to benefit from this Government? What is fundamentally wrong with the requirement that such a person take that oath before we reach into the pockets of the American taxpayers and spend their money to give that person a personal benefit? I simply cannot understand the opposition. What kind of patriotism have we, today?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I should like to set straight a few facts, for the RECORD.

In the first place, there are only eight Ivy League colleges. It is true that all of them support the present proposed legislation. There are 131 educational institutions whose presidents, faculties, or boards of trustees have objected to the disclaimer affidavit requirement.

Second, the vote by which the bill was recommitted last year was far from overwhelming. It was by a vote of 48 to 42.

Third, the recommittal motion, as I recall—and the Senator from Arizona will correct me if I am wrong, because he has the RECORD before him—was a straight recommittal motion.

Fourth, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its various members, in many an informal discussion, in which I participated, including several which I had with the distinguished Senator from Arizona, gave this question careful thought during the remainder of the last session, discussed the subject with many educators, receiving voluminous amounts of correspondence on the subject, and brought the matter, under the leadership of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, to a full committee meeting, where we had a quite extensive discussion as to what should be done. I can remember the points raised at that discussion by the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Arizona, and the other 2 members of the minority, who did not agree with the 11 members of the majority in sending back to the floor a far different bill than the one that was rejected last year.

I regret that I cannot agree with the Senator from Arizona that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare did not give careful consideration to the bill which has been brought out and is now on the Senate floor. I think it did.

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

Mr. BUSH. In just a moment.

In answer to the question directed to me by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, I should like to point out the difference once more between the oath of allegiance and the affidavit, because the Senator apparently is not quite familiar with the difference between the two oaths under question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I read them. I saw them in the report. I think I know the difference.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to point out to the Senator and for the RECORD that there is a very important difference. Some persons cannot see it; some can. Those who can, feel it very deeply, and they are just as patriotic and loyal to this country as those who do not see it. I think it is due to a difference in attitude. It may be due to a difference in background. But it is not due to a difference in loyalty to the United States.

In the one case the money is denied unless an individual has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit, a signed statement, that he does not believe in and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional method.

In other words, he has to say, "I am suspect. I have to sign an affidavit. Nobody else has to do it who gets funds from the Federal Government, but because I am at an educational institution, I have to sign an affidavit saying that I have never been a member of any party or belonged to any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government."

But the difference between that affidavit and the oath of allegiance is very great. The oath of allegiance is affirmative. It says, "I am devoted to the United States. I do swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States and will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic." It seems to me that is an affirmative position for a man to take, and that is all he ought to be asked to take. If he is a Communist or has been a member of a Communist organization, he is going to lie about it if he wants to get his scholarship. But why should we want to offend the heads of institutions and faculties? Hundreds of them have sent in petitions for this repeal, because they say the affidavit is extremely offensive to them.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Following the logic of the statement the Senator has made, is there not an implied assumption that every time we ask anyone to take an affirmative oath, or every time I am asked to take the oath of office, I am suspect, because I have to take the oath of office?

Mr. BUSH. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is the difference?

Mr. BUSH. There is a great deal of difference.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is not a difference in the world.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator willing to tax the American people to educate any youth or anyone else for the purpose of defending the U.S. Government when that person is sensitive to taking an oath that he is not a member of and does not support an organization which has as its purpose the overthrow of this Government?

Mr. BUSH. The difference is that between an affirmative position and being offended by being suspected of having been connected with the Communist Party. These persons are sensitive about being singled out from all others getting funds from the U.S. Government and being told, "You must sign an affidavit saying you are not a member of

the Communist Party or any other organization which advocates the overthrow of the U.S. Government."

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am willing to do it. I am willing to take an oath in the Senate, and before God, that I do not subscribe to and do not believe in the overthrow of my Government by force or violence. But I am unwilling to say that I will tax the American people to support someone in education, in the defense of this country, who is unwilling to say that he is a patriot to the extent that he is not a member of any organization and does not support any organization that believes in the overthrow of this Government by force or violence.

Mr. BUSH. Certainly, nobody will question the loyalty of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not see how we can reconcile our patriotism by taxing the American people to educate, for the national defense, those who are unwilling to take an oath that they do not belong to such an organization.

Mr. BUSH. I suggest that they are willing to take an affirmative oath of allegiance to defend the Constitution and this form of government.

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

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. This argument did not appeal, not only to the heads of colleges, but to the Senate, I may point out. What has not been brought out is that the Senate voted, by a vote of 46 to 45, to amend the measure exactly as we offered. The only reason why the amendment went by the boards was, when there were further arguments, very much of the type we are hearing this afternoon, the Senate voted to recommit, 46 to 45. The Senate thought it was a fair solution of the problem.

In addition, Mr. President, so has the President of the United States thought this way. In addition, so has the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. President, I should like to make these facts very clear for the RECORD. This happened after the Senate debate and after these votes. On December 12, 1959, the New York Times headlined the story, "Eisenhower Hits Student Aid Oath." On November 26 the New York Herald Tribune headlined the story, "NIXON Opposes Disclaimer in Student Loans." And the Governor of my own State, Governor Rockefeller, took the same position on this matter last year, in December 1959. The newspaper story is headed "Rockefeller Urges Red Oath Repeal."

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

Mr. JAVITS. I do not have the floor. I am not through.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New York has quoted President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and Governor Rockefeller. Does not the Senator think they can be wrong once in a while?

Mr. JAVITS. They certainly can be wrong once in a while.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator——

Mr. JAVITS. If I may answer the question, yes, they can be wrong once in a while. They are human beings, like the Senator from New Hampshire, who can be wrong every once in a while also.

The point is that this whole matter has been put upon the narrow basis that some highbrow, esoteric college presidents or college professors have decided they do not like this, and some fussy students have decided they will not take the money in this way.

The President of the United States may be wrong, but he is a pretty good authority. He is cited as being a pretty good authority on both sides of the aisle. So is the Vice President. So is the Governor of my own State.

I am simply buttressing the authority which has already been cited by the Senator from Connecticut with some authority which is entitled, certainly, to receive respectful attention from the Senate. The authority could be wrong, but it is entitled to receive respectful attention from the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New York another question. Who does the Senator think stirred up this controversy, anyway? Does the Senator think the President of the United States, the Vice President, or Governor Rockefeller, raised this uproar after we passed the act in good faith and it worked perfectly for a year. Does the Senator think it was stirred up by some "fussy" professor and some "fussy" students, or does the Senator think it developed out of thin air?

Mr. JAVITS. I think this is one of the essences of our society. People who are dissatisfied with a certain thing stir up the question, and if their position appeals to reason it begins to appeal to us, to other officials of the Government, and to people generally, and then something is done about it.

I wish to point out, Mr. President—and I am sorry to intrude upon the Senator's time, but I think it is pertinent to the argument—that the National Defense Education Act was passed not for the benefit of individual young fellows who are meritorious. The act was passed to obtain the best talent in the United States to help fight the cold war. This is in the national interest and in the national service.

I say that the disclaimer affidavit is not worth losing a whole bunch of these young people, who are bright and able, because their stomachs turn at this particular oath. It is not worth it to lose them, for we have on the statute books the Smith Act, and the Smith Act says that any person is guilty of a felony if he advocates the overthrow of the Government by force.

Why should we write the provision in this law, where it may deprive us of the very talent which we are trying to win to our side? I think that is the essential argument which has induced me to join in favor of the bill, as it was amended.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I merely wish to set the record straight.

We have been talking about the number of colleges and universities which have opposed this provision. I am sure the Senator would not object to my questioning him in regard to the matter.

Is it not true that as of May 12, 1960, which is the latest date I have seen for a list—there may be a revamped list which would bring the figures more up to date—the institutions which have withdrawn from the student-loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit total 18?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The institutions, which have declined to participate in the student-loan program because, the disclaimer affidavit, total eight.

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The institutions whose presidents or boards have publicly stated disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit, but which institutions continue to participate in the student-loan program, total 85?

Mr. BUSH. I will say to the Senator, when we add all those up, we get a very high percentage of the college and university population of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was about to come to that question. This totals about 10 percent of the total university population in the United States. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSH. I would like to see the Senator's proof of that statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If my memory serves me correctly, there are some 1,300 institutions of higher learning in this country.

I had not finished my questioning. If we add to the number I have already discussed the 20 institutions whose faculties have expressed disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit, we have a total of 131, which in my book is approximately 10 percent of such institutions—10 percent is not an overwhelming percentage, no matter whether one is in politics or in the field of colleges objecting.

I desire to make that perfectly clear. I am sure the Senator would not object to it, because the actual number of colleges and universities which have taken what we might call the extreme action in this case is 26, out of some 1,300. There are 85 which simply detest the daylights out of the disclaimer affidavit, but they surely do like the money, and they continue to take it.

There are 26, I will say—and these include some great colleges and universities—which have the courage of their convictions and which have turned it all down.

If the Senator is not too impatient and will indulge me, I have another question.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator, but I should like to reply to the comments the Senator has posed as a question in regard to the college and university population and so forth.

I do not think the Senator has made a very good case for the 10 percent. At any rate, the Senator has neglected also to point out that other organizations protest this affidavit and support the bill, and those include some pretty big constituencies. The Senator will observe

that those are listed at the top of page 7 of the report. They include the following:

The American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

The American Association of University Professors.

The American Civil Liberties Union.

The American Council of Learned Societies.

The American Council on Education.

The American Jewish Congress.

The Association of American Universities.

The Association of Graduate Schools.

The National Council of Churches of Christ.

This does not sound like such a narrow area of support, I will say to my very dear friend. It sounds to me like a very broad area of support.

Finally, there is the New England Society of Newspaper Editors. I do not know what is the matter with the American Society of Newspaper Editors, but they probably did not get around to this, since they were so busy politicking in Washington, D.C.

It seems to me the area of support is very, very broad indeed among the people who are the heads of these organizations, as well as the members of these organizations. Certainly these are intelligent people.

Mr. President, I do not desire to monopolize the floor. I shall be glad to answer one more question for the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not include the associations and organizations purposely, because if I had done so I would have had to mention, on the opposite side, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Those may not be very large organizations, but I think the American Legion alone probably has two or three times the membership of all the groups my friend has mentioned. If the American Legion does not have, we can add in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as well as a large number of religious organizations and other associations.

Mr. BUSH. I will say to the Senator, like the Senator from Arizona, I am a member of the American Legion and of the VFW. I do not expect to be thrown out for taking the position I take today, nor do I believe that the officers of those organizations necessarily speak for the large constituencies.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suggest, then, we could eliminate this whole area of argument by saying that none of the heads of these organizations speak for 100 percent of their membership.

Mr. BUSH. That is probably true.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Any more than any college presidents or college professors speak for any large number of students.

I have knowledge of an organization in Washington, D.C., which represents students all over the country who fervently support the disclaimer affidavit and the oath.

I think we have to consider not simply what the college presidents or the college students desire to do, or what the American Legion or the American Civil Liberties Union desires to do, but we must consider what is best for the United States of America, as determined by the Senate in the debate.

Mr. BUSH. I am impressed when I see a petition signed by 98 percent of the members of the faculty of Wesleyan University of Middletown, Conn.—98 percent of the members of the faculty signed the petition, which gives me some conviction that the faculties generally in that area, at least, are sympathetic with the bill which is before us now.

I believe the colleges and universities we talk about in the report represent a very high percentage of the population in the academic community.

In conclusion, I can understand the difficulty that some of my friends have with this question. The question is one of the spirit and of the mind. It is very difficult to explain why a man in the academic world feels as he does about that which is so precious to him, called academic freedom, but it is wrapped up in the argument that we are having this afternoon. He does not want to be singled out or to have his associates or his students singled out as suspect because they are members of an educational institution of higher learning. They resent that, and on their behalf I resent it. That is the reason that I take the position that I take this afternoon. I do not believe that the United States will be one bit more in danger if we pass the bill. On the other hand, I believe we shall be better off because we shall bring back into this program some of the institutions which are very able to contribute to it through their faculties.

So I conclude by expressing the very strong hope that the bill will pass today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order authorizing the insertion of the article by President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale, be rescinded, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

LOYALTY: AN ISSUE OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

(By A. Whitney Griswold)

(President Griswold, of Yale, explains why many universities, including his own, have refused Federal funds for student loans in protest against loyalty affidavits.)

A debate of large dimensions is going on over the issue whether loyalty oaths and affidavits shall be required of college students seeking Federal loans. But the central issue is not always entirely clear to those directly involved, and is blurred and confused in the public mind. It is not a question of being for or against the Constitution, for or against loyalty. It is a case of two different groups of Americans talking at cross purposes about the same thing—namely, the security and welfare of the Nation and the means of strengthening both through higher education. These are the only terms in which the central issue of the controversy can be accurately identified and understood.

Since the National Defense Education Act went into effect a year ago last September, the great majority of the Nation's colleges and universities have raised their voices in criticism of one particular provision. This is the disclaimer affidavit that accompanies the oath of allegiance, and that is required of all recipients of the act's benefits. The affidavit requirement appears in title X, section 1001(f), the full text of which reads as follows:

"No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits."

Individually, and through such representative organizations as the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the American Association of University Professors, and the Association for Higher Education of the National Education Association, the colleges and universities have protested this affidavit and have urged its repeal.

The Government has not been unresponsive to their views. Last winter the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Flemming, testified in their support, and Senators Clark, of Pennsylvania, and Kennedy, of Massachusetts, introduced a bill repealing section 1001(f) in its entirely. Hearings on this bill, which had the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were held before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in April and May, and the committee reported the bill favorably by a vote of 12 to 3.

After debate in late July, however, the bill was amended to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit but retain the oath of allegiance, and then sent back to committee. Finally, on December 2, on the eve of his departure for his trip abroad, President Eisenhower spoke out categorically in favor of the affidavit's repeal. There the matter rests awaiting reconsideration by Congress when it assembles next month.

The colleges and universities are not protesting the oath of allegiance. They do question its appropriateness as a condition to financial aid for college students, as distinct from its traditional usage in conection with the assumption of a public office or trust; and they also question whether more general use may not wear it thin.

Too, they are mindful of the historic fact that any oath required by the State can be misused. Nevertheless, they accept the oath of allegiance. By itself the oath is no more than an affirmation of the duties every citizen owes to his country, whether he takes the oath or not. It is thus coextensive with and expressive of the basic law of the land. The disclaimer affidavit, on the other hand, extends beyond the basic law of the land into the realm of belief and conscience, where definitions are vague and actions become matters of debate. What the colleges and

universities are objecting to is this disclaimer affidavit.

Unfortunately, these are not the terms in which the issue is commonly presented. Although the position of the colleges and universities is extensively documented in the printed hearings on the Clark-Kennedy bill and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and has attracted widespread press attention, what comes through to the public is an oversimplified impression of fastidious intellectualism finding fault with the law, of the egghead refusing to accept the common lot of the citizen and the patriot.

What's wrong with loyalty oaths? We have all pledged allegiance to the flag as schoolchildren. Everyone who takes out a passport swears to uphold the Constitution. Why should anyone hesitate to take such an oath in any circumstances? Why should any American object to disclaiming beliefs abhorrent to all Americans? These and less temperate questions imputing subversiveness and disloyalty are evidence of a wide gulf of misunderstanding between the public and the colleges and universities.

A natural reason for the position of the colleges and universities is that no one enjoys being doubted when everyone else is trusted. Yet this is the way the colleges and universities are made to feel by the disclaimer affidavit. The affidavit originated in the Taft-Hartley Act. From this act it was written into the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and then into the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Farmers, veterans, and beneficiaries of social security (to say nothing of other recipients of Federal benefits, such as the officials and employees of railroads, steamship lines, and airlines) have never had to make a disclaimer affidavit. In 1959 it was dropped out of the Taft-Hartley Act. This means that the only recipients of Federal benefits to whom it now applies are students and teachers in colleges and universities.

To the latter, this seems like the short end of the stick. They do not see why their students and faculties should be treated differently from any other individuals, groups, professions, or occupations that receive Federal subsidies or loans. And it is all the harder for them to appreciate the justice of this when they reflect on the role they are being asked to perform and the manner in which they are being asked to perform it. In one and the same breath they are told that they are the Nation's first line of defense—and the Nation's poorest security risk. They are called upon to put forth their best effort in the name of national security; yet they alone are obliged to submit to certain qualifications concerning their loyalty.

To them, this seems worse than discrimination in the ordinary sense of the word. It seems like a vote of no confidence from the very party that is asking them to come to its aid, at the very moment and in the very circumstances in which that aid is most urgently needed.

Is this the result of a native anti-intellectualism that stubbornly survives even the most serious crises? Whatever its origin, the fact is that the most important act of Congress to identify education with the national interest since the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Morrill Act of 1862 singles out higher education from all professions and occupations as a dubious loyalty risk—which goes far to explain the objections of the colleges and universities.

Feeling as they do, the colleges and universities are all the more averse to being parties to the discriminatory practice. Yet this, too, is forced upon them by the terms of the National Defense Education Act. In the student loan program the institution is required to invest 10 percent of its own funds in each loan, and to administer the disclaimer affidavit and oath of allegiance to each recipient.

Thus the institution not only becomes an active agent in administering an affidavit of which it does not approve; it also is forced to adopt a double standard for its students, as only those who need financial assistance are required to take the affidavit and oath. This places the institution in a moral dilemma which none enjoys, and which a number have decided they could resolve only by refraining from or withdrawing from participation in the loan program.

It is true that repeal of the affidavit will not wholly relieve the colleges and universities of the discriminatory practices of which they complain. Students and faculty accepting benefits under the terms of the National Defense Education Act will, presumably, still be required to take the oath of allegiance, while others will not. But, as already pointed out, the colleges and universities regard the oath of allegiance as a far less onerous requirement than the disclaimer affidavit, and one that, in present circumstances, is supportable.

Another and purely practical reason for the objection of the colleges and universities to the disclaimer affidavit is their belief that it is inherently futile. They know that similar affidavits have led to some convictions for perjury. But they do not think the affidavit can be relied upon either as a safeguard against disloyalty or as a means of inculcating loyalty.

That no truly subversive or treasonous person would hesitate to use it—or the oath of allegiance, for that matter—as a cloak for his intentions has been proved, rather than disproved, by the perjury convictions.

On the other hand, the affidavit cannot create loyalty. Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled. If men are born loyal, the only kind of loyalty that survives infancy in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticism and even doubt. Such loyalty may and usually does have an instinctive base; but if the opportunity to satisfy curiosity and answer criticism is limited, or qualified, or made conditional upon the acceptance of restraints, the instinctive base of loyalty is undermined.

The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths of any sort are of little value compared to the devotion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, "knows what he fights for and loves what he knows."

While the oath of allegiance may have the effect of recalling or stimulating such a sense of loyalty in the person who takes it, that effect is hardly strengthened by the accompanying affidavit. When a man pledges his allegiance to the Government and the Constitution, either we take him at his word (in which case the disclaimer affidavit becomes tautological) or we doubt his word and say to him (as the affidavit seems to say), "Even though you have just affirmed your allegiance to the Government and the Constitution, you are still not to be trusted." In the latter case the affidavit implies perjury in taking the oath of allegiance. In either case it is difficult for the colleges and universities to see how it will inspire loyalty in the rising generation.

The question now presents itself, Why are the colleges and universities objecting to the affidavit in the National Defense Education Act, when for nearly a decade they have acquiesced in it in the National Science Foundation Act?

The answer is that, although they have not liked it in either act, in the National Science Foundation Act the affidavit was the responsibility of the individual receiving the benefit. But in the National Defense Education Act, through investment in the loan program and administration of the affidavit, the institution itself is involved.

Again, the broader scope of the National Defense Education Act, its trailblazing character, and its weightier impact on the younger generation make the affidavit stand out more prominently as a matter of principle. It was also felt that the National Defense Education Act might be establishing the pattern for Federal support of higher education and setting the example for governmental relations with the colleges and universities for the indefinite future; and in this context matters of principle assumed special importance. When the framers of the National Defense Education Act followed the precedent of the Taft-Hartley and National Science Foundation Acts, and the disclaimer affidavit seemed about to be frozen into the system, the colleges and universities decided the time had come to make their opposition known.

But the case of the colleges and universities rests on more than mere discomfort at being objects of and parties to discriminatory practices. One possible remedy for any such practice is to generalize it. If every recipient of Federal benefits and all students in higher education were required to make the affidavit, the colleges and universities could no longer plead that they were suffering from discrimination.

The truth is they would find this cure no better than the disease. Justice Holmes once said that questions like this were better answered by a page of history than a volume of logic. The fundamental position of the colleges and universities is rooted in history, and it is only through an understanding of that history that we can fully understand what they are driving at today. The gravamen of their case against the affidavit is that, in juxtaposition to the affirmative oath of allegiance, it distorts the combination and imbues it with the nature of a political test oath.

This is the historic way in which such oaths have been constructed. They invariably begin with simple declarations or affirmations of allegiance, like the ancient oath of fealty or the present oath of allegiance. They are then expanded (as by the disclaimer affidavit) to include more and more avowals or disavowals of beliefs, doctrines, and associations, as well as denials of unpopular or criminal acts. Thus they project the authority of the state into the realm of belief and conscience where, according to our political tradition, it has no business; and the individual may be forced to acquit himself of crimes and offenses left so vague that he can be convicted on the mere appearance of evil if he cannot be convicted of its practice.

Experience has taught us lessons about political and religious test oaths which are all too easily forgotten. It was under the scourge of these oaths that our Protestant ancestors emigrated from England to settle in America; that our Catholic ancestors lost their lands and lives; that Sir Thomas More died telling his daughter, "It was a very hard thing to compel me to say either precisely with it against my conscience to the loss of my soul, or precisely against it to the destruction of my body"; that Puritan dissenters and Quakers went to jail, sat in the stocks and had their ears cut off.

The oaths that caused these sufferings grew to be over a page long, and, in the words of Sir Frederick Pollock, became "swollen with strange imprecations and scoldings," until in 1868 they were at last abolished in favor of the simple oath of allegiance.

"I, , do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty

Queen Victoria, her heirs, and successors, according to law. So help me God."

These things are easily forgotten, but colleges and universities, where history is studied and the past is ever present, remember them. They were fresh in the minds of the framers of our Constitution, fresh enough for Alexander Hamilton to denounce test oaths as "a subversion of one great principle of social security, to wit: That every man shall be presumed innocent until he is proved guilty."

Their effect, said Hamilton, "was to invert the order of things, and instead of obliging the state to prove the guilt, in order to inflict the penalty, it was to oblige the citizen to establish his own innocence to avoid the penalty. It was to excite scruples in the honest and conscientious, and to hold out a bribe to perjury." All this, Hamilton concluded, was "repugnant to the true genius of the common law" and "unknown to the Constitution. * * *"

The colleges and universities recall more recent experiences with test oaths than those which began with the marital troubles of Henry VIII. They recall the oaths of religious conformity that bound the early American colleges in the 18th century and were not finally sloughed off until the 19th (by Oxford and Cambridge in the middle of the 19th)—oaths that militated against Catholics and Protestant sects dissenting from the established religion of the institution.

They recall, too, the loyalty oaths imposed by Congress in the Reconstruction period after the Civil War, of which Lincoln declared: "I have found that men who have not even been suspected of disloyalty are very averse to taking an oath of any sort as a condition to exercising an ordinary right of citizenship."

In the words of the Supreme Court (in *Ex Parte Garland*), "All enactments of this kind partake of the nature of bills of pains and penalties, and are subject to the constitutional inhibitions against the passage of bills of attainder, under which general designation they are included."

For the benefit of a generation which, fortunately for it, has less knowledge of them than the men who drafted the Constitution, bills of attainder were arbitrary bills which extinguished the civil rights of an individual and enabled the state to impose upon him such penalties as loss of property, prison, and death, without benefit of trial by jury. Bills of attainder and test oaths grew up together in the same country, in the same period of history and, although they are not identified with one another in modern law, they partook of the same essence in their day and served the same brand of justice.

That oaths of allegiance, even without the objectionable features of the historic test oaths, can be misused as instruments of oppression was proved by Hitler. He merely required that civil servants and professors swear allegiance to him. That was all he needed to give the semblance of legality to whatever coercive steps he chose to take to compel their adherence to the Nazi Party line.

It was in no small measure his use of the oath that drove many German university professors into exile—among them many of the leading nuclear scientists who enabled the United States to produce the atomic bomb instead of Germany. They and their fellow exiles in other fields of learning, finding posts in American universities, have testified to the dangers of all oaths, however innocuous their beginning, in a way that has undoubtedly made their American colleagues sensitive to those dangers.

The colleges and universities do not believe that the oath of allegiance in the National Defense Education Act will be used as Hitler used his oath of allegiance. Indeed, as I have already said, they have accepted it. But the German experience, with its peculiarly direct and intimate significance to our college and university community, and that community's continually fresh memory of the political and religious test oaths in Anglo-American history, make it that much more anxious lest the disclaimer affidavit bend the present oath of allegiance in the direction of either. Hence it is that much more critical of the affidavit and more strongly in favor of its repeal.

Underlying this concern with test oaths, in fact underlying the whole position of the colleges and universities in this controversy, is their concern for freedom. For centuries, in Europe as well as in England and America, they have struggled for the right to pursue learning for its own sake without interference by church or state. They have done so not because they thought society owed them this right as a mark of respect or a special privilege, but because they have regarded it as a functional necessity identical with freedom of the press and similar to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly.

In this historical perspective, they see a consistent use of oaths like the disclaimer affidavit as instruments of coercion, conformism, and oppression, which are enemies of learning as much as they are opposites of freedom. If, now, our colleges and universities are to serve the cause of freedom and discharge the solemn duties with which the public, through the National Defense Education Act, has vested them, they can do so effectively only through procedures consistent with both freedom and learning.

Again and again history affords object lessons of what happens to learning when it is denied the freedom that is its natural medium. Nazi Germany is a glaring example. A nation that cannot trust its intellectuals cannot trust itself. A people that is afraid to expose its political and social institutions to the curiosity and criticism of the rising generation is not free; by whatever method it whispers this fear to itself, it shouts its insecurity to the world.

It is not the disclaimer affidavit that will make our colleges and universities bulwarks of our security, nor even the oath of allegiance, which they accept. It is our trust in them to pursue the course the Nation has set for them—a course they can pursue in freedom and in no other way.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 6 to the bill, and concurred therein each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 15, 1960, p. 12725, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12117, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12117) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes",

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure "1962" in said amendment insert "1963".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation or exchange, $2,550,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 6.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a comparative table of appropriations for 1960, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Comparative table of appropriations for 1960 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1961

REGULAR ACTIVITIES (TITLE I)

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in House bill, 1961	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1961	Conference allowance, 1961
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Research	$67,721,590	$68,981,700	$67,934,000	$70,247,600	$68,827,200
Plant and animal disease and pest control	49,800,600	48,775,600	52,011,000	52,236,000	52,236,000
Meat inspection	21,324,900	21,562,700	21,562,000	21,562,000	21,562,000
Total, salaries and expenses	138,847,090	139,320,000	141,507,000	144,045,600	142,625,200
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	12,056,500	15,131,500	15,131,000	15,131,000	15,131,000
Construction of facilities		900,000		3,700,000	2,550,000
State experiment stations:					
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	31,553,708	32,553,708	31,553,000	32,553,708	32,553,000
Penalty mail	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Total, State experiment stations	31,803,708	32,803,708	31,803,000	32,803,708	32,803,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	182,707,298	188,155,208	188,441,000	195,680,308	193,109,200
Extension Service:					
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	53,715,000	56,580,000	55,715,000	57,715,000	56,715,000
Retirement costs for extension agents	5,674,375	5,961,000	5,875,000	5,961,000	5,961,000
Penalty mail	2,491,307	2,491,307	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000
Federal Extension Service	2,242,540	2,392,660	2,255,000	2,275,000	2,265,000
Total, Extension Service	64,123,222	67,424,967	66,335,000	68,441,000	67,431,000
Farmer Cooperative Service	615,800	644,650	620,000	620,000	620,000
Soil Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	82,322,000	82,882,000	83,132,000	83,132,000	83,132,000
Watershed protection	22,750,000	27,750,000	32,000,000	37,000,000	35,000,000
Flood prevention	18,000,000	15,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Water conservation and utilization projects	75,000				
Great Plains conservation program	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	133,147,000	135,632,000	143,132,000	148,132,000	146,132,000
Agricultural Conservation Program Service: Agricultural conservation program	241,500,000	242,600,000	242,000,000	242,000,000	242,000,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Research and Service:					
Marketing research and agricultural estimates	15,412,500	16,571,500	16,315,000	16,605,000	16,515,000
Marketing services	26,054,600	26,570,400		26,579,900	26,579,900
Total, Marketing Research and Service	41,467,100	43,141,900	16,315,000	43,184,900	43,094,900
Payments to States and possessions	1,195,000	1,195,000	1,195,000	1,195,000	1,195,000
School lunch program	[1] 110,000,000	[1] 110,000,000	[1] 110,000,000	[1] 110,000,000	[1] 110,000,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	152,662,100	154,336,900	127,510,000	154,379,900	154,289,900
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Salaries and expenses	[2] 3,518,300	[2] 4,637,300	[2] 4,447,000	[2] 4,487,000	[2] 4,487,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	5,843,378	14,621,800	14,621,000	14,621,000	14,621,000
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service	9,361,678	19,259,100	19,068,000	19,108,000	19,108,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	909,500	941,325	930,000	941,325	940,000
Commodity Stabilization Service:					
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	[3] 40,535,000	40,135,000	40,135,000	40,135,000	40,135,000
Sugar Act program	71,500,000	74,500,000	74,500,000	74,500,000	74,500,000
Conservation reserve program	335,000,000	361,783,000	310,000,000	335,000,000	330,000,000
Total, Commodity Stabilization Service	447,035,000	476,418,000	424,635,000	449,635,000	444,635,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Operating and administrative expenses	6,376,700	6,376,700	6,376,000	6,376,000	6,376,000
Rural Electrification Administration: Salaries and expenses	9,632,000	9,632,000	9,632,000	9,632,000	9,632,000
Farmers Home Administration: Salaries and expenses	30,744,750	31,467,650	30,500,000	31,467,650	31,050,000
Office of the General Counsel	3,162,025	3,358,845	3,358,000	3,358,000	3,358,000
Office of Secretary	2,881,000	2,899,500	2,899,500	2,899,500	2,899,500
Office of Information	1,431,665	1,478,685	1,478,000	1,523,000	1,488,000
Library	831,900	895,660	895,000	895,000	895,000
Total, regular activities	1,287,121,638	1,341,521,190	1,267,809,500	1,335,088,683	1,323,963,600

CORPORATIONS (TITLE II)

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses	($2,330,000)	($2,330,000)	($2,630,000)	($2,630,000)	($2,630,000)
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Restoration of capital impairment	[4] 2,110,424,413	1,325,000,000	1,226,500,000	1,226,500,000	1,226,500,000
Reimbursements for special activities:					
International Wheat Agreement	63,875,000	49,042,000	32,572,000	32,572,000	32,572,000
Emergency famine relief	104,508,000	115,000,000	107,094,000	107,094,000	107,094,000
Sales for local currencies (Public Law 480)	968,016,000	881,000,000	881,000,000	881,000,000	881,000,000
Migratory waterfowl feed	35,000	35,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
Bartered materials for stockpile	129,000,000	422,950,000	422,950,000	422,950,000	422,950,000
Animal disease eradication	1,056,500				
Grading and classing activities	1,607,000	715,000			
Total reimbursements for special activities	1,268,097,500	1,468,742,000	1,443,634,000	1,443,634,000	1,443,634,000
Administrative expense limitation	[5] (42,400,000)	(48,428,000)	(44,726,000)	(45,726,000)	(45,726,000)
Total, corporations	3,378,521,913	2,793,742,000	2,670,134,000	2,670,134,000	2,670,134,000

RELATED AGENCIES (TITLE III)

Limitation on administrative expenses: Farm Credit Administration	[6] ($2,310,000)	($2,480,000)	($2,480,000)	($2,480,000)	($2,480,000)
Total, titles I, II, and III	4,665,643,551	4,135,263,190	3,937,943,500	4,005,222,683	3,994,097,600

[1] In addition, $43,657,248 transferred from sec. 32 funds in fiscal year 1960, transfer of $40,000,000 budgeted for fiscal year 1961, and $45,000,000 recommended in bill for 1961.

[2] In addition, $2,493,000 transferred from sec. 32 funds in fiscal year 1960, transfer of $2,539,000 budgeted for fiscal year 1961, $2,493,000 recommended in House bill, and $2,539,000 recommended by Senate, and agreed to in conference.

[3] Includes $1,400,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.

[4] Includes $675,000,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act 1960.

[5] Includes additional $400,000 authorized in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.

[6] Includes additional $185,000 authorized in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.

Loan authorizations

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in House bill, 1961	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1961	Conference allowance, 1961
Rural Electrification Administration:					
Electrification	[7] $136,000,000	$110,000,000	$110,000,000	$110,000,000	$110,000,000
Telephone	[7] 104,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	240,000,000	190,000,000	[8] 190,000,000	[8] 190,000,000	[8] 190,000,000
Farmers Home Administration:					
Farm ownership	26,900,000	20,000,000	26,900,000	26,900,000	26,900,000
Farm operation (production and subsistence)	197,100,000	154,000,000	197,100,000	197,100,000	197,100,000
Soil and water conservation	2,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	[9] 226,000,000	177,000,000	[10] 227,000,000	[10] 227,000,000	[10] 227,000,000
Total, loan authorizations	466,000,000	367,000,000	417,000,000	417,000,000	

Permanent authorizations

Agency and item	Authorizations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Increase or decrease
Agricultural Research Service: Animal quarantine station, Clifton, N.J.	$30,000		−$30,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:			
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec. 32)	251,446,365	$318,000,000	+66,553,635
Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act fund	670,000	670,000	
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	252,116,365	318,670,000	+66,553,635
Commodity Stabilization Service: National Wool Act	50,050,313	51,000,000	+949,687
Total, permanent appropriations	302,196,678	369,670,000	+67,473,322

[7] Includes $25,000,000 contingency authorized in 1960 Appropriation Act, but not requested in budget, 1961.
[8] In addition, contingency of $50,000,000 authorized for each program for 1961 in House bill, raised to $60,000,000 by Senate, and agreed to in conference.
[9] Includes $20,000,000 contingency authorization provided in 1960 Appropriation Act, but not requested in budget, 1961.
[10] In addition, contingency of $40,000,000 authorized for 1961.

ELIMINATION OF AFFIDAVIT OF DISLOYALTY

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2929) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to keep the record straight, and we are going to try to keep it straight as we go along. I should like specifically to refer to other areas where education is provided with Federal funds and where oaths are required. I read from the Congressional Digest of April 1960, volume 39, No. 4:

> At the request of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress performed a survey of all the departments and most of the agencies of the Federal Government to determine which ones require loyalty oaths or disclaimers of subversive affiliation.

I am not going through all of these statements, but only enough in order to keep the record straight. We will put more in as the record is bent a little.

> II. OATHS AND DISCLAIMERS SPECIFICALLY REQUIRED BY STATUTE
>
> NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
>
> The only requirement of this nature administered by the National Science Foundation is contained in section 16(d) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), which requires a loyalty affidavit and oath of allegiance from persons receiving payments under foundation scholarships or fellowships.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it true that the National Science Foundation has been in operation for 10 years?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Just about 10 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. And does the United States of America, through the National Science Foundation, provide education for certain young people?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. In all that period of time has the Senator from Arizona heard any great objections to that program?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has never heard any complaint about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. As a matter of fact, following the subject a step further, the National Science Foundation requirements are very similar to those of the National Defense Education Act. There is no legislation introduced relating to these provisions in the National Science Foundation Act, which was enacted in 1950. And the National Defense Education Act was in effect about a year before all the furor started. Is this not correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. I compliment the Senator. He is always forthright and courageous. I am glad that he mentioned the fact that a national organization of college students exists in this country with headquarters here in Washington and with representatives in colleges throughout the country. This organization is composed of young men and women who stand up without fear and do not hesitate to take the oath of loyalty to the United States or to sign an anti-Communist affidavit or disclaimer. I salute the membership of this organization.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, to proceed a little further, when the year 1960 ends I will have visited with 55 different educational organizations at the student level, either in a classroom or in my own office, and such a small number of those people express dissatisfaction with this program that it would be impossible for me to give the complaints any value which would approach 1 percent.

In reading through this list I see the name of my own school. It is not my alma mater because I never graduated from a college. I refer to the University of Arizona. I recall speaking at the annual meeting of the Arizona Pioneer Historical Society at the university last year, and the president sat next to me. I had gone through my library, remembering that I had it in my possession, and I found a loyalty oath and disclaimer that had been sworn to by that illustrious American, John C. Fremont, before he became Governor of Arizona. In fact, it was before 1880. I jokingly said to the president, who is a good friend of mine, that if it was good enough for a Governor of Arizona, it was good enough for a student.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Did the affidavit which John C. Fremont took have reference to the Communist Party?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not recall that it spelled out Communists, but it talked about advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government. I am trying to find it. When I find it I will put it in the RECORD and the Senator can see it. It is a much more substantial oath than the one we are asking students to take.

To continue my remarks concerning the study that was made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library

of Congress under the heading "Department of Defense," we find the following:

Section 624 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1959 (recurring appropriation act provision) reads:

"No part of the funds appropriated herein shall be expended for the support of any formally enrolled student in basic courses of the senior division, reserve officers training corps, who has not executed a certificate of loyalty oath in such form as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense."

Under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act it is provided that in order to be eligible for a traineeship award under section 7(a)(3) of the act, an individual must "have executed and filed with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation an affidavit that he does not advocate, and, is not a member of any organization that advocates or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Under the regulations of the Public Health Service Act there is a requirement for a loyalty oath and disclaimer in order to be eligible for regular Public Health Service Research fellowships and for National Institutes of Health traineeship awards.

My whole purpose in reciting the few cases that I have recited is to point out that not only are there precedents under acts which carry the words "national defense" in their titles, but that it is also the historic procedure used in government all through the country. It is nothing new to require students to take such an oath. I cannot for the life of me understand why some of our educators—and I might say some of them are among our most learned and highly respected educators—have taken the attitude that they have taken on this particular subject. That is the extent of the remarks I care to make on this subject. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I withhold my suggestion. I yield to my friend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that every member of the staff and every Member of the Senate and House signs an affidavit which is substantially the same as the non-Communist affidavit provided in the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think it is substantially the same. We swear to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I certainly believe that covers it.

Mr. THURMOND. The language of the affidavit which is subscribed to by every staff member in the Senate is as follows:

No person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, who—

(1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States;

(2) is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States, knowing that such organization so advocates;

(3) participates in any strike or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agency; or

(4) is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States or such agencies, knowing that such organization asserts such right.

Is not this oath substantially similar to the oath required under the National Defense Education Act? If that is the case, if every person who works for the Government of the United States, including every secretary who works for a Member of Congress, takes such an oath, why should there be any question about anyone who is to get a grant or a loan to go to school to pursue further learning in an institution making such an affidavit? Why should there be any question about any student or any teacher making such an affidavit?

If a person is not a Communist, and if he does not advocate the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, why does he not have the courage to say so? Why should he wish to hide behind something? There may be the insinuation that he is a Communist. Frankly, I believe that some of them are Communists. I believe that is the reason why some teachers and students refuse to take the oath.

I do not say that all the students and teachers who oppose the oath are Communists, but it is my firm opinion that some of the leaders in this movement in some of these institutions who are trying to get the oath requirement repealed are Communists. I believe some of them are fellow travelers. I believe they are pushing this program in order to foster the cause of communism in this country.

I know there are a great many good people who believe in the contention that is made with respect to the affidavit on the ground of academic freedom. They feel that academic freedom and freedom of speech are involved. They believe that the rights of an individual should not be violated.

However, in this day and age, when we are threatened with communism, which is the greatest threat that our country has ever faced, it is no time to quibble, it is not time for the American people to show any patience toward anyone who is not for 100 percent Americanism in the making of a loan or grant to a person. Otherwise, we would be merely furthering the education of such a person, who has a warped mind or is a Communist or a fellow traveler, and who will use his further knowledge to harm this country.

I do not believe there is any excuse for changing the affidavit. I am amazed that the proponents of the bill should come back this year after we recommitted the bill last year. I am completely surprised that they should come back again and ask the Senate to repeal this non-Communist affidavit.

It makes no difference to me if the proponents cite every college and university in the country as being opposed to the affidavit. They have gone to great pains to break down into different categories the opposition to the affidavit. They list institutions which have withdrawn from the student loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit; institutions which decline to participate in the student loan program because of the affidavit; and institutions whose presidents have stated that they disapprove of the disclaimer affidavit but which continue to participate in the student loan program. Then they show colleges and universities whose faculties have expressed disapproval of the affidavit. They also list associations and organizations reported to protest the disclaimer affidavit.

I believe it is about time for Congress to take a strong and unyielding stand for Americanism. It is a good time for us to show our colors. It is time for us to set an example in this country by saying to the young people of this country, and to the older ones, too, who want to get these grants and loans: "If you are not willing to take an oath that you do not favor overthrowing the country, and that you are not a Communist, the Government of the United States has no grant or loan to give you."

Mr. GOLDWATER. In answer to the Senator's question and statement I wish to recognize him as a Senator who displays a natural showing of patriotism. It is a display of patriotism which we seldom see in this country. I am extremely proud that the Senator from South Carolina is a friend of mine and I am a friend of his.

The act contains almost the exact words read by the Senator when he quoted from the affidavit which every employee of ours in the Senate must make and swear to before he can be paid out of Federal funds.

The language that is used in the act, under section 1001(f) reads:

No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of, and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

That is the portion of the act to which certain educators have objected most strenuously. I feel rather certain that if that provision were eliminated, many of the objections would be removed, because when I read the second proviso, I am certain the Senate will understand why.

But I cannot understand what is the motivation of the protest. Does it come under the guise of fear of abuse of freedom of speech? I cannot believe that. Does it come under the guise of destroying freedom of association? I cannot believe that, because I do not believe it was ever the intent of the framers of the Constitution to encourage the membership of any American in an organization which would advocate the overthrow of the American Government.

Are the educators afraid of Federal control? No, I cannot believe that these particular educational institutions which protest most violently would be afraid of Federal control. If I am not mistaken, the most zealous advocates of Federal control come from those colleges, either in the form of professors or past students.

I am at a loss to know what goes through the minds of those persons. I know some of them. I know, for example, the president of my university. He is one of the most dedicated Americans. He is a southerner by birth and by instinct. He holds American traditions high. But for some reason, known only to him, he opposes this provision.

If we retained only the second part, I think this would be a different story. Let me read what the second proviso is.

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001, title I, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

Certainly, in answer to the Senator's basic question, the answer would have to be, Yes, the provisions of both are the same.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona this question. I notice on page 2 of the report the following statement:

S. 2929 simply removes the redundant, ineffectual, and undesirable disclaimer of disloyalty.

Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Arizona that the present act is not effectual? Last year, when the debate was taking place, I invited the attention of Senators to section 1001, title 18, of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which reads as follows:

Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, factitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

That provision of the United States Code, section 1001 of title 18, provides punishment for a person who makes a false or fraudulent statement. So there is a way to enforce the provision which the committee wants to eliminate. Yet it is claimed that it is ineffective. Why is it ineffective, if there is a way to punish a person with a $10,000 fine or imprisonment of 5 years, or both? Is the Senator from Arizona in accord with that statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am in accord with that statement. If the Senator from South Carolina will read the minority views submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], and myself, he will find our agreement with the question he just put to the junior Senator from Arizona expressed all the way through.

We feel that stronger penalties should be provided in the act than are provided. We feel that the penalties provided in the existing act are not strong enough. We should like to see them strengthened. We feel that this is our opportunity to amend the proposal so that it will have teeth. I shall read what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who was the author of the motion to recommit, said last year. He summed up the arguments for recommittal as follows:

The country is entitled to something better, and the Senate is entitled to something better than the delusion that we have done something to restrain Communist activities, when all we have done is to give a wide open invitation to Communists by passing a futile, meaningless gesture favoring patriotism. I should hope that the committee might find some substitute offering a slight hope of putting a Communist in jail for being disloyal to America.

That statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14097.

I repeat, because the Senator from South Carolina was not in the Chamber when I spoke earlier to this point, that while no specific instructions were issued by the Senate at the time of the recommittal of the bill to the committee, nevertheless one must gather from the rather voluminous debate preceding the vote on which action was taken that it was the intent of the Senate that the committee give the subject further study.

As I related earlier, no hearings were held on the subject. The committee had a very short, informal discussion of the bill prior to reporting it. In fact, the bill before the Senate today is identical with the bill which was recommitted to the committee last year.

Mr. THURMOND. Last year, it seems, there were those who favored the repeal of the provision and who were merely looking for some excuse to repeal it, without there being any merit in their case. They alleged that it did not constitute an effective national security measure. But as I have pointed out, it is effective, because there is a way to enforce it.

Another point that was made was that the provision cast unfounded doubts upon the loyalty of members of the educational community. As I have pointed out, anybody who works for the Government takes a similar oath. Why should the educational community be singled out for exclusion from an oath when millions of employees on the Government payrolls can get on them in the first place only by taking such an oath?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Again, I cannot understand the reasoning behind the objection. I pointed out earlier, and I can point out to the Senator from South Carolina, if he will peruse the document he has in his hand, the results of the study made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress with respect to other acts which require such oaths.

For 10 years applicants for fellowships and traineeships under the National Science Foundation have been required to execute both the disclaimer and the oath.

The Vocational Training Act, which is one of the oldest educational acts on the statute books—if I am not mistaken, it dates back to 1916, and applies to persons of all ages—requires some type of oath and disclaimer before the applicants can benefit under the act.

So there is nothing new about this proposal. It goes back a good number of years to establish a precedent. If there had been objection to it, I think the objection could well have been raised many years ago, rather than at the present moment, when we are locking horns, so to speak, with the Bear of Russia, and find ourselves in need, so some think, of a stepped-up educational program.

Yet when we provide a stepped-up educational program, we cannot be too choosy about it; we cannot say to a person, "If you are not willing to make it adequately clear that you are a complete American, you cannot benefit under the act."

As I pointed out earlier, too, these objections come from a very small minority of American universities, colleges, and other institutions of higher learning. The total, as I pointed out earlier, unless the figure has been corrected since May 12, of this year, is 131. If my memory is correct, there are about 1,300 institutions of higher learning in the United States. Twenty-six have taken no positive action, such as refusing to take funds. The others are willing to object, but are still willing to take the money.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Florida wish me to yield to him?

Mr. HOLLAND. I rise merely to say that I think one of the things which is being done in the debate is to attribute to large numbers of young Americans an attitude which they do not support or defend, and which it is unfair to impute to them.

I do not like to bring my own connection with education too much into the picture, but I have been for many years, and am now, a member of the board of Emory University, which has some 3,500 or 3,600 students.

I am now, and I have been, off and on, for years, a member of the board of trustees of the Florida Southern College, which has approximatly 2,000 students.

I am now, and I have been for more than 30 years, a member of the executive council of the alumni of the University of Florida, which has approximately 13,000 students.

I have official relations with some other colleges which I shall not mention.

I know literally hundreds and, I believe, several thousand of the young men from my area and other areas who attend these institutions. I have not received a single letter that I can recall from any of those young men, and many of them are receiving these loans—com-

plaining of either the disclaimer or the loyalty oath. I have received from them many letters in which they complain that some educators and some students are taking a position which attributes to them and to other students a position which they would not take, and which they think should not be imputed to the young people of America.

Mr. President, I am glad to extend my remarks to apply to young people other than those of my own area. I do not know how many Senators have heard from the National Students Committee for the Loyalty Oath, which has its office here in Washington, D.C. I know that the chairman of that committee, Mr. Douglas Caddy, is of Georgetown University, one of the fine, old, highly regarded institutions of learning here in the Capital area. The executive secretary is Mr. David Franke, of George Washington University, another large and highly reputable institution of learning.

I shall not read all of the letter into the RECORD; but I wish to read two paragraphs which make the same point which has been made to me in dozens of letters from young men of my own area who resent the fact that there is being imputed to the students and the student youth of the Nation a desire to evade or escape responsibility for taking this oath and disclaimer.

The letter is addressed to me; it is dated February 15, 1960, and is signed by Mr. Caddy. It reads, in part, as follows:

> As you are well aware, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee recently voted to report out favorably Senator JOHN KENNEDY'S bill, S. 2929, to repeal the nonsubversive affidavit presently required of college students participating in the National Defense Education Act. It now appears that the Senate will act upon the bill in the near future.

I continue to read, but not consecutively:

> Supporters of S. 2929 cry out that college students are being discriminated against by the current NDEA affidavit. This is not true. There are 155,871 college students currently enrolled in Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) units on their campuses who have taken the same affidavit. Only 68,152 students are currently participating in the NDEA and have taken the affidavit. Yet the cry has never been raised that ROTC students were being discriminated against. The 12,000 college students who have participated in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 have also been required to take the affidavit. Federal employees and private citizens who volunteer for civil defense work must also take the affidavit at the present time.

Mr. President, I digress to say that during World War II, at a time when, as Governor, I was head of the civil defense organization in my own State of Florida, 338,000 of our citizens were rendering that service.

I continue to read from the letter:

> Can it truthfully be said, then, that college students are being singled out by the NDEA affidavit?

Mr. President, I have quoted a part of the letter; and the statement which I have made is, in its entirety, designed simply to have the RECORD show what I believe to be a fact—namely, that the vast majority of the young people of this Nation do not take the position that either of these requirements—either the loyalty oath, which was included last year in this same act, or the disclaimer affidavit—should be repealed; but, to the contrary, they have gone ahead and have executed these documents, and are, by the thousands, enjoying the generosity of their country, which is extended for one reason only, and that is to better qualify them and better assure our country of good service in the event of our being faced with heavy emergency in the fields of security and defense.

Mr. President, I think all of us must recognize the fact—as just now stated by the Senator from Arizona—that the present request is based upon the attitude of a very few of the individuals who are affected. I repeat that in my area of the country not a single patriotic organization of men and women or a single civic organization of men or women has, to my knowledge, taken a position endorsing this bill, as regards these two requirements; but, to the contrary, their position is reasonable and fair and properly recognizes the sense of loyalty and patriotism of the young people of America who, in the very great majority, believe just as the more mature citizens do.

I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his courtesy.

Of course I completely disagree with what my friend the Senator from Florida has said. But at a later date, and in my own time, I shall reply to what he has said.

Let me ask whether the Senator from Arizona has available a list of the institutions of higher learning which have written in or have expressed support for the present disclaimer affidavit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must say that I am not aware that any such list exists. I have no such list of my own. The only list I have is a list of patriotic organizations—including the American Legion, and others—which support our position, and the number of students—and I am trying to find the number now—who have expressed a desire to retain these requirements. These students are in the organization the Senator from Florida has mentioned, but I have no idea how many there are.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that perhaps one or two or four or five institutions have expressed support for the affidavit. I have not been able to identify them, and I thought perhaps the Senator from Arizona could do so.

I suggest to him, in all friendliness, that perhaps the fact that none of the institutions which he has mentioned as not having opposed the affidavit has written in in support of it, is one which the Senate should consider in the course of the debate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I can understand perfectly how my friend would reach that conclusion, but I could not agree with him.

I find that the American people who are particularly happy with things the way they are, as they pertain to themselves, do not take the trouble to write to us; and I think the same is true of all institutions. I have not made an effort to solicit the opinions of universities which have not written in. I only say that of the 1,300-odd institutions of higher education in the United States, only 26 have by any positive action indicated that they really mean business on this matter; and a total of 131—which is approximately 10 percent—have indicated dissatisfaction with it. In the absence of any expressions of disapproval, I must assume that a great majority of the remaining 90 percent find nothing wrong with the requirement that the students take the oath.

It is unfortunate that we did not hold hearings this year, because that in view of the excitement which has been generated in this country since the passage of this act, I believe we could have brought out, in the course of adequate hearings, the objections to and the support of the various positions. But the committee held no hearings; and the bill was reported within a few days from the time when it was introduced on the floor of the Senate; and only the customary argument between the majority and the minority took place within the committee itself.

I think it most unfortunate that that was done. As the Senator knows, I have discussed this problem with him on numerous occasions, as I have with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I feel there is a way in which we can work out a satisfactory approach to this problem, but I must say that both the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Massachusetts have been adamant in insisting that we completely remove the disclaimer and loyalty oath. With that attitude, I am afraid we cannot come to an amicable agreement. I feel we could have settled this problem weeks or months ago had the brilliant mind of the Senator from Pennsylvania been held ajar enough so that it might have accepted some of our arguments.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from Arizona. Obviously, two persons looking at the same scene from different points on the landscape are apt to draw different conclusions. I certainly feel acute distress at the suggestion of my friend that I have been inflexible or firm. I would not want to have the pot calling the kettle black in this regard. I think the Senator from Massachusetts and I have been sweet reason itself in an effort to compromise. The Senator from Arizona, I am sure, has the same feeling. I think that is probably the best way to leave it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to amend the act of 1958——

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have the page?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will look through the appendix, I think he will find a number of institutions listed there. I would not say the list is

large in number, but I have glanced quickly at it. I might mention some of them. The Veterans of Foreign Wars——

Mr. CLARK. I was concerned with institutions of higher learning.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Alliance College, in Cambridge Springs, Pa.; Norwich University; Wheaton College; Eastern Michigan College.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to take a look at the list, as my friend has suggested.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator could tell much more quickly if he would read this list. It is not an imposing list. But I still get back to my thesis that since we have not heard from approximately 90 percent of the universities, and I know they have been prevailed upon to write by the various organizations who are listed in the report, we must assume, I think correctly, that they have no interest in it one way or the other.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. My own judgment on that question would not be in accord with that of the Senator from Arizona, because it would occur to me that the members of the associations and organizations which did protest to the committee against the disclaimer affidavit, whose names are set forth on page 7 of the report, many of whose members are set forth on page 32 and following of the hearings before the subcommittee, would naturally assume the position taken by the association to which they belong as the one with which they concurred, unless they wished to violently dissent.

I think the Senator from Arizona will find that among the organizations which have expressed their objection to the disclaimer affidavit are organizations representing the overwhelming majority of the higher institutions of education.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would not want to leave the RECORD stand this way. I, myself, am a member of several organizations. Sometimes I agree with what they do, and sometimes I do not.

One thing that has been very amusing to me during my career in the Senate is the inability of liberal organizations to be consistent. I notice on the list the Civil Liberties Union. I know it believes very strongly in civil liberties and the right of people to use their liberties. I think it was yesterday, when the Texas Democratic Convention was held in Austin, that one of the great victories obtained by the majority leader of the Senate was over the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, which demanded a signed pledge from each State delegate to support the Democratic Party's nominees in the November election. Here they are insisting upon a pledge and they are insisting upon an oath, but these same liberals will turn around and say, "Oh, no, we cannot require Communists to take an oath or a young American to declare his loyalty to his country." One of the interesting things I have noticed in my 8 years in the Senate is that the people who speak the loudest about rights, about stepping on other people's toes, are the very first to demand the very same prerogatives when it is advantageous for them to do so.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely wanted to call the attention of both distinguished Senators engaged in the present colloquy to the fact that a sizable number of colleges and universities which declined to have any part in this program originally, as well as of those who have withdrawn, are institutions supported by churches which do not favor serving in the Armed Forces of the Nation. For example, in the group of institutions which declined to participate, I notice two of our very fine academic schools which have that background; namely, Swarthmore and Haverford. If the Senator will look at the list, he will see other institutions of that kind. What I have said is without derogation of them. They are fine academic institutions, with a good record of civic service and service in other fields that the people of that particular religious persuasion have rendered.

I am merely calling attention to the fact that it should not be a source of surprise to us that institutions of that kind would not want to participate in a defense program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a comment on what the Senator from Florida has said?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Florida mentioned Swarthmore and Haverford, which are in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. So is Bryn Mawr. My daughter is at present a student at Bryn Mawr. While these institutions have a background in the Society of Friends and were originally organized by the Society of Friends, not a single one is supported at the present time by the Society of Friends, or is connected, on any legal basis, other than perhaps a sentimental interest in the past, with pacifist views of that fine Pennsylvania institution, the Society of Friends.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my good friend for that comment. I had the pleasure recently of spending a summer vacation at Buck Hill Falls, at an institution supported by one of the Quaker groups, the other branch has one on the same grounds nearby, as the Senator well knows. I refer to the fall of 1958. I was not surprised to find there that the attitude toward service in the Armed Forces, at least of the grand and conscientious people to whom I talked while there, was quite the same as I have found among the Society of Friends all my life. I say this without any reflection on that institution, because I recall one very fine ambulance organization that served in my war, the war in which I served, which is the one before the war in which the Senator from Pennsylvania served. That ambulance organization was composed, as I understood, entirely of members of that religious belief, and no one could have been braver.

I merely wish to call attention to the fact that it is not surprising that schools such as the ones the Senator has mentioned—and there are others on the list, which the Senator will recognize—have felt it was against their deep and conscientious convictions to participate in a program of this kind.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment the Senator from Arizona for the position he has taken in this debate. I cannot help recalling when we passed the National Defense Education Act. As the Senator from Arizona knows, at that time I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I believe I was the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Education. I not only had a great deal to do with the National Defense Education Act, but I also participated very strongly in regard to its passage by the Senate and through the conference committee.

I cannot forget that at the time there was a great deal of opposition to the bill in the U.S. Senate. I was one of those who felt we had to give our education processes, particularly as they related to defense, a big push. I felt that we had grown lackadaisical—perhaps apathetic—about our educational system. I came to the floor of the Senate at that time, with the Senator from Alabama and some others, and fought for the National Defense Education Act.

Upon what basis did we fight for that act? We fought for it upon the basis that we had to do something to get these people going, which would contribute to the defense of our country.

In such a situation I, like most other Senators, have taken an oath to my country, on several occasions. I took my first oath in the National Guard, when I was 16 years old. I took another when I went into the Air Force. I took an oath when I became Lieutenant Governor of Colorado, and I took one when I became district attorney. I took an oath when I entered the Senate. I may have taken others.

I cannot see how any American could feel that this would limit his mental capacity, his opportunity to have free thought or free study, and to be free in his objective thinking.

Last year I heard most of the arguments on this question, and I participated in the discussion. I should like to ask my friend a question. The arguments we heard last year were primarily to the effect that, "After all, if a man is a Communist, he will sign this affidavit and it will not mean anything, anyway." While I have been in the committee today, I suppose this argument has recurred on the floor of the Senate, or that it will recur. This is the type of cynical, frustrated thinking which I personally cannot condone. It seems to me that if one is to use such an argument, which was used extensively against the affidavit last year, one might as well say, "There is no use in administering an oath of office in the Senate, when Senators take office." We might as well say, if we

want to extend the thought, "There is no use in administering an oath to a witness who goes on the witness stand, because that witness may try to save his hide," or "may try to save himself from incarceration," or "may try to save himself from a very large judgment."

If we adopt this decadent philosophy—which it is—that a person does not mean what he signs, then we might as well stop administering oaths in the Senate. We might as well stop having our secretaries and employees of the Senate, as the Senator from South Carolina suggested, take oaths. We might as well do away with the entire procedure and rely upon the good will of everyone to do his best for his country.

The oath has a tradition of hundreds of years.

I note that the faculty of the University of Colorado is listed as disapproving of this affidavit. I know there are many members of that faculty who approve of it as strongly as others may disapprove of it. I cannot speak with regard to other institutions from personal knowledge, but I am sure that is true with respect to others.

Because this issue involves defense, we must try to build up the strength which will enable us to defend our country. We must develop mathematicians, scientists, and others who are proficient in foreign languages, so that we can communicate with other peoples of the world.

Despite this, the purpose of the bill before us is to say, "It does not matter whether these people have any concept of loyalty to the Government or not, they should not be imposed upon by being made to take such an oath." If we are imposing upon such people by requiring them to take an oath, I say we should let them go somewhere else, that we do not want them under the National Defense Education Act, because this is of vital concern and necessity to our country.

I deplore the decadent, frustrated, and cynical philosophy which says that when a person signs such an oath it does not mean anything. If we have reached that point in this country I say, "Heaven help us."

I thank my friend from Arizona, who has done such a beautiful job, for yielding these few moments to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I recall with great pleasure that the Senator from Colorado served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I add that I wish the Senator were still with us, because we miss his strength and his judgment.

Is it the recollection of the Senator from Colorado that there is any act which carries the words "national defense" in the title, with respect to which money is to be disbursed, as is true in this case, which carries a similar oath or affidavit as a requirement?

Mr. ALLOTT. I could not answer that question completely, because I have never made a complete study of the question, but I can recall no instance in which such is not true.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am not certain that is a truism. Thinking about several acts, I can see a pattern which must repeat itself in other acts.

Mr. ALLOTT. When the Senator was asking the question I was trying mentally to run over the acts in my mind. I can think of no circumstances where it is not true, although there may be some.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friends.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sorry I was not able to follow all of the argument this afternoon, since the bill came before the Senate, but I have been occupied with committee matters which are rather important. I was able to come to the floor only a little while ago.

I should like to ask the Senator if I am correct in interpreting the measure now before the Senate. The measure now before the Senate, the Kennedy bill, S. 2929, in effect proposes to leave in the present act the so-called oath of allegiance to the United States, the oath to support and defend the Constitution, but proposes to eliminate from the present provisions of the National Defense Education Act the so-called disclaimer affidavit, the statement to the effect that the recipient of the loan does not belong to an organization which advocates overthrowing the Government of the United States by force or violence or by illegal or unconstitutional means; is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is the intent of the proposed legislation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is my understanding. The thing which is completely mystifying to me is why anyone would desire to take that statement out of the act and not take out the oath of allegiance. It is utterly illogical to me, and completely ununderstandable.

I have said before that the only supportable argument which I know for eliminating the whole disclaimer affidavit and loyalty oath might be placed on the basis that certain other people who get Federal money do not have to take it. I refer to loans such as farm loans. I do not think it is a completely logical argument, but I say it is the only possible supportable argument. To eliminate the oath of disclaimer would in effect, unless the entire requirement were taken out and it was put on the basis of complete equality, say to teachers and others who advocate the provision being taken out, "Yes, go ahead and teach subversion. Go ahead and teach the philosophy of overthrowing the Government of the United States by force or violence or by illegal or unconstitutional means."

I should like to verify my understanding with the Senator from Arizona. The disclaimer, as I understand, as it exists in the law today, does not prevent any teacher from advocating orderly, constitutional, or legal change in the form or the legislative structure of this Government. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is nothing in the law that provides a teacher cannot stand up and say, "I advocate or teach that a certain provision of the Constitution of the United States should be changed, but changed in the orderly due process provided by the Constitution." There is nothing in the law that prevents such teaching.

As I look over the list of colleges, I am shocked to see those that have taken a position opposing the disclaimer. There are some colleges in my home State that have taken such a position.

I do not recall having received a single letter from a student objecting to taking the oath or to signing the disclaimer. I have, on the other hand, received a substantial number of letters from college professors in two or three colleges in my State taking great offense, not because they are required to sign any such affidavit, but because students under them, who will be the citizens of tomorrow, are required to make this statement. So far as I can determine, the students are not objecting. There is not the least objection from students.

But we have a pedagogical philosophy that opposes the oath that seems to run rampant through our colleges, and the only way I can interpret the actions of such pedagogs is that they feel it is perfectly all right for them to stand in the classroom if they wish to do so and to teach the overthrow of this Government by force or violence or by unlawful, illegal, or unconstitutional means.

Such philosophy is completely beyond my ken. I cannot imagine any loyal citizen taking such a position or tolerating it in the United States of America. We have ample ways of changing our laws if we do not like them. If we want to change a policy—even if we want to change the Constitution—which we have done many times, we have the means to do so in an orderly manner.

I ask the Senator from Arizona if he thinks it would be proper for a teacher in a classroom to teach students how to do second-story work, to rob, to get into houses, and how to shoot a gun properly in the commission of a crime. Does the Senator think such teaching would be acceptable?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, the junior Senator from Arizona thinks such teaching would be quite wrong, although from the amount of crime in this country I must suspect that there are such institutions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not believe that even those who so loudly ask for the elimination of the disclaimer provision would stand up and say, "I ought to be able to teach in the classroom how to do second-story work, how to commit robbery, how to hijack trucks, or how to commit fraud or teach the arts of forgery."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Or to stuff ballot boxes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, or to stuff ballot boxes, although I do not believe they would go quite that far. But it is just as logical, under the heading of liberty of education and liberty of teaching, to say that teachers ought to be free to teach how to commit crimes of various kinds as it is to say that teachers ought to be permitted to teach the overthrow of the Government by force or violence or by illegal or unconstitutional means. I think the country is not aware of the language in the bill that these institutions are trying to get thrown out. There is nothing in that language which prevents freedom of teaching, within orderly, legal, and constitutional bounds, and it is only the teaching of the overthrow of the Government by illegal or unconstitutional means as such that the disclaimer proscribes.

I say it is incomprehensible to me why any American citizen should possibly object to such a statement. There is something more insidious behind this proposal than appears on the surface.

I do not know whether the Senator from Arizona agrees with me or not, but I think it is an ominous situation. In my experience we have seen periodic outbursts of so-called freedom of education proposals by people who object to any restraint on teaching communism and the militant overthrow of the Government. The subject has arisen periodically. Whether it is like the 17-year locust or not, I do not know, but it comes up about that often.

This is a provision that I simply cannot rationalize as an American citizen, and I do not believe thinking students can rationalize it. The only support that it seems to have comes from certain faculty members who seem to think that they ought to be free to teach philosophies that advocate the overthrow of this Government if they wish to, and they argue for it under the guise and the excuse of educational freedom. I cannot quite comprehend their reasoning. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is impossible for me to comprehend the workings of the academic mind as completely as I should like to, because I was exposed to them only for the better part of 1 year. I sometimes regret that I did not avail myself of the full collegiate career, but when I hear educators complaining about this provision of the law, I am rather glad that I put off my education until a later time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say I was exposed to a little more college education than 1 year, but I think perhaps in many ways the Senator was fortunate, because in my own experience I have known certain teachers who literally taught subversion of the American system of government, sometimes in a very tactful way and sometimes in a very blunt way. What I have said does not apply to all teachers. The overwhelming number of teachers in this country are loyal, perfectly fine and perfectly rational teachers so far as the American system of government is concerned. But we do have a small coterie in many institutions in this country that keep festering with this philosophy under the guise of educational freedom. I have been exposed to some of them in the past.

I was exposed, prior to World War I, to a group of teachers who had been sent out to a college I was attending. They had been sent out from a university in this country which has since become rather well known for its so-called left-wing views. The teachers had been sent to the college that I was attending. If anyone ever saw a group which had a single purpose, namely, the weakening of basic confidence in the Constitution of the United States, it was that group.

They had their effect, I will say, on a number of students at that time. That has happened many times since.

However, the overwhelming number of teachers are just as stable, just as sound, and just as loyal to the United States and its system of government and its Constitution, as any citizen can be. I have received a number of letters from teachers advocating the rescission of this particular provision under discussion by us. I have received letters from more teachers, however, quietly saying that they see no reason at all for repealing this section; on the contrary, they see a great deal of good in retaining it.

So, so far as the teachers are concerned, I believe it is a small minority which is advocating the rescission, but, unfortunately, they have had an effect on faculty action in a number of colleges.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my good friend. In conclusion, I wish to read a very brief part of an article appearing in the magazine the New Leader, which at its best cannot be considered a conservative publication. I should like to quote from an article written by Carl A. Auerbach, who is a professor at the University of Wisconsin, and has written frequently on the subject of civil rights. He makes a very good point when he says:

> I do not see how anyone can take the oath in good faith who believes in the overthrow of the United States by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. The oath seeks not only to elicit a promise of future behavior but also of future belief—to "bear true faith and allegiance to the United States." What is explicit in the disclaimer is implicit in the oath. If the oath is unobjectionable, so is the disclaimer affidavit; if the affidavit is objectionable, so is the oath.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, with the permission of the acting majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I am not the acting majority leader.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and I ask further unanimous consent that I may retain the floor after the call is dispensed with.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I was on my feet, addressing the Chair, before the Chair ruled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator must object or fail to object.

Mr. CLARK. May I address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may not.

Mr. CLARK. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that I may retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator must make one request at a time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and I ask unanimous consent that it may remain at the desk for 4 days, in order that other Senators may join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 3677) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to redefine the term "new drug" and to provide for the licensing of persons engaged in the propagation, manufacture, or preparation of drugs dispensed only upon prescription, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the reason for my asking that the bill lie on the desk for 4 days is that I have not had an opportunity to study the bill with members of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill relates to matters which have been under discussion in connection with the investigation of the manufacture of ethical drugs, an investi-

gation which is being conducted by that subcommittee. Perhaps after such a discussion, other Senators, after examining the bill, may wish to join as cosponsors.

Hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on the administered pricing practices in the ethical drug manufacturing industry have not been completed. Yet facts now in the record that I, individually, have heard and considered show that some legislation should not await their completion. Hence, I have prepared and am sending to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It would redefine the term "new drug" and provide for the licensing of persons engaged in the propagation, manufacture, or preparation of drugs dispensed only upon prescription.

The term "new drug" would be redefined so as to require that new drugs would not only have to be safe but efficacious. The bill would also vest in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the duty of licensing persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of prescription drugs.

The drug hearings disclosed that the 20 largest drug manufacturers spend a large percentage of sales to promote the prescription of their products by doctors by brand names. As I have previously explained to this body, when a doctor prescribes a drug by brand name, the druggist can fill the prescription only with the brand the doctor specifies, even though he has other brands which are identical generically that are considerably less expensive. Despite the fact that different brands are identical generically, the contention was made at the hearings that identical products which met the safety requirements of the law, nevertheless, were for various reasons not equal in therapeutic quality or efficacy. I am satisfied that much of the high cost of drug products has come about as a result of this claim, whether it is fact or fiction. Hence, the requirement of this bill that the Food and Drug Administration pass on the efficacy as well as the safety of new drugs should make it more difficult to contend successfully that there is a difference between two brands which are identical generically and both cleared as to safety and efficacy. Thus, promotion costs of new drugs attributable to this contention could be saved and the price of new drugs lowered accordingly.

We cannot afford anything but the best drugs. There is not and should not be any room in America for first-, second-, and third-class drug products. In passing on efficacy as well as safety in new drug applications the Food and Drug Administration could go a long way toward eliminating any basis for the contention that there are second- and third-class drugs. Also of great importance is the section of my bill under which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with the responsibility of issuing licenses to manufacturers of drugs which are sold only on prescription. Ample authority is also given the Food and Drug Administration to obtain the necessary and proper information upon which to base the issuance or the continuation of such a license. The bill also provides the necessary opportunity for judicial review of the licensing procedure.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that the enactment of the licensing section of this bill will result in great benefit to the public. If there are irresponsible "bathtub" manufacturers of prescription drugs, they can be eliminated or brought into line under appropriate licensing standards. No longer could one drug manufacturer say to the practicing physician that its products are better than another manufacturer's products if both are making the identical drug product under identical processes and procedures. Think, Mr. President, of the money being wasted today by promotional practices regarding brands that might be saved and reflected in the price to the ultimate consumer if this bill is enacted into law. I am satisfied that large numbers of physicians would prescribe drug products by generic names if this bill is enacted. If this were done, competition might very well come into play within the industry.

Mr. President, in offering this bill today I am fully aware that there are other areas where corrective legislation is needed in order to restore competition in the drug manufacturing industry. I am presently considering such legislation and it is my intention to prepare and introduce it at a later date. I know of no area where corrective legislation is more needed, not only to benefit the industry but the public as well.

Mr. President, I was much gratified that Mr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made several important legislative recommendations, many of which we have been talking about, in rough form, for some time.

We will welcome Mr. Flemming's suggestions and criticisms of the bill and his suggestions as to other legislative proposals. We hope we may work in cooperation with him toward the enactment of legislation which will bring down the cost of prescription drugs, so that they may become available to more persons who need them.

ELIMINATION OF AFFIDAVIT OF DISLOYALTY

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2929) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief.

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I am proposing on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That subsection (f) of section 1001 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. 581) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) No person may apply for or receive any grant, payment or loan under this Act while he is a member of the Communist Party or any other organization having for one of its purposes or objectives the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence, and has knowledge of such purpose or objective of that party or other organization.

"(2) No person who within five years has been a member of the party or any other organization of the kind referred to in paragraph (1) may apply for or receive any grant, payment or loan under this Act unless his application for such grant, payment or loan is accompanied by a written statement, executed under oath, containing a full and complete disclosure of the facts concerning his membership in that party or other organization and the knowledge possessed by him during the period of his membership therein with regard to the purposes and objectives thereof.

"(3) Whoever knowingly violates paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing the floor, I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the removal of the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act. But I do so without enthusiasm and indeed with a certain reluctance. I think there are some reasons which are of sufficient weight to justify the removal of this affidavit. But I also feel that most of the arguments on behalf of this bill are spurious ones. I disagree with the basic philosophy behind them and for that reason I wish to make my position clear and to suggest an alternative to the bill before us today.

I oppose the present disclaimer affidavit for two reasons. The first is that it is vaguely worded and loosely drawn. It requires a student to certify "that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

When we consider that teenage youths who sign this affidavit in bad faith are liable to criminal prosecution, it seems to me that the affidavit is extremely vague. What do we mean by "believe in"? Are we to try to punish beliefs as distinguished from acts? What do we mean by "support"? What are "illegal or unconstitutional methods" as distinguished from the use of "force or violence"?

We all recall that during the recent civil rights debate, it was not uncommon for the opponents of various amendments to describe those amendments as attempts to overthrow the Constitution

by unconstitutional or illegal means. And so I oppose this affidavit because it does not go directly to the mark, because it is unclear, vague, and subject to a variety of interpretations. And I oppose it for a second reason.

There is something rather distasteful about requiring our young people to sign a rather elaborate affidavit denying that they are Communists or subversives. But I do not make too much of this point. I believe the Government has a legitimate right to require a disclaimer affidavit if it serves a sufficient purpose. Nor do I believe that students ought to feel abused, or put upon, or maligned, or discriminated against if they are asked to sign such an affidavit as one of the qualifications for receiving valuable public benefits. I believe that if they approached their Government for help in the proper spirit of humility and allegiance, they would be able to sign such an affidavit without any grave misgivings. But there is something about this affidavit which seems to me to violate good taste. It is unnecessarily officious.

For these reasons, I will support the elimination of this affidavit. But in doing so, I would also like to point out my opposition to a number of arguments which have been brought forth against the loyalty oath and the affidavit which, in my judgment, do not hold water.

These arguments are used interchangeably against both the oath of allegiance and the disclaimer affidavit. We should remember that the bill which the committee brought to the floor last year eliminated both the oath of allegiance and the disclaimer affidavit. The report which the committee issued last year condemned both with fine impartiality although this year the report supports the oath of allegiance.

The broadsides issued by educators and groups opposed to this section of the act originally condemned both the oath and the affidavit and used the same arguments against both. This year, obviously as a tactical maneuver, many of these complainants say they can live with the oath, but it is clear that they are accepting it only as an act of expediency. They are unhappy with it and that once they get the affidavit eliminated, they will then move on against the oath itself. For this reason, my remarks today pertain both to the oath and the affidavit.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. DODD. Yes, I am happy to yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not a fact that originally the proponents of the bill advocated abolishing both the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. DODD. That is correct, and that is what I referred to a moment ago. I made that point.

This situation intrigues me—namely, that the same arguments which now are made against this ugly disclaimer—and I say, and repeat, that I believe it is distasteful; I want that point to be clear—were also made, last year, against the oath of allegiance, although those who formerly protested against the oath of allegiance now say—this year—they will accept the oath of allegiance. I find that attitude on their part a suspicious one, and I have my doubts about their position.

Mr. THURMOND. And we find that those who formerly opposed both are now stating that they are willing to accept the oath of allegiance, do we not?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not the fear of the Senator from Connecticut that, later, some of them will try to have the oath of allegiance requirement repealed?

Mr. DODD. Yes, I think some of them will. I realize, of course, how dangerous it is to indulge in blanket generalizations and, particularly, blanket denunciations; and I know the Senator from South Carolina feels as I do about that.

But in answer to his question, I say that I am more than suspicious; I am fairly well convinced that, in the present situation, some of those who are behind the present proposal to repeal only the disclaimer affidavit really desire later to do away with the oath of allegiance, and will attempt to do so when they think they can get away with that.

Mr. THURMOND. As a matter of fact, when we analyze the situation, we find there is really no valid objection to either the oath of allegiance or the non-Communist affidavit. Does not the Senator from Connecticut think this bill grows out of a desire on the part of some of the people in this country to call themselves great liberals and to claim academic freedom, and so forth, whereas, as a matter of fact, this type of philosophy is inspired by Communists and fellow-travelers, and a lot of people have been misguided, and some warped minds have been misled into joining this movement?

Mr. DODD. I say to the Senator that is highly possible. However, I say again, because I want him to understand it clearly, that I do not believe in the disclaimer affidavit. I do not think the Senator was here when I made that statement. I said I thought it was officious. I could not find another word to fit. I have been searching my vocabulary. It is officious. It is repugnant to me. I do not think it is right to ask people to say under oath that they are not disloyal or that they are not members of a party advocating the overthrow of this Government.

My argument tonight is that, while I am against the affidavit of disclaimer, I do not want the RECORD to appear that I—and I think this is true of many other Senators here—have been "taken in" by what I think is a change of tactics. This is why, a little later, I shall have something to say about another proposal, which I hope will merit the support of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut for yielding, but I want to say that, so far as the Senator from South Carolina is concerned, he is in favor of retaining both requirements in the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. DODD. I understand. I thank the Senator.

The argument of these groups runs as follows: the device of loyalty oaths and affidavits is an invasion of academic freedom; it enforces an odious conformity; it is a tactic of the totalitarian state; it undermines true patriotism; it discriminates against and points a finger of suspicion at the entire educational community; it discriminates against the needy student by setting up a "double standard" within our colleges; and it creates suspicion and animosity between the U.S. Government and our educational community. This is a formidable list of charges, all of which I believe are not substantiated.

Does section 1001(f) of this bill constitute an invasion of academic freedom? If it does, the only implication to be drawn from this assertion is that the U.S. Government has no right to ask a student to affirm loyalty or to renounce any ideology whatever, or any organization whatever, as a condition for participation in Government-sponsored programs. I reject this interpretation of academic freedom. Under appropriate circumstances, the Government has every right to require of a student, a teacher, or anyone else a pledge of loyalty and an assurance of opposition to those forces that would destroy our Government by force or violence. This is a basic allegiance from which no American is exempt.

The educators who have written to me on this subject generally take the position that the student's right to inquire freely, to satisfy his intellectual curiosity, to criticize his political system, is challenged by the loyalty oath and the affidavit. I think this argument is specious. Freedom of inquiry is not even remotely at issue here. The student who presently signs up under the national defense education loan program has the same academic freedom as all other students. He may inquire into anything he chooses; he may satisfy his intellectual curiosity to the full; he may criticize his Government to his heart's content. But as a willing participant in a Government program aimed at strengthening the Nation's defense, he must be willing to affirm basic loyalty to our country and certify his opposition to treasonable acts against it. If the vociferous minority among the educational community that has blown this issue up into a major controversy contends that academic freedom embraces even freedom to engage in treasonable activities, they should say so, and make as good a case for that strange doctrine as they can. But unless they contend that academic freedom includes freedom to engage in treason, they have no justification whatever for dragging this issue into the current controversy.

The student has no legitimate reason for objecting to this oath on the grounds of academic freedom. But even if he does object, he is free to follow his false notion of academic freedom by remaining outside of the program.

Remember this. The Government established this program to promote the national defense. No one is required to participate. The Government stretches

out its hand for no one. Instead it is the Government that is sought out by the student. The student asks the Government to finance his education on the grounds that his contribution as an educated man to the total national strength will justify the Government expense involved in educating him. Having sought out the Government for aid, has the student the right to object to the exceedingly modest qualifications required by the Government?

There is an implication in the statements of some educators that the student ought to be absolutely free from all allegiance in order that he might pursue his scholarly inquiry unimpeded by any restrictions or reservations whatever. No one is free from all allegiance.

Neither the student, nor the clergyman, nor the doctor, nor the businessman, nor the laborer, nor the farmer is free from the obligation of professing this patriotism, and of defending the Nation against its enemies. None is spared from this obligation—least of all those who wish the Government to finance their education in order that they may more fully contribute to its preservation.

The next argument made in learned articles, and indeed in the committee report, is the implication that the loyalty oath is the tactic of the totalitarian state. The hideous specter of Hitler and the loyalty oath he required of the German academic world has been brought forth and equated with the provisions of this act. The record of other tyrannies is cited as evidence against this loyalty oath. There is an attempt to create the impression that the loyalty oath is bad of itself, that it is a tool of despotism and accompaniment of tyranny. Can anyone honestly see any valid resemblance between the oath that the criminal Nazi regime forced upon its academic world and the loyalty oath which our free Government requires as a qualification for voluntary participation in an educational program founded upon the needs of national defense?

A loyalty oath can be good or bad depending upon the object of the profession of loyalty. It can be sublime or it can be satanic. It can be noble or ignoble depending upon the thing to which loyalty is sworn. If vows of allegiance have been used by tyrannical governments, they have also been used by all free governments. If this is a practice of illicit groups, it is also the practice of religious organizations and the most worthy of fraternal and patriotic groups. If it is used by the forces of ignorance, it is also employed by the forces of enlightenment.

The compulsion by force of oaths of loyalty to a bad regime is wrong. The needless requirement of loyalty oaths to a good regime is absurd and foolish. But the modest requirements of an oath or an appropriate disclaimer as a qualification for voluntary participation in a Government program geared to the national defense is so obviously right and just and reasonable that any comparison between it and anything remotely connected with Hitler is inexcusable, and ought not to pass unchallenged.

Page 7 of the committee report states the following:

> The wholesale extension of loyalty oaths to free citizens will ultimately and most insidiously weaken rather than strengthen loyalty to the Nation. For loyalty is not to be equated with formal outward expressions. Historically, we know that it is precisely those societies which have been most tyrannical that have insisted on frequent and formal expressions of loyalty by its citizens. Loyalty to country is a spiritual quality; it cannot be coerced nor is it strengthened by automatic, unthoughtful responses to stock questions.

There is a whole series of irrelevancies in this paragraph which I would like to point out.

First of all, the present act as it stands today does not involve any wholesale extension of loyalty oaths. It is a selective extension to a selective group of volunteers for a specific purpose. None are required to participate; all who do so participate on their own initiative. There is here no coercion, no "automatic, unthoughtful response to stock questions."

It is the intent of this oath, and the affidavit as well, that it be taken with careful thought and with serious reflection. The committee report itself regards the oath as so serious a matter that it considers the false taking of such an oath as a sufficient reason for imprisonment. And as for the rest of that paragraph, I ask my colleagues, was your loyalty insidiously weakened by the morning pledge of allegiance which you took each day as a school child? Was your loyalty undermined by the repeated singing of our national songs in school or at the ball park or at political meetings? Was your loyalty weakened by the repeated oaths of office, all of which the committee apparently place in the category of "automatic, unthoughtful responses to stock questions"?

Another argument made is the assertion that this act involves discrimination against the educational community. It is said that no other programs involving the extension of Government benefits require a loyalty oath and a disclaimer of disloyalty and that to level this requirement at the educational community alone is discriminatory and points the finger of suspicion at education.

There are three answers to this assertion. The first is that the aid given under the National Defense Education Act is not to be equated with other general Federal aid programs. In this instance, the educational community is treated differently because the nature of this program is different. The object of this program as I have said repeatedly before is, "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the defense needs of the United States." It is not a general aid to education statute such as the Senate passed a few months ago, without any loyalty oath requirement.

The second answer to the charge that this act is discriminatory against education is that there is a sound reason for the distinction between what is required of the beneficiary under the National Defense Education Act as opposed to the requirements of beneficiaries of the farm program, the FHA program, and the social security program which are most commonly cited as comparable examples.

Participation in the social security program requires a complete disclosure of one's income status and compulsory taxation irrespective of the wishes of the person involved.

Participation in the farm support program requires the farmer to put up his crop as collateral for the loan the Government gives him.

In the case of the FHA beneficiary, his house is collateral.

No such requirement is made of the student. The only collateral that the Government can hope for from him is his good faith, his loyalty, his patriotism, his devotion to the country which is educating him in the interests of its own defense.

If he is unwilling at the start to make a formal statement of such good faith, whether because of disloyalty or because of mixed-up ideology, then he can hardly be considered a good risk. For our Government to fail to make some attempt to satisfy itself as to the good faith of the beneficiaries of its loans would appear to me to be gross negligence.

The third response to this point of discrimination is that in the field of education, unlike that of the farm program or the social security program or the housing program, a person's basic philosophy is of necessity a crucial element. Whether the farmer or the homeowner or the social security beneficiary as such is dedicated to our concept of government is irrelevant to the success of those particular programs. But whether the man or woman who is educated to enhance the contributions he can make to the defense of his country is loyal is of fundamental importance. The student is expected to make an ideological contribution to society. He is expected to contribute to the world of ideals, of concepts, and as such, his philosophy on the one fundamental question of loyalty to his country is legitimate and highly relevant and ought to be determined insofar as it is possible to do so—before Government money is expended on his education.

To those who say that a loyalty oath or disclaimer of disloyalty will not inculate patriotism, I say that no one has argued that this is its fundamental purpose.

Section 1001(f) is not aimed at creating loyalty. The Government assumes that except in rare cases a person taking the oath is already loyal, although it considers it worth while to remind him of his obligations and his responsibilities to his country.

The purpose of this section of the act is rather to deter the disloyal from attempting to get Government benefits. It may well be that this form of deterrence is inadequate. If so, we should try to make it more adequate. But I believe that those who have a record of disloyalty and who are immune from the Smith Act under the gravely weakened status of that act arising from Supreme Court decisions would be reluctant to run the risk of providing the Government with a means of prosecuting them. I do not expect these provisions to be too

effective but I think they would have some effect, and if we made no attempt at all to deal with this problem we would be negligent in our duty.

Then we have the argument that this act discriminates against the needy students by setting up a double standard which requires loyalty oaths of the needy but leaves the other exempt and undefiled. This is rather a laughable argument coming from those supposedly trained in logic. It could be said with just as much sense that the Government sets up a double standard and discriminates against a large body of students when it finances the education of some and does not finance the education of others. The use of the word "discrimination" in this context obviously refers to the dictionary definition "an unfair or injurious distinction." It is a symptom of something seriously wrong with a segment of our educational community that they should protest against an oath of allegiance to their Government and a renunciation of its enemies on the grounds that it demeans such a student by requiring him to perform an odious, unfair, and injurious act.

Is it not truer to say that the Government under this act singles out the needy student in order to help him? Is it not truer to say that it singles him out for benefits rather than burdens, for preferment rather than mistreatment? And that the loyalty oath is merely an obvious necessity arising from this preferment?

The only group discriminating against the needy student so far as this issue is concerned are those few colleges which have abolished the loan program by which the needy students might have received an education in the college of their choice.

Finally, we have the argument that this act has unnecessarily stirred up friction, suspicion, and resentment between the educational community and the U.S. Government. The fact is that a minority of about 30 or 40 colleges in the land—out of 1,350—have withdrawn from the loan program. The fact is that this minority has stirred up resentment against the U.S. Government and blown up this controversy to as great a size as it could. The fact is that a minority of colleges and universities are boycotting the U.S. Government and, having done so, they have the gall to claim that they are the offended parties, that they are the innocent victims of the friction and suspicion and resentment.

The tactics of these colleges and educational spokesmen have been one of the reasons why I am reluctant to make any change in this act. This act has only been on the books for less than 2 years. The loyalty oath and affidavit provisions were inserted in the act rather perfunctorily, according to the remarks of the junior Senator from Massachusetts last year on the floor of the Senate. There was no intent by the Congress to offend the educational community or arouse its resentment. Had the representatives of that group come to the Congress in a reasonable manner and quietly sought to work out their differences, I have little doubt but that the Congress would have gone very far to meet their objections.

But instead they chose to repudiate a Government program. Instead they chose to stir up the students against this act which was aimed to benefit them and the Nation's defense. Instead they chose to liken our Government to the Nazi regime of Hitler, to shed crocodile tears, and to put on an air of persecution.

If there is friction between the academic world and the Government as a result of this oath controversy, it is the academic world which must take the major blame.

I am very reluctant to yield to this kind of tactics. My tendency would be to let these colleges and universities that are boycotting their Government continue to do so. Let them stay out of this program and all future Government programs aimed at helping students and schools.

But I would much prefer an alternative under which the legitimate requirements of the Government can be satisfied in a way least offensive to what I consider are the misguided spokesmen of a minority of the educational world.

Last year, this bill was sent back to committee because the Senate was dissatisfied with it as it stood. The committee was expected to hold further hearings and to return with a bill which provided more safeguards against the disloyal applicant than is contained in the mere oath of allegiance as it is presently worded.

In the face of this the committee held no public hearings, made no changes in the bill, and has returned to us for consideration the exact bill we recommitted last year.

Therefore, I believe that the Senate should do here on the floor what the committee was expected to do. To that end, I introduce and send to the desk an amendment to amend the present wording of the loyalty oath by including in it an express definition of the enemies of the United States against which the student pledges to defend our country in the present oath.

I agree that loyalty in its significant form cannot be brought about by the taking of oaths. But neither can it be encouraged by the calculated avoidance of all manifestations of loyalty. Loyalty to our Government is a moral and rational obligation binding upon every American. And the open profession of this loyalty is also an obligation binding upon all Americans under appropriate circumstances. The oath in the present bill is an appropriate expression of loyalty. And I therefore support it and seek to strengthen it. The affidavit, in the present bill, is legitimate in concept but objectionable in its present wording and unnecessary to achieve the legitimate objectives it seeks. I believe that the solution which I propose will preserve the just claims of the Government against the unwarranted assumptions of some of the academic world and will at the same time remove whatever legitimate grievances this group may have while yet protecting in some measures the national defense education program from being misused for the benefit of disloyal Americans.

I prepared an amendment, which I shall place in the RECORD. The amendment stands between those who believe that we should have a disclaimer affidavit and those who believe it should go out. It is a moderate position. I doubt now, from what I heard a few minutes ago, that it will be acted on. However, since I spent some time on it, and perhaps because the question may arise again, I should like to make the amendment and the explanation I had proposed as a part of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT INTENDED TO BE PROPOSED BY MR. DODD TO THE BILL S. 2929

Following the word "domestic" on line 3 of page 2, strike out the period and add a comma followed by the words "including the Communist Party and any organization which advocates the forceable overthrow of the Constitution or the laws of the United States of America."

EXPLANATION OF DODD AMENDMENT

The present oath of allegiance required in the National Defense Education Act reads as follows:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

My amendment would add to the end of this oath the following phrase: "including the Communist Party and any organization which advocates the forceable overthrow of the Constitution or the laws of the United States of America."

I offer four reasons for the adoption of this amendment.

First, it seems to me logical that an oath which includes a pledge to defend our Constitution and laws against all enemies, foreign and domestic, should include at least a basic definition of what is meant by foreign and domestic enemies.

Second, the committee report lists as one of its reasons for eliminating the affidavit the contention that the oath of allegiance itself provides sufficient protection against the use of this act by disloyal persons. The committee report contends on page 3 that should a member of the Communist Party or of any other subversive organization take the oath of allegiance contained in this act, he would be subject to criminal prosecution for nondisclosure of such membership. The committee further contends that even if the student were not a member of any such organization at the time of his loan application but later joined the Communist Party, he would be liable for prosecution at the time he joined the Party if he were still receiving loan installments.

Under these circumstances, I believe that the wording of the oath should be so clear on this subject as to prevent any confusion on the part of the student or leave any pretext for the excuse that the student took the oath in good faith without realizing its full implications. My amendment, by singling out the Communist Party as an enemy of the Nation and by clearly defining as enemies all organizations which seek the forceable overthrow of our Government, removes this vagueness in the present oath of allegiance.

Third, in his minority views on page 18 of the report, the able junior Senator from Vermont, Mr. PROUTY, quotes Freeman W. Sharp of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, who points out that there is grave doubt that membership in the Communist Party would be construed by the courts as a violation of the present oath of allegiance but that the Communist Party member who signed the affidavit, which goes further in defining what

are the enemies of the United States, would be in violation of the false swearing provisions of section 1001 of the U.S. Criminal Code.

Therefore, if the committee majority is right in maintaining that Communist Party membership would constitute criminal violation of the oath of allegiance, we owe it to those taking the oath to clearly single out what we mean by enemies of the United States. If, on the other hand, Senator PROUTY and the sources he quotes are correct in contending that a clearer definition of foreign and domestic enemies is needed than that contained in the present oath, we owe it to the country to provide that clearer definition as I have done in my amendment.

Fourth, the elimination of the disclaimer affidavit, if not compensated for by other action, would leave the impression that the right of our Government in this matter is limited to calling for a vague, affirmative oath of allegiance and that the Government may not also require a clear statement of opposition to the unquestioned enemies of our country. This is a concession that it is not necessary to make and that I am unwilling to make.

In summary, my amendment merely defines the enemies against which the loan applicant pledges to defend the Constitution and laws of the United States. This addition to the oath implies no disloyalty nor does it go beyond the oath itself in requiring what some people resent as negative disavowals.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, because of certain advice which I have received, I shall not offer my amendment. I have read it into the RECORD.

I shall conclude by saying that I hope we can clear up this situation and be done with it. I hope that never again shall we have this kind of furor raised in this country, with a great many people frightened and intimidated and confused, not by the forces of government, but by some people inside academic communities and outside academic communities who have axes to grind.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we have had some discussion with reference to the Prouty amendment, and it is my understanding that with a few slight modifications the amendment is acceptable to the proponents and sponsors of the repeal bill which is before us. We are agreeable to these modifications, and I think I speak for the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In respect to those whose names are on the agenda to speak, I ask unanimous consent that their remarks may be inserted in the RECORD, since the schedule was unpredictable, and they had some commitments. With that understanding, I have no particular desire to have a quorum call or even to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. We can approve this bill; as I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts, and if any refinements or modifications are necessary, there will still be an opportunity to do so, either here are in conference.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment is in the nature of a substitute. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I accept the amendment. I still prefer the bill that was reported by the committee. I think the substitute follows the precedent we followed in the case of the labor bill which was passed last year, when we enacted a similar section and when we were unable to repeal the affidavit the year before. My judgment is if we accept the language of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont we will have a better chance of carrying this effort through to successful completion this year. After all, our objective is not merely action in the Senate, but by the House also.

It is my judgment that in the atmosphere which exists in Congress in June of this year, we have a much better prospect of carrying the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Vermont, through the Senate and the House than we would have in carrying the committee bill. I think, therefore, that the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be greatly preferable to the present law. It will result in the repeal of the oath and the affidavit. It will subject those who accept money from the Government, and who are members of the Communist Party, to severe penalties, the same as is provided in the committee bill.

I express my appreciation to the Senator from Vermont for suggesting what I consider to be a happy compromise.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I point out that while I myself have had no objection to the loyalty oath or the disclaimer affidavit in existing law, nevertheless I know there are objections, for various reasons, in the minds of some persons who are very sincere.

I shall not take much time. I know many Senators wish to leave because of the lateness of the hour. However, I point out in the speech which I had intended to deliver, but which I shall insert in the RECORD, that I think it is quite conclusive that the amendment which I have offered, while it removes the objectionable procedures which are in the minds of some persons, is still much stronger than existing law.

I treat that at some length and discuss it in detail. I discuss the relationship of the amendment with the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and various other facets of the security program. Nevertheless, I believe the amendment protects the American people. Actually, it is tougher, so far as subversives are concerned, than the present law. It does away with the features of the affidavit and the loyalty oath.

Mr. President, I think that at this time I should ask to modify my amendment in a very mild form.

On page 1, line 4, of the amendment, which is at the desk, I propose to strike out "establishment, control, conduct," so that the language will read, "having for one of its purposes or objectives the seizure or overthrow of the Government of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I have seen a copy of the amendment. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment actually does away with both the oath and the affidavit?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. DODD. So the bill is left without any provision for an oath?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct; there is no oath whatsoever. I am sorry I have not had an opportunity to make my speech in full. If the Senator from Connecticut will read the individual views in the report, he will find a set of questions which I presented to the Department of Justice and also to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Both those agencies suggest that the oath is absolutely worthless; that a Communist could not be convicted under it. They point out, for example, that one who was not a Communist and who took an oath in good faith, but who 3 or 4 months later became a Communist, could not be guilty of a crime.

They also point out that one who is actually a Communist could take an oath of office today, based on court decisions and statutes at the present time. It is rather convincing that both agencies believe that the oath does not carry very much weight.

Mr. DODD. Is it to be understood, then, that the purpose of the oath was only to lay a foundation for criminal prosecution? Does it not have any other value?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not believe it does even that, according to the best legal talent with whom I have been in contact.

I call the attention of the Senator to the question which I posed on page 16 of the report:

> Would an individual, who is not a member of a subversive organization at the time he makes application for benefits under the National Defense Education Act, but who later joins such an organization while receiving benefits under the act, be guilty of a criminal offense if he had executed the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929?

I raised this point with the Department of Justice, and John D. Calhoun, Assistant Deputy Attorney General, had this to say:

> We are unaware of any criminal statute which would be applicable to the facts as set forth in your letter. Generally, the provisions of the statutes relating to perjury and false statements are applicable to statements which are alleged to be false at the time they were made, and, in our judgment, they would have no application to activities in derogation of the oath at a date subsequent thereto.
>
> Moreover, even though the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929 be construed as a promise for future conduct, there is serious doubt whether in the circumstances described in your letter, an individual would be liable to criminal punishment for a subsequent failure to abide by the oath.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress subscribes to the same opinion, and there are innumerable court cases which, I believe, sustain those views.

Mr. DODD. Then it seems to me that all we have done is to effect a compromise. We have abandoned the oath on the ground that it is not enforcible;

on the ground that one who took the oath could not be punished.

Is there not something more to an oath of allegiance than the possibility of punishment for falsely executing it? I was brought up to believe that an oath of allegiance was an act of loyalty and faith in and support of something which was worthwhile.

Mr. PROUTY. I have no objection whatsoever, and never have had, to an oath of allegiance or to an affidavit. I have taken such an oath many times.

Mr. DODD. I do not believe the Senator ever has had objection, but I feel certain there have been persons who have had. In a subtle way they have conjured up or dragged up many other arguments about the nonenforcibility of a criminal statute, and they may have won a great victory through sabotage of the bill tonight by having the Senate abandon the simple oath of allegiance to the country.

Mr. PROUTY. I cannot entirely agree with the Senator that subversive influences have won a great victory, because the law, as provided in my amendment, will be stronger and more realistic than the provisions of existing law.

I am sympathetic to the Senator's attitude with respect to persons who hesitate or decline to take the oath of allegiance. Such action cannot be justified on any ground. Nevertheless, we must face up to the reality. We will have a law which will be stronger than existing law. It will protect the Government against subversive influences, whereas the existing law, in many instances, does not.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator from Connecticut want to have it go out to the country that if the Prouty amendment is accepted, the forces of subversion will have won a great victory in the Senate?

Mr. DODD. I did not say anything of the kind. What I said, was that some persons are active for the repeal, in the first place, of the oath of allegiance.

The program a year ago was to accomplish exactly what will be done by the Prouty amendment if we strike out or abandon the oath of allegiance and disclaimer of disloyalty.

I said earlier, while the Senator from Massachusetts was not in the Chamber, that I thought there was something distasteful about a disclaimer of disloyalty, but that I thought an oath of allegiance or loyalty was a very simple and decent thing.

I said I thought there were people who were using the same argument against the oath of allegiance as they were using against the disclaimer of disloyalty. That was the point I raised in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. KENNEDY. I was confident of that, but I did not want to have any misreading of what the Senator from Connecticut had said, or any misreading of his intention. As the Senator from Connecticut knows, the bill which the committee reported to the Senate contained an oath of allegiance. Personally, I do not object to continuing the oath of allegiance, if there is a feeling in the Senate that that would be desirable.

Mr. PROUTY. I certainly have no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator from Connecticut would like to propose that as an amendment to the substitute, I would accept it.

Mr. DODD. I would. I think it is an entirely right action for us to take.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When this matter came before the Senate in July of last year, the great controversy which arose was over the disclaimer, not over the oath; and the only effort made at that time was to repeal the disclaimer. The bill went back to the committee, as I understand, on a recommittal vote of 49 to 42; but at no time was there any real discussion about taking out the oath. At one time it was said that it was not required of other groups which received loan funds from the country. But never was there any real objection to the oath itself.

I think this entire situation can be cured if the Senator from Vermont, instead of offering his proposal as a complete substitute for the bill, will offer his proposal as an amendment to the bill which now is before us, which preserves the oath. Then we shall have the oath and also an enforceable provision with respect to any applications for loan funds by persons who belong to or have belonged to subversive organizations, but have not disclosed that fact. I believe that in that way the difficulty would be cured. I respectfully make that suggestion to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DODD. I concur in the suggestion.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask that I may submit my amendment, instead of an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill, as an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has a right to modify his amendment; and it will be modified accordingly.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, certainly the Senator from Vermont has a right to modify his amendment; and I believe the Senator from Connecticut has made a valuable suggestion.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for the compliment.

Mr. PROUTY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I intended to make be printed in the RECORD just prior to the taking of the vote.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROUTY

In the interest of self-preservation, an element in any society, in the interest of guarding our republican form of government guaranteed to the States by article IV, section 4, of the Constitution, in the interest of providing for the common defense and securing the blessings of liberty, the Federal Government has the right and the duty to avoid taking any action which would further the interests of those inimical to the United States.

The duty of the General Government was made unmistakably clear in the writings of James Madison in the "Federalist Papers." This is what the father of the Constitution had to say:

"In a confederacy founded on republican principles and composed of republican members, the superintending government ought clearly to possess authority to defend the system against aristocratic or monarchial innovations * * * but who can say what experiments may be produced by the caprice of particular States, by the ambition of enterprising leaders, or by the intrigues and influence of foreign powers?"

The history of mankind has taught the unforgettable lesson that excessive and misguided protection of individual privilege ill serves the cause of freedom. Without some legislative restraints on individual privilege, there is neither law nor liberty.

If there is one overriding issue in the debate which is now taking place, it is whether the Federal Government should permit Communists and other subversives to partake of benefits under a statute which was adopted in order to strengthen our defenses and to assist in the development of our scientific capabilities to meet the cold war which may currently become a hot war.

In some ways, it is ironic that the Senate should be considering such legislation at a time when the tensions between the East and the West have reached an all-time high. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was adopted in order to assist students who would otherwise financially be unable to pursue courses that would enhance their effectiveness in the defense of the United States.

Title I, section 101 of the National Defense Education Act reads as follows:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

"We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

"The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

"To meet the present education emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

This statement establishes the fact that the Congress in enacting this legislation was concerned with promoting our national se-

curity and not with a general program of aid for education. American technology, particularly in the applications of science, has been acclaimed throughout the world. It is too often forgotten, however, that most of the fundamental sciences upon which this technology rests were first developed abroad. This applies to the basic laws of physics formulated by Galileo, an Italian; Newton, an Englishman; and more recently, Einstein, a German.

Every Member of the Senate is well aware of the advances in the chemical industry which were made by the Germans during the latter part of the 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century. In fact, until after World War I America's chemical industry was not of too great importance in our economy. When German dyes, pharmaceuticals, and other products were denied to us, American efforts developed a preeminent chemical industry.

While America was the first Nation to apply atomic energy, the basic scientific research in nuclear fission stems from the studies of Rutherford of England, Niels Bohr of Denmark, Planck of Germany, Madame Curie of France, Enrico Fermi of Italy, and countless other gifted scholars. The enactment of the National Defense Education Act was in part a result of America's awareness of the need to advance our basic knowledge following Russian successes in the exploration of our space. Here again, we were assisted by the experience of Wernher von Braun, a gifted German scientist who became a loyal U.S. citizen.

All of those who provided the fundamental scientific knowledge upon which our advanced technology rests received a disciplined education in these basic fields in other countries that was not available in most of our educational institutions until recent years. We had a vast new country to develop and exploit, and our efforts were devoted to training engineers who could invent and develop equipment which applied the knowledge already available. Our educational institutions were concerned with the development of those instruments of production that were necessary to make the maximum use of our vast resources.

I am still a firm believer in the fact that our own technology is superior to the Russians because under our security system we do not reveal all that we have accomplished for propaganda purposes. On the other hand, since we do enjoy a free press, any failures are immediately noted and brought to the attention of the entire civilized world. This, in a large sense, explains Russia's claims to outdistancing America's performance in the exploration of outer space. Yet, once again, it is important to maintain our perspective, and it should be noted that most of the satellites presently in orbit were launched by the United States of America, and not by Russia. Furthermore, they have far more advanced equipment to record and transmit pertinent data which enhances our knowledge of the outer atmosphere than their Russian counterparts. Our military capabilities have been demonstrated by the successful launching of an Atlas missile on Friday, May 20, which covered a range from Cape Canaveral to the Indian Ocean below the southern tip of Africa.

A report submitted by the President's Science Advisory Committee on May 24, 1959, reviews the position of science and technology in the world of today. Portions of this document, which was prepared by a group of our leading academic scientists including Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, formerly Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, as well as the present occupant of that post, Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, read as follows:

"Science, engineering, and technology have obviously been responsible for a host of conspicuous changes at all levels of our modern civilization. There is much reason to expect that such changes will continue, and will indeed accelerate. There is no way to turn back the clock or to turn off scientific advance. There will be no international moratorium on science or technology. The people of the United States, on the most practical grounds, must accept and support these propositions. By ignoring them, or by fostering them only with reserve, they could doom their Nation to unnecessary weakness and backwardness in a world where other nations are not so foolish. Alfred North Whitehead said in 1916:

" '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.'

"This is even more forcibly apparent in 1959 than it was in 1916. It follows that we must educate more, and especially we must educate better scientists and engineers. But this is not enough. We must have trained specialists in many fields. Even then we would not be successful if, having such specialists, the American people were merely to applaud and reward them for their contributions while still thinking of them as useful strangers, dimly understood and more feared than admired. Hence, we must also cultivate a widespread dedication to and respect for learning in all fields, and a deep understanding between the public and the experts.

"GROWTH OF SCIENCE

"The story of man has from the very beginning involved his progress in the conquest of nature, and, less successfully, his effort to understand himself and to live amicably with his fellow men. Here we are concerned with the accelerating conquest of nature which began in prehistory and proceeded in spite of superstitions, of magic, and of taboos. Yet modern science had its beginnings only 300 years ago, and since then our ability to understand nature has grown by leaps and bounds and at an ever-accelerating rate. Twentieth-century advances in the techniques of research in applied science, replacing the simpler process of invention, have aided the explosive growth of modern industrial societies.

"Science affects the life of every contemporary man every day. It conditions decisions that need to be made by his government on many matters, including national defense, foreign policy, and public health. It affects the decisions made by individuals on business problems, on selecting a community in which to live, on choosing an automobile, a record player, or perhaps even a dentifrice. If an individual is ignorant of science he must guess what to do or else believe what he is told. Even if he is told what to do by an expert, he has no way to check on this advice or even to understand it. This unhappy predicament is precisely that of most citizens of the United States today. Their fate in important matters and in trivial matters alike may thus be decided without their participation. And it will not be otherwise so long as they remain illiterate about science and technology.

"The march of science and technology is of growing importance to every American as a citizen. Congress regularly appropriates huge sums for scientific research and even larger ones for engineering and development; yet a majority of the voters have little grasp of what this is all about. Do we, for example, seek to make shots at the Moon, or send vehicles to Mars, in order to extend scientific knowledge alone—and, if so, how much is that effort worth? Is our primary purpose to launch such vehicles before the Russians do for the sake of impressing the rest of the world? Then how much are such achievements worth? To what extent do these space ventures attain primarily a strengthening of our military capabilities? If our space ventures essay all of these purposes simultaneously, we must still have judgment on the weight to be given to each purpose. To be able to think beyond the press releases and publicity statements, to understand the background of national debate requires a greater comprehension of space problems than that provided by science fiction or the comic strip.

"Yet the field of space research is only one important field of modern technology which is of concern to the average citizen. There are other fields involving communications, transportation, and human health. But are there still others which we do not recognize at all? Is it because no comparable sputnik has awakened us? The shocks provided by achievement elsewhere may not be an adequate guide to our progress or our efforts. A national effort is required to strengthen our scientific and technological efforts in all fields, aimed at the advance of knowledge and the enhancement of the general welfare. In a democracy such an effort can succeed only if it has widespread public understanding and support.

"In a frontier society, such as that of America of 100 years ago, it was natural that physical prowess and bravery, inherent in the pioneer, should have been held in high esteem. Today the frontier is intellectual; the scholar, the research worker, the scientist, the engineer, the teacher are the pioneers.

"Until recent years the total intellectual capacities of our Nation have never really been fully challenged. But they are being challenged today. Our intellectual resources will be adequate to meet our needs only if all the brain power of our population is fully developed and utilized. Well-trained minds are among the most critical of our present national assets among the scarcest and most valuable of our resources.

"Fortunately, Americans of high talent can be found in every field of human endeavor, in teaching and in music, in art and in craft, in science and in economics; we have produced brilliant clergymen and philosophers, engineers and lawyers, doctors and politicians. We need high-quality leadership in all these fields; we need to make sure that the young potentials for such high-quality leadership are developed and not wasted. To this end intellectual excellence needs to be fostered, rewarded, and applauded. Though the star athlete may remain a hero, it is now evident that an even deeper recognition ought to be given to the scholar. An enhancement of the Nation's desire to learn and an increase in its respect for intellectual excellence have become essential to national progress, and even to survival. Whatever importance we may attach to the acquisition of physical and mechanical or social skills, they must not be mistaken for, or replace, the acquisition of intellectual competence.

"It is true that as the schoolchild grows into the adult, he must accept adult responsibilities as a member of a family, a member of society, and a wage earner. But it does not follow that schools should overemphasize vocational skills or personal adjustment and social techniques at the expense of intellectual subjects. When social and technological change took place more slowly than it does now, it was sometimes possible for one generation directly to teach the next the practical skills that experience

had developed. But social and technological change are now taking place too rapidly for this kind of instruction to be the best method of preparation for adult responsibilities. The vocational necessities remain, but the best help our schools can now give many students is an intelligent understanding of the world in which they live—a basis on which they can begin to think and learn for themselves so that they will not be lost or supine in the changing world of tomorrow.

"There is much more to learn than there was 100 years ago and hence the learning process must be made more efficient at every level. Time is precious in each student's life so there is an evident necessity to examine our methods of teaching and learning and to work imaginatively on every possible way of improving them. But at this point we face the distressing fact that good teachers are now in short supply in all fields and at all levels and that they are going to be in shorter supply in the future.

"At the college and university level, teachers with Ph. D. degrees are important because of their more extended training in scholarship and research. In the recent past some 40 percent of such faculties have held Ph. D.'s, but the prospects for the future are that there will be a further decline.

"The National Science Foundation, in 1956, estimated that we must have 300,000 or more new college teachers by 1970 if we are to keep pace with our needs. Prospects for filling even 40 percent of these positions with Ph. D. recipients are very slim. Some authoritative sources have indicated that we will provide only 20 or 25 percent. In fact, the National Education Association has found in studying newly employed college teachers, that the percentage holding earned doctor's degrees dropped steadily from 31.4 percent in 1953–54 to 23.5 percent in 1956–57.

"There were only 250 students in the country in 1957–58 who took Ph. D.'s in mathematics; 500 in physics; 1000 in chemistry; 650 in all engineering fields; many of these, of course, will not go into teaching at all.

"High school science teachers come from teachers' colleges, from liberal arts colleges, and from universities where they have taken either a major or a minor in science, with perhaps some education courses to meet certification requirements. The present corps of full and part-time high school teachers of science and mathematics of all kinds numbers about 140,000 and the annual loss is about 10 percent. Thus merely to replace those who leave, and taking no account of increased student population, 14,000 new teachers would be needed each year. But secondary school populations will increase at least 50 percent by 1969. Thus merely to maintain our present inadequacies we will need to increase input each year until by 1969 it is at least 21,000 new science teachers each year."

The statements from the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee clearly show the need of our developing our potential of gifted youth so that not only can we compete effectively in the contest with the Russians, but also secure the support of the underdeveloped countries who will look to us for leadership in today's world of technology.

We all remember that when sputnik came people in all walks of life in this country became determined that we would as a nation reduce any possible scientific gap that might exist between the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

Sputnik proved that the Russians were far more advanced in the fields of rocketry and space exploration than America had estimated. In the light of this situation Congress would have been derelict in its duty had it not enacted legislation within its power to protect the national welfare.

The enactment of the National Defense Education Act into Public Law 864 of the 85th Congress on September 2, 1958 marks a new era in our efforts to promote science and technology. Previously the Federal Government, through the National Science Foundation and the Atomic Energy Commission, had granted fellowships to further our general position in the fields of atomic energy and the natural and social sciences.

We all recall that when the National Defense Education Act became law it contained the requirement that every individual who seeks benefits under the act shall have to take an oath of allegiance and execute a non-Communist affidavit.

A hubbub was raised last year in some academic circles about the oath and affidavit requirements and as a consequence thereof the Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported a bill which would repeal both the oath and the affidavit. The recommendations of the committee met strong objections on the Senate floor and there was a regrouping of forces behind a so-called compromise proposal which called for repeal of the non-Communist affidavit only. A slim majority of the Senate quickly ran up the hill to approve the compromise and after taking a look at it became dissatisfied with its action and the Senate then proceeded to send back the whole controversy to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

In a speech in support of his motion to recommit the bill repealing the non-Communist affidavit the distinguished Senator from Louisiana summed up the mood of the Senate when he said:

"It seems to me that when the loyalty, the security and the safety of a nation are involved, if the Senate can come no nearer to agreeing than to decide the issue by the margin of a single vote, it is evident that sufficient consideration has not been given to the issue, because certainly there is no division among us on the question of our desire to protect this Nation."

The Long motion to recommit the bill was agreed to by the Senate by a vote of 49 yeas to 42 nays.

In February 1960 a majority of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee ordered reported S. 2929, a bill which would leave the oath of allegiance requirement in the National Defense Education Act but remove the non-Communist affidavit requirement. This proposal is nothing new. It is the same old so-called compromise which the Senate finally deemed unacceptable last year.

It is indeed ironic that a majority of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee now finds itself in the unenviable position of having to advance concepts and language it has hitherto roundly condemned as discriminatory and ineffective.

Last year the committee opposed the loyalty oath requirement observing (1) that it is ineffective as a security measure, (2) that it interferes with the operations and objectives of the National Defense Education Act, (3) that it casts doubt upon the loyalty of the members of the educational community, and (4) that it raises a serious constitutional problem.

I asked this question in my individual views contained in the committee report and I ask it again now: How can the committee counsel us to follow a path it has found to be strewn with inequity and unrighteousness?

I agree with my colleagues on the Labor Committee that affidavits have their shortcomings as security measures but I do not believe that we should remove the affidavit requirement from the law until a more protective device has been found to replace it.

I do not think that a majority of the American people want members of the Communist Party or other subversive organizations to get grants or loans under a program which was set up to improve our national defense. This is the reason I intend to speak at length today.

The Communist conspiracy, which seeks to destroy all of the rights of the individual which we cherish and hold dear, has always approached America as a special target.

In an article which appeared in a national magazine, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, drove sharply home the grim facts about Communist penetration of our national life.

This is what Mr. Hoover had to say:

"Never a day passes that I do not receive reliable reports on Communist activities in many different parts of the Nation. Almost no field of our society is immune to them."

In their untiring efforts to shape the thinking and attitudes of what they term the "masses," Director Hoover says, and I quote: "The Reds have always devoted much attention to idea-molding fields, such as education, the press, radio, and television. Here, too, they are still dangerously active."

Mr. Hoover makes it unmistakably clear that the vast majority of American teachers are loyal citizens. Yet, he points out that there is evidence that the Communist Party has members at work in every kind of educational institution. This is how he characterizes the Red strategy:

"Being good tacticians, the Communists realize that one concealed party member in education may be worth a dozen in less strategic fields, and some of their more successful propagandists in this area have influenced, and are influencing, the ideas of thousands of young people."

In January of 1960, Director Hoover of the FBI appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to discuss the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party USA. This is the warning Mr. Hoover gave on that occasion:

"Profaning the very meaning and spirit of the 'Star Spangled Banner' by opening its sinister conclave with our national anthem, Communist Party USA convened its 17th national convention on December 10, 1959, in a hotel in New York City's Harlem section. Four days later the same 200 delegates representing other Communists throughout our Nation, adjourned in a state of jubilance.

"And well they might feel in high spirits—because the Communist Party USA emerged from this convention more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic."

In the view of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the most significant achievement of the Communist Party convention was the welding of the party into a solidly unified, aggressive force, behind the militant, devious, and ruthless leadership of Gus Hall, ex-convict and an avowed enemy of the American way of life.

J. Edgar Hoover drew the attention of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to the radio and television interviews conducted at the Communist Party convention wherein Gus Hall, party leader, stated that the American public definitely has underestimated the size and influence of the Communist Party U.S.A. According to Hoover, Hall added that the Communists in this country should make even greater strides toward increasing its already growing number of members. Hall boasted that the party is "growing in industry and youth" due mainly to the change in political climate.

Andrew Ilyinski of New York City, an employee of the Bureau of Customs of the U.S. Treasury Department, displayed to a House of Representatives committee last year, samples of typical Communist propaganda periodicals published abroad and sent into the United States destined to student groups in schools and colleges. Mr. Ilyinski

stated that every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications.

A spot check of the volume of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in the United States was made over a 12-month period in 1959 by the Bureau of Customs, Mr. Ilyinski stated. The result of the spot check showed that at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in the United States were processed through the port of New Orleans during this 12-month period. Mr. Ilyinski further stated that the port of New Orleans, where the spot check was made, is one of the lesser ports of entry from the standpoint of Communist propaganda, and that a heavier volume of this material is coming into the United States by way of approximately 40 other ports of entry. It is clear from the statement of this distinguished Customs official that last year upward of 12 million packages of Communist propaganda went to American colleges and universities.

I again quote from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's comments on the proceedings of the 17th National Convention of the U.S. Communist Party in December 1959. He said:

"If for a moment any American considers the Communist to be blind to opportunity, let him consider this vile tactic which came out of the 17th national convention:

"It is obvious to the Communists that, if its party is to survive, it must attract the youth of this Nation. As newspapers and other media reveal almost daily, many of America's juveniles are in a state of upheaval—adult authority and morality have been spurned to the point where juvenile arrests in this country in 1958 increased 8 percent over the preceding year.

"During the convention, an Illinois Communist took note of the juvenile delinquency situation and proposed that if 'we' provide them with a place to go and with activities, they will not be so delinquent, 'we' (the Communists) can move them in a positive direction.

"What can be more despicable or dangerous to our democracy than this sort of Red Pied Piper trickery?"

It is obvious that the Communists will stop at nothing in order to penetrate every segment of our society. One of the prime targets of the Communist conspiracy is our youth. It has always occupied a top position in Communist activities, and the resolution recently passed at the December 1959 convention of the Communist Party clearly illustrates the new designs and plans for the subversion of our young people. The resolution states:

"The incoming national committee within a period of no more than 30 days after the adjournment of this convention, shall appoint a full-time director of youth affairs and establish a functioning national commission on youth affairs composed of youth and adult members. This commission, amongst other things, shall issue a regular national party youth bulletin. We urge that in a brief period of time those State committees which have not done so, shall establish political and organizational responsibility for youth affairs."

What does all this mean? It means in the words of Mr. Hoover himself that "the Communist Party remains deeply interested in the American college student."

The aim of the Communist Party to rob young people of their birthright by destroying their faith in our Republic was clearly stated in an appeal to the college students by the FBI chief entitled "Communism and the College Student":

"You, the college student, whether or not you realize it, are the rich earth which the Communist conspirator hopes to kill. Your mind is the soil in which he hopes to plant alien seed. Your subsequent acts are the products whose growth he strives to direct. The harvest which he seeks is the destruction of our democratic processes of government."

It is inconceivable to me, to strike out the non-Communist affidavit from the National Defense Education Act without adopting another means of affording the Federal Government some measure of protection against those who may be recipients of benefits while advocating the overthrow of our constitutional form of government by illegal methods.

Because I believe that a majority of the American people do not want members of the Communist Party or other subversive groups to get grants or loans under a program which was set up to improve our national defense, I intend to speak at length today in opposition to the committee bill.

During the course of my remarks, I shall advance, to the best of my ability, several contentions which I feel are well documented. These contentions may be enumerated as follows:

First. I contend that the Federal Government conditions its financial assistance to a great number of groups with security requirements and that the argument that putting security provisions in defense education programs is discriminatory, is an argument without foundation in fact.

Second. I contend that contrary to the impression created by those who support the committee-reported bill, what is involved here today is not only the possible repeal of the non-Communist affidavit provision as it applies to undergraduate students seeking loans, but also the repeal of the non-Communist affidavit provision as it applies to four different categories of graduate students who get cash grants under the National Defense Education Act.

Third. I contend that S. 2929 will not protect the interests of the United States because, if enacted into law, individuals who join the Communist Party while receiving National Defense Education Act benefits would be guilty of no criminal offense.

Fourth. I contend that even if a person were a Communist at the time he made application for a national defense education grant or loan, he might still be able to avoid conviction if S. 2929 is enacted into law.

Fifth. I contend that although the oath and affidavit provisions in the National Defense Education Act could be utilized to punish an individual who was a member of the Communist Party at the time he made application for a grant or loan, there is grave doubt about the fact that an individual could be punished if he joined the Communist Party after he had made application for such benefits.

Sixth. I contend that existing internal security statutes are not adequate to protect the Federal Government from individuals who apply for or receive benefits under the National Defense Education Act while belonging to the Communist Party.

Seventh. I contend that my amendment has more merit than the provisions presently in the National Defense Education Act because it requires no oath or affidavit to which some people object for religious or other reasons, and my amendment will have an impact only upon the guilty and the innocent are affected by both the committee bill and the existing provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

Eighth. I contend that under my amendment it would be a crime for a member of the Communist Party or another subversive organization to apply for or accept grants or loans under the defense education program while—on the other hand—individuals who join the Communist Party, after making application for grants or loans, could escape conviction under both existing law and the committee-reported bill.

1. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONDITIONS ITS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO A GREAT NUMBER OF GROUPS WITH SECURITY REQUIREMENTS AND THE ARGUMENT THAT PUTTING SECURITY PROVISIONS IN DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IS DISCRIMINATORY IS AN ARGUMENT WITHOUT FOUNDATION IN FACT

Now, let us turn to my first contention—that the Federal Government conditions its financial assistance to a great number of groups with security requirements and that the argument that putting security provisions in defense education programs is discriminatory is an argument without foundation in fact.

Mr. President, I have been throughout my lifetime a supporter of academic freedom—but I distinguish academic freedom from academic special privilege. And I contend that if anything academic is at issue today it is special privilege and not freedom.

The rafters of the Senate Chamber have rung with a cry that the non-Communist affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act is discriminatory; the rafters of the Senate have also been shaken with the cry that the Federal Government does not condition its assistance to other groups, only students under the National Defense Education Act. Mr. President, nothing could be further from the truth.

Federal employees

Loyalty oaths and disclaimers of subversive affiliation are required of all Federal employees. Public Law 330 was an enactment, in permanent form, of a previous restriction against the employment of subversive persons in the Federal Government which appeared in appropriation acts. This law states:

"No person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, who—

"(1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States;

"(2) is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States, knowing that such organization so advocates."

Public Law 330 provides that everyone entering Federal employment must execute an affidavit to the effect that his employment does not and will not constitute a violation of the act.

Department of Defense

Section 624 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 1959 (recurring appropriation act provision) reads:

"No part of the funds appropriated herein shall be expended for the support of any formally enrolled student in basic courses of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers Training Corps, who has not executed a certificate of loyalty, or loyalty oath in such form as shall be prescribed by the Department of Defense."

At the present time, according to the Department of Defense figures, there are about 155,000 college students enrolled in ROTC units across the Nation during the current school year. Interestingly enough, the number of ROTC students is more than double the total number of college students benefiting from the Federal loan program—68,152 students as of November 1, 1959. There has been no hue and cry that our ROTC students are discriminated against, and as far as I know, not one single Senator has received a letter indicating that these students should not have to take the loyalty oath and non-Communist affidavit.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Section 403(b) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 provides that each person, other than a Federal employee, who is appointed to serve in a State or local organization for Civil Defense, shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath in writing before a person authorized to administer oaths, which oaths shall be substantially as that cited in the section.

In other words, any civil defense person, even though not employed by the Federal Government, has to take an oath, notwithstanding the fact that it is highly unlikely that he will have any contact whatsoever with secret material.

National Science Foundation

Loyalty oath and nonsubversive affidavit requirements are found in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. The statute requires a loyalty affidavit and oath of allegiance from persons receiving payments under Foundation scholarships or fellowships.

Department of Interior

Section 376.2.6 of the Departmental manual states that a prospective representative who wants to represent employees in labor-management negotiations may be required to submit affidavits of nonaffiliation with the Communist Party or other subversive organizations.

Atomic Energy Commission

Public Law 85-766 specifies that appropriations made to the Atomic Energy Commission shall not be used to confer fellowships on certain individuals. The terms of appointment, which the prospective fellow agrees to in a letter of acceptance, include a declaration that he will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, that he is not a Communist or Fascist, that he does not advocate and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. In addition, the prospective fellow is required to complete a personnel security questionnaire.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The regulations under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act provide that in order to be eligible for a traineeship award under section 7(a)(3) of the act, an individual must have "executed and filed with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation an affidavit that he does not advocate, and, is not a member of any organization that advocates or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence, or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Another section of the regulations imposes an identical requirement with respect to eligibility for a research fellowship under section 7 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The regulations under the Public Health Service Act require a loyalty oath and disclaimer in order to be eligible for regular Public Health Service research fellowships and for National Institutes of Health traineeship awards.

Workers in private industry

It is not commonly known but under the language of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to proclaim a list of private enterprises, such as plants, factories, mines, railroads, etc., in which it would be unlawful for any member of a Communist organization to hold office or employment. This is true even though the workers in these private facilities get no benefits at all from the Federal Government.

We should all remember very distinctly that until last year all officers of labor organizations were required to file loyalty oaths with the National Labor Relations Board in order for their unions to make use of the Board's authority to settle employee representation and unfair labor practice disputes.

Yes; Congress did away with the non-Communist affidavit requirement affecting union officials but it replaced it with provisions of law that are far more sweeping and far more effective.

The Kennedy-Landrum bill, which became law last year, makes it a Federal crime for any Communist to hold office, however petty, in labor organizations and in groups or associations of employers dealing with any labor organization.

Section 504 of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 contains the significant prohibition in these words:

"No person who is, or has been, a member of the Communist Party * * * shall serve—

"(1) as an officer, director, trustee, member of any executive board or similar governing body, business agent, manager, organizer, or other employee (other than as an employee performing exclusively clerical or custodial duties) of any labor organization, or

"(2) as a labor relations consultant to a person engaged in an industry or activity affecting commerce, or as an officer, director, agent, or employee (other than as an employee performing exclusively clerical or custodial duties) of any group or association of employers dealing with any labor organization,

during, or for 5 years after the termination of his membership in the Communist Party.

"Any person who willfully violates this section shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

The provision in the new labor reform law which makes it a crime for a Communist to hold office in any association of employers or labor union was inserted by the House of Representatives. Interestingly enough, not one single motion was made in conference or in the House of Representatives to strike the antisubversive feature of the new law.

Not only is it a crime for a man to hold office in a labor union or employer association if he is presently a Communist, but the new law also makes it a crime for an ex-Communist to serve in this capacity if he was a party member within 5 years prior to the time he got his position.

Employees of the Government

At the request of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Library of Congress performed a survey of all the departments and many of the agencies of the Federal Government to ascertain which ones require loyalty oaths or disclaimers of subversive affiliation. This survey indicates that there are a number of agencies which I have not mentioned today, including the Veterans' Administration, the General Services Administration, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and the Department of the Treasury, which require claimants, or other people who are not working for the Federal Government, to complete affidavits concerning subversive activities or affiliations.

For the benefit of Members of the Senate, I submit for the RECORD the following pertinent portions of the Library of Congress survey:

"PUBLIC LAW 330 AND EXECUTIVE ORDER 10450

"Public Law 330 was an enactment in permanent form of a previous restriction against the employment of subversive persons in the Federal Government which appeared in appropriation acts. This law states that "no person shall accept or hold office or employment in the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, including wholly owned Government corporations, who—

"'(1) advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of Government in the United States;

"'(2) is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of Government in the United States, knowing that such organization so advocates.'

"Except for persons employed by the Government of the United States for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property, Public Law 330 provides that everyone entering Federal employment must execute an affidavit to the effect that his employment does not and will not constitute a violation of the act.

"Section 8(a) of Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, as amended (Federal employee loyalty security program), based in part on Public Law 733, 81st Congress, provides:

"'The investigations conducted pursuant to this order shall be designed to develop information as to whether the employment or retention in employment in the Federal service of the person being investigated is clearly consistent with the interests of the national security. Such information shall relate, but shall not be limited, to the following:

"'* * *

"'(4) advocacy of use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States, or of the alteration of the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

"'(5) membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, associations, movement, group, or combination of persons which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or which has adopted, or shows, a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seeks to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means.'

"Standard forms 61 and 61a—Appointment affidavits—cover the provisions in Public Law 330 and Executive Order No. 10450, and state in part:

"'**A.** Oath of office: 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; that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

"'B. Affidavit as to subversive activity and affiliation: I am not a Communist or Fascist. I do not advocate nor am I knowingly a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of the Government of the United States, or which seeks by force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States. I do further swear (or affirm) that I will not so advocate, nor will I knowingly become a member of such organization during the period that I am an employee of the Federal Government or any agency thereof.'

"The oath of office set out above is required of all officers and employees of the Federal Government, except the President, by Revised Statutes 1767 (5 U.S.C. 16). A number of statutes which require specific officers and employees to take an oath of office have come to our attention: e.g., section 18 of the Taylor Grazing Act and various oaths required of territorial officers, mentioned in the attached letter from the Department of the Interior. Statutes of this type have not been treated in this memorandum. There is also a requirement for any person prosecuting a claim, either as an attorney or on his own account, before any of the departments or bureaus of the United

States, to take the oath of allegiance, and to support the Constitution as required of persons in the civil service. Revised Statutes 3478 (31 U.S.C. 204).

"Standard Form 57—Application for Federal Employment—includes the following questions:

" '23. Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., or any Communist organization?

" '24. Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of a Fascist organization?

" '25. Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive or which has adopted, or shows, a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means?'

"Similar questions are asked in Standard Form 60—Application for Federal Employment, Short Form—and Standard Form 86—Security Investigation Data for Sensitive Position.

"Letter of inquiry

"The text of our letter requesting the information was as follows:

" 'The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is seeking information concerning loyalty oaths and disclaimers of subversive affiliations required of persons by the U.S. Government. We have been requested by the chairman of the committee to contact each department and agency of the Federal Government to obtain copies of all laws, orders, regulations or internal directives administered by them which require such oaths or disclaimers.

" 'We shall very much appreciate your cooperation in providing us with this information as it applies to the ————, other than the requirement of Public Law 330, 84th Congress (5 U.S.C. 118p–118r). Inasmuch as it is needed in connection with pending legislative consideration of section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, we must have this material by Saturday, April 25, 1959.'

"Results of survey

"The following agencies and departments stated that they administer no loyalty oaths or disclaimers other than those referred to in the preceding material. Certain of the departments and agencies, such as the Defense Department and the three military departments, make use of additional oath or disclaimer forms which apply only to their own personnel. We have not included these additional requirements because they did not seem pertinent to the inquiry at hand:

"Department of Agriculture.
"Department of Commerce.
"Department of Labor.
"Bureau of the Budget.
"Civil Aeronautics Board.
"Export-Import Bank of Washington.
"Farm Credit Administration.
"Farm Credit Banks.
"Federal Aviation Agency.
"Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.
"Federal Communications Commission.
"Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
"Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
"Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
"Federal Power Commission.
"Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
"Federal Trade Commission.
"General Accounting Office.
"Government Printing Office.
"Housing and Home Finance Agency.
"Library of Congress (oral).
"National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
"Panama Canal Company.
"Post Office Department.
"Railroad Retirement Board.
"Renegotiation Board.
"Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
"Securities and Exchange Commission.
"Selective Service System.
"Smithsonian Institution.
"Subversive Activities Control Board.
"Tennessee Valley Authority.
"U.S. Information Agency.
"U.S. Tariff Commission.

"I. Oaths and disclaimers specifically required by statute:

"National Science Foundation: 'The only requirement of this nature administered by the National Science Foundation is contained in section 16(d) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), which requires a loyalty affidavit and oath of allegiance from persons receiving payments under Foundation scholarships or fellowships. The language of this requirement is very similar to section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which, I understand, was based in large measure upon section 16(d) of the Foundation Act.' (William J. Hoff, General Counsel.)

"Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: 'Section 403(b) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 provides that each person other than a Federal employee who is appointed to serve in a State or local organization for civil defense shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath in writing before a person authorized to administer oaths, which oath shall be substantially as that cited in the section.

" 'Also attached is a copy of an oath, based upon section 403(b), taken by persons other than Federal employees who enroll at the OCDM Civil Defense Staff College which was established for the purpose of training State and local employees and other individuals in specialized defense plans, programs, and services.' (Charles H. Kendall, General Counsel.)

"Department of Defense: 'Section 624 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1959 (recurring Appropriations Act provision) reads: "No part of the funds appropriated herein shall be expended for the support of any formally enrolled student in basic courses of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers Training Corps, who has not executed a certificate of loyalty or loyalty oath in such form as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense." '

"The oath prescribed under this section is as follows: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God.'

"Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service: Naturalization oath of section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act states:

" '(a) A person who has petitioned for naturalization shall, in order to be and before being admitted to citizenship, take in open court an oath (1) to support the Constitution of the United States; (2) to renounce and abjure absolutely and entirely all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which the petitioner was before a subject or citizen; (3) to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; (4) to bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and (5)(A) to bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law, or (B) to perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by the law, or (C) to perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law.'

"II. Oaths and disclaimers based on administrative regulations implementing legislation which denies rights or privileges because of subversive activities or affiliations:

"Atomic Energy Commission: 'Section 145 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2165(b)) requires the Commission to make certain findings before an individual may be employed by the Commission or be granted access to restricted data. Each individual who seeks such employment or access is accordingly required to complete Form AEC–1 (Personnel Security Questionnaire) attached herewith. Questions 17–20 of this form refer to possible subversive activities, and the individual is required to certify that his answers to all the questions are correct and complete.

" 'Public Law 85–766 specifies that appropriations made to the Atomic Energy Commission shall not be used to confer fellowships on certain individuals. The terms of appointment, which the prospective fellow agrees to in a letter of acceptance, include a declaration that he will support and defend the Constitution of the United States, that he is not a Communist or Fascist, that he does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence. In addition the prospective fellow is required to complete a Personnel Security Questionnaire.' (Edwin E. Ferguson, Deputy General Counsel.)

"Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States: 'The Commission is impressed with the statutory duty of inquiring into whether or not applicants before it have at any time voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, given aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any hostile force. This requirement relates to claims which arose during World War II and the Korean conflict and may be found where marked in the enclosed copy of Public Law 615, 83d Congress. It may also be found at section 312 of Public Law 285, 84th Congress. Appropriate inquiries are made in the respective application forms (enclosed) designed to implement these statutes.' (Andrew T. McGuire, General Counsel.)

"Veterans' Administration: 'Although seemingly not pertinent to the inquiry, you may be interested to know that in connection with the administration of the forfeiture provisions of section 3504, title 38, United States Code, the Administrator, by regulation, requires that claimants for benefits "who in time of war resided in territory of or under the military control of an enemy of the United States or its allies will be required to execute VA Form 8–508". See 38 C.F.R. 4.108. (The form in current use is VES–4169.) By this means information is elicited as to past associations with pro-Japanese, pro-German or anti-American-Filipino organizations, a number of which have been identified as Nazi, Fascist, or Communist. Any further information desired relating to the use of such forms will be furnished.' (David A. Turner, Associate General Counsel for the General Counsel.)

"Department of State: 'Under section 212 (a)(28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1182, certain classes of subversive aliens are ineligible to receive visas. Section 222(a) of the same act, 8 U.S.C. 1202(a), requires that applicants for immigrant visas file an application which shall include a statement as to membership in any excludible class of aliens and section 222(e) requires that the application be under oath, 8 U.S.C. 1202(e). Regulations in implementation thereof are found in 22 C.F.R. 42.30–42.35. Section 42.30(g) requires that the application be under oath.'

" 'Although the regulation contained in 22 C.F.R. 51.142 authorizing the Passport Office or the Board of Passport Appeals to require of passport applicants an affidavit concerning membership in the Communist Party has not been revoked, it is considered without authority of law by reason of the decision of the Supreme Court in *Kent* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, and is no longer being applied.' (Loftus Beckar, the Legal Adviser.)

"Interstate Commerce Commission: 'The Commission under its employee training program established under 5 U.S.C., section 2301, has employed as instructor in management and supervisory techniques. In accordance with 5 U.S.C., section 2313, which prohibits training through facilities advocating overthrow of the Government, it has required the instructor to certify that he is not affiliated with any subversive organization and that he does not teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government as set forth in the provisions of this section. The Commission does not require any other loyalty oaths or disclaimers of subversive affiliations other than that as set forth in 5 U.S.C., sections 118p–11r.' (Robert W. Ginnane, General Counsel.)

"The Civil Service Commission commented on the Government Employees' Training Act provision as follows: 'Section 14 of the Government Employees' Training Act prohibits use of training facilities or personnel which teach or advocate overthrow of the Government. Contracts for training service are made by the agencies. The Commission does not require an oath or disclaimer, relying instead on standard investigative procedures.' (L. V. Meloy, General Counsel.)

"International Cooperation Administration: 'This agency requires of each employee, at the time of appointment, a written certification that he is not now and has never been a member of any organization listed by the Attorney General under the mandate of Executive Order 10450, section 12. The certificate is not sworn and is not required by law. (A copy of the certificate form is attached.)

" 'This disclaimer of subversive affiliations is required as a matter of unwritten agency policy. Its purpose is twofold:

" '1. Under section 8(c) of Executive Order No. 10450 as a part of such investigation.

" '2. Under section 531 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (Public Law 665, 83d Cong.) as amended, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration must certify in writing, as to each employee (with certain specific exceptions) that the Director "* * * believes such individual is loyal to the United States, its Constitution, and form of government, and is not now and has never knowingly been a member of any organization advocating contrary views. The disclaimer aids the Director in making the required certification." ' (John G. Burnett, General Counsel.)

"III. Oaths and Disclaimers Required Administratively:

"Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: 'Excluding Public Law 330, 84th Congress (5 U.S.C. 118p–118r) and section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act, there are no statutes administered by the Department which specifically require loyalty oaths or disclaimer of subversive affiliations. There are no orders, regulations, or directives except for those relating to the above statutes and except as described in the following paragraphs.

" 'The regulations under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C., ch. 4) provide that, in order to be eligible for a traineeship award under section 7(a)(3) of the Act (29 U.S.C., 37(a)(3)), an individual must "have executed and filed with the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation an affidavit that he does not advocate, and, is not a member of any organization that advocates or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods." (45 CFR 401.82(d). Another section of the regulations imposes an identical requirement with respect to eligibility for a research fellowship under the above-cited section of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. (45 CFR 401.88(d)). There are no further instructions regarding these oaths, but the forms upon which such oaths are obtained are attached.

" 'Also, although the applicable regulations do not require a loyalty affidavit or statement under the grant program for training (sec. 4(a)(1) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(a)(1)), in practice the attached OVR 9 is used for short courses (as distinguished, we understand from regular university courses) supported under that section. In such cases the last page which calls for the loyalty statement is not crossed out.

" 'The regulations under the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., ch. 64) require a loyalty oath and disclaimer in order to be eligible for regular Public Health Service research fellowships (42 CFR sec. 61.9(e)) and for National Institutes of Health traineeship awards (42 CFR sec. 63.5(c)). A copy of the pertinent provisions of these regulations is attached.

" 'Essentially the same kind of oath and disclaimer requirements are imposed in the administration of the traineeship programs for professional public health personnel (42 U.S.C., sec. 242d) and for professional nurses (42 U.S.C., sec. 242e). This is done, however, not by regulation but by certain provisions included on the application forms (copies attached).' (Reginald G. Conley, Assistant General Counsel.)

"Department of Defense: 'The Defense Department industrial security program. All employees of private corporations doing contract work for the Defense Department who are to handle classified information are required to submit a Form DD48–1 entitled "Certificate of Nonaffiliation With Certain Organizations." The organizations referred to are those contained in the Attorney General's List of Subversive Organizations.'

"General Services Administration: Under GS Manual I–1, sections 407.05 and 408.04, consultants, bidders, contractors, subcontractors, and the officers, employees, associates, or any authorized representatives who because of their contractual relationship with the GSA are required to have access to classified defense information must fill out GSA Form 176 which includes a disclaimer of subversive affiliation.

"Department of the Interior: Paragraph 376.2.6 of the Departmental Manual states that a prospective employee representative seeking to represent employees in labor-management negotiations may be required to submit affidavits of nonaffiliation with the Communist Party or other subversive organizations. The affidavit requirement reads as follows:

" 'Affidavit: A request may be made on the petitioner (if an organization) for copies of its constitution and bylaws and the names and titles of its officers. The petitioner may also be required to file a statement (by an individual, or by each officer of an organization) that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with that party and that he is not a member of and does not believe in any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods: *Provided*, That any labor organization which is an affiliate in good standing of a national federation or other labor organization, whose policies and activities have been directed against these advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence, will be presumed, prima facie, to satisfy this requirement without filing a statement.'

"Department of the Treasury: 'Applicants for a special validation endorsement for emergency service as a merchant mariner must make application at a Coast Guard Marine Inspection Office and complete a document entitled "Specially Validated Merchant Mariner's Documents Application Questionnaire." This document must be signed by the applicant under oath, and contains questions concerning subversive activities or affiliations.'

" 'Applicants for a Coast Guard Port Security Card are required to complete a "U.S. Coast Guard Security Card Questionnaire, under oath, which contains similar questions.'

"Civil Service Commission: 'The International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board requires execution of Form 1LB–2, which includes questions on affiliations (Nos. 15, 16, 17, and 18) form attached. The requirement is pursuant to section 7 of its regulations and E.O. 10422, January 9, 1953, as amended by E.O. 10459, June 2, 1953, and E.O. 10763, April 23, 1958.' (L. V. Maloy, General Counsel.)"

2. CONTRARY TO THE IMPRESSION CREATED BY THOSE WHO SUPPORT THE COMMITTEE-REPORTED BILL, WHAT IS INVOLVED HERE TODAY IS NOT ONLY THE POSSIBLE REPEAL OF THE NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT PROVISION AS IT APPLIES TO UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS SEEKING LOANS, BUT ALSO THE REPEAL OF THE NON-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVIT PROVISION AS IT APPLIES TO FOUR DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF GRADUATE STUDENTS WHO GET CASH GRANTS UNDER THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

I should like to proceed now to my second contention that contrary to the impression created by those who support the committee-reported bill, what is involved here today is not only the possible repeal of the non-Communist affidavit provision as it applies to undergraduate students seeking loans, but also the repeal of the non-Communist affidavit provision as it applies to four different categories of graduate students who get cash grants under the National Defense Education Act.

Let us take a look at the graduate fellowship program, for example, and bear in mind the fact that this affects only people who have already got their college degree and want to go on to study for 3 more years.

The graduate fellows get 3 years of study paid for by the Federal Government. This isn't a loan; it is a grant. The individuals involved will get about $2,500 each year for 3 years or a total of about $7,500, in cold cash.

Let us take another example—the modern foreign language fellowship program.

The individuals involved in this program have already graduated from college and the Federal Government is paying their way for additional study to the tune of about an average of $3,525 per year. This is no loan; it's cash on the barrelhead.

There is a third program for people who have already graduated from college. This is a program for those who want to attend foreign language institutes. The individuals involved in this program either go just during the summertime or throughout the school year. In either case they receive about $96 a week. There are a lot of people employed by the Federal Government who don't make anywhere near this kind of money and they have to sign a non-Communist affidavit. But the proponents of the committee bill say it's all right for the Federal employee but not this fellow who's getting $96 a week to study foreign languages. Bear in mind, again, that this isn't a loan—it is a grant in cold hard cash.

There is still another program for people who have already graduated from college and want to go on to further study. This is the counseling and guidance program.

Those who want to go on to counseling and guidance training institutes after they graduate from college can do so under the

National Defense Education Act at Federal expense. Whether they go just in the summertime or throughout the school year, these individuals get on an average of about $108 a week. Contrast this with the salaries paid some people who work on Capitol Hill and who have signed the non-Communist affidavit, and you will find that in many cases the people under the National Defense Education Act are doing a little bit better from a financial standpoint. Nevertheless, it is argued here today that it would impinge upon their freedom to sign the affidavit.

What am I saying here? I am simply saying that notwithstanding the wind of oratory which has been circulating around the Chamber, if we repeal the affidavit requirement for undergraduates we are repealing it for four graduate groups as well. Let there be no mistake about that.

3. S. 2929 WILL NOT PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES BECAUSE, IF ENACTED INTO LAW, INDIVIDUALS WHO JOIN THE COMMUNIST PARTY WHILE RECEIVING NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT BENEFITS WOULD BE GUILTY OF NO CRIMINAL OFFENSE

I do not believe that the non-Communist affidavit presently required of college students who receive benefits under the National Defense Education Act should be removed unless something effective is put in the law to replace it.

If the Senate approves the committee-reported bill, S. 2929, an individual who made application for benefits under the Defense Education Act, and who later joined the Communist Party while receiving benefits, would not be guilty of a criminal offense merely because he had executed the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929.

I presented this situation to the Department of Justice and John D. Calhoun, Assistant Deputy Attorney General, replying for the Department, had this to say:

"We are unaware of any criminal statute which would be applicable to the facts as set forth in your letter. Generally, the provisions of the statutes relating to perjury and false statements are applicable to statements which are alleged to be false at the time they were made, and, in our judgment, they would have no application to activities in derogation of the oath at a date subsequent thereto.

"Moreover, even though the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929 be construed as a promise for future conduct, there is serious doubt whether, in the circumstances described in your letter, an individual would be liable to criminal punishment for a subsequent failure to abide by the oath."

If there is a department any more qualified to pass on the efficacy of our criminal statutes than the U.S. Department of Justice, I have yet to hear of its name.

So that it will be clear to all Senators that if they vote for S. 2929 they are voting for a bill which would allow members of the Communist Party to accept benefits under the National Defense Education Act and get off without any punishment whatsoever, I quote the entire text of the letter which I received from Assistant Deputy Attorney General Calhoun of the Department of Justice:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1960.

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of February 2, 1960, concerning the bill (S. 2929) "To amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to repeal certain provisions requiring affidavits of belief." You requested the views of this Department as to whether an individual who is not a member of a subversive organization at the time he makes application for benefits under the National Defense Education Act, but who later joins such an organization while receiving benefits under the act, would be guilty of a criminal offense if he had executed the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929.

S. 2929 would amend section 1001 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 by striking out subsection (f) which requires an affidavit relating to the applicant's membership in an organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and inserts in lieu thereof a provision requiring that the applicant subscribe to an oath of allegiance to the United States.

We are unaware of any criminal statute which would be applicable to the facts as set forth in your letter. Generally, the provisions of the statutes relating to perjury and false statements are applicable to statements which are alleged to be false at the time they were made, and, in our judgment, they would have no application to activities in derogation of the oath at a date subsequent thereto.

Moreover, even though the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929 be construed as a promise for future conduct, there is serious doubt whether, in the circumstances described in your letter, an individual would be liable to criminal punishment for a subsequent failure to abide by the oath.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. CALHOUN,
Assistant Deputy Attorney General.

It occurred to me after reading Mr. Calhoun's letter dated February 5, 1960, that the Department of Justice might possibly have overlooked the membership clause of the Smith Act, 18 United States Code 2385. I, therefore, wrote Mr. Calhoun asking whether the Department of Justice had considered the Smith Act provisions when it reached the conclusion that no criminal statute would apply to an individual who joins the Communist Party while receiving benefits under the National Defense Education Act.

On April 20, 1960, Assistant Deputy Attorney General Calhoun gave me firm assurance that in reaching its conclusions on the whole problem the Department of Justice had given full consideration to the language in the Smith Act. This is what Mr. Calhoun had to say in the April 20 letter:

"This is in response to your letter of April 12, 1960. You inquired whether the hypothetical situation posed in your letter of February 2, 1960, would be punishable under the Smith Act, 18 United States Code 2385.

"The hypothetical situation is whether an individual who is not a member of a subversive organization at the time he makes application for benefits under the National Defense Education Act, but who later joins such an organization while receiving benefits under the act, would be guilty of a criminal offense if he had executed the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929. By letter of February 5, 1960, we advised you that we knew of no criminal statute that would be applicable to the above facts. You are correct in assuming that we considered the possible applicability of the Smith Act.

"We assume you had in mind the possible applicability of the so-called membership clause of the Smith Act. However, even under this clause it is necessary to prove, in addition to membership in a subversive organization, that the organization teaches and advocates forcible overthrow of this Government in language of incitement, the individual's knowledge thereof, and his intent to assist the organization in achieving this goal."

To carry on this line of inquiry further, I asked the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service whether an individual would violate criminal section 1001, or any other section of the Criminal Code, if he took the oath prescribed in S. 2929, assuming its enactment, in good faith, and later, while receiving benefits under the National Defense Education Act, became a member of the Communist Party, or some other group which has a similar desire to overthrow the Government by illegal or unconstitutional means.

Freeman W. Sharp, legislative attorney, American Law Division, gave this response:

"An oath of this nature taken in good faith at the time would only be violated by a future action contrary to the oath. It would be very difficult to convict a person of violation of such an oath. Actually, violation of the oath would be in the nature of treason which, as you know, requires two witnesses to the same overt act for conviction. It is my belief that should the Government prosecute for violation of the oath required to be taken, the courts would require proof of intention to violate it at the time the oath was taken. Since your question presupposes that the individual * * * took the oath in good faith at the time, the answer would seem to be that he could not be convicted under section 1001 of the Judicial Code."

I am sure it is clear from the statements I have read from the U.S. Department of Justice and from the Library of Congress that if an individual joins the Communist Party after he takes the oath prescribed in S. 2929, he can receive money under the National Defense Education Act and there won't be anything in the statute books to stop him from doing so.

4. EVEN IF A PERSON WERE A COMMUNIST AT THE TIME HE MADE APPLICATION FOR A NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION GRANT OR LOAN, HE MIGHT STILL BE ABLE TO AVOID CONVICTION IF S. 2929 IS ENACTED INTO LAW

Now, I turn to my next contention that even if a person were a Communist at the time he made application for a national defense education grant or loan, he might still be able to avoid conviction if S. 2929 is enacted into law.

I ask the Library of Congress whether an individual would violate section 1001, or any other section of the Criminal Code if he were a member of the Communist Party at the time he made application for benefits and took the oath provided in S. 2929.

The opinion of American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service, makes it unmistakably clear that it may be possible for an individual to avoid conviction even though at the time he applies for money under the national defense education statute, he is a card-carrying member of the Communist Party. I quote below excerpts from the opinion of Freeman W. Sharp, American Law Division, Library of Congress, at this point:

"You will note that section 1001 of the Criminal Code only applies to knowingly and willfully falsifying, concealing, or covering up a material fact or making a false statement or representation or making a false writing or document, etc., while the oath in S. 2929 is a future promise to bear true faith and allegiance to the United States and to support and defend the Constitution and laws thereof in order to receive certain benefits under the National Defense Education Act. It should be noted further that because section 1001 is a penal statute it will be strictly confined by the courts within the fair meaning of its terms, *U.S.* v. *Moore* (1950) 185 F. 2d 92.

"I am unaware of any legal decision or statute which specifically holds or provides that mere membership in the Communist Party is, in fact, either a failure to bear true faith and allegiance or to support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States or even to specifically declare mere membership in that party illegal.

"Contrast this with the present requirement of section 1001(f), the National Defense Education Act (U.S.C. 20:581(f)) which requires the individual in part to make an affidavit that 'he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional method.' A present member of the Communist Party who executes such an affidavit under the act would seem to be, in fact, violating criminal section 1001."

I know that Senators will be interested in the cases on non-Communist statements under criminal section 1001 of the United States Code, and I submit for the RECORD the following citations of cases, on which the Library of Congress relied for a part of its opinion: *U.S.* v. *Marzani* (1947), 71 F. Supp. 615, affirmed 162 F. 2d 133, affirmed 335 U.S. 895, and adhered to on rehearing 336 U.S. 653; *U.S.* v. *Schneider* (1942), 45 F. Supp. 848; (Nazi Party) *U.S.* v. *Barra* (1945), 149 F. 2d 489; (Nazi Party) *U.S.* v. *Dawe* (1945) 149 F. 2d 491; *Frasier* v. *U.S.* (1959), 267 F. 2d 62; *Sells* v. *U.S.* (1959), 262 F. 2d 815, cert. denied 360 U.S. 913; *Bryson* v. *U.S.* (1956), 238 F. 2d 657, rehearing denied 243 F. 2d 837, cert. denied 355 U.S. 817, rehearing denied 355 U.S. 879.

I think the American Law Division opinion which I have just quoted brings sharply to focus the fact that the non-Communist affidavit which the committee reported, S. 2929, would remove, is a far more protective device than the loyalty oath requirement which it retains.

The very able lawyer and distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana shares the opinion of the American Law Division on this question, for he is quoted in the Congressional Digest, April 1960, as saying the following:

"What would we have? We would have merely an oath of allegiance to the United States, which any Communist on earth can take. After he takes it, if he is prosecuted for it, or found to be a Communist, all he will have to say will be that 'Just for that one brief moment when I took the oath of allegiance, I did intend to be loyal to the United States, and I changed my mind the moment I had signed the paper.' That is all he needs to do.

"Anyone who has ever handled criminal prosecutions knows what I am talking about. The burden would be on the Government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, before a jury, which must decide the case unanimously, that the particular person, during the brief moment when he took the oath of allegiance, did not mean to be loyal to America. It would have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt in order to convince a jury of 12 persons that the particular individual did not intend, during that brief moment, to be loyal to the United States."

I do not believe that the Constitution of the United States is a suicide pact in the view of the American people, but I feel that as Members of the U.S. Senate we will be making a mockery of our constitutional responsibility if we foster the careers of people dedicated to the overthrow of our form of government by giving them money and other benefits under the National Defense Education Act.

I have demonstrated, I think, that although it does have some shortcomings, the non-Communist affidavit provision in the law makes a greater contribution to our national security than the loyalty oath feature.

Although I will concede that both oaths and affidavits have their weaknesses from a security standpoint, I do not intend to vote for the repeal of either until better provisions are found to replace them.

The quotations I have read previously from legal authorities at the Department of Justice and Library of Congress indicate rather clearly that it wouldn't matter whether a man is a Communist at the time he applies for benefits or at the time he receives them; he would be completely eligible for such benefits and get off scot free.

When the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare made its report on S. 819, the predecessor to S. 2929, the majority of the committee stated, "It is folly to pretend that this oath and disclaimer provide any protection against subversion."

Surprisingly enough this year a majority of the committee has taken an entirely different tack and argues that the oath requirement would offer some protection against misuse of defense education funds by members of the Communist Party.

Let us turn to page 3 of the committee report and take a close look at what the majority has to say:

Starting with the second paragraph on page 3, the report deals with covering up, concealing, or nondisclosure of a material fact. The statute (sec. 1001 of the Criminal Code) is quoted to the effect that it applies to a person dealing with the Government who knowingly and willfully "falsifies, conceals, or covers up * * * a material fact." It also states that the statute applies to nondisclosure and cites: *U.S.* v. *Uram* (148 F. 2d 187 (1945)), where defendant, in applying for an FHA loan, did not reveal that he had a prior loan which was in default, and *U.S.* v. *Heine* (149 F. 2d 485 (1945)), in which an alien was convicted for failure to disclose his Nazi Party membership on his application for an alien certificate of identification.

Let us consider whether the fact of Communist Party membership would be a material fact in deciding whether or not a loan is to be granted under the NDEA as amended by S. 2929. Corpus Juris Secundum volume 37, Fraud, section 18 has this to say concerning "a material fact":

"A false representative to be actionable, and likewise, a false concealment to be actionable, must relate to a matter material to the transaction involved; that is the false representation or concealment must be the efficient, inducing, and proximate cause, or the determining ground, of action or omission. Thus representations are material if the transaction would not have occurred in their absence or with knowledge of their falsity, and if they are related directly to the transaction involved. Likewise, the concealment of facts which, if known, would have influenced a party to refrain from action causing injury has been held material. A representation is immaterial if the same thing would have been done in the same way in the absence of such representation; and, in general, failure to disclose facts which did not substantially affect the transaction have been held immaterial."

Consider the two cases cited in the memorandum. The Uram case involved appeal from a conviction under certain Federal criminal statutes. Defendant, when applying for an FHA loan, failed to reveal that a prior loan was in default. An important point to remember is the fact that on his application for credit, the defendant was specifically asked to list all prior loans and failed to fill in the proper information.

This case does not in any way support the arguments which supporters of S. 2929 are trying to make because if they are successful in getting the bill through individuals will no longer be required to sign any statements regarding their membership in subversive organizations.

As in the Uram case, the defendant was supposed to put on his application form the fact that he had a prior housing loan, so, too, under existing law is a student supposed to tell the truth in making statements about his affiliations with subversive organizations.

If the Kennedy bill is adopted, individuals will simply have to take a loyalty oath and sign no statement about subversive beliefs or affiliations. If *United States* v. *Uram* makes a case for anything, it is a case for retention of the affidavit or adoption of my amendment.

Now the majority report is so written that it suggests, contrary to what I have just stated that *United States* v. *Uram* was a case involving simple nondisclosure of a fact about which the defendant was never questioned. Suppose that were true, although, in fact, it was not. There is some kind of a logical relationship between granting a loan to one whose credit is good and not granting a loan to one whose credit is not good due to a prior defaulted loan. This unquestionably would be a material fact upon which the FHA would logically base its decision whether to grant the loan.

The Uram case could conceivably meet the definition of a "material fact" which I read you from corpus juris. The question here, however, is whether the fact of Communist Party membership is so related to the extension of benefits under the NDEA as to be "material" under that act as amended by S. 2929.

The purpose of the National Defense Education Act is stated in title 1, section 101 of the act (20 U.S.C. 401) as follows:

The Congress finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States (Public Law 85-864, title I, sec. 101, Sept. 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1581).

The act says that the "security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women," etc. Nowhere in the act is a particular group barred until we reach section 1001(f) (20 U.S.C. 581) which at present bars those who have not both executed a disclaimer affidavit, which at present cannot truthfully be executed by party members, and also taken an oath of allegiance. If the provisions of S. 2929 were in effect, only those who have not taken the oath would be barred. Party members could take such an oath. It could then be argued that, Congress having eliminated the

specific bar against party members in S. 2929, the fact of membership would no longer be material.

With respect to the fifth paragraph on page 3, there is some question as to the extent to which party membership would afford a legal basis for denying a loan. Party membership would not seem to be illegal and Congress, by enacting S. 2929, would specifically lift the ban on such members. The purpose of the act, as amended, would be to achieve the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of the Nation's young men and women who have taken the oath of allegiance required by section 1001(f).

With respect to the "congressional purpose which has emerged from the debates on this bill," the courts would probably follow the rule of statutory interpretation which provides that as long as the statute is clear and unambiguous on its face the courts will give the natural and ordinary meaning to its provisions. They will resort to the reports, debates, etc., only if there is a patent ambiguity. There would seem to be no ambiguities on the fact of the act.

The fifth paragraph of the report on page 3 also refers to the omission or concealment of the fact of party membership as being made a material fact "especially in the light of the Secretary of HEW's expressed intention to deny loans to applicants who are members (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 11, pp. 14088 and 14089). The mere intention of the Secretary to deny a loan cannot make the omission a material fact, unless the Secretary has at least colorable authority to deny. The paragraph also states that "even if the Secretary did not have actual authority to deny a loan on grounds of such membership, it has been held that such absence of authority cannot be attacked in a prosecution under section 1001, so long as the Secretary's general authority is apparent, *U.S.* v. *Meyer* (140 F. 2d 652, 2d Cir. 1945)." The question may be raised, however, whether the Secretary would have any authority at all, since Congress, in adopting S. 2929, would have eliminated all authority to bar party members on mere membership, as long as they had taken the oath of allegiance.

The situation here would differ materially from that in the Meyer case. In that case the validity of the constituted tribunal was raised (p. 655). The Court said:

"The courts have consistently held that the unconstitutionality of the operation or proceeding in relation to which a deception was practiced is not a defense in a prosecution for such deception. As long as a department or agency has colorable authority to do what it is doing, the constitutionality of the statute or order granting the authority in the first place is immaterial. * * * And here the combination of Executive Order 9066, Public Proclamation Nos. 1 and 2, and the rules for exclusion proceedings surely vests the Exclusion Board with ample apparent authority.

There the overall authority to exclude persons from the military area continued and was apparent, while here the overall authority would be specifically repealed by the Congress in enacting S. 2929. That case and the cases cited by it in the paragraph partially quoted involved false statements and representations. Here only the omission of a fact which Congress specifically dispensed with is involved.

What has been said thus far also applies with equal force when the party member receives any installment of the benefit.

The case of *United States* v. *Heine*, on which the committee relies in its report, does not in any way give any support to its arguments.

In the Heine case the defendant was convicted because he answered "none" when asked to name the organizations to which he belonged. He actually had been a member of the Nazi Party.

Under the new version of S. 2929, an individual isn't required to state that he does not belong to subversive groups so therefore he cannot be convicted for falsifying a statement in that regard, and too, as I have demonstrated previously, once the Committee bill is adopted, the fact of Communist Party membership can no longer be considered a material fact in deciding whether or not a loan is to be granted under the national defense education statute.

5. ALTHOUGH THE OATH AND AFFIDAVIT PROVISIONS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT COULD BE UTILIZED TO PUNISH AN INDIVIDUAL WHO WAS A MEMBER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AT THE TIME HE MADE APPLICATION FOR A GRANT OR LOAN, THERE IS GRAVE DOUBT ABOUT THE FACT THAT AN INDIVIDUAL COULD BE PUNISHED IF HE JOINED THE COMMUNIST PARTY AFTER HE HAD MADE APPLICATION FOR SUCH BENEFITS

I now turn to my next contention that—although the oath and affidavit provisions in the National Defense Education Act could be utilized to punish an individual who was a member of the Communist Party at the time he made application for a grant or loan, there is grave doubt about the fact that an individual could be punished if he joined the Communist Party after he had made application for such benefits.

Dr. Freeman W. Sharp of the Legislative Reference Service, pointed out in a memorandum prepared on the National Defense Education Act that a present member of the Communist Party who executes the non-Communist affidavit under the act would be violating criminal section 1001 of the United States Code.

However, the Department of Justice points out that the provisions of statutes relating to perjury and false statements are applicable to statements which are alleged to be false at the time they were made. So, therefore, even with the affidavit provision left in the National Defense Education Act an individual could not be punished if he signed the affidavit in good faith and later joined the Communist Party after he had made application for benefits.

6. EXISTING INTERNAL SECURITY STATUTES ARE NOT ADEQUATE TO PROTECT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM INDIVIDUALS WHO APPLY FOR OR RECEIVE BENEFITS UNDER THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT WHILE BELONGING TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY

My next contention is that existing internal security statutes are not adequate to protect the Federal Government from individuals who apply for or receive benefits under the National Defense Education Act while belonging to the Communist Party.

The membership clause in the Smith Act (18 U.S.C. 2385) provides as follows:

"Whoever organizes or helps or attempts to organize any society, group, or assembly of persons who teach, advocate, or encourage the overthrow or destruction of any such government by force or violence; or becomes or is a member of, or affiliates with any such society, group, or assembly of persons, knowing the purposes thereof—shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any Department or Agency thereof, for the 5 years next following his conviction."

With such a broad provision of law as this on the statute books, one might properly inquire why it is necessary to insert in the National Defense Education Act language which would make it a criminal offense for a Communist to accept funds provided under the defense education programs.

I shall try to answer this question as clearly and succinctly as I can.

First, may I point out that there is a real possibility that the Supreme Court will declare the membership clause of the Smith Act a nullity, not on constitutional grounds, but on the theory that another statute has repealed the Smith Act membership clause by implication.

In the *Yates* case (354 U.S. 298), the Government brought charges against 14 leaders of the Communist Party in California. The charges brought were for conspiring (1) to advocate and teach the duty and necessity of overthrowing the Government of the United States by force and violence, and (2) to organize as the Communist Party of the United States a society of persons who are so advocated.

The Government wasn't able to prove either of these two charges with respect to five defendants and the Supreme Court could have limited itself to saying just that and no more, but look at what it said by way of dicta:

"For all purposes relevant here, the sole evidence as to them was that they had long been members, officers, or functionaries of the Communist Party of California; and that standing alone, as Congress has enacted in section 4(f) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, makes out no case against them. So far as this record shows, none of them has ever made a single remark or been present when someone else made a remark, which would tend to prove the charges against them.

I think that the dicta in the Yates case indicates the Supreme Court is giving very serious consideration to the possibility of deciding that section 4(f) of the Internal Security Act bars prosecution under the membership clause of the Smith Act.

There is further evidence of this possibility in the fact that on June 29, 1959, the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Julius Irving Scales, Petitioner* v. *The United States of America*, in setting down the case for reargument, specifically directed Government counsel to address itself to the question of whether section 4(f) of the Internal Security Act bars prosecution under the membership clause of the Smith Act.

What does section 4(f) of the Internal Security Act say? It reads, in part, as follows:

"Neither the holding of office nor membership in any Communist organization by any person shall constitute per se a violation of subsection (a) or subsection (c) of this section or of any other criminal statute."

I, myself, do not believe that Congress ever intended to render to a state of impotency the membership clause of the Smith Act when it enacted the Internal Security Act of 1960, yet, the Supreme Court feels that the question is of such significant merit that it ought to hear arguments from the Federal Government on it.

This brings me to the second point I wish to make regarding the inadequacy of existing security statutes to protect the Federal Government from the subversives who receive benefits under the National Defense Education Act.

Suppose the Supreme Court holds that the membership clause in the Smith Act was not repealed by section 4 of the Internal Security Act. Would then an individual who joins a subversive organization while receiving benefits under the National Defense Education Act be guilty of a criminal offense if he had executed the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929? I put this question to the Department of Justice and John D. Calhoun, Assistant Deputy Attorney General, replying for the Department on February 5, 1960, and I quote:

"We are unaware of any criminal statute which would be applicable to the facts as set forth in your letter. Even though the oath of allegiance set forth in S. 2929 be construed as a promise for future conduct,

there is serious doubt whether, in the circumstances described in your letter, an individual would be liable to criminal punishment for a subsequent failure to abide by the oath."

I was so shocked to hear from the Department of Justice that a member of a subversive organization could receive benefits under the National Defense Education Act if S. 2929 were adopted, that I wrote the Department again on April 12, 1960, to inquire whether the Department, in reaching its conclusions, had considered the possible applicability of the Smith Act.

Again replying for the Department of Justice, John D. Calhoun, Assistant Deputy Attorney General, said:

"We assume you had in mind the possible applicability of the so-called membership clause of the Smith Act. However, even under this clause it is necessary to prove, in addition to membership in a subversive organization, that the organization teaches and advocates forcible overthrow of this Government in language of incitement, the individual's knowledge thereof, and his intent to assist the organization in achieving this goal."

7. MY AMENDMENT HAS MORE MERIT THAN THE PROVISIONS ALREADY IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT BECAUSE IT REQUIRES NO OATH OR AFFIDAVIT TO WHICH SOME PEOPLE OBJECT FOR RELIGIOUS OR OTHER REASONS—AND—MY AMENDMENT WILL HAVE AN IMPACT ONLY UPON THE GUILTY. THE INNOCENT ARE AFFECTED BY BOTH THE COMMITTEE BILL AND THE EXISTING PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

My amendment has more merit than the provisions already in the National Defense Education Act because it requires no oath or affidavit to which some people object for religious or other reasons—and—my amendment will have an impact only upon the guilty. The innocent are affected by both the committee bill and the existing provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

Dr. William P. Fidler, speaking for some members of the American Association of University Professors, asked Congress to repeal the non-Communist affidavit in the National Defense Education Act. During the course of his remarks, Mr. Fidler had this to say:

"Time and again this question has been put to me: Why should a person who receives money raised by taxes from loyal Americans refuse to declare himself free of disloyalty? Or, in practical terms, why should not the sword of prosecution be hung over the heads of disloyal liars?

"I would be forced to agree that this is not a bad idea if the requirement directly and exclusively affected only persons of the kind aimed at. But the requirement does not do this and cannot because it is a bad and confused means to an end. It is a shotgun blast discharged into a crowd in the hope of bringing down guilty persons. That is no kind of law to have."

You will note that the very essence of Dr. Fidler's objection to the affidavit provisions in existing law is the fact that it applies to the innocent as well as the guilty.

I am pleased to say that in contrast to the Kennedy amendment, which requires a loyalty oath of both the innocent and the guilty, and in contrast to the provisions in existing law, which requires an oath and affidavit from both innocent and guilty, my amendment requires neither oath nor affidavit.

The amendment simply provides that if an individual applies for or accepts benefits while belonging to the Communist Party or another subversive organization, he will be guilty of a crime. The innocent won't have a thing to worry about.

My amendment is totally consistent with the action which Congress took last year when it removed the oath and affidavit requirements affecting labor organizations and substituted therefor a new provision of law which simply makes it a crime for a labor union official or an official of an employers' association to be a member of the Communist Party.

I think that many Members of the Senate have been misled to believe that the vocal minority in academic circles which has opposed the presence of the affidavit requirement in defense education programs is a majority. I would point out, however, that the American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, conducted a survey among college presidents and what were the results of that survey? The "affidavit" was approved by a majority of the university and college presidents that responded to the survey.

Let us keep uppermost in our minds the fact that while 20 institutions have refused to participate in some portions of the defense education programs because of the oath and affidavit, more than 1,300 other schools are actively participating. Unfortunately, some people's version of "liberty" depends on the old maxim about whose ox is being gored.

I contend that those few universities who have refused to cooperate in defense education programs are, in effect, impinging upon the freedom of choice of students who might want to go to college or do graduate work under the NDEA. These few college officials have taken the attitude—we don't care whether you, as an individual, want to sign the non-Communist affidavit or not—we're not going to let you make that decision.

I do not condone this attitude but I have tried to understand it and that is why I have advanced an approach that requires neither oath nor affidavit and which reaches the guilty and not the innocent.

8. UNDER MY AMENDMENT IT WOULD BE A CRIME FOR A MEMBER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OR ANOTHER SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATION TO APPLY FOR OR ACCEPT GRANTS OR LOANS UNDER THE DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM WHILE—ON THE OTHER HAND—INDIVIDUALS WHO JOIN THE COMMUNIST PARTY, AFTER MAKING APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS OR LOANS COULD ESCAPE CONVICTION UNDER BOTH EXISTING LAW AND THE COMMITTEE-REPORTED BILL

My next contention is that under my amendment it would be a crime for a member of the Communist Party or other subversive organization to apply for or accept grants or loans under the defense education program while—on the other hand—individuals who join the Communist Party, after making application for grants or loans could escape conviction under both existing law and the committee-reported bill.

"(1) No person may apply for or receive any grant, payment or loan under this act while he is a member of the Communist Party or any other organization having for one of its purposes or objectives the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence, and has knowledge of such purpose or objective of that party or other organization."

I think it is unmistakably clear from a reading of this paragraph of the amendment that any individual who applies for or receives any grant, payment or loan while belonging to the Communist Party, or any other subversive organization, will be performing an unlawful act.

It will be recalled that earlier in my speech I pointed out that the only protective features in the National Defense Education Act at the present time are the oath and affidavit. I pointed out also that it was the view of the Department of Justice and the American Law Division of the Library of Congress that prosecutions for false swearing in the affidavits could deal only with statements false at the time they were made and would have no application to activities in derogation of the oath at a subsequent date.

What applies to the oath and affidavit in the National Defense Education Act also applies to the oath in the reported bill, S. 2929, and in the light of the opinions of the Justice Department and the Library of Congress, it is apparent that any one who takes the oath and signs the affidavit in good faith could join the Communist Party while receiving benefits and not be punished.

Now, let us take a look at the second paragraph of my amendment. It reads as follows:

"(2) No person who within 5 years has been a member of the party or any other organization referred to in paragraph (1) may apply for or receive any grant, payment or loan under this act unless his application for such grant, payment or loan is accompanied by a written statement, executed under oath, containing a full and complete disclosure of the facts concerning his membership in that party or other organization and the knowledge possessed by him during the period of his membership therein with regard to the purposes and objectives thereof."

If we examine this paragraph very carefully, we will note that the innocent fellow doesn't have to file any statement about what organizations he has belonged to. You will note further that the innocent individual does not have to swear that he has never been a member of the Communist Party, or any other subversive organization. Any individuals who have in the past belonged to subversive organizations have to file a written statement disclosing the facts about such membership. Once the facts are disclosed, it will be up to the people considering the person's application to determine whether this activity, together with other factors, would warrant disapproval of a request for a grant or loan.

The last paragraph of the amendment is the penalty paragraph, and it provides that anyone who violates paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

This penalty is the same penalty that would attach if a person committed perjury in completing any Government application form.

My amendment does not make it a crime to be a member of the Communist Party as would the Humphrey-Kennedy proposal which was offered in the Senate in 1954

What I and those who support me are trying to do today is to take every step possible to discourage members of the Communist Party from attempting to apply for or accept money under a defense statute, the National Defense Education Act.

We all know that the purpose of the national defense education law, in the words of the act itself, is—

"To provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

My amendment does not make it a crime to be a member of the Communist Party; it simply states that it shall be a crime for a Communist Party member to try to get or receive money under a law devised to advance the security and defense of this Nation.

Many Senators presently serving in this body will recall that when the Communist

Control Act of 1954 was under consideration, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is now the floor manager of S. 2929, offered an amendment in the Senate which would make mere membership in the Communist Party a Federal crime. A number of Senators cosponsored that amendment and it was agreed to by a vote of 84 to 0.

It is worthy of note that all of the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee who served in the Senate in 1954 voted for this measure, including Senators HILL, MURRAY, KENNEDY, MORSE, GOLDWATER, COOPER, and DIRKSEN. I am confident that those members of the committee whose service in the Senate commenced at a later date would certainly have joined their colleagues if they had been given the opportunity to do so.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 11, page 14208, contains the actual text of the Humphrey-Kennedy amendment and I should like to take the liberty of reading section 3 of that amendment which made it a crime to join the Communist Party.

The pertinent portion of the amendment reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Whoever knowingly and willfully becomes or remains a member of (1) the Communist Party, or (2) any other organization having for one of its purposes or objectives the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by use of force or violence, with knowledge of the purpose or objective of such organization, shall upon conviction be punished as provided by the penalty provisions of section 15 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 794).

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'Communist Party' means the organization now known as the Communist Party of the United States of America, the Communist Party of any State or subdivision thereof, and any unit or subdivision of any such organization, whether or not any change is hereafter made in the name thereof."

It will be noted from a careful reading of the words I have just quoted that those who sponsored the Humphrey-Kennedy amendment wanted the Congress to go way beyond anything I am proposing today. My amendment simply makes it a crime for a Communist to accept defense money. The Humphrey-Kennedy amendment made Communist membership itself a Federal offense. Therefore, even if a citizen never got a nickel from the Federal Government, he could have been put in jail under the Humphrey-Kennedy amendment for joining the Communist Party.

During the course of the debate, the junior Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, and I quote:

"That one of the great difficulties has been our treatment of the Communist Party as a legitimate political party."

He stated that situation would be ended if the amendment proposed by Senator HUMPHREY and him were adopted.

Senator PASTORE was equally eloquent on that occasion. I quote from his remarks:

"Is it not a fact that what we are trying to do through this substitute is to recognize the fact that the Communist Party is a party of an international conspiracy to destroy our Bill of Rights and our American institutions? By this action are we not saying that everyone who belongs to it is a criminal in the eyes of Americans?"

The senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, pointed out on August 12, he thought the Humphrey amendment which he had cosponsored should be adopted. I quote from the comments of Senator MORSE:

"In my judgment, this amendment should bring the conservatives and the liberals together, because we have always been of one mind on the issue of communism. As constitutional liberals, on the one side, and as constitutional conservatives on the other, we have all been dedicated to a common patriotic motive; namely, that our constitutional system of Government shall persevere in the history of the United States."

The senior Senator from Minnesota, the principal sponsor of the amendment, Senator HUMPHREY had this to say in a very moving attack on the Communist Party:

"Do we believe it is a party dedicated to the destruction of this Republic? Is it a force dedicated to the destruction of this Government as we know it? If it is, then Senators should vote for this amendment.

"If Senators do not believe that the Communist Party is such a conspiratorial force, let them vote against the amendment. There is no way in the world in which one can cloak himself in nice legal phrases."

I am not one who sees a Communist under every bedpost, but I do think the Senate ought to give great weight to the comments J. Edgar Hoover made only a few months ago to the Internal Security Subcommitttee about the status of the Communist Party today:

"The Communist Party today is more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic than it has been in the past."

I hope that the Senators impelled by patriotic motives to demand, in 1954, that Congress make mere membership in the Communist Party a crime, will support my amendment today, which would only make it a crime for a Communist to accept money under a defense statute.

Senators will remember that the Humphrey-Kennedy amendment which said, in effect, join the Communist Party and we'll put you in jail, was an amendment which was adopted by the Senate unanimously but which was altered significantly in conference. Senators will recall also the seriousness with which Congress viewed the defense problem after the appearance of sputnik. Some Senators who had long opposed Federal aid to education voted for the National Defense Education Act because its purpose was so directly related to the long-term security of this country. Nothing more clearly expressed the congressional purpose behind the National Defense Education Act than the preamble of the statute itself which made repeated references to "the security of the Nation," "the defense of this Nation," and the "national interest."

Even if my amendment went so far as to outlaw the Communist Party, as did the Humphrey-Kennedy amendment offered in 1954, it would still be in harmony with the Constitution and Supreme Court decisions interpreting the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has not often considered the constitutionality of laws forbidding membership in certain organizations. But where it has, the Court has upheld their validity without regard to the specific intent or activity of individuals involved.

In *Bryant* v. *Zimmerman* (278 U.S. 63), a New York statute aimed at the Ku Klux Klan punished membership in certain oath-bound associations which had failed to register. The Supreme Court held that to forbid individual members to attend meetings or retain membership did not violate due process of law.

In *Whitney* v. *California* (274 U.S. 357), the defendant was charged with violations of the California Syndicalism Act by reason not only of her participating in the organization of the California Communist Labor Party, but also her membership in it. One of the questions before the Supreme Court was her claim that, in fact, she personally opposed the illegal aims of the organization and that they were adopted over her objections. Dealing with this claim, the U.S. Supreme Court, without exploring her own intentions, placed reliance on the fact that she had knowingly kept her membership after the aims of the party had become clear. The majority of the Court felt that there was nothing inconsistent with the 14th amendment in punishing knowing membership in the Communist Labor Party even without the element of specific intent to carry out the objectives of the association.

The membership clause in the Smith Act, which makes it a crime to organize any group or become a member of any group which advocates the overthrow of the Federal Government, was discussed by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in *Frankfeld* v. *U.S.*, 198 F. 2d. The court had this to say:

"So far as membership in an organization advocating destruction or overthrow [of Government] is concerned, such membership is condemned only where there is knowledge on the part of the accused of the unlawful purpose of the organization. Membership in an organization renders aid and encouragement to the organization; and when membership is accepted or retained with knowledge that the organization is engaged in an unlawful purpose, the one accepting or retaining membership with such knowledge makes himself a party to the unlawful enterprise in which it is engaged."

A petition of certiorari was filed with the Supreme Court in the Frankfeld case but the petition was denied. It is my understanding that the same construction of various State syndicalism laws has been approved in the State courts (*People* v. *Ruthenberg* (229 Mich. 315), writ of error dismissed by Supreme Court, 273 U.S. 782).

I think it is clear from the decisions to which I have referred that my amendment would be in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution even if it outlawed the Communist Party, which it most certainly does not.

The proposal which I have submitted for the Senate's consideration is one designed to deny to members of subversive organizations the benefits available under the National Defense Education Act.

Does the Federal Government have the power to deny Federal benefits to subversives? The answer is a resounding "yes."

In *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* (339 U.S. 382), the Supreme Court upheld the "non-Communist oath" provision of the Taft-Hartley Act, which withdrew the benefits of the act from unions whose officers had failed to file an oath that they did not believe in the violent overthrow of the Government and did not then belong to the Communist Party or any organization that so believed.

Speaking of the oath formerly required of union officials under the Taft-Hartley Act, the Supreme Court made the following important point:

"We think that the 'belief' provision of the oath presents no different problem from that present in that part of the section having to do with membership in the Communist Party. Of course, we agree that one may not be imprisoned or executed because he holds particular beliefs. But, to attack the strawman of 'thought control' is to ignore the fact that the sole effect of the statute upon one who believes in overthrow of the Government by force or violence—and does not deny his belief—is that he may be forced to relinquish his position as a union leader."

The Court made it perfectly clear that the principle that one should not suffer the loss of any right or privilege because of his beliefs could be reduced to an absurdity. This is what the Court had to say:

"Suppose, for example, that a Federal statute provides that no person may become a member of the Secret Service force assigned to protect the President unless he swears that he does not believe in assassination of the President. Is this beyond the power of Congress, whatever the need revealed by its investigation? An affirmative answer hardly commends itself to reason unless, indeed, the Bill of Rights has been converted into a 'suicide pact.'"

In the same case, *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* (339 U.S. 382), Justice Jackson wrote a powerful concurring opinion in which he discussed the nature of the Communist conspiracy.

Under the topic head "Every Member of the Communist Party Is an Agent To Execute the Communist Program," Mr. Jackson made this cogent observation:

"Membership in the Communist Party is totally different [from membership in lawful political parties]. The party is a secret conclave. Members are admitted only upon acceptance as reliable and after an indoctrination in its policies, to which the member is fully committed. Moreover, each pledges unconditional obedience to party authority. Adherents are known by secret or code names. They constitute 'cells' in the factory, the office, the political society, or the labor union. For any deviation from the party line, they are purged and excluded.

"Inferences from membership in such an organization are justifiably different from those to be drawn from membership in the usual type of political party. Individuals who assume such obligations are chargeable, on ordinary conspiracy principles, with responsibility for and participation in all that makes up the party's program."

The Supreme Court, deciding in favor of the constitutionality of the oath in the Taft-Hartley Act, decided that the oath was designed to protect the public against what Congress has concluded Communists have done and are likely to do again.

Let us look at some more cases dealing with the power to deny privileges to members of subversive organizations.

In *Garner* v. *Board of Public Works* (341 U.S. 716 (1951)), the U.S. Supreme Court sustained the Los Angeles loyalty oath, which required each employee to file an affidavit with respect to his Communist Party membership and to swear that he did not now advocate and had not within 5 years from enactment of the ordinance advocated violent overthrow of the Government and did not and had not within such period belonged to an organization which so advocated. This oath went way beyond the Taft-Hartley oath in that it applied to past advocacy and past membership.

One of the attacks made on the oath in this case was that it violated due process because its negation was not limited to organizations known by the employee to be within the proscribed class.

The Supreme Court rejected this argument because it felt justified in assuming that scienter or knowledge was implicit in each clause of the oath.

In *Adler* v. *Board of Education* (342 U.S. 485), the Supreme Court upheld a New York statute which prohibited employment in the public schools to persons who advocated overthrow of the Government or who belonged to organizations which so advocate. The new Feinberg law requires State officials to make a listing of the proscribed organizations. The Supreme Court, in upholding this legislation, took note of the fact that the New York courts had construed the statute to require knowledge of organizational purpose before the regulations could apply.

Members of the Senate will note that my amendment makes it a crime for members of the Communist Party and other Communist groups to get benefits under the National Defense Education Act only if they have knowledge of the aims or purposes of the subversive organization to which they belong.

Therefore, the amendment is clearly in keeping with the holdings in the Garner and Adler cases.

It is true that some State loyalty oath statutes have been struck down by the Supreme Court but these statutes were poorly drafted and did not meet, as my amendment meets, the requirements laid down in the Garner and Adler cases.

Take, for example, *Wieman* v. *Updegraff* (344 U.S. 183). This case involved an Oklahoma statute which required each State officer and employee to take a loyalty oath that he is not and has not been for the preceding 5 years a member of any organization listed by the Attorney General of the United States as Communist front or subversive.

As construed by the Supreme Court of Oklahoma, it excludes persons from State employment solely on the basis of membership in such organizations, regardless of their knowledge concerning the activities and purposes of the organizations to which they had belonged.

The Supreme Court, in its opinion, pointed out that it had rejected an attack on the oath in the Garner case because it felt justified in assuming "that scienter was implicit in each clause of the oath."

The Supreme Court also emphasized the fact that although it had upheld the legislation being attacked in *Adler* v. *Board of Education* (342 U.S. 485), in upholding it, it expressly noted "that the New York courts had construed the statute to require knowledge of organizational purpose before the regulation could apply."

The Supreme Court went on to say that under the Oklahoma statute before the Court "the fact of membership alone disqualifies."

In the majority opinion, Justice Clark noted that membership in a subversive organization may be innocent and it was on the question of knowledge that the case turned.

The Court held that the Oklahoma statute violated the due process clause of the 14th amendment.

The clause, it said, does not permit a State, in attempting to bar disloyal persons from its employment on the basis of organizational membership, to classify innocent with knowing association.

The power of the Federal Government and of State governments to deny privileges to subversives upheld so clearly in the Adler and Douds cases, is broad in scope.

In both Adler and Douds, a principal argument was that the legislation involved violated the first amendment rights of those affected. Justice Minton threw this argument out saying:

"If they do not choose to work on such terms, they are at liberty to retain their beliefs and associations and go elsewhere * * * his freedom of choice between membership in the organization and employment in the school system might be limited, but not his freedom of speech or assembly, except in the remote sense that limitation is inherent in every choice."

My amendment does not forbid anyone to join the Communist Party; it simply states that you can't be a Communist and get defense money, too.

Chief Justice Vinson was rather frank in the Douds case which upheld the constitutionality of the loyalty oath as applied to union officials. This is what he had to say:

"Congress has undeniably discouraged the lawful exercise of political freedoms as well * * * men who held union offices often had little choice but to renounce communism or give up their offices."

The National Defense Education Act confers benefits not only on students but on college graduates who are already in the teaching profession. Justice Minton pointed out in the Adler case the harm that can be done in the classroom by one disloyal to the United States. Justice Minton made this well-reasoned statement:

"A teacher works in a sensitive area in a schoolroom. There he shapes the attitude of young minds toward the society in which they live. In this, the State has a vital concern. It must preserve the integrity of the schools. That the school authorities have the right and the duty to screen the officials, teachers, and employees as to their fitness to maintain the integrity of the schools as a part of ordered society, cannot be doubted."

Even Associate Justice Douglas, who disagreed with the majority opinion in the Adler case, admitted that "the school systems of the country need not become cells for Communist activities; and the classrooms need not become forums for propagandizing the Marxist creed."

There is no question in my mind about the fact that the Federal Government is not obligated by good constitutional law, good morals, and, particularly, good sense, to allocate money set aside for education connected with national defense to promote the careers of people who have joined the Communist conspiracy.

The clear and present danger test as applied to my amendment sustains its constitutionality.

Certainly there is support in the majority opinions in *Gitlow* v. *New York* (268 U.S. 652), and in *Whitney* v. *California* (274 U.S. 357), for the proposition that where Congress has dealt directly with aspects of speech, as in a sense my amendment does, by limiting defense benefits to those without membership in subversive associations, the issue is properly one of whether the congressional determination of the necessity of the restriction is reasonable and, if it is, there is no occasion to apply the clear and present danger test.

The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in dealing with a membership clause, had this to say about the application of the clear and present danger test to such a clause:

"The defendants contend that these provisions [literature and membership clause] of the statute are unconstitutional because they do not require a 'clear and present danger' as a condition of criminality; but it would be little short of absurd for a statute to forbid advocacy of the destruction of the Government or membership in an organization formed for the purpose of such advocacy only in the event that they result in 'clear and present danger.' This would be to make the mere success of an attempted crime the criterion of criminality for making the attempt."

It is my firm belief that if the "clear and present danger" doctrine were ever applied to the amendment which I offered, that it would be applied with regard to the danger to be anticipated from the Communist Party rather than from the individual who violated the amendment by getting defense benefits while a Communist. All our security statutes would be absolutely meaningless if the Government had to prove that it is in danger of overthrow from the activity of any one individual. It is the individual Communist's contribution to his party together with that of his comrades that gives the party power.

Turning to *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* (339 U.S. 382), this is what the Supreme Court states:

"The attempt to apply the term 'clear and present danger,' as a mechanical test in every case touching first amendment freedoms, without regard to the context of its application, mistakes the form in which an idea was cast for the substance of the idea, although the first amendment provides that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech, press, or assembly, it has long been established that those freedoms themselves are dependent upon the power of constitutional government to survive. If it is to survive, it must have power to protect itself against unlawful conduct and, under some circumstances, against incitements to commit unlawful acts."

Chief Justice Vinson pointed out in a Taft-Hartley loyalty oath case that the legislation was not designed to prevent incitements to revolution but rather to forestall the havoc which individuals who advocate disloyalty may bring about if placed in positions of authority and responsibility.

In "Speech: Public and Private," an article in the Columbia Law Review, Morris L. Ernst and Arthur J. Katz draw a significant distinction between public speech which can be dealt with in the marketplace of ideas, and secret speech which cannot be evaluated in terms of immediate danger to the country because of the very fact that it is concealed. Mr. Ernst and Mr. Katz had this to say:

"It is obvious that in dealing with secret speech as opposed to public speech, the Court is faced with a problem to which the established standards of clear and present danger are not readily applicable. Secret speech, particularly when combined with concealed political activity, never yields an opportunity for the kind of consideration of the issues by the citizenry which it is the purpose of the first amendment to secure. There can be no competition in the marketplace of thought if the people are not informed of the ideas, aims, or identity of a group until after these ideas have been translated into action."

In their very excellent article, Morris L. Ernst and Arthur J. Katz further clarify the difference between public and secret speech by this example:

"The man who mounts a soapbox in a municipal park to urge the overthrow of the Government is entitled to the protection of the first amendment unless the circumstances surrounding his speech makes it clear that his listeners will forthwith arm themselves and march on city hall. Here the test of danger is a practical, workable one which can be applied in terms of the time and opportunity available for the expression of diverse opinions, for the consideration of the issue by those to whom the speech is addressed and for self-defensive action by the Government, if necessary. On the other hand, political plans secretly conceived and executed, or executed under the guise of activity apparently remote from the ends sought, do not (and, we can assume, are not meant to) provide time or opportunity for consideration, choice, or proper counteraction. The very use of stealth in a society that protects public speech negates the protection of the first amendment."

The thinking expressed by the Court in the Frankfeld decision appears to be very much in accord with the arguments advanced by Mr. Katz and Mr. Ernest.

In the Frankfeld decision the Court remarked:

"The question presented is not one as to freedom of speech or as to the right to organize for proper political purposes, but goes to the power of the Government to outlaw and punish conspiracies whose purpose it is to overthrow the Government itself by force and violence. Modern history is replete with instances of the danger to the Government inherent in such conspiracies; and there is nothing in the Constitution or in any sound political theory which forbids it to take effective action against that danger."

The late distinguished Chief Justice Vinson in the Dennis case gave a strong and persuasive answer to the argument that the Smith Act should be held invalid in its application to the defendant because of the "clear and present danger" rule. Listen to the words of Chief Justice Vinson, who was speaking for the U.S. Supreme Court:

"Obviously, the words cannot mean that before the Government may act, it must wait until the putsch is about to be executed, the plans have been laid, and the signal is awaited. If Government is aware that a group aiming at its overthrow is attempting to indoctrinate its members and to commit them to a course whereby they will strike when the leaders feel the circumstances permit, action by the Government is required."

Harry L. Wallace, writing in the Indiana Law Journal, summed up the whole relationship of the question of free speech to the question of denying public benefits to subversives when he said:

"Because the Government may not lock up an advocate of disloyalty if there is time to expose the fallacy of his ideas in the marketplace, it does not follow that it must necessarily employ him in the schools to expound those fallacious ideas to the children with whose care he would be entrusted."

Had the present controversy been existing when Mr. Wallace wrote the article, he might have said that just because the Congress has not outlawed the Community Party it does not follow that it must necessarily allow Communists to get loans and other benefits under a defense statute.

Supreme Court cases make it unmistakably clear that my amendment in no way conflicts with the bill-of-attainder provision in the Constitution

"A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial."

This is the definition of a bill of attainder which has been given by the U.S. Supreme Court and adhered to since the time of its definition.

In order to qualify as a bill of attainder a statute must apply either to named individuals or to an easily ascertainable group. However, just because an individual or group is named in a statute does not in and of itself mean that the law is a bill of attainder. In *American Communications Association* v. *Douds*, the unions argued that the loyalty oath in the Taft-Hartley Act was a bill of attainder, and the unions cited the familiar cases, *United States* v. *Lovett* (328 U.S. 303 (1946)); *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wallace 333 (1867)); and *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wallace 277 (1867)). The majority of the Supreme Court dealt with the unions' arguments in the following words:

"Those cases and this also, according to the argument, involved the proscription of certain occupations to a group classified according to belief and loyalty. But there is a decisive distinction: In the previous decisions the individuals involved were in fact being punished for past actions; whereas, in this case they are subject to possible loss of position only because there is substantial ground for the congressional judgment that their beliefs and loyalties will be transformed into future conduct."

The Supreme Court pointed out that disloyal individuals were not forever disbarred from union office. This is what the Court had to say:

"There is no one who may not, by a voluntary alteration of the loyalties which impel him to action, become eligible to sign the affidavit. We cannot conclude that this section is a bill of attainder."

The courts have pointed out time and time again that if every statute which applied to specific individuals or groups were a bill of attainder it would be impossible to pass any criminal or regulatory legislation which applied to anything less than all persons within the jurisdiction.

In *United States* v. *Lovett*, the case involved a rider on an appropriation bill which prohibited payment of further compensation to three named Federal employees. The Court interpreted this as a permanent proscription from any opportunity to serve the Government and considered the rider a bill of attainder. Whereas, in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* the Court upheld a loyalty oath as stated previously because there was no one who could not by a voluntary alteration of his loyalties become eligible to sign an affidavit and hold union office.

In the concurring opinion of Justice Frankfurter in the Lovett case, Mr. Frankfurter sketches out a theory that a prospective statute could not be a bill of attainder because it did not punish past conduct.

The theory that a statute imposing unavoidable disqualifications is a bill of attainder was smashed to the ground by *Hawker* v. *New York* (170 U.S. 189 (1898)). In that case the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a statute disqualifying convicted felons from the practice of medicine as applied to an abortionist convicted prior to the passage of the statute. The Court reasoned that a State might rightfully require good character of those who had practiced medicine and that it could reasonably determine that conviction of a felony was conclusive evidence of poor character.

In *Garner* v. *Board of Public Works* (341 U.S. 716 (1951)), the Court was faced with a situation which involved a Los Angeles city charter provision which barred from city offices and jobs, persons who were associated with subversive organizations. An ordinance adopted pursuant to the charter provision required all city employees to take an oath that they had not advocated subversive views or been associated with any subversive organization within 5 years prior to enactment of the ordinance.

The Supreme Court upheld the oath. In spite of its retrospective features the Court refused to find a bill of attainder holding that the charter and ordinance simply "declared general and prospectively operative standards of qualification and eligibility for public employment."

My amendment does not disqualify applicants for benefits under the National Defense Education Act on the basis of past conduct. It does state that in the future it will be a crime for Communists or other subversives to apply for or accept them.

As in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* the union official was faced with the choice of renouncing communism or losing his job. So, too, is an individual faced under my amendment with a choice. This is the choice: to be loyal to the United States and be eligible for benefits or to be disloyal and ineligible for such benefits.

The Members of the Senate will recall that during the last session of Congress we enacted the labor reform law which contained in section 504 a provision very similar to my amendment. The labor reform provision to which I refer bars Communists from holding office in labor organizations and in groups or associations of employers dealing with any labor organization.

The distinction between that provision of law and my own amendment is the fact that the labor reform bill language goes way beyond it and prohibits anyone from serving as a union leader or employee of certain business associations not only on the basis of

present membership in the Communist Party but on the basis of past membership as well. This feature of the Kennedy-Landrum bill was never objected to in the House of Representatives or by the Senate conference group headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Since my amendment requires only a disclosure of past membership in the Communist Party on the part of those who seek defense education benefits, and since the amendment does not provide for automatic denial of benefits on the basis of past membership, it is clearly in harmony with the ex post facto provisions in the Constitution.

An ex post facto law is a law which inflicts a greater punishment for an offense than was annexed to the crime when committed (*Calder* v. *Bull* (1798) 3 Dallas 386, 390). Accordingly, if the proposed disqualification would be an additional punishment for offenses committed before its enactment, it would be invalid. But a statute is not deemed to be penal if it imposes a disability—not to punish—but to accomplish some other legitimate governmental purpose (*Trop* v. *Dulles* (1958) 358 U.S. 86, 96).

In American Communications Association v. *Douds* ((1950) 339 U.S. 382), the Supreme Court, as stated earlier, upheld a statute denying certain benefits under the National Labor Relations Act to unions whose officers had not filed non-Communist affidavits. In that case Chief Justice Vinson wrote:

"Power is never without responsibility. And when authority derives in part from government's thumb on the scales, the exercise of that power by private persons becomes closely akin, in some respects to its exercise by government itself."

It was the Supreme Court view that Congress could exclude from union office those classes of persons whom it feared would misuse powers lodged in them. It is my view that Congress may also exclude from benefiting under a defense statute those individuals dedicated to the overthrow of the Government that provides the benefits.

There are now in effect Federal statutes which deny the right to engage in certain activities to persons who have been convicted of specified crimes. The Federal Alcohol Control Act, for example, forbids the issuance of a basic permit to any person who, within 5 years prior to the application, has been convicted of a felony under Federal or State law, or has, within 3 years, been convicted of a misdemeanor under any Federal law relating to liquor. The Investment Company Act of 1940 makes it unlawful for any person who, within 10 years, has been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor relating to certain securities dealings, to serve as an officer of any registered investment company.

In all of these situations individuals are deprived of certain rights because of past conduct. In each case the courts have upheld the statutes involved.

My amendment does not deny benefits to those who in the past have belonged to questionable organizations. It simply requires the disclosure of prior membership in subversive organizations.

In the Garner case referred to previously, the loyalty oath was upheld even though it required as a condition precedent to getting a Los Angeles City job that the individual applicant had not been associated with a subversive organization prior to enactment of the ordinance.

The relevancy of past loyalty to future conduct was brought sharply to focus by the words of the Supreme Court in the Garner case. In that case the Court said:

"Past conduct may well relate to present fitness; past loyalty may have a reasonable relationship to present and future trust. Both are commonly inquired into in determining fitness for both high and low positions in private industry and are not less relevant in public employment."

CONCLUSION

The unfortunate developments of the past week clearly show that the statement by the Soviet Premier, Nikita Khrushchev, in June of 1957 when he calmly assured a nationwide television audience that one day the United States would be a Communist nation is still his basic belief. He stated, and I quote:

"I can prophesy that your grandchildren in America will live under socialism. And please do not be afraid of that. Your grandchildren will not understand how their grandparents did not understand the progressive nature of a socialist society.

A number of years before this statement was made by Mr. Khrushchev, the Communist intent was more graphically described. The Communist Party's 1921 constitution proclaimed its purpose:

"To destroy the bourgeois state machinery; to establish the dictatorship of the Proletariat in the form of Soviet power; to abolish the capitalist system and to introduce the Communist society."

These words reveal the nature of the Communist conspiracy which has, within the past four decades, engulfed almost 40 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the earth's surface. The ultimate and tragic aim of the Communists is to control and dominate this Nation, and eventually to conquer the world.

Many people today tend to discount the menace of domestic communism. They believe, because of a decline in its membership, that the Communist Party in this country is no longer an influential organization. Some go so far as to say "the party is almost over." Those who believe this are only deluding themselves and others. It is a mistaken policy which has already done considerable harm and which may bring even more disastrous results. We must keep in mind in estimating the influence of this well-organized and aggressive group that each party member or sympathizer must be evaluated in terms of his political, social, and economic weight and influence and the fact that he has the backing of a major foreign power. William Z. Foster, former national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, stated that "Communist strength cannot be measured even approximately by statistics. The Communist Party's strength runs far beyond all formal measurements."

Founded in 1919, the American Communist Party is a Russian-inspired, Moscow-dominated, anti-American conspiracy against our Government, our ideals, and our freedoms. It is, in fact, simply the American branch of the Russian Communist Party; an organic part of the Communist movement seeking world conquest and more specifically the destruction of the American Government as its chief obstacle.

I am aware that there are many conscientious individuals who are not in any way subject to Communist discipline who object to the present so-called non-Communist affidavit. In fact, President Eisenhower himself in his budget message for the fiscal year starting July 1 stated that:

"I am recommending repeal of the provision of the National Defense Education Act that prohibits payments or loans from being made to any individual unless he executes an affidavit that he does not believe in or belong to any organization that teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government. This affidavit requirement is unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels that it is being singled out for this requirement."

Frankly, if there is this much feeling with reference to the act, it is proper to raise a question as to whether a better method might not be adopted to insure the allegiance of those who are receiving benefits from the Federal Government to advance their own education while at the same time promoting our security. In fact, under the existing legislation it would be possible for an individual to swear that he was a loyal citizen at the time that he embarked upon his educational program, but he could later join a subversive organization and still receive benefits under the act without being liable to any criminal punishment.

It was my hope in preparing remarks that I have read today that I would treat this whole issue in the most objective manner possible. I have endeavored to secure the best advice of the Department of Justice, the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, and other qualified persons and agencies. I feel, as I have explained earlier, that I am submitting language to the Senate which would prevent anyone from applying for, or accepting, benefits under the National Defense Education Act while a member of a subversive organization. My proposal does not require the signing of any affidavit nor the taking of any oath. It will, I think, safeguard the interests of the United States.

There are many sources of financial support for individuals who wish to pursue an educational program without requiring assistance from the Federal Government. Those who are unwilling to submit to the discipline imposed by my amendment should be required to finance their education without recourse to the taxpayer.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier I suggested, with respect to Members who wished to be heard on this matter, that I would ask unanimous consent that their remarks be printed in the body of the RECORD. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] appear in the body of the RECORD, in the course of the debate prior to the vote.

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

LESSONS IN LOYALTY

(Statement by Senator BRIDGES)

During my 24 years as a Member of this body, I have witnessed a number of teapot tempests in this Chamber.

One of the more recent debates of this particular nature occurred during the first session of this Congress when the Senate spent considerable time discussing the merits of S. 819. This bill sought to delete the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit provisions from the National Defense Education Act.

I was dismayed by the amount of time devoted to this piece of legislation last year but gratified by the end result when the bill was recommitted to committee. I am sure that many of my colleagues shared my hope at that time that S. 819 and its objectives would thereafter rest in peace.

WATERED-DOWN VERSION STILL OBJECTIONABLE

Unfortunately, such was not the case. The sponsors of the bill apparently saw fit to slice up S. 819, sweeten it with verbal sauce and serve it to the Senate in sections.

The sweetened portion before us today is no more palatable, however, than the original serving. To my way of thinking, S. 2929 is still a distasteful piece of legislation.

Rather than removing both the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit like its ill-fated

predecessor, S. 2929 attacks only the affidavit provision.

But it still boils down to the time-worn proposition of six against a half dozen.

NO BASIS FOR OBJECTIONS TO AFFIDAVIT

Quite frankly, I see absolutely no reason why any patriotic American should find cause to object to an affidavit which states, in substance, that he does not believe in, and is not a member of, and does not support, any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

I have given a good deal of thought to this matter.

I have looked at the affidavit from all angles.

I have tried diligently to see the other side of the coin.

But it still saddens me that Americans should be so concerned over such a simple repudiation of any collusion with the enemy.

LET'S EXAMINE THE ARGUMENTS

My purpose is not solely to state my opposition to this legislation. The fact that I am opposed to it surprises no one, I am sure.

I shall direct my remarks today to the arguments presented by the proponents of S. 2929. I shall attempt to analyze their objections to the disclaimer affidavit to see if any of them hold water.

IS ACADEMIC FREEDOM THREATENED?

First of all, some advocates of the bill have claimed that the affidavit is a threat to academic freedom.

Now, let us examine this claim.

For a number of reasons, it simply does not bear up under close scrutiny.

The most obvious reason is that all students are not required to sign an anti-Communist affidavit. Only those students who are seeking financial assistance from the Federal Government are required to comply with this provision of the act.

Therefore, any student who finds that the disclaimer is obnoxious or objectionable has only to seek another benefactor in order to pursue his education without being bothered with such a requirement.

GOVERNMENT ASKS SIMPLE GUARANTEE

In effect, the Federal Government is saying to the prospective student: "I am prepared to assist you financially and the only thing I ask in return is a written guarantee that you have no intention of using this education to assist my enemies in their attempts to destroy me."

This hardly strikes me as an abridgement of academic freedom.

If for some reason beyond my perception a student feels that he can honestly object to the disclaimer procedure, the Federal Government does not withdraw his right to further education. The Government merely asks that the prospective student obtain his financial assistance elsewhere.

DEFECTING COLLEGES ABORT FREEDOM OF CHOICE

The only infringement of academic liberty which I have noted in this entire controversy was not committed by the Federal Government. On the contrary, it was perpetrated by those college presidents and administrators who saw fit to withdraw from participation in the National Defense Education Act student loan program.

These self-styled "freedom-fighters" have actually closed their doors to worthy students who need Federal assistance in obtaining a college education.

They are saying, in substance, that any student who, through financial necessity, must turn to the student loan program for assistance, cannot enter their institutions of learning.

I should add here, that only a handful of misguided educators have chosen to abort academic liberty in this fashion. The overwhelming majority have displayed the kind of clear thinking which one might expect of intelligent, well-educated men.

Beyond that, we must remember that the educator opposition to the affidavit has reached the saturation point, while educator support is mounting steadily. I am convinced that the pendulum of educator opinion began swinging in the opposite direction some time ago.

According to the U.S. Office of Education, a total of 1,360 colleges and universities are participating in the loan program during the current academic year. There are conflicting reports as to exactly how many colleges have withdrawn from the program, or have expressed their intention to withdraw, because of the disclaimer affidavit. The report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare lists 18 institutions which have withdrawn and 8 others which have declined to participate because of the affidavit.

The sum of both these categories hardly makes a dent in the total number of participating colleges.

Like everything else, there are always a few dissenters who object to any rules, regulations or requirements.

ARE WE SINGLING OUT STUDENTS?

Now let's examine another popular objection to the disclaimer affidavit.

Some of the champions of S. 2929 believe that the affidavit singles out students for suspicion.

This seems to me to be a little ridiculous.

Do these critics mean that the Federal Government should not require any individual or group to do anything without imposing the same requirement on 180 million Americans?

Perhaps what the opponents of the affidavit are saying is that all beneficiaries of Government assistance should be required to sign a similar affidavit.

While I am not advocating such a policy, I would certainly have no objection to it. If these individuals feel that every person receiving Government subsidies should come under this requirement, it is all right with me.

The fact of the matter is that Government employees are required to execute an affidavit to the effect that their employment does not constitute a violation of Public Law 330 of the 84th Congress. The wording of this Public Law is remarkably similar to the National Defense Education Act affidavit. Despite this requirement, I have heard no complaints that Government employees are being singled out for suspicion.

Thousands of Americans employed in private industry sign such an affidavit because their companies are engaged in Government contract work but no screams are coming from that quarter.

I might add that students at our service academies must meet this requirement, but no hue and cry is being raised by these young men. And our academies are always filled to capacity.

Additionally, it is interesting to note that the National Science Foundation Act has been in force for 10 years and has been successful in such activities as the awarding of scholarships and graduate fellowships in the sciences. However, this 1950 act requires a loyalty oath and an oath of allegiance from persons receiving assistance under these programs. Nevertheless, I hear no anguished reports about this act.

In short, I hardly think that there is sound reasoning behind this claim and I dismiss it for lack of good logic.

ARE THE STUDENTS OPPOSED TO IT?

Then there is a group which justifies passage of S. 2929 on the grounds that college students, in general, are opposed to the provision in question.

To begin with, this is at best a flimsy basis for remedial legislation.

In addition, on closer inspection the claim appears to be without foundation.

Let's examine the facts. The first year the student loan program was in operation, approximately 28,000 loans were made. During the 1959–60 academic year, which is now drawing to a close, the program swelled to more than 70,000 individual loans. Also, it is estimated that this program will attract about 125,000 loan applications during the next academic year.

If the students are opposed to this provision, their opposition is certainly not reflected by these figures.

Speaking as one U.S. Senator who has received a large amount of mail on this subject from college students, I want to stress that my correspondence from young men and women on this topic has been overwhelmingly in favor of retaining both the loyalty oath and the disclaimer affidavit.

I have in my possession—and I should be happy to produce them should any of my colleagues so desire—the names of 3,718 college students who have taken a stand in favor of the affidavit and in opposition to the legislation we are now considering.

STUDENT COMMITTEE ORGANIZED

Earlier this year, an organization known as the National Student Committee for the Loyalty Oath was started by a group of students here in the District of Columbia. This group has snowballed into a nationwide organization of men and women of college age, students at universities and colleges from Maine to California, all of whom are opposed to this bill under consideration.

I really do not think that this indicates a feeling of resentment to these provisions.

IS THE AFFIDAVIT UNNECESSARY?

I have also heard the argument that it is unnecessary for the Government to extract such a guarantee from students.

To find an answer to this claim, let's inspect the mechanics of the bill itself.

I feel there is no need for me to dwell on the fact that this act was passed initially to promote the national defense. Its very name should be sufficient evidence of that fact.

IT IS MERELY GOOD BUSINESS

In the final analysis, this act places the Federal Government in the position of an agency loaning money to needy scholars for continuance of their educations. And I think we can all agree that sound lending institutions do not scatter money to the four winds without first obtaining certain guarantees from the borrowers.

Under NDEA, however, the Government makes no demands with respect to collateral and is willing to accept without question the good intentions of its debtors to repay the loans.

In fact, the only requirement for eligible students is the taking of the loyalty oath and the signing of the antisubversive affidavit.

IS THE AFFIDAVIT INEFFECTIVE?

Objectors to the affidavit also claim that it is ineffective; that subversives can still sign it and reap the benefits of the NDEA.

They can, but I question whether or not they will.

Section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act states in its final sentence—and I quote—"The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits."

If a Communist were to check on this reference to the United States Code, he would find the following words:

"Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the

United States, knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

To be sure, there is no absolute guarantee that an enemy of our country would decline to sign such an affidavit. But, if he did, he would do so with full knowledge that he would be running the risk of subsequent imprisonment on the grounds of perjury. I feel certain that this risk would be a very effective deterrent to any would-be student loan applicants from the ranks of the Communist Party.

IS IT SUPERFLUOUS OR BURDENSOME?

Finally, there are a few persons who have claimed that loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits are superfluous and burdensome.

I do not know of anything that annoys me more than this kind of thinking among supposedly loyal Americans.

It seems to me that loyalty, like patriotism, and any other outward sign of allegiance to one's country has become "old hat" in this day and age.

I, personally, consider it a pleasure to doff my hat when the American flag goes by; an honor to join in the singing of the national anthem; a privilege to repeat the pledge of allegiance; to take a loyalty oath or sign a disclaimer document. Because of this, however, some of our supersophisticates or pseudointellectuals or fuzzy-brained internationalists might consider me to be eccentric or at least somewhat amusing. But, if such outward manifestations of patriotism indicate eccentricity, then we should all be thankful that our forebears were eccentric along these lines of patriotism.

S. 2929 SHOULD BE DEFEATED

In closing, I cannot help but indicate a little disgust over the fact that the Senate of the United States should be required to take time out from the pressing legislation which is needed in other fields to spend time on such a needless bill as S. 2929. I trust that my colleagues will treat it with the contempt it deserves; that it will be defeated with speed and dispatch; and that we can get back to the important business of the Senate.

Mr. McGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks I had prepared for discussion on the loyalty oath be included in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

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

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

What is the purpose of a loyalty oath requirement for college student loans? Is it to prevent subversives from obtaining student loans? Is it to inspire loyalty in students?

If it is any one of these things, then it cannot succeed in accomplishing its purpose.

Even the Senators supporting the oath requirement admitted it would not keep Communists from getting loans. I cannot imagine a devoted Communist hesitating to sign a loyalty oath. In fact he might be eager to sign.

As a college professor for many years, I am sure that the routine administration of an oath during a financial transaction will not inspire students to a higher regard for their country.

To demand, rather than expect, loyalty from any class of citizens is to weaken this Nation's democratic ideals.

There is nothing inherently wrong or improper about loyalty oaths. If the recitation of a loyalty oath inspires patriotism in an individual, let him take an oath when he so desires. But let us not require oaths of those who find them personally distasteful for routine matters.

Recently I took my first oath as a Senator. It was a solemn moment and one I shall remember always. I was swearing to dedicate myself to my new job, an affirmation of acceptance of solemn responsibility.

It is entirely proper that Senators begin their term of office by swearing an oath of allegiance, and all are proud to do so. But it is not necessary to take an oath to obtain an FHA home loan or to receive Government crop supports.

No one expects a loyalty oath to be connected with these financial transactions with the Government. Why then do we single out student loans as more important than other loans?

Never have I doubted the loyalty of 99.9 percent of the American people. This is a loyalty not of laws or codes but of individual belief in the rightness of the American system and respect for the rights and dignity of every person. As long as this loyalty exists in this country, we need no laws to protect it. If it disappears, no law will ever restore it.

Communism is "soft" on truth. It's time we got tough with the Communists. Instead of coddling them with statutes which protect them from exposure to our most devastating weapon—unrestrained and unlimited education—let's hit them hard where it hurts. Let's throw the books at them.

But our attention is focused upon students in our universities. These students fall into one of two categories. Either they are loyal or they are Communists. If loyal, they are no problem. If not—if by chance and in spite of all existing precautions, a Communist should slip into one of our colleges, what then?

I submit that even under these improbable circumstances we have much less to fear than some suggest.

It is clearly established that the most vulnerable aspect of communism is its inability to stand the tests of criticism and truth. This is communism's "softest" or weakest side.

From our point of view in the United States, ideas, truth, and freedom of criticism are our greatest weapons in the struggle against totalitarianism around the world.

The Communists themselves offer the most dramatic evidence. In the Soviet Union, both propaganda and severe censorship shield the Russian people from the truth. The Communists fear unlimited, unrestricted education because it seeks the truth and the truth exposes the false premises of communism.

Instead of worrying quite so much about the one or two Communists who might slip into our colleges in spite of all existing precautions, we should close in on them with the searching light of truth inherent in our educational system.

The Communist system cannot withstand this searchlight which our system turns upon despotism wherever it occurs.

Even the most avid supporters of the disclaimer affidavit requirements which have been scorned by several of our major colleges, universities, and educational leaders, admit that the signing of such a document will not deter a single Communist. Why not then throw the books at whomever might slip into our educational system and instead of shielding them from our great educational processes, subject them to truthful analysis? Education represents our most powerful weapon against communism.

Mr. McGEE. I ask unanimous consent, moreover, that correspondence I have received on this question likewise be included in the RECORD following my remarks. It includes a statement from the Wyoming Chapter of Sigma Xi, an honorary scientific fraternity, opposing the loyalty oath; one from the Western Association Graduate Schools, opposing the loyalty oath; and one from the President of the Wyoming Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, likewise opposing the loyalty oath.

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

WYOMING CHAPTER OF SIGMA XI,
THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING,
Laramie, Wyo., February 12, 1960.

Hon. GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: The Wyoming Chapter of the Society of the Sigma Xi approved the following motion in their regular meeting last night:

"The chapter secretary shall notify the Wyoming Congressmen in Washington that it is the consensus in the Wyoming Chapter of Sigma Xi that the requirement for a disclaimer affidavit relating to subversive activities should be eliminated from the National Defense Education Act."

The Society of the Sigma Xi is an organization whose aim is to encourage original investigations in science. Its membership is composed of men and women engaged in or devoted to scientific research. The Wyoming Chapter now has 173 active members including teachers and research workers in most of the scientific discipline.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. BALL,
Secretary.

WESTERN ASSOCIATION
OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS,
Boulder, Colo., March 16, 1960.

Hon. GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: At its annual meeting on March 1, 1960, in Berkeley, Calif., the Western Association of Graduate Schools, which is composed of 49 graduate schools in colleges and universities located in every Western State, including Alaska and Hawaii, unanimously adopted the following resolution, which I am instructed to transmit to you:

"Whereas the requirement of affidavits of disbelief or disclaimer oaths as a condition for receiving fellowships or loans is an unwarranted interference with freedom of expression and is ineffective: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Western Association of Graduate Schools urge the Congress of the United States to eliminate the affidavits of disbelief or disclaimer oaths which appear in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

Respectfully yours,

DAYTON D. MCKEAN,
Secretary, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Colorado.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING,
Laramie, Wyo., February 16, 1960.

Hon. GALE W. MCGEE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GALE: The University of Wyoming chapter of AAUP has completed a vote on the following proposition:

"The Wyoming chapter of AAUP should forward a statement to Senator GALE MCGEE informing him of the chapter's opposition to

the disclaimer affidavit of the 1958 National Defense Education Act, and urging that this affidavit be eliminated from the act."

This resolution was passed with only one dissenting vote. This action by the chapter confirms a resolution by the chapter forwarded to the national office of AAUP in February 1959.

I might say that the vote was taken by mail and was intended to be anonymous. Nearly all of the members, however, did sign their ballots, a sign, I believe, of their strong feelings in the matter.

As president of the local chapter, I am forwarding the results of this ballot to you, knowing you are doing all that you can to help eliminate the disclaimer affidavit.

Cordially yours,

JOHN K. MATHISON,
Professor of English, President, Wyoming Chapter, AAUP.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the most eloquent and thoughtful statements I have seen on the disclaimer affidavit provision of the National Defense Education Act is the resolution which was adopted recently, with only one dissenting vote, by the Brigham Young University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

This resolution, coming as it does from the faculty of Utah's largest and a most highly respected private educational institution, which is the pinnacle of the widespread education system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, is most noteworthy. I ask unanimous consent to place it in the RECORD at this point.

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

Whereas the National Defense Education Act of 1958, includes a provision (sec. 1001(f), title X) which reads: "No * * * funds * * * shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods"; and

Whereas this provision invites serious objections because of the vagueness of its language, its possible impingement upon areas of freedom guaranteed in the first amendment, its ineffectiveness against genuine threats to national security, its imputation of a need for special loyalty checks on the academic community, and its implications for Federal control in the field of education; and

Whereas this provision has prompted many prominent American universities, such as Harvard, Yale, Amherst, and Princeton, to refuse to participate in the NSDA program and inspired requests for the repeal of the provision from many other great universities, such as Columbia, Dartmouth, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; and

Whereas resolutions calling for the repeal of this provision have been adopted by such organizations of stature and responsibility as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Association of Law Schools, the Association for Higher Education, the Association of American Colleges, the National Students Association, and the American Association of University Professors; and

Whereas the President of the United States in his January 18, 1960, budget message called for the repeal of the disclaimer affidavit proviso; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill (S. 2929) providing for the repeal of the disclaimer affidavit: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Brigham Young University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors records its opposition to the disclaimer affidavit provision of the National Defense Education Act and urges the Members of Congress of the United States from the State of Utah to vote for its repeal.

Adopted at a meeting of the B.Y.U. chapter at Provo, Utah, on May 23, 1960, by a substantial majority but not unanimously.

RICHARD D. POLL,
President, B.Y.U. Chapter, AAUP.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the question be put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Vermont. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2929) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1001 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(f)(1) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.'

"(f)(2) No person may apply for or receive any grant, payment, or loan under this Act while he is a member of the Communist Party or any other organization having for one of its purposes or objectives the seizure or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence, and has knowledge of such purpose or objective of that party or other organization.

"(3) No person who within five years has been a member of the party or any other organization of the kind referred to in paragraph (1) may apply for or receive any grant, payment or loan under this Act unless his application for such grant, payment or loan is accompanied by a written statement, executed under oath, containing a full and complete disclosure of the facts concerning his membership in that party or other organization and the knowledge possessed by him during the period of his membership therein with regard to the purpose and objectives thereof.

"(4) Whoever knowingly violates paragraph (2) or paragraph (3) of this subsection shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1614, House bill 11998.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that there will be no further legislative business this evening; but if Senators have statements to be printed in the RECORD I suggest that they submit them now, before I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first, let me ask the acting majority leader whether the previous order for the Senate to convene at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow still stands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does, indeed.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND MUTUAL SECURITY—RELEASE BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued today by the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Thomas Gates, with respect to action on the mutual security program, particularly the military assistance portion thereof.

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

The Department of Defense released today the following statement of the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr.:

"I am deeply concerned over the fate of the military assistance program.

"The President requested a $2 billion appropriation for military assistance for fiscal year 1961, to provide weapons and military equipment to strengthen our alliances and to promote our own national security. The Joint Chiefs of Staff all stated that they would not take one dollar away from the military assistance program in order to augment the funds for their own services. Military assistance is just as much a part of our own national defense as are the appropriations for our Army, Navy, Air Force, Central Intelligence Agency, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

"I have testified before the Congress, as have other Defense Department witnesses, in support of the $2 billion request. We have discussed frankly every aspect of the program. We have responded to every question and criticism. We have a sensible, sound, well-administered program. Yet the House

Appropriations Committee recommends that the appropriation be reduced by 20 percent.

"In spending military assistance funds, it is necessary first to maintain existing allied forces in good working order and conserve the investment already made. Therefore the proposed reduction must come from cutting down on force improvement, that is, postponing indefinitely the newer weapons: 80 percent of any cut below the budget request must be absorbed in equipment for force improvement, which includes missiles, electronic equipment, modern aircraft, and ships, modernized tanks, and combat vehicles and the like.

"The impact of the proposed cuts would fall most heavily on NATO, which also bore the greatest weight of last year's appropriation cut.

"We must lead the free world without hesitation.

"We must contain the Communists, but we cannot do it with imaginary weapons.

"We must continue to sustain the capability and determination of our allies to defeat both aggression and internal subversion.

"We must provide for the military assistance program as an integral part of our national defense required by our national interest.

"Before departing for the Far East, the President said in telegrams to House leaders: 'This (cut) cannot but jeopardize our own security and the defense of the free world.'

"I urge the House of Representatives, when it debates this appropriation on Thursday, to restore the full $2 billion intact."

PURCHASES BY FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDING COMMISSION—LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release issued by the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, with respect to certain observations made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and by me.

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

DEPARTMENT RELEASES SECRETARY MUELLER LETTER TO SENATOR PROXMIRE

The U.S. Department of Commerce released today a letter from Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller to Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin. Text of the Secretary's letter follows:

JUNE 15, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Your public attacks earlier this week, and your renewal of them on the floor of the Senate yesterday, prompt this letter.

As a father, I have very great personal interest in my son and I do not intend to remain silent while you, in your efforts to discredit me, continue to try to hurt him.

My son's independent furniture company has done business over the years with private individuals and firms and various public agencies. As Secretary of Commerce, I did not follow its transactions or ever solicit Government business for his or any firm. But, since your attacks, I requested and received thorough information as to the incident from both the State Department and from him.

From these facts, I believe that any fair-minded person would recognize that my son has not asked or received treatment from the State Department beyond its procedures for anyone engaged in a similar business transaction. The record shows that both parties conducted their affairs in a proper manner and in the public interest.

For example, the mode of transportation of furniture was found to be the most desirable for the Department under all the circumstances and was used to save extra expense that faced the Government in rentals of the unfurnished new building and of old properties. The Department prior to executing the contract for furniture made a check with four additional American firms of prices for comparable items of basic office furniture.

A reading of the documents in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and of transcripts of your radio remarks on the case, fortifies my belief that through ignorance you twisted the truth.

For example, in radio broadcasts you said:

"Now the fact is that the Secretary of Commerce is a member of the Foreign Service Building Commission, which is responsible for this kind of purchase."

And again:

"The Secretary of Commerce, of course, in authorizing the Foreign Service Building Commission to go ahead and buy from his son's company, * * * it seems to me is engaging in a—what I think is a very irregular practice."

I never authorized such action—and I cannot but feel that you could have found that out.

Had you asked anyone familiar with the situation, including members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, you would have learned that the functions of the seven-member Commission were taken away by President Roosevelt in 1939 through a reorganization project and very properly transferred to the State Department's Office of Foreign Buildings. You also would have discovered that no meetings have been held by the inoperative unit for at least 10 years—long before my day.

I have confidence in my son, who is running a small business of his own. I felt proud to see him stand up to the unfair attacks of a U.S. Senator and to reply convincingly to your charge by saying in the press that you were using "half-facts and innuendos * * * in attempting the destruction of a small business whose dealings over the years have been and always will be honorable."

In assuming the right to discuss this matter publicly, you certainly undertook an obligation to act and speak fairly. Since you have failed to do so, my purpose in responding is to set the record straight in the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee be authorized to meet tomorrow, at 10:30 a.m., to hold a hearing on the nomination of Hyman Freehof, of the District of Columbia, to be an Examiner in Chief of the U.S. Patent Office. Notice of the scheduled meeting was filed on Monday of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, did I correctly understand the Senator from Michigan to ask for authorization for a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to meet tomorrow morning, to hold a hearing on a nomination?

Mr. HART. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have to object, because today the senior Senator from Oregon asked me to object to any requests for the holding of hearings by the Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me add that I shall find myself compelled to object to requests for the holding of committee meetings or subcommittee meetings from this point on, when the Senate is in session.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at this time of tension and doubt created by the bluster and threats of the Soviet Union, it is of first importance that the cause of the captive nations be kept in mind by all freedom-loving people.

The widespread observance of Captive Nations Week, as created by Congress in its resolution of July 17, 1959, will be a worthy means for attaining this objective. I have been delighted to receive from the mayor of Buffalo, the Honorable Frank A. Sedita, a letter announcing their plans for setting up a citizens' committee to observe Captive Nations Week.

In order to give full information about this to those who may be prompted to take similar action, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter which Mayor Sedita has written to me on this subject, together with the enclosures outlining the plans for his citizens' committee.

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

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
June 7, 1960.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I thought you might be interested in the observance of Captive Nations Week which is planned for the city of Buffalo. A citizens' committee has been appointed and is preparing plans for sports, music, dances, and other appropriate events during the week of July 17–23.

So that you may know something of the thinking that lies behind this movement, I am attaching copy of letter of invitation to committee members, and copy of letter to other mayors throughout the country, informing them of our activities.

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. SEDITA,
Mayor of Buffalo.

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
May 11, 1960.

DEAR ———: I am sure you are aware of the importance and meannig of the Captive Nations Week resolution enacted by Congress last July. When President Eisenhower signed this resolution on July 17, 1959, making it a law of our country (Public Law 86–90), he issued a proclamation designating the week of July 19, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week." The Presidential proclamation read in part as follows:

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations."

The law provides that the third week of July for each succeeding year be designated as "Captive Nations Week," until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. Last year we had no opportunity to plan in advance for the ceremonies and activities which this law calls for. This year I am taking the initiative to make certain that the citizens of Buffalo will have every opportunity to demonstrate their support of the aspirations of the people of the captive nations for freedom and independence. To that point I am appointing a Citizens Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week.

The committee will have these responsibilities:

1. To plan appropriate public ceremonies which will draw attention to the struggles of the captive nations for their freedom and independence and the historic relationship of their aspirations to the victory of our Founding Fathers which brought liberty and national independence to the United States.

2. To promote activities which will bring greater public appreciation of the rich and distinct cultures, folklore, customs, and music of each and all of the captive nations.

3. To develop public understanding that the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the peoples of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace.

I take pleasure in extending to you an invitation to become a member of the Citizens Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week. Will you please let me know if it will be convenient for you to serve? The first meeting of the committee will be called soon and I look forward to seeing you then.

I am confident that Buffalo has the spirit and the enterprise to carry out the high purposes of Public Law 86–90. We have always been proud of the fact that our city is made up of people of diverse national and religious backgrounds, all working in harmoniously unity for the common good. It is natural, therefore, that our people should have warm sympathy for the oppressed in the captive nations set forth in the law.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. SEDITA,
Mayor.

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
June 6, 1960.

DEAR MAYOR: I thought you would be interested in the advance preparations being made in Buffalo to commemorate Captive Nations Week as provided in Public Law 8690. It is my understanding that President Eisenhower will issue a proclamation, as he did last year, designating the week of July 17–23 "Captive Nations Week."

Last year there was little time available for advance preparations to commemorate this week, due to the fact that Congress enacted this law but a few days in advance of the third week of July. This year I felt advance preparations should be made so that appropriate ceremonies and activities would be carried on in the city of Buffalo. To this end, I established a Citizens Committee to Commemorate Captive Nations Week, appointing to it individuals representing each of the nations named in the law, and other outstanding citizens. My letter of invitation to serve on this committee sets forth what I believe to be the basis for a suitable program for the week. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information.

Unless similar action is taken by the mayors throughout the country, it is my conviction that the intent of the law, which is to alert the American people to the importance of keeping the spark of freedom alive behind the Iron Curtain, will not be fully implemented.

At this moment of history, when the question of peace with justice looms so large in the minds of all of our people, it is important to note that Congress made a finding, the effect of which is that the striving of these people of the captive nations for their independence and freedom is a powerful deterrent to war, and one of the best hopes for a just peace. Certainly there is a compelling objective and one which I am sure all Americans support.

If you establish a citizens' committee along similar lines, I can assure you that the members of our Buffalo committee and I will be happy to share our plans and program developments with you.

Very truly yours,

FRANK A. SEDITA,
Mayor of Buffalo.

ELIMINATION OF AFFIDAVIT OF DISLOYALTY

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there may be some misunderstanding as to the action of the Senate a moment ago on the bill that was under consideration today. To be sure, the so-called Prouty substitute was a substitute for the entire Kennedy bill, but before action was taken, it was changed and made an amendment to the bill so that the loyalty oath remains in the act, and this is, in addition, in lieu of the disclaimer requirement which was the subject of controversy both last year and this year. This is an enforcible provision, in my judgment, and leaves the loyalty oath intact.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, who was recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Florida in error, because the Chair did not realize the Senator from Illinois had not yielded the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to ask the Senator a question. This substitute, on its face, shows it strikes out both the loyalty oath and the disclaimer of Communist affiliation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct, and that is why the Senator withdrew his amendment as a substitute and offered it as an amendment to the bill, so that the result was the retention of the loyalty oath, and it is in lieu of the disclaimer affidavit.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that is the action taken, very well. I think the criminal statute is more effective against Communists, but I had been told the substitute struck down the entire loyalty oath, and the copy on my desk indicates that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to clarify the situation officially, I ask that the Chair, after conference with the Parliamentarian, advise the Senate as to exactly what action was taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was offered so as to make an amendment to the bill, as opposed to a substitute for the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In other words, the statement made by the Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair repeat it, so Senators may hear?

Mr. KERR. Let the Senator from Illinois repeat it, and let the Parliamentarian listen and decide whether it is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understood the Presiding Officer to say that the explanation given by the Senator from Illinois was correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Montana did not ask if the statement of the Senator from Montana was correct. He asked the Presiding Officer if the statement of the Senator from Illinois was correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The answer, in either case, or in both cases, is "Yes."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer. It may well be that the situation is exactly as the Senator from Illinois has stated. I certainly would not want to express the slightest disagreement to it, but I think those of us who were waiting—and there were several of us waiting—for the quorum call, with the understanding from the clerk in charge that the Senator from Vermont was going to speak for a long time, were waiting so we could vote on final passage, are entitled to examine the substitute and see what it does.

For that reason, I shall move to reconsider the vote, and have the motion go on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, is that in order? I have asked that it go on the calendar. Business has been transacted since action on the bill. That is not the order of business at this time. I have moved to reconsider and asked

that my motion go on the calendar, and I shall insist on that motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to table the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida, the Chair is advised, may enter the motion to reconsider, which is privileged.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida understands the procedural matter. He has a right to enter the motion to reconsider, which is done, and it goes to the calendar, but then it requires a motion to take it up, debate on that motion, and a vote upon that motion, before the motion to reconsider can be brought up. I claim the right to look at what has been done in my absence. I had been advised by those in charge of the debate that there was going to be a sizable debate. I simply went to an adjoining room, along with other Senators who feel, as I do, that this matter is of great importance and wanted to be here when action was taken, to find that action had been taken when we were outside.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for an interpretation.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, may we have order, so we can get the ruling of the Presiding Officer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

After the motion to reconsider has been entered, another Senator may move to proceed to the consideration of the motion to reconsider, and that motion is debatable.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is exactly the way I understood the situation. I shall debate it if that motion is made now. I do not think I shall debate it in the morning. I want an opportunity to see what was done in the absence of several of us who have a vital interest in the legislation. I think we are entitled to see what was done, particularly when we were wrongly advised—and I am not charging any deliberation—that the argument of the Senator from Vermont was to take a long time, and we would be safe in going to an adjoining room and waiting for a quorum call before final action was taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will consider this, I ask unanimous consent that the motion made to reconsider, to go on the Calendar, be taken over until the session tomorrow, with the full understanding that the Senator from Montana or any other Senator will not be prejudiced in his right to make the motion, and that it will not be considered as intervening business for that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I am willing to make the motion to reconsider, but I do not propose to have taken away from me the right to see what has been done with respect to a matter in which I am greatly interested and in which the people of my State are greatly interested.

I think all Senators can observe the situation. I am not going to be obstinate about it. I am not going to be ugly about it. However, I am going to insist upon my right under the rule to have the matter on the Calendar. If the distinguished Senator wants to oppose that, I shall oppose his position at some length, but I shall be glad to make the motion myself tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Florida understands the situation fully, in the light of what the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, has stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will go to the Calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer, the distinguished acting majority leader, and the minority leader. I think we are all entitled to have the rules prevail and to know what we are doing before we accede to actions.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session for the consideration of the nomination for the Indian Claims Commission.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the Clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of T. Harold Scott, of Colorado, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I wish to announce that it is anticipated there will be a number of votes tomorrow. There will be a number of votes on amendments to the Defense Department appropriation bill, which is now the unfinished business. There will be a vote on the Japanese peace treaty. If we get to it, there will possibly be votes upon the housing bill reported by the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

The Senate will meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning. I anticipate a late session tomorrow evening.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 15, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1185. An act to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be lost as the result of the construction of a dam;

S. 1358. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes;

S. 1892. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Norman project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 2327. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

S. 2439. An act to authorize certain teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to count as creditable service for retirement purposes certain periods of authorized leave without pay taken by such teachers for educational purposes;

S. 2954. An act to exempt from the District of Columbia income tax compensation paid to alien employees by certain international organizations; and

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to establish an objective for coordinating the development of the District of Columbia with the development of other areas in the Washington metropolitan region and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 1960, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15, 1960:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to serve no longer than December 31, 1960:

Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.

GEORGE D. AIKEN, U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont.

WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon.

Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary, International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to serve no longer than December 31, 1960:

Mrs. Zelma Watson George, of Ohio.

Arthur F. Lamey, of Montana.

Frederick Blake Payne, of New York.
Charles Rosenbaum, of Colorado.
Miss Frances E. Willis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1960:

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

T. Harold Scott, of Colorado, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

II Corinthians 4: 11: *That the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh.*

Most merciful and gracious God, with eager and earnest hearts we are invoking Thy blessing and dedicating ourselves anew unto Thee through the merits and mediations of our Lord and Saviour.

May the spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee, His love, His faith, His humility, His compassion be incarnated in us and become the sovereign and supreme reality in the mind and heart of humanity.

We humbly acknowledge that we so frequently fail to embody and express His spirit and do not make vivid and vital the beauty of His life which our character and conduct should reveal.

Grant that in these troublous and bewildered times we may manifest the influence that His spirit has upon us and have the courage to make greater trial of His way of life, trusting Thee as He did, loving our fellow men and seeking their welfare as He always did.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 132]

Barden	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Bentley	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
Blatnik	Jensen	Short
Buckley	Kearns	Steed
Burdick	Loser	Taber
Carnahan	Mitchell	Taylor
Durham	Morris, Okla.	Teller
Fisher	Moulder	
Gray	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SALARY INCREASES FOR POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreements of June 8 and 9, 1960, and clause 4, rule XXVII, I call up motion No. 6, to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 537, providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9883, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman sign the petition?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 10 minutes; and if the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] desires time, he will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to thank all Members on both sides of the aisle for having given consideration to the discharge petition. The petition is entirely within the bounds of the rules of the House. It is not uncommon that such a petition be passed by this body. It is a matter of great urgency that this matter be disposed of at the earliest possible moment.

We all know this is going to be a short session. We know, other than over this route that we have taken, that the Members have so graciously helped with, that these long-suffering people, these Federal employees, would not have been given the relief to which they are entitled.

I want to thank the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for having taken up and, in their own judgment, done what should be done to dispose of this matter satisfactorily. I do hope that we will vote on this in the shortest possible time, and that the House will give favorable consideration to the measure so that the other body may act upon it at the earliest date.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I understood the gentleman from Kansas yielded 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa. Would that be within his rights?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GROSS. I yield for that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The gentleman from Louisiana particularly wishes to know if he can still yield his remaining 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has control of the remaining time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress some 12 years and I do not recall at any time such highhanded action on the part of a committee as that demonstrated this morning in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service when the Morrison amendment was offered and adopted.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] offered an amendment that makes drastic changes in the pending pay bill. Do not labor under the illusion that the amendment will provide the same bill to which you affixed your signatures on the discharge petition, even with the percentage figure changed from 9 to 7½ percent, because this is not the case. But let the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], who railroaded what amounts to a new bill through the committee, explain the details if he can.

He offered his amendment and then immediately moved the previous question. There was no copy of his bill in my possession in the committee room and it was not until 12:30 that copies were made available on the House floor. This is the first opportunity I have had to read the amendment. There was no explanation whatsoever in the committee until after the vote had been taken which adopted the amendment. Then out of the goodness of the hearts of the majority, members were permitted to ask a few questions.

I reiterate that I have never witnessed more highhanded action on the part of a committee, especially in dealing with a $700 million bill, and if I am reelected to the next Congress and go back on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service next year I will remember the treatment accorded to some of us today. This method of operation in a committee of Congress is wrong and it is intolerable. It is injurious to the public welfare and does violence to orderly and sane procedure.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was the action taken today acceptable to the lobby that put across the signing of the discharge petition?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have heard no complaint from the lobby so far.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it acceptable to them now?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not ask them. They are not so far away, if the gentleman wants to make inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is one of the biggest pieces of legislative manipulation I have seen in a long while. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held rather long hearings on a proposal whereby certain employees, the greater segment of them in the postal service, if that bill were passed would get about 23 percent. The others would have received from 16 to 15, to 14, down to 10 percent.

The committee held these hearings for quite a while, for several weeks. As a matter of fact, finally, when they closed the doors and considered the matter in executive session, the committee all at once decided by a majority vote to strike out the whole bill and just say in substance "give every employee in the Government a 9-percent increase in salary except for a $350 minimum for postal and classified workers." That means everybody. It means the folks who work in your office who work on Capitol Hill. If you can find me a Government employee who is not included in the bill, let me know because the chairman himself when I asked him whether certain groups were in the bill, said that he was not sure and he said, "If they are not in, we will put them in." They took care of that. So, as I said a moment ago, there is a 9-percent increase for everybody. Just last Monday, the day before yesterday, I was informed of a meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to consider an amendment to the bill because, as you know, this bill does not come in in the regular way. It comes to the floor of the House by a petition which, of course, Members have a right to do and 219 of them signed that petition and said that they wanted this bill considered. So last Monday a meeting was called, or ordered by our chairman to consider, and of course not in writing, a proposed increase to employees of 9 percent or to reduce the 9 percent to 7½ percent. So just a while ago, at 11 o'clock, they came up with the committee print on H.R. 9883 to be offered as a substitute. So this morning the substitute was approved by the committee. I have not had time to read it all. I read a part of it. I tried to get the chairman to read it to us, but there was not the time. So we got around to it and looked the thing over. It may be agreeable to all of you—I do not know. But, the committee changed the 9 percent to 7½ percent and leaving the bulk of postal employees at a little over 8 percent. Then they put in a few extra pieces of legislation. We put in about four or five new employees in the service in the higher grades. When you get through with this bill, you are going to spend something over $700 million. You are going to get to vote on it up or down, and that is all. If you want it—take it. You cannot amend it at all under the rule.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the committee action this morning do more than change the 9 percent to 7½ percent?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes; I think, perhaps, the author of the bill can explain that.

Mr. ARENDS. Certainly, we are entitled to know and we should know what is in the committee amendment. I hope the gentleman who is offering the committee amendment, although he has over the past weeks changed his position many times, will tell us what is in the committee amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Speaking of changing positions, I can also tell you we did not get to vote on the first bill introduced at all when the committee first met in executive session. We did not even discuss the contents of the original bill. The thing was all stricken out except the enacting clause and we wrote a new measure providing for 9 percent across the board.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if it is not true that the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois expresses a desire and a right of the House of Representatives, which was denied to the members of the committee this morning, namely, the right to know what was in the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We tried to find that out and it was voted down. We did not get to find out what was in the bill except in a general way. There are a good many changes, and I hope when the time comes the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman, will fully explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, since some remarks at the outset today were directed at me, I wish to state that this legislation was very carefully considered by our full committee for over 6 weeks. We took all due and deliberate time to work out just about every detail that any Member wanted to bring up concerning this bill. We finally reported out a bill providing increases of approximately 9 percent across the board with a $350 annual minimum for postal and classified employees. That the bill as reported out was the one subject to the discharge petition. The committee voted by a yea-and-nay vote, and I believe that vote was 17 to 5 when it was voted out of our committee. The discharge petition carried 219 signatures.

A committee meeting was scheduled for today at 11 o'clock. I suggested to the chairman that perhaps it would be better to meet at 10, for I wanted to discuss my amendment fully. I gave the chairman of our committee a copy of my amendment last night, approximately an hour after I had completed it. In the 2 hours of general debate that will be allowed for the consideration of this bill we will discuss it very thoroughly.

At the committee meeting this morning time left, after discussing parliamentary procedure, was too short to allow an adequate discussion of the details of my amendment.

In effect this is what the amendment does, and I will be glad to explain it fully to the membership when we go into debate on it. The amendment that was offered in effect changes the amount of the general increases from 9 percent across the board to approximately 7½ percent across the board with $5 a year added for each step of the first six postal field service salary levels.

This bill was voted out by a yea-and-nay vote by our committee this morning. My amendment for 7½ percent was voted by a clear-cut majority of 17 to 4, and the committee worked its will. I am sorry the committee did not have more time to allow me to explain it in detail. Frankly, I think this 7½ percent, taking everything into consideration, is a good, fair, and moderate pay raise that is certainly justified. That the majority of the membership of the House feels that way is evidenced by the fact that 219 Members affixed their names to the discharge petition. They want this bill to come to the floor for debate and to be voted on. I can assure the membership that the full membership of the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service did vote on this. They voted on several other motions and they tabled several other amendments. During the whole time I have been here, and, as far as I can ascertain from the beginning of the proceedings of the House, the same rule of the will of the majority has prevailed. The overwhelming majority of our committee voted that they want this amendment for a 7½-percent, across-the-board increase.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mrs. BLITCH. The gentleman has explained what the lowest salaried employee would obtain under this bill; will he please tell us what the highest salaried employee will obtain under this bill?

Mr. MORRISON. It will be a 7½-percent, across-the-board increase with a maximum of $18,500 for the top classified salary.

Mrs. BLITCH. Has the gentleman figured out the number? I cannot make mathematical calculations that quickly.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know the number of supergrades we have in the Government, but I will be glad to get it for the gentlewoman. This amendment, in essence, is a straight 7.5 percent across-the-board increase, offered as a substitute for the 9 percent pay raise bill which is the subject of the discharge petition.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is in this new bill which is to be offered as a committee amendment, but I am going to talk on the bill that was on the discharge petition and which was the only thing before us up until this hour.

Mr. Speaker, if for no other reason—and there are many—this bill should be

recommitted to the committee for the elimination of that portion which applies to legislative employees.

If there is any group of employees either in or out of Government who are on the whole adequately compensated, it is the employees of Congress, and if there is any place—and again there are many—where there should be selectivity rather than an across-the-board increase, it is among the employees who serve Congress.

I think most Members of Congress are aware, and certainly all of us should be aware of the complicated formula under which the salaries of most of our employees are computed, and this in itself subjects Congress to criticism, if not ridicule. The very idea of starting with a base salary which has been increased by various and sundry devices not less than eight different times, employing flat increases, percentage increases, all predicated upon the gross rather than the base salary, lends itself to a charge of finagling, and there is every basis for the criticism that Congress is trying to confuse, if not mislead, the public in the operation of the legislative branch of the Government. Any further percentage increase would only tend to increase the inequities which now exist.

The very fact that literally hundreds of employees are kept on the payroll, some at substantial salaries, while Congress is not in session and while there are no duties to be performed by many of these employees, is to me a convincing argument that these employees are in an entirely different status from other Government employees.

In the case of employees in congressional offices, as all of you are aware, the pay cannot only be adjusted up or down by the Member, but the employment can even be terminated without notice. The fact that the total amount which can be spent for secretarial and clerical hire in the office of each Member is predicated on the so-called base salaries, is, to say the least, most misleading, and I doubt if there is a Member on this floor today who can tell you both the base and gross salary being paid to the employees in his own office, without referring to the Rube Goldberg formula under which these salaries are computed.

I realize there are many Members who assume the attitude that it is no one's business how we operate the business of Congress, but I would remind you that it is the same taxpayers' dollars that we spend here that we appropriate for other branches of our Government. Economy, efficiency, and, above all, fiscal responsibility should begin here—right here in this House today. Oh, I know someone will attempt to justify his action by what the other body does, and I hear the old song that the public does not get to see the records in the other body. We are responsible for what happens here in the House of Representatives, and it is time that we begin to meet this responsibility.

It will be interesting to hear how some Members will attempt to justify their vote on a bill which will add thousands of dollars to the cost of operating the House of Representatives, when instead we should be taking steps to reduce the expenses which could be done at a savings at not less than $5 million a year right here in this body, without affecting the efficiency one iota, and I might add without disrupting any of the practices of an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body.

Many Members have told me that they were not aware that this bill applied to legislative employees. I would say to them that before you vote for this bill you had better find out what all it does include. Other Members have told me that they felt confident that the bill would be vetoed. To me, that is all the more reason why this bill should be recommitted. If we are honest in our desire to provide pay increases where they are justified, let the committee bring out a realistic bill which can be supported enthusiastically and which the President will have no reason to veto. I, too, believe this bill will be vetoed, and I believe the veto would justifiably be sustained, and that is just another reason why I will not vote for it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I must disagree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] and others who are not inclined to favor this increase in salary. I think the majority of this House believes that this increase is justified.

I might also say to the gentleman from Missouri that it is entirely within his discretion what salary he gives his employees. If his employees are not worth the salary they are getting, certainly he should pay them commensurate with the work they do.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That does not apply to employees of committees or other employees of the House.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The chairmen of committees can set the salary of committee employees. I say that the people who work in Washington, on the Hill, especially, are the lowest paid employees considering what they do. I am not going to kid myself at all. I depend upon my very competent staff, and I do not believe we could accomplish 50 percent of our work if it were not for the faithful employees we have.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman that we do have many faithful employees; but I have two employees in my office who will do more work than five employees in many other offices.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Would the gentleman care to name one?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Name one what?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. One other office where five employees would not do as much as your two.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not going to call names. I am not trying to tell what other people do. I know you have certain opportunities. I have the opportunity to pay the employees what I think they are worth, and I do it, and I am not ashamed of the salaries they are paid.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I may say in closing that I have been in the public service for 26 years. I have known what it is to live on wages that are much lower than the industrial wages paid during times of inflation. I know that these people suffer great hardships and they could get better jobs on many occasions, but they have seen fit to stay with the Government because they are loyal employees who recognize their responsibilities and discharge them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can pass this resolution immediately.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 537.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker shall recognize Representative James H. Morrison, or Representative John R. Foley, or Representative Joel T. Broyhill, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours to be equally divided and controlled by the Member of the House requesting the rule for consideration of said H.R. 9883, and a Member who is opposed to said bill to be designated by the Speaker; the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except those offered by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Amendments offered by direction of Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may be offered to any part of the bill but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. This special order shall be a continuing order until the bill is finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9883, with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, in many respects the circumstances under which this legislation is being considered by the House are familiar to most of the Members. As remarked by a Member several years ago, the situation is somewhat like an old movie shown on television. You watch it thinking you have never seen it, but nevertheless you have a strong feeling it has all happened before.

And so it is with this bill, except for one important difference. In my memory, there has never been such uniform and overwhelming support among the Members for salary increases for postal and other Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, the only question, as I see it, is as to the amount of the increase. As I was explaining to the membership before the adoption of the rule, our committee reported out a bill after 6 weeks of hearings during which either side that wanted to could be heard. We came out with a bill and reported it to the House which called for a 9-percent pay increase straight across the board with a $350 minimum for the postal field service, rural carriers, and classified workers. That bill as reported to the House was amended today by a committee amendment which will be offered at the proper time. This committee amendment is very simple. In general, it does not do anything to the original bill that was reported out except to change the amount from 9 percent to 7½ percent. It covers all the people who were covered in the original bill as reported by our committee—the bill which was subject to the discharge petition. The change, as I said, is that it cuts the 9 percent straight across the board increase to 7½ percent straight across the board. In some instances, in the postal field service for the first 6 pay levels it gives $5 a year extra for each of the automatic salary steps.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Was any change made in the minimum amount of the pay raise?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; the minimum of $350 was taken out completely. There is no minimum of $350 in the amendment that is to be submitted to the Committee of the Whole at the proper time.

Mr. GARY. Does the bill in addition make permanent the 2½ percent increase we granted last year which will expire on July 1 unless it is made permanent?

Mr. MORRISON. It makes that 2½ percent increase permanent.

Mr. GARY. And the 7½ percent is in addition to the 2½ percent which is made permanent?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; that is right.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman referred to some increases in the lower brackets. Was that action designed to take the place of the minimum?

Mr. MORRISON. It does not nearly come up to the $350 minimum. But in effect it does give the very low-salaried employees a little better than 7½ percent. But I believe in each case it is well below 9 percent, and the slight extra allowance is only for those in the lower grades.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for the information.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment which was adopted this morning provides for a 5-cent postage stamp.

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. CHELF. Do any of the other amendments that were adopted provide for an increase in the postal rate?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. The 7½ percent is not what the committee voted out at first. Now, to show the interest of the Members of this House in this matter, more than 80 Members introduced pay raise legislation that was considered by our committee. I want the membership to know that every viewpoint on both sides of the aisle, and of all concerned, was considered by the committee. Everybody had his day in court, so to speak, and was permitted to testify before the committee.

I know of no instance, in the nearly 18 years that I have been here, when anybody made a more constructive or substantial or more forceful argument for a pay raise for Federal workers than was made, in our hearings, when comparisons were submitted between Government pay and pay for similar work in private enterprise. In every one of those cases that was cited before our committee it was shown that workers in private industry doing comparable work receive higher salaries than postal and other workers in the Federal Government.

I can further say that the testimony that was brought out showed one example of a newspaper advertisement for people to apply as janitors. Actually they were offering to pay janitors in the larger cities far more money, as starting salaries, than the postal carriers and clerks get who have been working months and years for the Post Office Department.

I can further state in support of this wage increase that the whole weight of testimony that was in favor of it more or less dwelt on the fact that here we are, in this great Nation of ours, not paying our Government workers the fair and just salaries that workers get in similar employment in private enterprise.

I think the committee studied this amendment well. It was adopted by a tremendous majority. I think 17 to 4, which was today's vote, will certainly show that by far the vast majority of the committee that went into detail on this thought that a very excellent case had been made for the proposed salary increase.

All of us know that the time is getting short. We all know we have to be practical about this. Frankly, I felt that whereas I was personally in favor of the 9 percent, and I still think it was highly justified, this compromise of 7½ percent will be far more acceptable to some of the Members of the House. I am sure the same situation prevails over in the Senate. And so, I felt that by bringing out this amendment today, which will be considered at the proper time, the 7½ percent is certainly the proper thing to do under the circumstances—if we are going to be realistic and practical about this legislation and give the House and the Senate a chance to vote on it and give the President a chance to act on it one way or another.

There were many who said the President would veto any pay-raise bill this year. I do not know what the President is going to do, and I do not think anyone else knows what the President is going to do. But I think when you have this bill as it will be amended today, coming within the time we have before adjournment, it will have an opportunity to go to the White House. If it is signed, that ends it. If it is vetoed, we will have a chance to override that veto.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. I congratulate the committee on coming up with this successful compromise. The question is really the amount of the pay raise, not whether there should be one, because if we are going to have the postal and other Government workers move along with private industry we must give some sort of a pay raise at this time. Is that correct?

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true most of the wives of the postal workers have to go to work to help support their families?

Mr. MORRISON. The witnesses who testified before us showed us example after example where both the husband and the wife were working. The husband was working for the postal service and the wife had to have another job in order to make ends meet, so to speak.

Mr. HOLLAND. The postal workers had to work at night to supplement their salaries to keep their families.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Quite frankly, in my opinion, increases considerably higher than those in the committee amendment are justified. My original bill so provided. But we all realize, particularly those of us who have served many years in the Congress, that the views of others deserve full consideration. All major legislation more or less represents a compromise as between different convictions, in the highest tradition of our democratic process.

Many of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have put aside their individual preferences in a true spirit of compromise to

bring to the House floor a bill to provide a moderate and fair pay raise which should generally be acceptable.

After careful and diligent study of all evidence developed in the hearings and in full consideration of the many different opinions, the committee decided that the amendment to be proposed represents a solution to which we could all agree. It is a real tribute to the tireless and conscientious work of every committee member that there is such overwhelming committee support for this amendment.

The committee amendment which I will have the honor to offer, which I will place before the House at the proper time, grants a 7.5 percent salary increase, in lieu of 9 percent provided by the reported bill, to all of the groups covered by the reported bill, with the provision, as I stated before, for slightly over 7.5 percent to those in the lower postal levels.

I would also like to call to the attention of the House the cost of this bill compared to what they said my original bill would cost, that is, $1,600 million. There was a great deal to do about that in our hearings. As I say, the bill that will be before the House for eventual passage after this amendment is presented, and if the committee amendment is adopted, will call for 7 5 percent overall increases and that will cost between approximately $680 million and $700 million. This is the best figure I have been able to obtain from the committee counsel—that is, between $680 million and $700 million.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Would the gentleman be willing to support a tax measure or an increase in the postal rates to take care of this increase in expenditures by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORRISON. I am the type of person who crosses a bridge when he comes to it. That question is not before the House today. That is still before the committee. Frankly, I think my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida, will agree that we should certainly know what propositions are brought before our committee before we finally act on a bill. I assure him I will try to do justice to myself and to my people, in trying to represent them, and that I will vote according to their wishes. How I will vote I do not know until I have something to vote on.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman realizes, of course, that this will bring us further into deficit financing. Do you not think that somewhere along the line this Congress, and do you not think that you as chief sponsor of this bill, has some responsibility to bring a bill here to pay for it?

Mr. MORRISON. I appreciate the gentleman calling me the chief sponsor, but I have over 79 other gentlemen who are with me on it, and I am not all alone in bringing this legislation before this session of Congress. But as I say, frankly that is not before the House now. I think at the proper time the House will take up that bill. The committee is just about to wind up action on it. What the committee does and what the House does is a matter on which the gentleman's guess is as good as mine.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I do not want to be unfair to my very able and distinguished friend, but do I understand from what the gentleman is saying that it means the gentleman will in committee support a postal rate increase of some kind?

Mr. MORRISON. I did not say what I would do, and I do not believe I will ever say what I will do before I see the bill that is presented to the committee and before all the amendments come up. Frankly I do not commit myself to my own constituents nor can I commit myself to the gentleman or to any other Member of the House as to what I will do on any proposal, before I have it before me.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. GRAY. If suggestions are in order, I suggest to the gentleman that the cost of this bill be taken out of the $4 billion surplus that the President is telling the people of the country we are going to have. Why do we need to raise the postal rates?

Mr. MORRISON. We are not taking up postal rates today; they are not germane and cannot be taken up today. So if the membership will allow me, I would like to explain further the bill and the amendment adopted by the committee this morning.

This increase will affect some 535,000 postal Federal service employees, 980,000 employees under the Classification Act, 8,100 Foreign Service employees, 19,300 employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and 15,000 Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee employees; 5,000 employees in the judicial branch; and 7,500 in the legislative branch.

The amendment contains provisions of the reported bill extending to these employees that I have just enumerated a very moderate pay increase.

I would like to cite some of the effects of this bill as far as the hourly wage is concerned. The average salary of our letter carriers is $2.23 an hour, or $370 a month. The committee amendment will increase this by about 17 cents an hour, or $28 a month. But this is the gross salary increase. This is not the take-home pay, it is not the amount included in his pay check. As I said, it is not take-home pay.

The average letter carrier is one of the finest family men in America. The family, of course, is the basis of our economy and our economic and our social system. The average letter carrier's family consists of husband, wife, and three children, a family of five. From the gross monthly salary of $370, before the employee receives anything, there is $26.64 deducted to pay his fringe benefits, and $17.17 for Federal and State income taxes. This reduces his monthly take-home pay to $326 a month, or $1.96 an hour.

Under the committee amendment his gross monthly salary would be $398. Deductions would be $28.64 to pay for his fringe benefits and $21.89 to pay for the Federal and State income taxes, leaving a net monthly take-home pay of $347.22, or $2.09 an hour. Now, this is after this 7½-percent increase is put into effect. In other words, carried down to the fundamental question of take-home pay, the committee amendment would grant an increase of 13 cents an hour in the average take-home pay of a postal letter carrier. This is the additional amount the letter carrier will have with which to buy meat, groceries, and milk, and to buy clothing for his family, to make payments on his mortgages, or whatever he has to do with it.

Certainly it is only fair to grant this moderate salary increase in recognition of the conscientious and efficient public service rendered by our postal employees.

A moment ago I told you about an advertisement that was in a paper. I would like to be specific and quote from this want ad. It appeared in a paper at Detroit, Mich., where many employees in the postal field service work and live. It reads:

> Wanted: Janitor for city hall. Examples of work: Sweep, mop, scrub, and polish floors; clean and maintain lavatories, replace light bulbs. Starting salary, $4,450; $5,050 after 2 years.

Frankly, I feel that no more need be said to demonstrate that the salary adjustments proposed by the committee amendment are extremely moderate and should be approved and granted to these Federal employees.

Some reference has been made, during our pay deliberations, to fringe benefits for Federal employees—usually by way of implying that they are so liberal that they can take the place of salary. This is a myth. I am proud of the fringe benefits we have been able to gain for Federal employees and am sure that they and their families deeply appreciate these benefits. But they are not to be confused with hard cash in the pay envelope. They are not considered negotiable by shopkeepers or bill collectors or mortgagees. It is much easier to get along with these people when we should show them the color of our money.

Nor are Federal employees' fringe benefits by any means so liberal that they can replace justified pay raises. If anything, they lag further behind similar benefits in private enterprise than is the case with Federal employees' salaries. The Cordiner committee disclosed in 1957 that Federal employees personally contribute more than their fellow workers do in private enterprise for fringe benefits. According to the report, employees of 356 firms covered by one study paid an average of 4.5 percent, and employees of 1,000 firms covered by another study paid only 3.5 percent, of their

salaries for fringe benefits. Federal employees pay 7.2 percent.

Another factor largely overlooked, or given too little weight in the administrative consideration of salary legislation, is the record of productivity by postal and other Federal employees. When postal rate increases or appropriations are being sought, the proponents quite often argue brilliantly and forcefully of improved service and efficiency to justify the rate increases or appropriations. The history is told in glowing terms of a 15 or 17 percent increase in mail volume in recent years, with little or no increase in such man-years of work as are within management control.

In truth and in fact, we all know that this fine record of efficiency is attributable to the performance of more and more work by the 535,000 postal employees. Yet opponents of salary legislation give it no weight at all as justifying pay raises for the very employees who have done the work. The employees are commended indirectly and by words—not by supporting reasonable pay raises in recognition of their efficiency. This failure to give full credit where credit is due in my judgment can become one of the most damaging blind spots in employee-management relationships and in the administrative consideration of salary problems. It tends to create a climate closing off the best avenues of communication and exchange of views between employer and employee—except as a one-way street for the views of the employer.

I strongly urge the Members to vote for the committee amendment providing this 7½ percent pay raise for postal and other Federal employees.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his very able presentation today. I am glad that we are going to have an opportunity to vote for a pay raise for Federal employees. I was one of those who introduced a pay raise bill and I was very happy to sign the petition to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the subject. Personally, I feel as does the gentleman, there should be a 9-percent increase. I would like to ask this question: Does not the gentleman agree with me that regardless of what the rates may be for postage the people who are working in the Postal Department should have adequate compensation for the work performed, and that the people working for the Government in other Departments should have adequate compensation for the work performed comparable with what can be obtained in industry?

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. MERROW. We are living in an age of constant peril, and every realistic appraisal of the future indicates that this condition will continue for a long time. At the same time, almost every aspect of society and government is growing more complex and is demanding a progressively higher degree of expertness. Under these circumstances, the Government must do everything possible to assure itself of the services of the most competent people.

The questions of employee morale and, even more, of the recruitment and retention of intelligent, imaginative, and experienced employees have long constituted a major problem for the Federal Government. To fail now to adopt this well-merited pay raise will needlessly and unjustifiably intensify this problem.

The pay schedule for the Federal service continues to lag, not only behind the costs of living, but also behind the salary levels being paid in private enterprise. Since the last Government pay raise in 1958, wages in private industry have risen considerably. At the same time, studies in productivity have shown that the increase in work output among Federal employees compares very favorably with that of private industry.

Congress, therefore, has a special moral and legal obligation to investigate the needs of Federal employees and to act promptly to rectify any inequities that may exist. These investigations have now been completed. Both Houses of Congress have held hearings on the question of Federal compensation, and both of these hearings have demonstrated conclusively that a pay raise at this time is both deserved and urgently needed.

The time has now come for action. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to these Federal employees that we can neither ignore nor delegate to anyone else.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I want to pay my respects to the gentleman and congratulate him upon the introduction of this bill and for the fine exposition he has made of the subject. Moonlighting among Government employees is something that must be avoided. A man's loyalty should be to his first job, not to his secondary position. Moonlighting is too prevalent at this time, and by "moonlighting" I mean that a Federal employee must secure a second job in order to be able to have an adequate income.

While I am on my feet, I would like to pay my respects to your colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON], who placed this petition on the desk. Whenever the chips are down and the Federal workers need assistance, it seems they go to Louisiana, to you or to Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is a great compliment to the gentleman from Louisiana that he was able to get 219 Members of this House to sign that petition. It indicates the respect in which we hold him and the high position he has earned in the House. During the 8 years Mr. THOMPSON was able to work with people and coordinate efforts. I serve on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with him and I know the great things he has done for your State of Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] for his very able and intelligent statement made on a very, very important bill.

Mr. Chairman, many post office employees have complained to me, claiming that their postal pay increase bill is being kicked around for personal or partisan or selfish advantage as the countdown toward adjournment begins. They are cynical and bitter for they believe that Congress is only going through the motions.

Much as they resent it, they know where they stand with the President who is flatly opposed to any pay increase for postal workers, and by extension, for all classified employees of the Federal Government, during 1960. But they are suspicious of the legislative maneuvering in the Congress whereby the impression is conveyed that Congress is seeking to ingratiate itself with over 2 million Federal employees for the record, while privately writing off hopes for a pay increase bill at this session.

"It is not enough," the postal employees insist, "for Congress to vote for a pay increase, and then wash their hands of it. What we want to know is whether Congress means business about this, and whether it is prepared to go all the way and vote to override the Presidential veto, before this session adjourns."

That is the issue. From several disillusioning experiences in the past, they have learned much. This time they will be watching, not only the vote for the bill, but the vote to override the President.

For the Congress cannot have it both ways on this bill which is necessary to relieve the economic handicap under which Federal employees must work. The indifference of Government toward the bread and butter problems of its own employees, is undermining their morale and their efficiency. To overcome this lack of understanding and appreciation, it is urgent that the many friends of Federal employees in the Congress should intensify their efforts to line up the commanding support that is necessary to override the veto.

The good faith of the Congress itself is at stake here, for the Federal employees have no recourse but to appeal to us for help. As they compare their lot with the consistently improving pay standards of private industry, they realize that their own position is steadily deteriorating.

We have seen how the United States has lost prestige and power in its relations with the rest of the world through the misleading emphasis on economy, to the detriment of public progress, in recent years. This pennywise conservatism, desperately hugging the status quo, has deprived our Nation of the means necessary to maintain its leadership. At home, this sterile fixation on budget balancing has cramped the progress of Federal employees.

If it were possible for them to transfer their civil service retirement system

credits to coverage under private employment, many would immediately avail themselves of the better opportunities available elsewhere.

As it is, Federal workers are dissatisfied, and rightly so. When they are not paid what they deserve, their job performance is bound to suffer.

To prevent further deterioration we must open the way for an improvement in the wage standards of Federal employees by passing the postal pay raise bill—with votes to spare on this round—and ready to beat the veto.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] on his statement on behalf of his measure providing salary adjustments for certain Federal workers.

As one of those who has supported this legislation all along, has introduced a companion to the original bill, and has signed the discharge petition which brought the bill to the floor, I urge full support for H.R. 9883 on the floor today.

Opponents of the bill say that postal workers have received seven pay raises in the past 15 years, and would have us conclude from this that everything is fine and no new attention to the Federal wage scale is needed. The fact is, however, that seven pay raises in 15 years is in no way out of line, that there has actually been only one pay raise after that granted in 1955 and, most important of all, that the wage of the average post office worker and the average classified employee is still below that of his counterpart in local government or private industry.

In the committee report, on page 5, a comparison of salaries of letter carriers to policemen and firemen in various large cities shows that the former is lower paid in every case. As I testified before the committee, the problem is particularly acute in the city of Oakland, Calif., a major portion of which I represent. In Oakland the automatic salary range for police and firemen ranges from $6,396 to $6,828 and this indicates so very clearly that in Oakland the letter carrier's range of $4,035 to $4,875 leaves him in a more inequitable position even than elsewhere.

The need for the salary increases provided in H.R. 9883 is clear. They are justified. I urge full support for the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, the other evening I visited a shoestore with my daughters. While the clerk was trying on the shoes, he asked me if anything was being done for his raise. I replied: "What raise?" He said, "The postal workers." I then learned from him after he leaves the post office he is forced to work from 5 until 9 at night in a shoestore to supplement his income so that he can furnish the necessities of life for his family of five children.

I was quite alarmed to find this was true in many, many cases, and having an office in the Federal building in Pittsburgh, I checked with other workers and learned of their plight in trying to raise an American family. I found postal workers employed in filling stations at night, in garages doing odd jobs, yes—and tending bar in clubs.

Some of these workers spend 16 hours away from their family doing extra work so that they can receive sufficient money to clothe, feed, and house their families.

In many cases, I found that their wives were forced to work as clerks in stores, offices, factories, and restaurants to supplement their husbands' wages.

This is a pitiful case in America where a man is penalized for being a Government worker and denied the pleasure of an enjoyable evening at home with his family like other American families do, who work for private enterprise.

This is a disgraceful condition, and we the Congress of the United States permit it to exist. We who pose before the world as a benevolent government do not show it to our own employees. In this session I have heard about billions of dollars which must be appropriated for peoples of other lands, and to raise their standard of living. I have always supported aid to raise the standard of living in other countries, but I am convinced now that it is time to think of our own, and at least give to our employees the right to enjoy American homelife.

This bill will cost the Government considerably less than what they have appropriated to the peoples of any one country in the world. To hear objections from the administration that a 7½ percent raise is too much for their own employees is an insult to the conscientious and dedicated postal workers of our own country.

The administration has forgotten its own employees too long.

This big business administration seems to be only interested in seeing that the big corporations make higher profits and the banker gets higher interest on the money loaned to the Government's underpaid workers. For the President of the United States to threaten he will veto any raise given to the Government workers is an insult to those who are devoted to Government. In fact, it is the Government workers who are responsible for the efficiency of our Government. You will not find them on the golf course when they have a job to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this bill has been cut to 7½ percent from 9 percent, for I believe that every man and woman working for the Government deserves and earned the 9 percent increase. Let the Members of Congress at least recognize their plight, pay them a decent wage so that the family life so long denied them can be enjoyed in the American way.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman, not only support this bill on this vote, but I promise the Government workers of America if it is vetoed by the President I shall vote to override it.

Mr BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, as one of the early signers of discharge petition No. 6, I respectfully urge all the Members here on the floor today to vote for the passage of H.R. 9883, the Federal employees pay increase bill, because these men and women not only deserve this recognition, but are in need of larger paychecks to properly support their families. I feel confident we have the votes to overwhelmingly pass this bill and I am hoping the President will not veto it.

Inasmuch as the Congress plans to adjourn early in July, I further respectfully request that additional bills be scheduled for debate that will improve the economic standards of our American families.

An excellent start in this direction would be the passage of my bill, H.R. 5868, to increase the present hourly minimum wage from $1 to $1.50. At today's prices, which continue to rise, I cannot conceivably understand or know how a man with a wife and two or three children can properly shelter, clothe, and feed them on a weekly salary of $40 or $50. We all know food costs are high and rents in our metropolitan area of Philadelphia are exorbitant for desirable living accommodations.

While it is true you can rent substandard homes and apartments in the $50 to $75 price range, the fact remains that the location is usually very undesirable for the raising of a family. What is needed at this time is legislation to provide additional low-cost housing units in Philadelphia and other cities at nominal rentals in well planned communities for those people who have limited budgets and cannot afford to pay high rents. I, therefore, urge you gentlemen to accept the housing bills presented by my committee, which will destroy blighted areas and create communities of comfortable houses and apartments for our middle- and low-income families with adequate school facilities for their children.

Mr. Chairman, millions of children throughout the country today are receiving an inadequate education simply because there are not enough classrooms available for them. In many of our cities and towns these very same children are attending school in split shifts. In these days of the cold war, when we are fighting for our very survival, the education of our children is one of our greatest assets. They will become our leaders of tomorrow and, therefore, we cannot permit them to continue to be crowded into poorly equipped schools.

Another major item in my program for the American family is the need for legislation to provide medical and hospital care for our elderly citizens who, because of restricted pension checks and limited assets, are unable to cope with emergency illnesses. There are several proposals pending before us to give help

to these very deserving citizens and I urge all here today to back my plea for their immediate passage.

I sincerely and honestly believe my program for the betterment of our American way of life is sound in every detail. It is not an expensive giveaway proposal and will benefit every American citizen.

As representatives of these citizens, I am requesting your support of this program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that my opposition to this measure is futile, since the majority of the Members of the House have already signed the discharge petition on this pay legislation. I am opposed to the measure. I think it is not justified and should not be approved. But, of course, it is going to be approved by the House.

Mr. Chairman, let me say something about the conduct of certain lobbyists on this piece of legislation. This morning when I went to the committee room of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I had difficulty getting to the room because of the great swarm of lobbyists outside in the hall. There must have been 75 of them. I had to pry my way through to get into my own committee room. And I have never seen such tactics employed as these lobbyists have been using during this fight for the pay bill. I think it is high time for the Members of the Congress to stand up and let these lobbyists know that they are not to be controlled by them, not to be dictated to by them. If we do not, it will be a sorry picture regarding any future pay legislation.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we have a national debt of over $285 billion. We pay $9.5 billion in interest each year.

Our Federal payroll is over $13 billion a year, over $1 billion a month.

In the last 15 years the salaries of Federal employees have been increased a total of 83.6 percent. There have been 8 pay raises in the last 15 years, for Federal employees. Besides, there is no group of employees in private industry that receives the fringe benefits that Federal employees are getting today. These fringe benefits amount in compensation to about 30 percent of their salaries. They have such liberal fringe benefits as life insurance, health insurance, retirement, hospitalization, and medical expenses. This Government has certainly been fair and liberal to our employees.

Mr. Chairman, we have a $285 billion debt, on which we pay interest each year of $9.5 billion. It is high time we stopped these reckless expenditures. I say that it is not in keeping with a sense of fiscal responsibility to increase the salaries of these employees today.

I am sorry to see the influence that these postal lobbyists exercise upon certain Members of Congress and particularly upon certain members of my committee. I regret it. I think that unless Congress stands up and lets them know that we will exercise our own judgment, this condition will get worse instead of better. I am sick and tired of the tactics of these lobbyists. I, for one, have never been controlled by them and do not propose to be controlled by them.

There is little I can say further, because I know this bill is going to pass. I think we are making a mistake. I do not think it should pass. But I do not care to argue the matter any longer. I am strongly opposed to the bill, but I am sure that will not have any effect.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is a realist. I certainly am a realist on this occasion. I have no illusions about what is going to happen to this bill. It will be passed by the House of Representatives today. But I want to tell you that in my opinion, as it is now written and as it will have to be voted upon under this gag rule that was petitioned out, it is not going to become law.

Having said that, I would like to point out that through the years I have been here I have supported pay increases for Federal employees both in the classified and in the postal service. So far as the postal service is concerned I have been concerned about the deficit in the Post Office Department. In the Republican 80th Congress, in which I was privileged to be the majority leader, we gave the employees the greatest single annual increase in pay they had ever had.

But with that pay increase we had a rate increase designed to keep the Post Office Department out of the red as far as we could. What happened in the 80th Congress, as far as pay increases are concerned, has been happening in the Congresses since that time. Increases have been voted from time to time. In 1958 we had a rate increase. In addition, as the gentleman from Tennessee has so well said, fringe benefits have been voted that I understand would amount to about an 18 percent pay increase.

I realize, of course, that everyone would like to have more pay, anyone who works for a living, but when those of us who have the responsibility to fix that rate of pay get ready to do something, everybody would like to be openhanded, but we have a responsibility otherwise. One Member on the other side of the aisle in the interruption of another speaker said:

> Take the pay increase out of the proposed surplus.

That is one philosophy of government. But I say to you that we should not go overboard because we have a little surplus that might be applied on the national debt to keep the credit of this country good and to keep us strong here at home.

This bill will add $700 million a year additional to the cost of our Government. It really has been a strange development, with 20-percent bills introduced, and a 9-percent bill petitioned out under a gag rule with no opportunity to correct things in this bill that I think are glaringly wrong. We are foreclosed from that opportunity.

Referring to the Post Office Department, there is presently a deficit of about $600 million a year. This bill in the Department alone will add an estimated $225 million a year. The author of the bill was asked about the rate increase that has been pending before the committee for a long time and he was reluctant to say what his position on that would be. That is understandable. But the fact is that a proposal for rate increases has been pending before that committee, given to the committee by the President of the United States, for months and months and months, and I have not seen any activity in respect to it and I do not suppose there is going to be any. In other words, the committee has ignored that recommendation, so we will add $225 million to an already existing deficit of $600 million.

People talk about the cost of living situation. My understanding is that the cost of living has gone up about 2 percent since we voted the last pay raise. That is not 7.5 percent. Again I want to point out that through the years since certainly about 1953 the cost of living has gone up about 10 percent and the pay increases have averaged out to a total of about 20 percent, and that does not take into account the 18 percent for fringe benefits.

One other point: We appropriated $500,000, as I understand it, to appoint a commission and to enable that commission to make a study of this whole Federal employee situation and to report back to us. It does seem to me that more attention might have been given to the matter of waiting for a report from that commission.

I said when I started that I did not think this measure would become law. I do not need to tell you that it is not in accord with the President's program. As the gentleman from Tennessee pointed out, the administration witnesses before the committee take the position that the circumstances at the time did not justify a pay increase. So I say to you on my individual responsibility, because the President has never committed himself as to what he would do, I have no question in my mind as to what his action will be on this measure if and when it reaches the White House.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to say I respect very highly the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. We have served together in the House for 18 years. There have been many times we have not agreed upon issues, but I want to say in the handling of the committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has always, in my opinion, handled it according to the rules of the House and the rules of the committee. When presented with a parliamentary situation, he has had the honesty, the character, and the integrity to make his rulings in accordance with the House rules or the committee rules, and if they were questioned and appealed, he would abide with the decision of the majority of the committee. The committee was called together this morning at 11 o'clock. Our normal time of meeting is 10 o'clock. The 1 hour that

was given to us was, therefore, from 11 o'clock to 12 o'clock, at which time we had to rise under the rules of the House; the rules do not allow the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to sit while the House is in session, therefore the majority of the committee found it necessary to avail themselves of the rules of the House in order to bring before the House for its consideration the legislation which you have before you. When they did avail themselves of the rules of the House, I must say the chairman responded to those rules and upheld them as he does in most instances, at least in all instances for which I have knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some talk in the well of the House about the lobbyists in the hall outside the committee room. It has been my experience in the Congress that a lobbyist is a person who opposes something you are for, but if he is for something that you are for he becomes either a public relations man or a representative of a friendly group. So all of us have the right to label these men who appear in behalf of the different groups as either lobbyists or public relations men. But I want to point out something to you that I know you know, and that is there are over a million employees classified and postal employees, yes, close to 1,500,000 employees, and they are denied the right of collective bargaining. I am not arguing that point at this time. But they do not have the right to bring the force of collective bargaining to bear for increases in their wages. They must depend upon the Congress of the United States when they want a pay raise. They come to you and to you and to you for an adjustment of their wage scale commensurate with that of people in outside industries who have the right of collective bargaining. Therefore, this Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has a peculiar obligation to see that these people are not left wanting, that they do have their day in court. Today is their day in court, before the Congress of the United States. There has been no move other than that permitted under the rules of the House to bring this subject before you for consideration. You have the responsibility to vote it up or vote it down. I have complete confidence that every Member of this House will act on his own responsibility when the roll is called.

Mr. Chairman, let us see about some of the merits of this case. President Eisenhower appointed committees to study this. He has appointed many committees. The Cordiner Committee was one that studied the rates of pay of these people in Federal employ. This was in 1957. Dust has gathered on that study. Then the O'Connell Committee was appointed. Here is what the O'Connell Committee said:

> Salaries fixed by statutes have not been adjusted in a timely and adequate manner in response to general changes in non-Federal salary levels.

There is the guts of the situation.

Federal employees' salaries have not been adjusted commensurate with salaries of non-Federal positions. What do I mean by that? Let us just look at the record.

The average gross monthly salary of a letter carrier is $370—that is gross salary. When you deduct the fringe benefits and tax deductions he gets $1.96 an hour—$1.96 an hour, or $89 a week; he gets $89 a week take home pay.

What is the average weekly earnings in industry? In the transportation business it is $118; in coal production and the petroleum industry, $116; in printing and publishing, $105; in machinery, $105; in chemicals, $100.84; in electrical machinery, $92.84; in stone, clay, and glass products, $91.30.

The average overall industry wage is $15 a week or $780 a year higher than that of Federal employees doing the same type of work.

We are before you on this day asking you to do something about this. You can quote figures about the increase in cost of living since the last time they had an increase in the cost of living, but Congress always lags behind in giving Federal employees their wage increases. When we grant this raise we still will not bring them up to the average wage outside of the Federal Government. We always lag behind, and regardless of whether the cost of living has gone up 2 percent or 3 percent since their last raise, they started with an inequitable wage balance to begin with. When we pass this bill today and if it should become law, it would still be behind pay for the same type of work, the same caliber of work in outside industry.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry, please?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In just a moment. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has said to this House that he has private information that this will not become law. We have reduced the 9 percent in the committee bill to 7½ percent. We have tried to compromise as far as we can possibly go in the discharge of our responsibility. If the President vetoes this bill it is his responsibility, and it is the responsibility of those who vote against overriding his veto when it comes back to this House. I want you to know that I for one am going to discharge my responsibility by voting for this measure; and when the bill comes back, if it does come back vetoed, I am going to accept my responsibility again and vote to override the President's veto. There are 1,500,000 families who need a few paltry dollars more to pay their debts, to buy food and medication and the necessities of life. The President can discharge his responsibility, and I will discharge mine.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman knows about a study and report that was made on the salary of postal and classified employees, but can you tell us what report or what study was given to the legislative employees?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The studies were given to the Federal employees outside of the Congress. The responsibility of the Congress is to make that study. If the gentleman wants such a study made I suggest that he introduce a bill and refer it to the Rules Committee. The House will be glad to consider the matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was just asking if a study had been made.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Not that I know of.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If a study has not been made how can the gentleman determine that a wage increase is needed or desirable for those people?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Living has gone up. If the gentleman does not want to use the increase he can set the wages of his own employees. I may say I am not using all of my allowance for my salaried staff.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Over half of the Members are not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed increase of the salaries of postal and classified employees which is before the House at this time is in my opinion one of the urgent items on our legislative program. It is urgent because any measure which is intended to help men and women to improve their means of livelihood is urgent. It is designed to satisfy human needs and nothing could be of greater material importance.

I am deeply interested in the objectives of the entire bill—H.R. 9883, as it has been amended—I would like to record my support for the benefits it will provide for both postal and classified employees. All are well deserved and I am of the firm belief the bill in its present form should be enacted.

The plight of the postal employees has been ably presented in the hearings and on the floor of this House. An impressive argument can also be advanced for raising the salaries of employees under the Classification Act who are covered by title II of this bill, and I would like to comment on several of the sound arguments which may be advanced in support of an increase of the salaries of classified employees.

The case to be made for this raise is sound. It is in every sense a debt which this Government owes to these employees. The discharge of that debt is overdue and there is no valid reason why it should be further delayed.

This pay raise can be substantiated in many ways. It is not necessary to rely on an emotional appeal or to fall back on fallacious reasoning which misrepresents the real conditions supporting the soundness of this legislation. There is ample factual material available to justify the 9-percent increase provided in this bill, as well as the 7½-percent proposed amendment. I shall in the course of my remarks summarize several of the more meaningful points which can be made in support of this pay raise. Among them are the following:

First. The rate of wage increases has been substantially greater during the last 10 years for employees of large corporations than it has been for Federal classified workers.

Second. The pay for comparable jobs in private industry in many metropolitan

centers is above that of classified employees. Bureau of Labor Statistics data on these areas of heavy concentration of Federal employment are already available. We need not wait for more.

Third. The 9 percent is well supported by the advance in prices and productivity since January 1958, and to a greater degree during the last 10 years.

Fourth. The Federal Government's policy toward its wage board employees is more equitable and realistic.

Fifth. Altogether too great emphasis has been placed on the cost of this pay raise.

Sixth. An annual salary adjustment plan will provide the most desirable solution to this classified salary problem.

Now let us examine these six points in some detail.

First. The rate at which hourly wage rates of employees of some of the largest corporations have been increased during the last decade has been substantially greater than the rate of salary increases for Federal classified employees. To understand the extent to which this has taken place, it must be kept in mind that since 1950 Federal classified salaries were raised 10 percent in 1951, 7½ percent in 1955, and 10 percent in 1958, or a total of 30 percent, if the percentages are compounded. Let me repeat that figure—classified salaries increased 30 percent since 1950. In the last 2 years of that decade, there has been no increase. Now let us see what industry has done.

The hourly rates of employees of General Motors Corp. advanced 62 percent from January 1950 to February 1960. Of this increase 9.5 percent was received since January 1, 1958. During the same 10-year period the United States Steel Corp. raised wages 63 percent and the Aluminum Co. of America, 87 percent. The increase of the Steel Corp. in the last 2 years was 7 percent and of the Aluminum Co. 10 percent—the 2-year period in which the Federal Government has given no increase.

To mention other instances—Firestone and Goodrich Rubber Cos. raised wages 56 percent in 10 years, including 6.8 percent since the beginning of 1958. The increase of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. was nearly 63 percent of which 13.7 percent was in the 2-year period.

These percentages are reliable, for they have been calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Even though they apply to a segment of industry, they have significance because the companies to which they refer represent a total employment of well on to 2 million, the majority of whom were involved in these wage statistics. They were the result of collective bargaining with several of the large unions. These increases in industry include only general increases of pay rates, cost-of-living and similar wage adjustments. They do not include incentive earnings, premium overtime pay, shift differentials or changes in skill level.

Second. Analysis of wage and salary trends in the metropolitan centers plainly indicates that the salaries of Federal classified employees are lagging behind those for comparable jobs in private industry. This disparity in pay is shown by a comparison of the average earnings of three representative office-type positions surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics with the average of the comparable grade in the Federal classification salary schedule. The positions compared were stenographer, key punch operator and tabulating machine operator.

In a number of widely scattered cities in which the current BLS survey program has been completed, the average earnings for these positions exceeded the comparable Federal average. This was true of Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Indianapolis, Jersey City, Newark, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. New York and Chicago have not been completed.

Throughout the hearings in both the House and Senate, emphasis was placed on the need to wait for the completion of the current BLS occupational wage surveys. I do not believe that is necessary. There are ample data now available. The 30 metropolitan areas for which final wage data have already been published have a Federal employee population of approximately 750,000 or close to one-third of all Federal employees. Sufficient data are available from many of the remaining 30 metropolitan areas to be completed by September to provide all the significant information needed. The cities which have been added to those previously surveyed are smaller cities and are not representative for purposes of classified salary analysis. Classified employees are to a great extent office clerical and professional employees who are employed in the larger communities. It is unfair and unsound to base the study of their salaries on labor market areas that are not metropolitan in character.

Third. The proposal to raise classified salaries 9 percent is also well justified by the advance that has taken place in consumer prices and productivity since January 1, 1958. The Consumer Price Index of BLS has advanced 3.2 percent from January 1958 to April 1960. If we assume that the postwar average increase in productivity of 3.1 percent a year from 1947 to 1958 has continued, we have the additional factor of a 6.2 percent productivity increase in the private sector of the economy. Thus our basis for urging the proposed salary increase consists of 3.2 percent for the price rise and 6.2 percent for productivity, or a total claim actually in excess of 9 percent.

If we take into account the fact that prices and productivity advanced more than Federal classified salaries from 1950 to 1958, there is even greater justification for a pay raise. During that period there was a combined increase in prices and productivity of 46 percent, but salaries were raised only 30 percent. There was, so to speak, a deficit of 16 percent. If that deficit is added to the increase of more than 9 percent of prices and productivity since 1958, we have an even greater basis for advocating a salary increase, but our 9-percent figure for the most recent 2-year period is sufficient for present practical purposes.

Fourth. There is another phase of the classified salary problem which deserves attention. It is the inconsistent policy of the Federal Government toward these employees as compared with its attitude toward those who are subject to wage boards. During the last 10 years classified salaries have been adjusted only three times. During that same period there have been annual wage adjustments for the nearly half million blue-collar workers in the Defense Department. Comparing the median hourly rate of a grade W–7 wage board employee with a GS–4 classified salary, the wage board rate increased 62 percent and the comparable classified rate 30 percent during that 10-year period.

On the basis of the same grade W–7 rate, the record shows that it was increased 6 percent in 1957, 5 percent in 1958, and 6 percent in 1959. What happened in these 3 years alone shows the very great inconsistency in the Government's policy. It also indicates that an important reason for wage board employees receiving added increases is that their rates are reviewed annually. And they should be. But why deprive classified employees of the same consideration?

Fifth. And this brings us to the next point of the need for more frequent review of classified salaries. Some method should be devised for making, if possible, an annual review of classified salaries. I believe such a system could be worked out successfully, and certainly it is needed to assure classified workers of the equitable treatment they deserve.

More frequent examination of these salaries would prevent the delay between classified increases—4 years in the case of 1955 pay raise. These delays are unfair to the employee because his rate of pay continues to lose purchasing power. A regular annual review would be administratively desirable for the Government. It would permit annual budgeting of the cost of whatever increase seemed desirable since the preceding year, and if done annually it would probably result in a smaller percentage increase falling within any single year while the employee would receive as much or more money over a given period. And, of course, the important fact is that he would receive it when he needed it—not 3 or 4 years later.

Sixth. There has been altogether too much emphasis on the cost of a classified salary increase. By that I mean that the principal consideration should be whether it is needed. If that can be demonstrated, it should be treated as having at least as much urgency as any other budgetary proposal. The important difference, of course, is that a pay raise has the purpose of helping people, and of greater importance, of helping our own Government employees.

To think first in terms of cost is the wrong approach. We should realize that a 9 percent pay raise will cost a good deal more today than it would have 10 years ago, and it will cost still more 10 years hence, if the price level continues to increase at the same rate. We should be prepared for these exigencies that are the result of economic change.

We should consider this proposal to raise classified salaries first for its benefit to the men and women who are serv-

ing the Government. But that is by no means the sole reason. We should consider it from the standpoint of national dignity and of administrative efficiency for it is upon the capabilities and the loyalty of our Government employees that much of the successful operation of this Government must depend. We cannot in good faith continue to ask the men and women of the career civil service to continue to perform the duties which each year become more exacting and more complex and at the same time refuse to accord them the simple justice of rates of pay which they have earned by any reasonable standard.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion and in the way of a summary I would like to make three additional observations concerning this legislation.

First of all, as well pointed out by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the legislation before us and the committee substitute which is pending is the result of a compromise. There is nothing unusual about that. Very often when we are considering major legislation which is somewhat controversial there always has to be a little give and take. I want to assure the membership of the House that the willingness on the part of us to compromise is not because we did not feel a higher increase was justified, because we know we can justify a higher increase; it was not because we did not desire to grant a higher increase to Federal employees, but it was in recognition of certain political facts of life. We realized we could get a great deal more support from Members for a 7.5-percent increase than we could for a higher amount. We have been reasonably assured that any legislation of this sort will be vetoed. We will certainly need support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House in order to act on a veto when this bill comes back.

My second point is this, and I make it as a statement of fact, and while it is repetitious I use it for emphasis. The Federal Government has not kept up with private industry insofar as the salaries of its employees are concerned. It has not nearly kept up. You can toy with statistics all you want to, but the record of the hearings on this legislation was full of proof in substantiation of my statement.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics presented evidence before the committee showing what the consumer price index was. It is up 113 percent since 1939. The figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that all grades from grade 5 up of Federal employees have not received increases consistent with the increases in the cost of living since 1939. Approximately 60 percent of our classified Federal employees have not received salary increases since 1939 in keeping with the increased cost of living.

Employees of other industries have fared much better than employees of the Federal Government. Since 1950 we have granted increases to Federal employees in an amount of approximately 30 percent. It may be interesting to observe that the employees of major industries of this country have received over twice as much in the way of increases since 1950. General Electric has increased its employees 62 percent since 1950, United States Steel 66 percent, Aluminum Co. of America 87 percent, Firestone and Goodrich Rubber Companies have increased their employees 56 percent, Lockheed Aircraft has increased its employees 63 percent. These major industries employ approximately 2 million people. This shows that the increases have been consistent with the general increases that industries have paid their employees since 1950.

Since 1958 these same industries have increased their employees on an average of 10 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I had a very interesting personal observation to make in the committee when one of the witnesses pointed out or referred to the increase that the grocery clerks here in the Washington area received as a result of collective bargaining back last January or February. He pointed out that they received a settlement that amounted to $97 per week. Back in 1937 I worked for the Safeway Grocery Co. for a short time. It was then the Sanitary Grocery or the Piggly-Wiggly Grocery Co. They paid their employees $23 a week. Since 1937 the Safeway Grocery Co. has increased its employees to $97, amounting to a 320 percent increase. The postal employees in 1937, during that period, received an average of $2,038 a year. The postal employees today—I speak primarily of the letter carriers—are receiving an average of $4,640; in other words, an increase of 123 percent. I do not believe any Member of this body would like to recognize the Safeway Grocery Co. as having better employees or thinking more of the welfare of their employees than the Federal Government—certainly not that many times greater.

Now, the executive branch has recognized that there are inequities existing in our Federal employees pay scale. The minority leader has pointed out they have recommended a study be made. I think that we are all in accord with that. But the study comes too late. They have known that these inequities have existed for years, and they should have taken the initiative several years ago to propose a study and to propose a plan on which the Congress could act to correct these inequities. This is but a partial solution of the problem. After the study is completed we can come back and further improve the situation next year.

My third point is with reference to this estimated cost of $680 million. I would hate to think that all of us who support this legislation are not as equally concerned about the fiscal condition of this country as those who oppose it. I submit that this instrument we have before us today, this legislation itself, is not in itself what is causing the additional cost of $680 million. The reason why it is going to cost $680 million more is because the Federal Government has assumed certain responsibilities and certain obligations as a Federal Government and is rendering certain services to the people of this Nation. Since we have assumed these responsibilities and obligations, it requires the employment of approximately 2.3 million people. We cannot economize by merely refusing to pay these people a proper salary and a competitive wage. Anybody that has any experience with business, anybody that has had any experience with employee-employer relationships knows that you cannot economize in your business by the blood and sweat of your employees. To those who are stressing fiscal responsibility today I say if you want to economize, then we can reduce some of these Federal services or eliminate some of these Federal responsibilities that we have assumed. We can eliminate some of the Federal agencies. Certainly we can employ better manpower utilization. Incidentally, the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been holding continuous hearings on manpower utilization to try and improve and get more effective use of our personnel. This argument that this pay increase is too costly has been used in every proposal during the past 10 years, and yet I do not believe any of the previous opponents will say today that we should not have granted those previous increases, because even after granting those previous increases, we are still very far behind. I predict that in the future, after we have granted this pay increase, the opponents here today will then recognize and might even acknowledge that this increase was necessary. We cannot overlook the increase in efficiency and morale and the improvement in our competitive position with other industries by acting favorably on this legislation today. This is a reasonable, a fair bill. As I stated before, it is the result of a compromise, a good compromise. I hope it will receive the overwhelming support and approval of the membership in order to insure that when the bill comes back up here, if it is vetoed, we will have the necessary votes to override the veto.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9883. This pay increase for Federal classified and postal employees is very much needed. The Federal Wage Board or blue-collar employees in the San Francisco area of California have received increases totaling 11 percent in the last 18 months. These increases were 5.1 percent in December 1958, and 5.9 percent in December 1959. However, the Federal classified and postal employees have received no increases during the same period. As a result, numerous classified employees in the San Francisco area are receiving lower salaries than wage-board employees who are working under their supervision. This is highly undesirable from a morale or administrative standpoint. H.R. 9883 will aid in correcting this situation. I think this bill is worthwhile and very much needed. I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Along with a few minority members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and including the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member, I have been fighting a steamroller today and for a

number of days past. I have no complaint about that. I have no quarrel with it, although I think some of the tactics of the steamroller reflect on the legislative processes of this country and of this Congress. I hope the American people will know as a result of this debate a little bit more about the system by which we juggle a $90 million percentage point of increase and kick it around when at the very same time there is a major scandal in the press, an effort to create the impression of a scandal, because of a $90 expense account. But I have no complaint about the fact I am in a minority.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9883, and before I go further let me say that I have voted for the two pay raises for postal employees that became law since I have been in Congress. I voted for one of the two classified pay raises that became law. And I hope, if I am here for some years to come, to vote for some more. But I am opposed to H.R. 9883.

I realize that I need to be a little bit more explicit, because there have been a number of 9883's kicking around this House and in the committee.

I oppose the newborn, minutes-old form, this so-called 7½-percent bill, as it comes to us this afternoon direct from the committee delivery room after a very violent Caesarean operation, and with it still red-faced and squalling, wrapped in swaddling clothes. I oppose this newest legislative offspring just as I opposed the original, H.R. 9883, which was greatly ballyhooed prenatally, and which was subsequently disowned and orphaned by its own parent or parents; they claim some 80 fathers to the bill. And I oppose this newest H.R. 9883 exactly as I opposed the offspring that came to this House under this discharge petition, which had a very short life, which was abandoned in the desert of committee reconsideration and left to gasp out its last breath all alone.

So let the record be clear that I am opposed to this bill. Now I am done with the obstetrical metaphors and I want to say some things in very blunt language. In doing so I address myself, Mr. Chairman, not so much to my colleagues here where the die is cast, but I address myself to the people of this country, to the taxpayers and to the Federal employees themselves, the two innocent bystanders in this tragedy-farce.

First of all this entire legislative undertaking has been an attempt to find out how much the traffic would bear and just how many political friends and votes could be picked up in the process of finding out how much the traffic would bear.

This is an attempt at successive, well directed, well engineered—and not all of the engineering and direction has come from within the Congress—a well directed and engineered attempt to retreat by successive steps to an ultimate victory of some sort.

I have great respect and regard for my friend from Louisiana and I do not criticize in the slightest his right to do what he did, but according to a report appearing in the publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers during a big super pay rally that was held here in Washington the first week of April, the gentleman is described as having said that he would fight to the limit to secure the passage of this bill, that is, the 12-percent and 23-percent bill. But even before the committee had completed its hearings the gentleman was asked by the chairman of the committee:

> You do not seriously insist on the 23 percent?

And his answer was:

> No, sir.

There was never a motion made by this gentleman in his own behalf or in behalf of these other gallant sponsors of this bill; there was never a motion made in committee to vote out this bill or even give it consideration in the executive session.

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Did the committee consider restricting the increase to salaries of $7,000 or less?

Mr. JOHANSEN. No, the committee did not, principally because the committee under the legislative principle that has been followed has not had a chance to consider very much of anything.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman believe that salaries of $15,000, $16,000, or more should have this increase?

Mr. JOHANSEN. The persons up to the highest level in the classified service get the straight 7½ percent.

I will say in further response to the gentleman, and this goes to my second point, this is an election year, something for everybody on the Federal payroll bill. I will say to the gentleman that even the efforts of the minority in the committee to get separate consideration on the floor of this House in separate bills as between the postal employees and the classified received the same steamroller treatment as was given the entire effort on the part of the minority opposition to the bill.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I want to go further and say this, the President of the United States immediately after the last 10-percent pay increase, at a time when the pay issue was not before the Congress, at a time when no one in good faith could accuse him of stalling tactics, recommended a Hoover Commission type of study to go into this whole program of Federal pay policy and pay procedure. That recommendation was repeated twice thereafter by the President of the United States.

I want to report to this House that on this very morning, as a member of the committee, the recommendation of the President of the United States was offered by the gentleman from Michigan as an amendment, and I will say to the committee that the recommendation of the President of the United States received considerably less courteous consideration than have the recommendations of some of the presidents of some of the organizations who represent the employees, and, of course, have a perfect right to do so.

I want to point out a third fact about this whole situation. This legislation involves the one kind of book burning which the liberals are in favor of and practice with great enthusiasm. I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is on the floor or not, but I call your attention to the fact that on the 3d of June when we saw the spectacle of this House being enlisted in cooperation with the effort to secure the 219 signatures, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] said, and I quote him accurately, I think, that:

> When it comes to human need I would never find the answer in a book of arithmetic.

I respect the gentleman's right to that view.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course I will.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. He quoted me correctly. Does the gentleman disagree? Does the gentleman contend that human needs should be left to the mathematical calculation of cold hearts?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would be very glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would be very glad to if the gentleman would permit me, but let me complete what I was saying and I think that will answer the gentleman. Let me say this, that I know of no sure way in which we can assure that this country, the people of this country, and the employees of this Government will know a more crucial and desperate need, I know of no sure guarantee that that will happen than if we continue persistently in this country to ignore and fail to find the answers in a book of arithmetic.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I cannot yield further.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman has mentioned my name. Is he afraid?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is the gentleman implying that I am afraid?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois would never question the courage of his good friend, the gentleman from Michigan. But, on general principle, I take it that any man who does not want to yield after mentioning my name is afraid to face the issue. I, of course, would respect both the sincerity of his conviction and his caution in retreat.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will be very glad to yield if the gentleman will make it very clear that he does not think the gentleman from Michigan is afraid.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I particularly thank the ranking minority

Member on our side for granting me this time, because I am sure he knows that most reluctantly, most regretfully, but in my case most necessarily, I am going to take a position opposite to his, on this legislation. I am going to vote for this bill. And because it is so exceptional a rarity for me not to support fully the position of the administration on fiscal matters, and because I think my position parallels that of many in this House who share my constant concern for sound fiscal policy, I would like in 2 brief minutes to tell you why I am so voting. I am voting for this bill, Mr. Chairman, because this is the only avenue given to me after all the 17½ months of this Congress wherein I can keep not a spoken pledge but certainly an assurance that I gave to those Government workers in my own district whom I know to be deprived of what they need to live decently, particularly the many in the lower grades, without taking extra jobs and without having their wives also working outside the home to obtain a necessary supplementary income. I have made a personal study of the family budgets and salaries of the classified workers and the postal workers in the 13th District over the period of the last 4 years. I speak from definite knowledge of the inadequacies of the salaries and the subsequent unsalutary effect upon both the service itself and upon the morale and actual physical well-being of those who are attempting to raise families on inadequate salaries—or are forced to supplement those salaries to the extent of having a second position of their own and/or additional work outside the home on the part of the wife and mother. The difficulty of obtaining and of retaining trained workers has become increasingly difficult as competition continues to increase through the rapid development of new industries which offer a salary range that cannot fail to attract men of good intent whose first responsibility remains for the welfare of their families

Aside from the deleterious effect on the service through frequent turnover and disrupted and insufficient service, however, I deplore the additional effect upon the worker himself who must attempt to support his family on a wage which, in our area and similar areas where the cost of living is high, simply cannot meet even the simplest needs of family living.

The area which it is my privilege to represent has an exceptionally high cost of living index. In fact, an analysis of the price index of the entire Chicago area, according to the Consumer Price Index for all items as of January 1960 shows the great extent to which the Chicago area is above the national level.

The annual budgets that have been submitted to me in 1960 by postal workers in the 13th District bear mute but effective testimony to the effect of this high consumer price index on Government workers on low-fixed salaries. Of the budgets so submitted, only 7.5 percent showed any surplus after deducting the cost of basic necessities. Of this 7.5 percent, half of these represented single men and none within this category had more than two dependents.

Investigation further showed that almost 75 percent of the postal workers whose returns were analyzed were forced to seek additional income in order to meet basic living costs.

Some budgets presented to me showed, despite extreme care and an effort at thrift, a deficit of over $1,000 per year in meeting just the ordinary expenses of living. In certain post offices there is evidence that certain workers hold, in fact, three part-time jobs in addition to their basic postal work. Past raises in pay have been more than absorbed by the rising cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, were there time, I could quote from letter after letter from Government employees whom I know and trust. These letters attest the inadequacy of present pay, and deplore the effect of that inadequate pay upon both the branch of Government which they serve and pointedly upon their families.

In the face, therefore, of reports which I personally have investigated and know to be true and not exaggerated, I could not possibly deny an increase at this time.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, without taking time to go into the sociologically bad effect on both the community as well as the family involved when a government worker is forced to live on insufficient pay, I would repeat that the present measure offers to me and others in similar circumstances the only avenue through which I can help the Government workers involved to obtain the increase in income which I know they need.

It, therefore, today, cannot be with me just a question of whether this bill is completely right or the plan just as I myself would have sought to make it. It is not just a question of how much I may dislike the "gag rule" for which some of my colleagues condemn the measure. I only know that I cannot possibly refuse to bring to those in my own area, particularly to those in the lower grades, what I think the Government of the United States owes its workers—a living wage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, not long ago I received a letter from a postal worker which moved me very deeply.

For some time I have been very interested in the first Allied crossing of the Rhine during World War II at Remagen Bridge—which will go down as one of the greatest exploits in American military history. I have followed the record of the heroes of the Remagen Bridge carefully since 1945. I know all of these men like brothers. I have visited with them and eaten at their homes. They correspond with me regularly.

This letter comes from a mail handler in the New York City post office named Anthony L. Samele. Tony Samele is a big, optimistic fellow who married his childhood sweetheart. When Remagen Bridge loomed, he was a squad leader in the point infantry company. Not only did he lead his squad in the precarious crossing of the bridge, but he helped clean a German machinegun nest out of one of the big towers on the bridge. He was the third man in the American Army to hit the east side of the Rhine on that dramatic day of March 7, 1945. He writes to me:

Everything has not been going too well for me since my Army days. I'll explain, as briefly as possible, to tell you what my life has been like since leaving the Army.

I'm married to a swell girl and have two children. I've been a regular mail handler in the Post Office Department for the past 8 years. My salary is $4,450. After taking out pension money and taxes, there is hardly much left. I live in three small rooms, with poor heat and ventilation. As my family increased, demands became more and more, and I was forced to borrow, since my earnings were insufficient to cover expenses.

My wife worries about the health of the children and not being a well person to start with she became very sick mentally and physically.

My wife had lost the sight of her right eye at the age of 5 as the result of a bad fall. This week, she was rushed to the Bronx Eye and Ear Hospital for an emergency operation on her other (left) eye. I had taken her to see two eye specialists, and both of them agreed that an operation was the only thing to do or she would be completely blind. It's been 4 days now and we still do not know the outcome. The doctor will not commit himself. As I'm writing this letter to you, I'm hoping and praying that everything will be OK with me.

The doctor wants his money, the hospital wants their money, and me with no hospitalization plan of any kind or money to pay them.

KEN, I have never asked anyone for a favor big or small. I'm no hero. I tried my best for my country when I was in the service. I've tried my best to support and maintain a family. I've never approached anyone for a handout, I don't know how. If it's within your power to help me, I would appreciate it very much and be grateful to you for the rest of my life.

Now, here is one of World War II's outstanding heroes—one of the eight enlisted men to receive a Distinguished Service Cross for his courage. Yes; I will help him, and help thousands of other loyal and hard-working postal employees and I hope the membership will join in supporting H.R. 9883 to give these people a well-deserved raise in their wages. And if the President sees fit to veto this bill, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to discuss issues which are not going to arise. Personally, I should feel some sense of exaltation today because I told you very early in this debate on the salary issue that a 7½-percent increase was approximately correct, and I do congratulate all of those who have extended this necessary and desirable increase for having arrived at a figure which seems to me to be most realistic and which seems to me to be passable.

I think all of us recognize that when these bills do come to the floor including large numbers of people that there can be inequalities, there can be groups covered that should not be covered; there are groups which perhaps did not receive

all they should get; but we should remember that the Congress of the United States is a continuing body and that grievances can be adjusted at all times, corrections can be made when those in charge of a legislative program desire them to be made.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am simply rising here today to state that I am definitely in favor of this bill; that I think over all it is a good bill, that it can become law, and that it can result in necessary increases for all but a few of our employees.

I recognize, as some of you do, that the bill in all its aspects is not exactly as I would like to have it; but under all the circumstances which have prevailed I believe this is a bill which we can support in sincerity and honesty. Where individuals have objections they can go to work to make those objections felt in the year ahead.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I again urge that all of those who have any regard for the majority judgment of this committee which did work long and hard on this bill and which found itself confronted with nothing really new this morning, we all recognized that what has been in the papers, what has been discussed time after time was nothing new, and I do not think those arguments are very valid. No one should have been surprised by what was voted on.

So I am going to support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one remark. This situation proves how ludicrous it is for the Congress to attempt to set salaries. Here in one week the committee reports a 9-percent salary increase, and then in a couple of weeks they report an amendment to 7.5 percent, with no basis in fact whatsoever. Until this Congress gets to a point of putting salaries under the control of a board and making them on a regional basis you will never have justice for the employees in high-cost areas, one of which I represent.

I am certainly sorry to see this spectacle on the part of the House making in one week a 9-percent recommendation and within the next week a 7.5-percent recommendation. It proves just how wrong we are in trying to set salaries on this kind of a basis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before us in a very strange manner. I am very happy that I have been able to be here during the debate. In the committee this morning I heard absolutely nothing about the present bill, H.R. 9883, as amended, in the way of explanation. The gentleman who offered the amendment did not take time to explain it; he did not seem to consider that was at all necessary, although it is my recollection he was enthusiastically in favor of a 9-percent pay raise bill which was taken from the Speaker's desk by way of discharge petition. I voted for that 9 percent. Of course, I would like to know some good reason besides political reasons, which I think I know, why we should suddenly be brought face to face with a 7.5-percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, even the 9 percent was considered highly inadequate by all proponents of this legislation. We started out with 23 percent, then we went slowly and gradually down until finally with tears and groans and ice water in our veins we decided on 9 percent as the very lowest that could be offered. Here we appear with 7.5 percent. How do we explain such a situation? I think there are two ways of explaining it.

First of all, what the gentleman from California has just said is eminently correct. We have shown ourselves as a committee and as a body—that is, the Congress of the United States—to be completely unfit to set wages.

During a colloquy I had with one of the employee representatives I said to him what I would like to say to many of the proponents of the present bill, not the original 9 percent—that this is the finest argument I have ever heard in my life for private enterprise.

We have been told how wonderfully the great corporations treat their employees as compared with the U.S. Government, and I agree with that 100 percent. So I said to this gentleman:

> How would you feel about doing what the late John Wanamaker suggested many years ago? He said, "I will be very happy to take over the postal service of the United States. I will run it efficiently, I will have no trouble with my employees, and I will make money out of it."

Mr. Chairman, that is the situation, and I think it is a situation that we had better consider very seriously.

We get ourselves into this hassle, Mr. Chairman, to my certain knowledge, at least every 2 years and usually once a year. It is never a satisfactory solution. Everything we do is always too little and too late, and this is going to be much too little and much too late.

Some time ago I offered an amendment to this bill in the nature of an escalator clause, such as has been used very successfully in private industry. That would not be considered because, of course, we know perfectly well that the leaders of the employee groups do not want anything that would automatically take care of their people, so that they would be perfectly well off and would not have to come in year after year with this kind of a compromise bill which, apparently, we all agree is quite inadequate and insufficient.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe in the committee system and I believe in our system of government. And, I must say here and now that if we are to be governed by discharge petitions, I would suggest that we go right ahead on that basis; that we send the Congress of the United States back to other occupations for which they would probably be better fitted and that we leave this matter entirely in the hands of pressure groups and the Executive. But, this is certainly not what we, when we took our oath of office, believed we were doing. This is certainly not what I, when I first came to this Congress, expected to be called upon to do. I expected to work in committee, to understand what was being brought out of committee, not to have things shouted through the committee; not to have them brought out on the floor unexplained. Why, this bill was never on our desk in the committee until 11 o'clock this morning. I understand that some members of the committee did have copies last night. I understand that one member of the committee did not even have a copy this morning. This is no way to legislate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to be able to support a pay raise bill on behalf of postal workers who do not have the flexibility in their pay structure that is provided classified employees. I had hoped to be able to support a reasonable increase for postal fieldworkers, particularly in the lower brackets, but I am not going to be given that opportunity. I offered a motion in committee when the 9-percent bill was considered to separate postal field workers from title II of the bill, which brought in all other employees. My motion was defeated. I cannot support a 7½-percent increase across the board for all employees of the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] say that this is fair and reasonable legislation. Well, if it is, what label did they put upon their 23-percent bill and then their 9-percent bill? If this is fair and reasonable, what label did you put on those bills? Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the leader of this movement, when hearings were held before our committee on the foreign service pay section of this bill?

Mr. MORRISON. Is the gentleman yielding to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am trying to get an answer to my question.

Mr. MORRISON. Well, it so happens that the chairman of the committee was conducting the hearings, and he conducted all the hearings, so I think the question should be addressed to him.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman attended the hearings on his own bill he must have known whether any witnesses appeared to justify an increase in pay for all foreign service employees.

Does the gentleman know or does he not know?

Mr. MORRISON. I was not there every minute of the time. It is possible that testimony could have been had when I was not there. All I did was introduce the bill which was considered by the committee. The chairman of the committee had control of the time, as to when witnesses would be heard who were for the bill and when witnesses would be heard who were against the bill. I am sure the gentleman has the same access to that information as I have.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can say whether they were there without going into a speech.

Mr. MORRISON. I am sure the gentleman knows as much as I do about who testified and who did not testify.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows, if he attended the committee hearings, that not a single witness appeared on behalf of the State Department in behalf of a pay raise for all Foreign Service employees.

I would like to ask the staff member for the committee who is sitting next to the gentleman from Louisiana to answer the question, but I am sure that would be a violation of the rules of the House.

Does the gentleman know when hearings were held on the 25 supergrades that were put into this overnight bill? When were hearings held to justify the 25 supergrades that the gentleman has in the amendment he offered this morning?

Mr. MORRISON. That does not create 25 supergrades. It merely reallocates existing supergrade positions. The cost of title II not over $40,000 a year. And I might add that this is one thing in this bill that President Eisenhower wants, because that is what he requested. I am very hopeful that by giving him what he wants——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech in behalf of the President of the United States. I doubt very much that the President approves this bill. But I cannot recall a single witness appearing before our committee in behalf of 25 more supergrades, nor do I remember a single witness appearing before our committee this year in behalf of a new $19,000 poo-bah in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If any member of the committee knows when any witnesses appeared before the committee to justify these high priced employees, I wish they would tell me. I do not know who dreamed this up. I assume it was dreamed up along with some more of the stuff that was dreamed up last night and rammed through the committee this morning.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly do.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is it not obvious that the reason why there were no hearings on these items is because these items were never in the bill until the amendment was put before us today?

Mr. GROSS. And yet they put a batch of supergrades in this bill and gave them nice, fat increases; supergrades calling for up to $18,500 a year. Under the terms of this bill they will get somewhere around a $1,000-a-year increase, some of them more.

But what is the increase for the 349,939 postal field service employees in level 4? Can the gentleman from Louisiana tell me how much he proposes to increase the top step in that level, while he is proposing to increase these supergrades and others by $1,000 to $1,200 a year? By how much is he going to increase these postal workers?

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman has asked me a question which may be rather confusing. I wish to say that there are no more supergrades created. There are just 25 supergrades reallocated. Several other jobs are increased, at a cost of less than $40,000 a year and which the administration asked for. As far as the increases in the class to which the gentleman is referring, if he will get out his paper and pencil, he can get the answer by taking their present salary and increasing it by 7½ percent.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is the author of this bill and he ought to be able to tell me what the increase is in the top bracket of the supergrades, as well as the highest increase to be given in level 4 where there are almost 350,000 postal employees.

Mr. MORRISON. The answer is very simple, 7½ percent.

Mr. GROSS. You bet your life, 7½ percent. You give several hundred superdooper employees an increase of $1,000 a year or more while a level 4 postal worker gets around $300 a year or less; is not that correct?

I might add that it appears the amendment will increase the pay of secretaries to Senators to $17,500 a year or an increase of about $1,000 a year. Can it be that these employees and others are suffering far worse than other workers trying to support families on $5,000 and $6,000 per year?

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

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

Mr. MEADER. Can the gentleman tell the House how much this committee amendment is going to cost the Government annually?

Mr. GROSS. I saw it for the first time when I arrived on the House floor this afternoon.

Mr. MEADER. Has any estimate been made about that?

Mr. MORRISON. If the gentleman will yield, I can answer that. It is slightly under $700 million, or between $680 million and $700 million. It is $150 million less than the 9 percent bill which was the basis of the discharge petition.

Mr. MEADER. Will the gentleman give me the source of that $680 million figure?

Mr. MORRISON. The committee counsel.

Mr. MEADER. It was not made by the Budget Bureau, as was the estimate on the original bill? Is that correct?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. GROSS. The bill we are actually considering at this time is a 9 percent bill. What we are talking about in dealing with the 7.5 percent increase is the amendment railroaded through the committee that may or may not be adopted. I assume it will be. But what we are actually dealing with at this moment is a 9 percent increase, not 7.5 percent. That is the bill that the discharge petition went to, and then they walked off and left it as they did with the 23 percent increase on which all the hearings were held.

My objection to this bill is that it goes across the board. It gives to those who least need the increase the greatest increase, compounding the inequities that already exist, and with no opportunity or disposition to correct these inequities. That is why this bill is so wrong and why I cannot support it.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 9883, as amended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As a member of the committee, I had an opportunity to hear and to review all of the testimony offered during the extensive hearings on this legislation, and as a result of those hearings can only conclude that the increase provided in the bill before us is completely justified.

It should be obvious to anyone that postal and Federal employee wages have not kept pace with wages paid in private industry in the past 20 years. Despite this condition, those who oppose this legislation ask that we wait another year to take any action so that a study now in process may be completed. In view of the studies that have been made in recent years, particularly the study by the administration-sponsored O'Connell Committee, whose report, to my knowledge, has never been published, I am forced to conclude that this problem has already been studied to death. In the report of the O'Connell Committee, it is readily admitted that "Salaries fixed by statutes have not been adjusted in a timely and adequate manner in response to general changes in non-Federal salary levels." In the face of that conclusion—a conclusion upon which the administration took no action—I have no reason to believe that the study now being conducted would have any result.

Further, I think we should recognize that the current study, which has been rather widely described as a study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is not what it seems. In the first place, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is simply making a survey of white collar wages. For a number of years the Bureau has been making a study of white collar wages in some 20 areas, and is extending that survey to an additional 60 metropolitan areas. Once the figures are gathered, the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission, and not the Bureau of Labor Statistics, are going to make comparisons of the wages paid to postal and other employees in thousands of different positions.

Personally, I have no hope that either the Post Office Department or the Civil Service Commission will arrive at any conclusions as a result of the survey greatly different from those expressed to our committee. Since the survey is limited to about 29 white collar positions, 23 of which are commonly filled by women or girls in private industry, it is hardly likely that it will provide information upon which anyone could logically or fairly determine a comparable wage for post office clerks and letter carriers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics already has all the figures anyone would need to determine what a fair wage

should be, and witnesses appearing before our committee demonstrated by means of these figures that since July 1951, average industrial wages have been increased approximately 70 cents per hour or 45 percent, while postal employee salaries have increased only 38½ cents per hour or 19 percent. To me this is sufficient evidence that there is an immediate need for postal and Federal employee salary increases. For that reason, as a member of the committee, I supported the majority opinion which is now before us.

My position is perhaps best summed up by a statement made by one of the witnesses appearing before our committee, Mr. E. C. Hallbeck, of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, who presented facts which clearly demonstrated that—

First. Postal wage increases have lagged more than 25 percent behind wage increases granted in private industry since 1951.

Second. The productivity of post office clerks has continued to increase which in itself warrants salary increases.

Third. The administration by its part in the settlement of the steel dispute stands committed to further wage increases in private industry.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the bill now before us. I hope that the President will approve this legislation. If he does not, I shall certainly vote to override a veto.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], a member of the committee.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important to know that the administration has requested additional supergrades. Also increases in the upper levels. In past years when we had given an increase across the board, the result was to narrow the wage level difference between the upper and lower grades, bringing about a serious inequity in the salary structure and violating the accepted principle of equal pay for equal work and responsibility.

A further point I want to mention here is that the last Federal Pay Act of 1958 which amounted to an increase of 10 percent created a considerable amount of new purchasing power. The pay increase we are considering at the present time increases the purchasing power of the American public about $2 billion a year in terms of the gross national income.

The purchasing power of the American public is going down. We have unemployment in various sections of the country. This will be a stimulant to our national economy.

But disregarding that, the equity of this measure is that the Federal employee as such is in need of an increase in his take-home pay, so as to bring him closer to industry in the high cost of living area in which most reside.

Also, although the Postmaster has given us figures that they have a large number of applications requesting jobs in the Post Office Department, those are in areas where unemployment is high, like Detroit, and some in the low-cost-of-living areas where there is a large demand for postal jobs.

I hope the committee will act favorably upon this legislation. In order to keep good well-trained employees in the employ of the Federal Government we have to give them a fair salary commensurate with the work they do.

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

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], asked this question. On page 2 of the committee report the budget figure of the 9-percent raise was $846,306,500. That is on a 9-percent basis. If you take off 1½ percent of that, which is one-sixth of it, you take off approximately $141 million. Then there was another adjustment downward which amounted to about $8 million. So in round figures, and I am only giving round figures, the difference between this bill, and it is just as statistically justified as was the figure of $846 million because it is based on that figure, is about $150 million less than the 9-percent figure which was given to us by the Civil Service Commission and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LESINSKI. In other words, the gentleman from California is saying that the figures presented have been substantially verified by the Commission. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, in order to be plain I have first outlined my points in favor of this legislation for the postal workers and Federal employees' pay raise.

First. This pay raise will not unbalance the Federal budget nor cause a deficit.

Second. Twenty-five percent of this pay raise will come back to the Government in taxes.

Third. Our U.S. economy of $500 billion of gross national product this year must be a balanced economy, giving due regard to necessities of our working people, as well as the production of luxuries. We in America should stop starving our community services and provide adequately for the workers who provide these necessary basic services.

Fourth. Government employment should be a model for other employers and employees in our U.S. economy. Government employment and Government employees should not be continued as another chronic depressed area. Whether or not Government employment is officially designated as a chronic depressed area, it certainly carries the general public reputation.

Fifth. There is no doubt about the efficiency and loyalty of our American people working in the postal service, and in Federal employment. But there is and continues to be a large turnover of these Government employees which shows the need of a pay raise, and basic dissatisfaction over wages, salaries, fringe benefits, and conditions of employment. This turnover of Government employees is unnecessary, causes inefficiency, and higher costs to the Government and to the taxpayers.

Sixth. This bill is not inflationary, as the pay raise for Government employees will go to provide the minimum necessities for families, food, clothing, housing, education for children, and transportation.

Seventh. We in Congress have a special responsibility to our U.S. postal workers and Federal employees. We have a tradition in America that adequate pay for a good day's work is an American heritage. Congress has this responsibility for the public employees. Nobody can reasonably argue that the present level of pay is adequate. Recognition should be given to the loyal service given by postal and Federal employees because it is the special concern of the Congress, as the employer who sets the rates for those employees. We in Congress are their employers and the guardians of Federal employment. A fair day's pay for a fair day's work is basic to our U.S. free enterprise system.

Eighth. Congress should see that all groups in our Nation's economy move ahead and progress together. I do not believe that any one group, particularly Federal and postal employees should fall behind. Likewise, if the level of Government employment does fall behind the level of employment of private industry, Government efficiency and Government employees will suffer. Private industry will be in a position of competition that can only be disastrous to employment for necessary public programs. Government employment must therefore compare favorably with employment conditions in private industry.

Ninth. When we have a group that has been as loyal as these U.S. Government employees have been—there have been no strikes and no industrial trouble, and when they have uniformly provided efficient services day and night, we should give such worthy service to our American people, every recognition, and back this pay raise fully. I think the compromise of 7½ percent recommended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is certainly a minimum amount which we should approve promptly.

In conclusion, I urge strong support of the current pay raise bill, H.R. 9883, and recommend adoption of the proposed committee amendment as a compromise to insure action in this session of Congress.

All that our good postal workers and other Federal employees ever have asked of their Government is timely and fair salary provisions. They do not ask for any special or extraordinary treatment, but they rightfully expect not to suffer discrimination.

Review of the record before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee confirms the overwhelming weight of evidence presented, at the committee hearing on H.R. 9883 and over 80 companion bills, including H.R. 9997, which I introduced on January 27, 1960, that immediate and substantial Federal employee salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees. I firmly believe that

all groups in our economy should move ahead economically at the same rate, and this pay raise is necessary to meet this test.

A man must receive a full day's pay for a full day's work, whether he works in private industry or the Government. The beneficiaries of this bill, our postal workers and Federal employees, can be no exception.

In the hearings before the committee, representatives of postal and other Federal employees clearly demonstrated that their salaries are well below salaries paid their fellow workers in private enterprise whose levels of responsibility are comparable. These employees proved that their salaries have been, and are today, far behind the U.S. national economy.

The Federal employees who are seen most by the general public, the taxpayers, the citizens of these United States, our fine letter carriers, whose motto, "Neither rain, nor hail, nor snow, nor black of night shall stay these couriers from their appointed rounds," are the direct public representatives of our Government, yet they cannot meet the rising cost of living as well as their neighbor who works in private industry, and cannot educate his child to be the engineer, scientist, or teacher which our Nation now needs.

The time for sympathy is past, the time for action is now. Now is the time to begin the end of this discrimination. Now is the time to vote for the bill, H.R. 9883, with the proposed compromise.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the prompt adoption of the bill and the committee amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I add my voice to those who have spoken in support of H.R. 9883, which would bring a long needed and necessary pay increase to postal and other Federal employees.

I also take this occasion to commend most sincerely the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and those members of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their effective work in achieving a breakthrough in a most important area of legislation.

As a cosponsor of the Morrison proposal and as a signer of the discharge petition, I join those who point out that a reasonable increase of 9 percent is preferable to that of 7½ percent. However, although the facts are not on the side of the administration, I certainly realize that the original increase of 9 percent would without doubt incur a Presidential veto.

Additionally, I realize that the amendment calling for a 7½-percent increase should make the bill less vulnerable to a Presidential veto. This amendment has been offered in good faith by reasonable men so that such Presidential action may be stayed, and that the issue may be clarified should a veto unhappily occur.

It may well be that the administration will not assume its responsibility in approving the amended bill. I do not think this possibility should deter us from approval of the bill. Our responsibility is to act affirmatively since we must not lose sight of the fact that the provisions of H.R. 9883 are needed and needed now.

It would be "carrying coals to Newcastle" to repeat the extensive documentation, made in committee and on this floor during discussion of the sum and substance of the issue, on the practical need to improve the wage standard of our postal and other Federal employees, and the economic feasibility of doing it at this time.

I not only urge passage of this bill, but I urge that it pass so overwhelmingly—in both Houses—that a Presidential veto, if still forthcoming—can be readily overridden, as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the President would like to see the employees of the U.S. Government on a wage level in line with that prevailing in private industry. I would also hope that he join with the supporters of the increase in realizing that the wage structure of our Federal Government is closely related to the maintenance and attraction of competent personnel. This is sound budget thinking.

Our duty in Congress is clear. Let the record show that the duty of the administration is also clear.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, today 1.6 million Federal employees and their families are watching our deliberations to see if their Government, their employer, will courageously face up to the ugly economic fact that the record high cost of living has reduced their standard of living.

These employees and their families have confidence that the Congress will help restore to them some of the economic position which they lost relative to their counterparts in private industry. As was pointed out so capably in the committee's report submitted by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]:

> All that postal and other Federal employees ever have asked of their Government is timely and fair salary provisions. They do not ask for any special or extraordinary treatment, but they rightfuly expect not to suffer discrimination or to be sacrificed on the altar of personal or political ambitions. Committee deliberations on the salary problem this year demonstrate once more that the Federal employees can expect and obtain sympathetic and fair salary consideration only through appeals to their elected representatives in Congress. They cannot hope for proper recognition at high executive levels, in terms of fair compensation, for the loyal and efficient services they render.
>
> The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has considered Federal salary legislation in each of the last four Congresses, including the 86th Congress. Only once in this 7½-year period has there been an administrative proposal for upward salary adjustments—a 5-percent increase during the 84th Congress. All other general salary increase bills have been bitterly opposed. Had the administrative recommendations been followed, over 500,000 postal workers and over 1 million other Federal employees might have received only a 5-percent increase in 7½ years. There have been three vetoes of pay raise legislation during this period.
>
> Notwithstanding constant administrative opposition, the Congress has succeeded in providing salary increases totaling nearly 20 percent for postal employees and slightly less for other Federal employees during this 7½-year period. Were it not for the intervention of Congress, therefore, Federal employees would be in even greater distress than they now find themselves.
>
> Review of the record confirms the overwhelming weight of evidence presented, at extended committee hearings on H.R. 9883 and over 80 companion bills, that immediate and substantial Federal employee-salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees.

I think it is of the utmost importance that we unmask for all to see the ruthless attitude of this administration toward Federal employees. We ought to make clear to those of the public who are still misled by the slick Madison Avenue slogans that this much self-advertised "Administration with a heart" has tenderness in its breast—but only for bankers for whom it has every sweet solicitude and whom the administration has enriched to the tune of billions in unwarranted high interest rates paid by each of us.

During the hearings before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee the administration, through its spokesmen, Maurice H. Stans, Robert B. Andersen, and Arthur E. Summerfield stanchly fought well-deserved pay raises for Federal employees, calling such increases inflationary, unjustified, fiscally irresponsible—and, yes, practically un-American.

I am confident that this Congress will again intercede for the many, many conscientious and loyal Government workers and make it unmistakably clear that to hold a Federal job a man or woman does not implicitly have to take a vow of poverty.

I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 9883 by such an overwhelming vote that any thought of a sustainable veto will be out of the question.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], is in Walter Reed Hospital today or he would have been here to vote for this bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I had the opportunity to listen to the many witnesses who appeared at the hearings held on the pay-increase bill now before us for consideration. It was clearly proven, to my satisfaction, that an increase of at least 9 percent would have to be

granted if our postal and classified Federal employees were to be given adequate help.

They have been suffering real hardships; they have been struggling under the burdens of ever-increasing living costs and high taxes. Those with families to support have found it impossible to make ends meet, and meager living and deprivations have been their lot. In a high percentage of cases, postal employees have had to seek outside work in addition to their post office positions, in order to meet their obligations. This has meant the sacrifice of loss of time with their families and a lessening of their morale and sense of well-being. We find that many wives have had to leave their home duties and find jobs in order to help maintain a decent standard of living. All this is most unfair; surely, our faithful employees are entitled to a living wage, to time for recreation, to a just reward for the services they render.

I was happy to vote for the 9 percent increase and pleased when our committee took favorable action on the bill. Thereafter, when it appeared that there would be a serious delay in bringing the pay increase bill before the House for action, a petition was placed on the Speaker's desk to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of the bill. Although I was engaged in a serious primary contest in my congressional district, I made a special trip from New York to Washington for the sole purpose of signing the discharge petition, and then returned immediately to New York to continue with my arduous campaign schedule. I wished to make this effort for our postal and classified Federal employees, because I appreciated the fact that it was imperative for Congress to take favorable action in their behalf without further *delay.*

Now it appears that the 9 percent increase voted by our committee is in grave danger of defeat; that the President would veto such a bill, and that we do not have enough strength to override the veto. A compromise appears necessary, and the increase of 7½ percent is now proposed. Although I feel that an increase of at least 9 percent should be granted, if that would mean complete defeat of a pay increases bill until next year, then I am compelled to go along with the compromise figure. While the 7½ percent figure is inadequate, it will alleviate somewhat the hardships which our postal and Federal classified employees are now suffering. They look to us for assistancce, and it is our duty to help them to the utmost of our ability.

I am fully cognizant of the fact that a pay raise is required for the employees covered by the bill. Therefore, in the event of a veto by the President, I shall vote to override the veto.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER], a member of the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, as I sat through the long—and, I must confess, sometimes tedious—hearings before our committee on pay legislation for postal and other Federal employees, I was struck forcibly by several points.

First of all, I would observe that the representatives of the employee groups and their associates certainly had done their homework; they presented the hard and incontrovertible facts. On the other hand, it seemed to me that much of the administrative opposition delved into as much fancy as fact.

As demonstrated in the committee report, the employees overwhelmingly proved not only their dire need for salary raises—now, not in the future—but also proved beyond question that their request is more than justified.

Administrative opposition, summed up in a nutshell, revolves almost completely around a proposal to delay action pending completion of a study.

Now I, for one, have had enough of administrative studies. As brought out in our hearings, during the past 10 years some 45 authoritative studies on Federal salary matters have been made. Every single one either reposes in a wastebasket or gathers dust in a forgotten file. There have been no tangible results at all.

And so, I think, may be the case with the study which we are now asked to await before granting salary increases. This study is completely beside the point. Even the proponents of the study acknowledge it will deal only with the higher, or supervisory, salary levels. Only a very small percentage of Federal employees possibly could be concerned in that study. Here, we are concerned with over 1½ million employees to whom the study will have very little significance.

The chief and the strongest opponent of any pay raise has been the Post Office Department. In answer to direct questions, departmental representatives as much as confessed they would not approve a 1 percent or 3 percent pay raise. Now let us see how this Department handles its own responsibilities.

This is the same Department that reported officially on its expenditures to a private management consultant for advice as to how the Department should be managed—that is, advice on how officials of the Department should do their jobs. This is the same Department that paid directors of the private consultant $400 a day for a 4¼-hour day. This is the Department that paid associates of the private consultant as much as $250 a day for a 4¼-hour day. This is the Department that willingly pays out these outlandish benefits to a private contractor to do work which postal officials should do; but will not agree that the letter carriers for example have earned 17 or 18 cents more an hour, as provided in the substitute amendment we will consider later.

This contracting out of administrative and management responsibilities of itself is highly questionable. The people to whom these vast sums are being paid are purported to be geniuses. It would be all right if they knew the answers, but in this instance, at least, the consultants had to go out and hire still other consultants to help them get the answers.

I hope that the Congress will see to it that our loyal and conscientious postal employees are given just a little bit of the fine consideration the Department lavished on these consultants to the consultants to the postal officials.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment to H.R. 9883. This bill provides for a 7½ percent increase across the board for all postal employees and makes permanent the 2½ percent temporary increase which the postal employees have been receiving since 1958.

I support this bill because I believe that the greatest force against communism within our borders is a satisfied Government worker who is proud of his employment, satisfied with his salary, and is faithful to his duties. I believe that a Government employee deserves a salary which will permit him to work in dignity, to obtain the basic necessities of life and to maintain his family as a unit. At the present time postal employees are paying this week's bill with next week's check or with borrowed funds. This condition must not be tolerated, it must not be permitted.

Let us examine the status of postal workers. Ninety-five percent of letter carriers are family men. Thirty-one percent must hold down a second job to try to meet their rent, their food expenses and to pay for the education of their children. Forty-three percent of their wives work and when they do their children are to a certain extent neglected. Ninety-three percent of all of the letter carriers operate at a deficit and must borrow funds. The annual deficit of an average letter carrier's family is $903. Credit unions have demonstrated that postal employees must borrow funds in order to meet their expenses.

This bill will cost our Government an additional $680 million. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have had the privilege of voting to cut requests and to reduce funds of over a billion dollars for wasteful practices in agricultural projects, in military construction projects, and in wasteful foreign handouts. I have fought for economy but not for false economy. These increases are not inflationary nor are they conducive to inflation. These increases are for services and do not produce a product, the price of which is raised. These services will be rewarded by these increases to meet the inflationary spiral brought about by rising steel prices, by rising military purchases and wasteful administrative practices. Too long have Government employees subsidized with their substandard wages the bonanzas and windfalls which banks and financial institutions received by reason of our Government paying a higher rate of interest on Government bonds. Too long have Government employees subsidized warehousemen who are favored by this administration with high rates for storage of our surplus grain, cotton, and wheat. Too long have our Government employees subsidized with their substandard wages the employees of foreign governments and foreign businesses. We must help now.

While the wages of employees of private concerns rise, the wages of Govern-

ment employees have had percentage increases on originally low salaries. We must realize that if we continue to allow the relative position of postal and governmental employees to deteriorate, our postal service will decline.

We in Congress are the advocates of postal workers and governmental employees. They do not have the right to strike, they cannot resort to collective bargaining to correct inequities, they cannot sit down in the face of speedup systems. They can only come to us, to testify as to their needs, to implore their representatives for economic justice and to be treated as family men and Americans. We have heard their pleas and I for one shall not fail them. I trust that this bill will pass.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9883, a bill to provide salary increases for postal and other Federal employees. Frankly, I believe that a pay increase for our Federal employees is in order, it is deserved, and desirable at this time, particularly as it applies to the postal workers.

Although I have consistently favored legislation for this purpose, I do regret that we find ourselves considering this proposal in this manner. I did not sign the petition for several reasons. As a matter of fact, I have never signed a discharge petition. It seems to me that this move to bring the bill, H.R. 9883, to the floor by this method, without giving adequate opportunity to employ the use of a rule, does more harm than good. There are inequities in this bill and the House is foreclosed from making such changes. As I said, I am for a pay raise and a reasonable raise at that. But we can go too far and perhaps destroy our actual objective.

In any event, I shall support this bill today and I am glad that the committee has at least considered giving the House an opportunity to act on a figure which has a more reasonable chance to become a reality. I hope that this issue and this problem can be resolved properly and well because I sincerely want the employees to receive the salary increase they deserve.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I realize as much as you do the futility of further debating the question involved here. I realize I am not changing any votes.

It seems to me that when we are dealing with legislation to spend well over three-quarters of a billion dollars, the Members of the House should have an opportunity to agree to or disagree with provisions of the bill; however, those who are today the managers of this bill deliberately filed a resolution which was a closed rule—no amendments other than committee amendments could be offered—and then passed it off on the Members of the House whom they urged to sign a discharge petition as the only way they could get a vote for a pay bill. It should be clear that Resolution 537 provided for an open rule and Members of the House could have voted on various provisions of the bill which they felt should be perfected. The petition method boomeranged on the bill sponsors because they themselves found it expedient to amend the bill. To get this done they exercised every pressure and did not give the Members an opportunity for even an overnight reading of the bill before they forced action.

It is most unfortunate, in my judgment, to delude the million and a half employees into believing a pay raise is now assured. If we are to be guided by the testimony before our committee, the President will not approve this bill as presently written.

The experience of Congress thus far with respect to overriding vetoes is that the House and Senate are in favor of supporting the President. It seems to me that it is not proper to make Federal employees believe they are going to get increases that are not yet in sight. This is what I have tried to avoid.

I offered a 6 percent pay raise amendment in committee. I was prepared to do everything I could to convince the President that such an increase might be approved, but I could not, in the face of our testimony, do it for a bill of this sort which would further distort the pay structure by adding extra pay in certain grades.

Let me repeat, I am in favor of fair, adequate, and equitable pay for those who are employed in Government. I do not believe the bill we are voting on today meets these objectives.

Here is an interesting thing. You have been handed a bill that you have not even seen before. It consists of about 20 or 25 pages. You are going to vote on it without even reading it. You have not had a chance to read it. It involves expenditure of $700 million. It affects 2 million people in Government. And yet you are required to vote either for or against the bill without having a chance to offer a single amendment. It is rather a poor way of handling legislation in a representative form of government, as I see it. It sounds a little like a dictatorship, does it not? You can judge for yourself. I could add one more thing. You have not even had a chance to look at the hearings, and the worst of it is the leadership in charge of the bill does not seem too concerned. It would not be so bad if it were not so important.

We should recommit the amended bill. We should send it back to the committee, where it could be promptly and carefully considered.

FEDERAL PAY SYSTEMS CAN NEVER STAY FIXED

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add the following statement:

It has been my privilege to have served on a committee responsible for civil service affairs of Federal employees ever since I came to Congress in 1937. Through these years it has been my experience that it is indeed difficult to develop any one particular pay plan that will adequately serve the more than 2 million Federal employees. After all, our compensation procedures deal with people and, as such, the pay procedures and systems must change with the changing times. It was my privilege to be chairman of the Civil Service Committee in 1948 with the 80th Congress, and at that time a study was begun that eventually became the Classification Act as it is basically written today. It required some 2 years' study and work by the committee and its staff to develop the pay plan found in the Classification Act of 1949. Much has happened since then that would cause us to recognize a new pay program is necessary.

PRESENT PAY SYSTEM NEEDS CORRECTING

What is wrong with the present pay system? In the first place, the present pay procedure is actually no system at all. Several recent studies of our wage and salary procedures have brought out this point.

Another one of the most common objections to the present classified Federal salary system is that it is overrigid. This is reflected in the existence of conditions under which administrative and operating personnel encounter numerous impediments in the effective accomplishment of programs due to specific requirements of the law. The question may be raised, Have we spent too much time on minute details of job descriptions and have not given enough thought to a declaration of congressional policy on pay for Federal employees?

The value and the effect of exceptional or superior performance of individuals in Government civilian positions have been to a large degree overlooked in the Classification Act as it is presently administered. Each position is placed in a class, and each class is placed in a grade, and each grade by law is given a rigid set of salary rates.

It is now recognized that the step increases in the salary plan as provided in the present classified pay system fall short of realizing the full value of such a plan, both as an incentive for the recruitment of personnel or the retention of employees. It is quite possible a broader range within each grade might give more comparability with pay plans in private industry.

A close examination of the between-grade differentials reveals the inadequacies and inconsistencies of our current pay and salary procedures. There is too little difference, salarywise, between a GS–12, for example, and a GS–13. This might very well retard the development of the abilities and qualifications of personnel, as well as the effective utilization of these employees.

Mr. Chairman, I am attempting to emphasize the point that the Classification Act of 1949, of which we were justly proud at the time it was passed, is in imperative need today for revision.

PROPOSED NEW PAY SYSTEM

Last year the Congress made available to the executive branch $500,000 to develop information for a new concept of compensation of Federal employees. We have been advised by the White House that this information will be available by this fall for study and that it will be available for the Congress January 1, 1961. We have proceeded to take the

first and one of the most important steps forward for a new pay plan.

I believe that one of the key principles needed in such a system will be the principle of comparability.

You may ask the question, what is comparability? Over the years we made no attempt to compare the pay of Federal employees with that in private industry—certainly in the classified jobs. During the 1920's and thirties there was a steady employment in the Federal Government which could not be found in any strict comparability with private industry. However, during the past 25 years labor contracts in such industries as steel, automobile, printing, transportation, and communications have featured the concept that those employees last on the job were the first off. This has meant that for the past quarter of a century there has developed in our private economy a concept of steady employment. It is now possible that we can realistically compare the Government worker, with his steady employment, with his counterpart in private industry.

Some of the other features for a new compensation system, being discussed by both legislative and executive people, would include:

First. Establish not only the principle that Federal salaries should be reasonably comparable with salaries paid by private industry for work of similar difficulty and responsibility but also provide the procedures to obtain on a regular annual basis valid salary and wage information for comparative purposes.

Second, Enable an annual review of Federal salaries and make appropriate adjustments on a timely and equitable basis.

Third. Provide for coordination among existing salary systems in the Federal Government, so that the principle of "equal pay for equal work" will have real meaning.

Fourth. Make such necessary reforms in the Classification Act salary structure as to make it a more effective tool of management and a more appropriate pay schedule of the employees.

This type of compensation plan would serve as a landmark in the history of Federal personnel actions, much as the Classification Act of 1949. However, if this Congress proceeds to go down the road of either a 9 percent or a 7½ percent pay raise, it will mean that this Congress has lost an opportunity to proceed with a lasting and equitable pay system for our Federal employees.

SUMMARY

In summary, I am opposed to either a 7½ percent or a 9 percent pay raise at this time. Evidence was not presented to our committee to justify either percentage increase.

An across-the-board pay increase of such size would merely accentuate current inadequacies in our salary and wage procedures. H.R. 9883, as amended, represents a patchwork approach to our compensaton systems when actually we need a new and basic change, as I have indicated earlier.

It has been my honor and privilege to work for almost a quarter of a century in the Congress for the civilian employees of the Federal Government. Over these years I have been impressed by their loyalty, sincerity, and desire to do a good job. The position I take today represents in the long run the constructive and equitable approach for the Federal employee, for the management of our Federal departments and agencies, and for the American taxpayer.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege as a new member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to act as one of a group of directors over the largest communications system in the world, namely, the Post Office Department of our Government, which, as you know, represents 50 percent of the postal service of the entire world.

It has also been my privilege to be a member of the Civil Service Committee of the same Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and, as you know, the Civil Service Committee has more to do with the personnel of the largest group of people working for any one instrumentality than any other in the entire world.

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

Mr. BARRY. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. As I understand, there is nothing in the legislation under consideration which provides for an increase in the salary of the assistant U.S. attorneys. Now, I think it is indeed unfortunate because here is a class of hard working—and, I mean it, very hard working—dedicated public servants who receive no increase whatsoever. It would seem to me that your committee is overlooking a grave injustice when you report out a bill that does not provide for this group of Federal employees.

Mr. BARRY. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very worthwhile legislation and I commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], and the other members of the committee for this compromise in an effort to try to avoid a Presidential veto. If a veto should come we should by all means vote to override it.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced a salary increase bill calling for 12½ percent, and I sincerely believe the postal and Government workers are solely in need of that amount if they are to enjoy a decent living; however, the committee has faced the practical reality of trying to pass a bill that reflects a compromise and one that has a chance of being signed by the President or being overridden. For that reason we are supporting the 7½-percent amendment in an effort to take a slice of bread if we cannot have a whole loaf.

Mr. Chairman, we could advance strong arguments for this bill all day long. I have many postal workers in my district who are holding down part-time jobs in an effort to supplement their inadequate postal salaries, because if they did not they would not be be able to provide their families with the bare necessities of life and properly educate their children. In cases such as this the employee and the Government are both being cheated. The Government is being cheated because a man cannot work night and day and give his best to the postal service. The employee is being cheated because he has no time to spend with his family and contribute to his community. Furthermore, the postal worker who holds down two jobs is depriving some unemployed person of the second job that he needs so badly. Mr. Chairman, this is a disgrace to our Federal workers and the Government to force this type of situation upon our postal workers and Federal employees. A 7½-percent raise will not cure all the ills of pay inequity but it will go a long way toward that end. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this much needed legislation because I am confident everyone will benefit.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully throughout the debate this afternoon to see if things had changed any in the past 8 years, and they have not. The arguments of those in opposition have been the same; substantively the same. And, what are they? Well, the minority leader tells us it faces a certain veto. That was the same message conveyed by the same gentleman a number of years ago and repeated on each occasion since. No. 2, we were told the department had a deficit. Well, if we apply the same criteria to every department and agency of the Government, each and every one of them has a deficit. Now we are told we cannot afford it. Well, tomorrow we are going to be asked to vote multibillion dollars for the citizens of other lands. If we can afford that, we can afford to deal with equity and justice to those who work for us.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas says—and this is a reversal of his usual argument—that it gives too much to those at the top and too little at the bottom. For 4 years I heard on the committee that we should revise our approach, because we were creating an imbalance in the relationship of Federal employees by raising too much those on the bottom and not enough those on the top. This is a reversal of the gentleman's position. Now, he also said that he was for 6 percent. Well, I remember when he was for 4 percent and the House gave 8 percent. And the need for more is still there because we have never adequately adjusted salaries. We have never once undertaken a salary adjustment that reflected the many, many months of lag time.

We are told it is against the policy of the administration at this time. And yet this is the very administration which undertook to encourage a settlement in the steel strike which inevitably led this body to a consideration of the need for higher salaries in Federal employment if we were to be even half way reasonably competitive. The truth is, Mr.

Chairman, those who oppose are really opposed to a pay raise now as they have repeatedly been in the past. They have not contended the amount proposed to be excessive, they have fallen back on every other type of argument including the charge of steam rollering. Of course, that charge is not true either. The bill arrives on this floor in complete conformity with the rules of the committee and of the House. The legislation has merit, I urge its adoption.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, although I shall vote for a pay increase bill on final passage today, I should like to register my acute dissatisfaction with the manner in which the leadership has handled this legislation. It is regrettable in the first instance that this legislation was so mishandled as to necessitate the filing of a discharge petition. Nevertheless, a sufficient number of Members saw fit to sign the discharge petition and bring a bill calling for a 9 percent pay increase before the House. Then, on the very day that we are asked to vote on this bill, it is announced that we are to be presented with a substitute version that will not only lower the pay increase to 7½ percent, but will also make other substantive changes in the original text. Now we are to have a bill before us that will be understood by only a handful of Members because no one will have had sufficient time in which to devote the amount of study that a bill of this magnitude demands. No one is absolutely certain as to what will be in the bill and what the effects of the bill will be. I am truly sorry that we must legislate in this fashion. It casts an unfavorable reflection not only on the ability and sincerity of the leadership, but also on the wisdom and deliberativeness of this entire body.

Notwithstanding the highly unorthodox manner in which this legislation has progressed toward final passage, I shall support it because of my sincere belief that the great majority of our Federal employees are conscientious, able, and hard working, and are fully entitled to an increase. My only regret is that we must achieve this worthwhile legislative goal in such an atmosphere of ineptitude.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, those Members of Congress who signed the discharge petition on H.R. 9883, the postal pay increase, have really performed a disservice to the postal and Federal employees that they are seeking to aid, for this reason: the bill having reached the floor cannot adequately be amended to a figure consistent with fiscal responsibility.

Representing as I do a metropolitan area district, I sympathize and appreciate the plight of especially the post office employees in providing for their families under their present wage scale; however, the across-the-board increase, without taking into consideration local standards of living, continues to distort the situation.

Rumor has it that the majority party is deliberately appealing to the emotions of Government employees by promising a pay raise that they realize is impractical, using this issue as a means of drawing a Presidential veto in order to make political capital of the entire matter. This may be clever politics, but it is bad government. Certainly the postal employees deserve understanding and an honest attempt to give them the salary increase to which they are entitled.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to conclude my earlier remarks by saying that never in corporate activity would a responsible management go about getting the kind of bill that is before us today. It would not be done. Management would be turned out of business were it to use the methods that were employed on this day in this House, before this Nation, in order to get the raise that is going to be voted by this Congress. This is said without regard to the merits of the matter.

The post office employees made a strong case for a much-needed increase in salaries. However, no such case was made by other employee groups who constitute approximately 1,500,000 Federal employees.

In fact, there is evidence to substantiate that certain existing inequities have become aggravated rather than cured by the present bill before us.

Until a thorough comprehensive method is evolved to establish Federal wage rates the many loyal Federal employees and the general taxpaying public will have to put up with the clumsy, inefficient, inequitable system in use by the present Congress. Some of us hope for better days.

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

Mr. Chairman, the question of study groups came up. I would like to make this point clear, that since 1953, in the last 7 years, it is reliably reported that there have been 45 study groups on the question of Federal workers' salaries. I want to suggest this, that as far as the Government workers are concerned, they want less study groups and more salary.

I should also like to quote this from the committee report:

> The much-publicized steel strike settlement, with the aid of the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor, improved pay and fringe benefits for steelworkers who already were being paid $3.11 an hour before the strike. The postal clerk and the letter carrier with 20 years of service receives only $3 an hour.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, there are at this very moment thousands of dedicated men and women who continue to carry on their daily tasks of helping to provide good government for this Nation in a most exemplary manner in spite of the fact that each of these persons knows that the present wage structure is shot through with inequities. Now in looking for proof of this charge of wage structure inequity I need go no further than to quote the administration's most recent budget message. President Eisenhower told the Congress in his last budget message that—

> Review and coordination of the excessive number of pay plans are the most effective means of removing inequities which adversely affect the Government's ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel.

When Federal employees claim that their wages are substandard, thus inadequate, they need to quote only the Government's own figures. According to the latest published data which I am able to produce, the average median annual wage for the great bulk of Federal employees is $4,875. More significant is the fact that almost one-half of all so-called white-collar workers on the Federal payroll earn less than $4,500 a year.

Last February Secretary of Labor James Mitchell was quoted as saying that the "spendable earnings" of an industrial worker with three dependents has risen to $82 a week. The Postal Establishment offers the same worker approximately $18 a week less take-home pay.

There is ample evidence to show that the present schedule of Federal wages is shamefully inadequate. These standards set by the Federal Government are certainly below the commonly accepted requirement for a healthy and decent standard of living. Wages are below what employees fairly want, what their families need, what the Nation can afford, and what is needed to man our public service with skilled, conscientious, and efficient personnel.

In my 14 years in Congress I have become increasingly impressed with the fact that the civilian employees working for the Federal Government are first and foremost dedicated public servants. These thousands of men and women are daily serving this Nation and giving to the American people the very best kind of government that we can have. And since every laborer is worth his hire this devotion to the common good by these thousands of civilian employees of the Federal Government must be matched with adequate compensation. Living in an era when we are rightly concerned about standards of living in even the remotest corners of the earth and when we justly tax ourselves to provide funds not only for the military defense of the free world but for economic development and for the sharing of our technology and vast natural and material resources, we cannot sit idly by and watch the standard of living creep up among other segments of our economy and at the same time ignore the fact that Federal employees are generally the last to receive needed adjustments in their compensation—oftentimes long after most others in non-Government positions have received their adjustments to meet not only the cost-of-living rise which now seems to occur with almost regularity but also to enjoy an even higher standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is constantly and rightfully using its power and influence to secure wage adjustments for and to help provide a higher standard of living for workers outside the Federal service. The Congress must not sit idly by and set standards for private industry and fail to meet these same standards when it comes to its own employees. To do so will be courting danger, real and eminent, and will certainly eventually lead to increased inefficiency and lessening of service to the people of all the States. Like wages in private industry, the Federal wage structure must be kept constantly under review so as to reflect sharp increases in the cost of living and so as to provide even more of the comforts and conveniences as well as the necessities for daily living that go to make up every man's life. As we advance technologically and as more products and services are made available to ease man's burden and raise his living standards, we must make certain that Federal workers are able to partake of these blessings.

In his state of the Union message last January the President told this Congress, "1960 promises to be the most prosperous in our history." This means higher production, higher employment, slowly rising prices, about a 2-percent increase in the Consumer's Price Index, a continued rise in profits and dividends, higher wages and salaries. This does add up to more prosperity except for the Federal employees unless the adjustments called for in this bill are enacted into law.

Mr. Chairman, this is worthy legislation, and I urge its approval.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the present administration is more in tune with the interests of the largest banking and industrial groups than it is with the interests of ordinary citizens. The farmers, the small businessman, the aged people all find that either the administration is opposed to the programs which are needed for their welfare, or it has no program whatever.

This same attitude extends to the field of public employment. For a number of years, postal and other Federal employees have been seriously underpaid. Today, I look forward to the opportunity to vote in favor of a long overdue and much needed increase in pay for these loyal public servants.

I am sorry that the bill before us took so long in reaching this stage. It is more than idle rumor to expect that the President will veto the bill we are about to pass, and that accordingly, the bill must be sent to the desk of the President quickly if we are to have a chance to escape a pocket veto.

The certainty of the veto is found in the statements made by official witnesses before the committees holding hearings on pay legislation, and also by the very character of the witnesses who arose in opposition to postal and other Federal employees' pay legislation.

Seasoned observers with long legislative records tell me they have never seen so many officials of Cabinet rank come to Capitol Hill to declare the administration's opposition to any pay adjustment.

The Postmaster General, himself, evaded a direct response to the question about whether he would favor as much as a 1-percent, across-the-board increase. Asked by the ranking majority member of the committee whether he would be in favor of such an increase, the Postmaster General responded:

> You know that is very interesting. I wish you might have asked me some of these questions earlier.

The Federal employees have been asking questions. They have been asking why it is that they, of all people, in the United States, should be singled out to suffer to a greater degree than others the impact of income deficit.

We have heard a great deal about the postal deficit and the way in which the increase before us would add significantly to that deficit.

It is appropriate to turn the question around and to ask, instead, of the administration, whether it has considered the ways in which the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees have suffered their own deficits and are even now unable to compete in the economic marketplace. The grocer does not give a special price to the Federal employee. Nor does the Federal employee live in endowed housing. Similarly he does not enjoy lower doctor bills or any other type of special considerations.

The only consideration upon which the Federal employee may rely is that which is forthcoming from the Congress of the United States. In House Report No. 1636, accompanying the bill before us, it is declared that in just 10 years Federal employees have been pushed 20 percent lower in their standards of living in comparison to their friends and neighbors in private enterprise. The report declares:

> There is only one place that the employees can come with any hope for remedial measures; that is to their Congress.

Today, we are about to undertake to give to the loyal Federal public servants a measure of the economic consideration they so desperately need. I shall be happy to vote for the pay bill, and I hope that it will be sent quickly to the President's desk in order that we may have an opportunity to take final action on the bill before Congress adjourns.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I support reasonable pay increases this year. It will be sad, indeed, if the insistence on 7½-percent defeats all legislation in this field. The Congress has been irresponsible with the issue by not providing increased revenues to carry the cost of well-deserved pay increases. I am convinced that the President will have to veto an increase as high as 7½ percent and the workers may then end up with nothing at all this year. A 5-percent increase this year, pending a full study of all Federal payrolls next year, is the fairest approach to the problem. I am sorry that political maneuvering has placed our fine postal and classified employees in this kind of a bind, as there is reason to believe that the President could sign a 5-percent bill even under present circumstances.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, it has been no easy task to wade through the confusing and often conflicting statistics that we have had to look at in order to try to determine the justification for any salary increases at the present time. As for myself, I have attempted to supplement the doubtful value of those statistics with information obtained directly from postal workers in my own congressional district.

Some of this information I have acquired through personal interviews with them, and part of it from budget sheets which they have sent to me at my suggestion showing their earnings and normal living expenses. For the great majority of postal families with whom I have had such contact it is readily apparent that they are having a difficult time making ends meet. One of the best yardsticks of this would seem to be the following results of a survey I took of my major post offices in an effort to find out how many employees either had to supplement their Federal wage with outside jobs, or had to send their wives to work.

In Binghamton, N.Y., with 362 employees of which only 303 were checked, 59 men had outside jobs and there were 102 working wives. In Johnson City, N.Y., with 46 employees, there were 12 men with outside jobs and 5 working wives. In Endicott, N.Y., with 82 employees, only 14 of those employees had neither outside jobs or working wives. In Corning, N.Y., where there are 49 employees, 5 had outside jobs and 17 had wives with jobs. In Elmira, N.Y., with 171 employees, 58 had to supplement their wages with outside, after-hours employment, and 60 had wives who were working to add to the family income. In Hornell, N.Y., with 41 employees, 12 had outside jobs and 15 had wives with jobs. Finally, in my own hometown of Owego, N.Y., with 20 employees, 5 men had after-hours work and there were 12 working wives.

And so the pattern went. Even assuming that it is not unusual nowadays for many wives to work, if they are free of confining household tasks, even though their husbands earn an ample wage for the family needs, I was and am convinced that the case of need for a proper salary adjustment, at least in the lower income brackets, had been made. The question remained of how much?

On this point, no matter what we may do we will not and cannot satisfy everyone. We can only use our best judgment. I was of the opinion, and so frankly stated to my postal and Federal employee constituents, that a 9 percent, across-the-board raise at the present time was too much, particularly in high-salaried classifications. Speaking frankly again, I have serious reservations as to the wisdom of as much as 7½ percent, but since at this point that appears to be the only figure that will come before me I shall vote for it with some reluctance. In doing so, I shall also continue to hope for the day when these matters are removed from the political arena.

In this connection, may I remind my colleagues that the President in his budget message to the Congress last January stated:

> Continued patching of individual Federal salary systems is not satisfactory as a sub-

stitute for a comprehensive Federal pay policy, which should be developed either by authorizing a Joint Commission such as I proposed or by some other equally effective means. Pending development and adoption of such a comprehensive policy, a general pay raise would be unwarranted, unfair to the taxpayers of the United States, and inequitable as among employees compensated under different and unrelated pay systems.

That is a strong and realistic statement but there has been no action to establish a Joint Commission.

Neither has there been any serious consideration of the President's postage rate increase proposals which would partially finance a salary increase.

If the fate of this bill is a veto, the failure of the Congress to seek long-range solutions to Federal pay problems and the expedient insistence on patchwork measures in election years will be to blame. The postal and classified employees in the lower pay ranges will be the chief losers, penalized by short-sighted and fiscally irresponsible attitudes in the Congress.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, following careful examination of the record, which confirms the overwhelming weight of evidence presented in extended committee hearings, I most earnestly hope that prompt approving action will be taken on this measure granting a reasonable cost of living pay adjustment to our postal and Federal employees.

Our Federal employees form a large and important part of our population. The various services they render are fundamental and essential to national progress.

It is only practical common sense and recognition of the facts of life that if our faithful postal workers and Government employees are encouraged, by reasonable cost of living salary adjustments, to meet their family obligations and face the future with a certain confidence, then there will be no doubt about their efficient duty performance, their loyalty as good Americans, and their repudiation of any and all Communist inspired propaganda.

The present bill we are considering can accomplish these good objectives in the national interest while at the same time extending fair and just treatment to Federal employees in comparison with similar responsibilities in private industry.

As you are well aware the salaries of our Government employees are set by law and it requires the action of the Congress to adjust their compensation. Let us fulfill the trust they have demonstrated in the Congress for fair play and fair treatment and let us approve this bill without further delay.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9883, a bill which I believe to be not only well deserved but long overdue. Although I am not a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I do have a large number of classified Federal employees and postal workers in my district and I know how increasingly difficult it has become for them and their families to make ends meet. The committee report, which I hope all Members have had an opportunity to study, makes this abundantly clear—especially the specious arguments against a pay increase set forth in the minority views.

The real fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that the Post Office Department is the biggest business in the world, employing 550,000 people in 42,000 offices. Yet, despite the fact that personnel standards are high, both with respect to intelligence and character, three-quarters of all postal employees must exist on salaries of less than $5,000 and only after 18 years of continuous service can a postal worker receive $5,000 a year, and his maximum compensation after 25 years of service is $5,175 per annum.

Mr. Chairman, the issue before us goes to the very conscience of our Nation. Can we, as the minority report would have us do, view with complacency a Federal personnel policy based upon substandard wages. I think not. I must say it is beyond argument that the present administration's attitude is one of deliberate indifference in which pay increases for Federal workers have been sacrificed on the altar of an anticipated $4 billion budget surplus. Thus, as in so many other areas, it becomes incumbent upon the Congress to assume leadership in this area and to take action which we know to be necessary.

I say necessary, Mr. Chairman, because the average salary of a post office employee is only $4,600—not enough to clothe, feed, and provide shelter for families, let alone educate children and provide a minimum of entertainment and recreation. We must bear in mind, surely, that research studies have shown that an average family enjoying a normal standard of living must have an annual income of $6,600.

Clearly, if there is one group that has been left behind in the parade toward higher income to meet higher costs of living, it is our classified and postal workers. If anyone in this body has any question on this point, I wish they would come with me to Toledo, Ohio, and talk to some of our postal and other Federal employees who are willing to open up their family budgets and show that it simply is not possible for them to pay for needed medicine and other essentials. A college education for children of these families is simply out of the question unless they happen to qualify for a complete scholarship.

Mr. Chairman, all of us look back with shuddering and disgust at the economic exploitation which took place in this country a half a century ago in the meatpacking, coal mining, and other industries. Is the present status of our Federal employees so much worse?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to lend my support to the passage of H.R. 9883 to provide our postal and other Federal employees a much-needed pay raise. The facts speak for themselves. In a recent issue of Labor Week figures arrived at from basic data of the U.S. Department of Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture, pointed out that the average weekly real income of postal and other Federal workers was down 3.3 percent from last year.

While the increase in salary provided by this bill is modest, it will mean a great deal to a postal employee who is trying to feed, clothe, house and educate a family—in many cases a large family—on a weekly take-home pay of $82 to $87.

Under the present pay scale, the postal employee receives less pay than the unskilled worker. Three Presidential vetoes have put his pay rate several years behind that of his fellow workers in private industry. I hope that this time the President will approve this well-deserved recognition of devoted service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the proposals set forth by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] on behalf of the faithful postal and classified Federal workers who are doing such a wonderful job for our Government despite the fact they are underpaid.

I know the committee in its careful consideration of H.R. 9883 heard many, many instances of how our Federal employees are forced to moonlight and take extra jobs, how their wives are forced to work, and other ways that they are trying to make ends meet.

I think that it is a disgrace that this should have to happen in the postal, and Federal services. We should pay our people a salary which will permit them to live and enjoy the American standard of living. No one should become a second-class citizen, economically, because he is patriotic enough to work for the Government.

I represent the great State of California, and in our State university we have a highly respected and completely independent group of economists, quite generally known as the Heller committee, which was set up for the purpose of research in social economics. The Heller committee operates on the concept that its purpose is to describe and present figures based on salary necessary for an employee to receive in order to live at what is currently recognized as comfortable living. Of course this committee goes beyond the rigid confines of cost-of-living in attempting to describe necessary wages for an employee and his family to have what is considered a comfortable living. They agree, as do I, that there certainly must be more in this life than a bare existence. The Heller committee is receiving and has received more than normal recognition in my State and throughout the United States as the outstanding authority in its field and I feel that its recommendations are of extreme value. Might I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Heller committee, in its recent report, indicates that an employee with a wife and two children who owns his home, should receive a salary of $6,638 per year. A wage earner who rents his home should receive a salary of $6,271. These salaries are recommended by the Heller committee on the premise that they will meet the American standard of living—a reasonably comfortable living for an employee and his family.

I urge you gentlemen here to provide a decent living wage for our Federal workers. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, this important debate has but a few minutes yet to claim the attention of the Members before we are called upon to vote upon the issue of whether or not there

shall be straight across the boards 7½-percent increases for the postal and other Federal employees. And, while it is stated by the committee there will be an amendment offered to reduce the percentage from 9 percent, as previously voted for by the committee, to the 7½ percent this morning voted by the committee, the basic reason justifying any proposed increase is the same. The report by our Post Office and Civil Service Committee, stated it was recommended as a strong and timely affirmation of the historic policy of the Congress that employees of the Government of the United States of America should receive fair compensation for the great public service they perform for the taxpayers of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I conclude that their considered recommendation of the 7½-percent increase straight across the boards for the postal workers and other Federal employees, constitutes a crystal-clear recognition that the historic policy of Congress, should be placed in practical terms and application in accordance with their recommendation that the increase be 7½ percent. They apparently recommend this because it has become apparent that there is no reasonable chance for the White House to approve so much of an increase as 9 percent. This recommendation of reduction to 7½ percent is, therefore, a necessary compromise. I not only respect our committee for making the recommendation to lower to 7½ percent under the circumstances, but I compliment them on doing so. For this 7½-percent recommendation is not one whit inconsistent with the firm policy which I basically believe in, to wit, that our post office and other Federal employees should be accorded salaries substantially in accord with those in private enterprise, for similar and comparable services.

For several years now, I have been pleased to take the time and make the effort of somewhat of a personal study of conditions under which many of the postal employees and their families in my congressional district live. I am frank to say, Mr. Chairman, to my personal knowledge, dozens of these postal workers are engaged in supplementary earning jobs, either before or after their regular post office work is completed. Of necessity, they have to seek supplemental jobs because their postal salary is not adequate and sufficient for them and their growing families to decently get by on. In many cases their wives, the mothers of growing children, necessarily leave the home during hours when they should be home giving supervision to their growing children; to also add to the family income for shoes, bread, and butter, and educational advantages for their children. Many wives leave their children in care of babysitters, or public kindergartens; or day nurseries, and go to work to help out. They have to.

The committee report specifies present earnings and anticipated earnings if this bill passes. It identifies the necessity of this 7½ percent as a minimum. The postal and other Federal workers have no recourse to obtain a decent salary increase excepting by action of Congress. They cannot present their just claims for decent salary increases excepting to committees of Congress and the full membership of Congress. The reasonable and constructive basis of collective bargaining is not available to them.

Mr. Chairman, I surmise that when this bill comes up for final passage, because this 7½ percent increase straight across the boards is recognized as so reasonable and necessary and just, that many Members of this great legislative body who inherently would like to support the position taken by the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in opposing this raise proposal, will be found voting "aye." I surely hope so. I am reasonably sure that all the Members of the California delegation on both sides of the political aisle recognize that with the steady and sharp increase in the cost of living in California, the cost of the necessities of life in California, will justify an "aye" vote for this 7½-percent proposal. I shall vote for it even though the distinguished minority leader has stated on this floor, substantially, he did not believe the bill would finally be enacted into law. This would indicate that while he stated it was his own individual opinion, and that the President of the United States had not told him what his opinion was and what he would do, he expects a veto. Nevertheless, I intend to vote for what I conscientiously and firmly believe to be right and just in the premises.

The additional sum of less than $700 million will not increase inflation for it will be expended by these postal and other Federal workers for the necessities of life. It will not unbalance the budget. It will not be unjust or unfair to employees in private industry. It will not set an unreasonable or impractical minimum.

Mr. Chairman, it will give to the employees involved what they deserve and what is right and just for the taxpayers, acting through this great Congress, to extend to their fellow Americans in the postal and other Federal employment.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation in its present form to provide salary increases for postal and other Federal employees. I shall vote for the bill.

In the congressional district I represent, the postal and other Federal employees compose one of the groups which suffers most because of the high cost of living. At present rates it is virtually impossible for postal employees to maintain a decent standard of living.

I have had many discussions with groups of postal workers and other Federal employees who live in New York City and I can attest that most of them are forced to take additional employment elsewhere during their off hours. Their wives work in order to meet essential needs. Is it too much to ask that these citizens be adequately compensated?

It is unfortunate that those Federal employees who live in large urban areas should be penalized. I am hopeful that one day we will enact Federal pay legislation that is realistically geared to a cost of living index around the country. What may be fair pay in a small rural community is not fair pay in New York City.

This bill, calling for a 7½-percent across-the-board increase is a fair compromise and I am happy to vote for it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, our Government has a tremendous responsibility today—greater than ever before. The quality of the discharge of this responsibility depends to a very great extent upon the 2,200,000 civilian employees of the Government.

There are a number of ways in which pay scales can affect the quality of the work the Government receives from its civilian employees: First, by attracting more and better qualified candidates for Government service; second, by encouraging experienced employees to remain in Government service; third, by providing incentive and increasing morale. We cannot afford today to have a demoralized civil service.

There has not always been a crisis. We have been fortunate to have employees of quality and dedication. We could have continued to underpay our employees and would still have had many who were dedicated and qualified—and only considerations of the justice of it all would have made us pay them more. But today, we are forced to consider more than justice.

We need to make Government service attractive to young people who will make it their career. Young people today are not so much interested in the things that are going to happen to them in 20 to 30 years from now as they are in the immediate present. They think not in terms of some future date, but in terms of today, in terms of present-day food and clothing and shelter, and education for their children. Unless the wage of postal and Federal employees is made and remains sufficiently attractive, the postal service and the Government generally are going to be unable to attract and, perhaps even more important, retain the best type of young people. Low pay scales force the prospective employee to choose between responsibility to his job interests or his loyalty to his Government and responsibility to the economic well-being of his family.

The "Report on Civilian Compensation in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government," compiled by the steering committee of the Interdepartmental Committee on Civilian Compensation in November 1957, stated in summary:

> Personnel turnover is increasing and quality is decreasing. Many jobs remain unfilled. Quality and quantity of applicants is inadequate.

Why are we failing to attract qualified applicants? Why are dropouts increasing? The committee hearings on Federal and postal pay raise bills are full of figures indicating that pay of Government workers is lagging seriously behind rates for comparable jobs in the private sector of the economy. For example, during the period between July 1951 and November 1959, post office clerks received wage increases averaging 38½ cents per hour, or approximately 20 percent, while production workers in manu-

facturing industries received wage increases averaging 70 cents per hour and in excess of 45 percent. In July of 1951, after the enactment of Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress, the entrance rate for a substitute post office clerk was $1.61½ per hour. This was about 1.8 cents per hour above the industrial average. By November of 1959 the entrance rate for a post office clerk was 27.2 cents per hour short of the industrial average.

The purchasing power of many Government employees today is substantially behind that of 1939. For G–5, G–7, G–9, G–11 and G–13 employees, a percentage wage increase of from 5.2 percent to 20.3 percent would be necessary to give them the purchasing power they had before the war.

A study of pay scales for policemen and firemen in large metropolitan centers, where 40 percent of all postal employees live and work, reveals that the lowest wage in 10 of 17 cities studied was greater than the highest wage which a letter carrier or clerk can receive according to the national postal salary schedule.

The evidence presented to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service clearly shows, according to indicators such as purchasing power and comparative wages, that our Government and postal employees are underpaid.

A pay raise for Federal employees has been criticized as a contribution to inflation. We do not know if rising wages are a cause of inflation. Even if they were, merely equalizing wages of Federal employees would not push up other wages. Those wage demands which endanger stability are not the ones which equalize, but those which are excessive and unnecessary. It is definitely not excessive and unreasonable to ask that Federal employees be paid at rates "reasonably comparable" to those in private business. The administration cites reasonable comparability as a basis for judgment of Federal wage scales. If this is so, why do they not help us to make the wages comparable?

The administration suggests that we should wait for further studies of comparability. Many of us would like to see a comprehensive plan for coupling Government and postal pay increases to increases in the rest of the economy. But we cannot wait. Should we postpone a raise in salaries, we will have increasing difficulty in finding qualified applicants for Government service, increasing numbers of resignations, and increasing demoralization. Do we have the right to say once again to our Government and postal employees: "Just wait another couple of years and keep up your good spirits. As soon as we finish all our studies of the problem we will all agree on a comprehensive plan to provide regular salary increases. We are sorry, but we just do not know yet how to give you the salaries you deserve."

We need qualified workers in Government service. There, employees are performing functions which are crucial to the national defense, safety, economy, and welfare. Large numbers of them act in direct support of defense activities or in other equally important tasks wherein failure might adversely affect the entire Nation. Not only do we have a responsibility to our present employees, but it is necessary that we have a Government service which is efficient and up to the enormous responsibility which faces it. I would feel responsible to neither my fellow citizens who are Government workers nor to the citizens of the country who demand and deserve good government, if I did not continue to support a just rate of pay for Federal and postal employees. H.R. 9883 will go a long way toward making their salaries what they should be.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support and urge favorable action on H.R. 9883, a bill to reaffirm the historic policy of Congress that employees of the Government of the United States shall receive fair compensation for the great public service they perform.

To state the objective differently, the bill recognizes that the high quality of service which is required for the conduct of the Government's business warrants recognition, in terms of salaries and wage rates, at least equal to that which is given to comparable services in private enterprise which is protected and supported by the Government.

As originally reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, this bill would provide fair and reasonable compensation comparable to that enjoyed by employees in private industry by giving a 9-percent across-the-board pay increase to those categories of Federal employees consistently included in salary legislation. As now amended, it provides a somewhat lesser raise of 7½ percent, which is certainly not excessive in any event and represents a sincere effort to make sure that this legislation does not end in a stalemate between Congress and the Executive. If this bill is vetoed and the veto is not overridden, then it will be obvious to all that no compromise could possibly have been effected, since those of us concerned with this legislation have more than leaned over backward to try to pass a bill which can become law.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 establishes beyond a doubt that a pay increase is warranted. During its consideration of the various pay bills, the committee was faced with the difficult problem of deciding what rate of increase should be proposed. It is my conviction that this decision should be based on a determination of the amount required to provide Federal employees with pay comparable to that in private enterprise. This view recognizes that all that postal and other Federal employees have ever asked of their Government is fair and timely salary provisions.

My motion in committee to amend H.R. 9883 to provide for a 9-percent across-the-board increase was approved by the committee on a conclusion that this amount of increase would achieve reasonable comparability.

The proposed pay increases would apply to slightly more than 1½ million employees of the Federal Government. The 9-percent raise would have meant an estimated cost of approximately $846 million. The lesser raise will cost about $680 million. It must be recognized that these 1½ million employees are the people responsible for performing the tasks incident to an annual Federal expenditure of well over $70 billion. It seems to me that the estimated cost is a completely reasonable price to pay to assure fair compensation to a group of employees who, in the aggregate, bear so great a responsibility.

The opposition to a pay increase has been based primarily on two arguments, neither of which, to me, is persuasive.

In the first place, the administration has argued that a pay increase at this time would have an unfavorable effect on its anticipated $4.2 billion budget surplus for next year. Certainly, there can be no argument against economical government or against the achievement of a budget surplus by legitimate economies. At the same time, reasonable people will agree, I think, that withholding pay from its work force is too high a price to pay for a budget surplus. This argument against pay increases raises a serious question whether the administration may be seeking to achieve personal objectives and political advantage at the expense of its civilian employees, who are clearly entitled to a salary increase at this time.

The second major argument has been that all efforts to adjust Federal salaries should await the results of a comparative study of Federal and private industry salaries, which has been recently undertaken by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This argument, it seems to me, is completely specious in the light of the overwhelming evidence which shows that Federal employees generally are now far below the levels of comparable salaries in private enterprise. Administration representatives who now oppose pay increases have themselves consistently maintained that the Government has extreme difficulty in recruiting and retaining competent employees in the Government because of disparities in pay. In this connection, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization on December 4, 1959, stated:

> In contrast, statutory increases in the Classification Act pay schedules have been much less frequent and have usually trailed far behind such changes in industry. The result has been an almost continuing unfavorable competitive position in the labor market for the kinds and quality of white collar employees needed to staff the varied and complex activities of our Government.

It is difficult to understand what purpose, other than mere delay, would be accomplished by awaiting the results of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' survey in the face of the clear evidence we have before us.

The evidence presented during the hearings on H.R. 9883 and a number of companion bills establishes without any doubt that immediate and substantial Federal employee salary adjustments are necessary in the interest of efficiency in the Government and fairness to Government employees. The evidence clearly shows that (a) Federal employees are substantially below the level of the national economy; (b) that the salaries paid Federal employees do not compare

favorably to salaries paid for comparable work in private enterprise; and (c) that the rates of salary increases for Federal employees have lagged far behind the rates of increases in private enterprise over a period of years.

The following are only a few of the many comparisons which were presented during the committee hearings and which convince me that pay increases are justified at this time.

The largest single group of employees in the postal service are the clerks and letter carriers. The responsibilities of their jobs have been compared to those of policemen and firemen. Postal clerks and carriers are paid in a salary range of from $4,035 to $4,875 per year. This is generally about $1,000 a year below the pay ranges of policemen and firemen in 60 large metropolitan centers. In one of the largest cities, for example, policemen and firemen are paid in a range of $6,396 to $6,828, roughly $2,000 more per year than postal clerks and carriers.

The average weekly earnings of postal letter carriers is $89.23. A recent Department of Labor publication shows that the average weekly earnings of production workers in various industrial groups ranges from a low of $91.30 to a high of $118.13. In other words, in January 1960 the lowest paid group of industrial workers earned $2 per week more on the average than did the postal employees. The highest paid group of industrial workers earned approximately 30 percent more than the avcrage postal employee.

The same unfavorable comparison is shown between Federal employees in the classified service and employees on comparable jobs in private enterprise. For example, evidence has been presented to show that in 10 selected cities in the country tabulating machine operators earn an average of from $4,487 to $5,321 per year. Federal employees doing the same kind of work are paid $3,814 per year. Draftsmen in private industry earn from $5,686 to $6,443 per annum as compared to Federal pay for the same work of $4,560 per year.

A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that guards in private industry in various cities are paid at rates ranging from $1.80 per hour to $2.45 per hour. The entrance pay for guards in the civilian service in the Government is $1.57 per hour and the maximum rate a guard can earn is $1.84 per hour.

I think these few examples of comparable salary rates are sufficient to show without any doubt that the current rates of pay for Federal employees are substantially below those of comparable workers in private enterprise. Equally conclusive evidence has been presented to show that the salaries paid to Federal workers have not kept pace with the increases and cost of living and as a result it is now necessary for far too many Federal employees to accept outside spare time employment in order to provide their families with the necessities of life.

It has also been shown, and this is admitted by administration representatives, that a great deal of the turnover of technical and professional people in the Government results from the Government's inability under existing salary scales to successfully compete with private industry for the services of those capable and well qualified necessary to perform many of the Government's functions.

I urge favorable action on this bill in order to recognize fairly and equitably the loyal, devoted service of the Government's civilian employees by giving them pay more nearly comparable to that enjoyed by their counterparts in private enterprise. Favorable action would further assure the Government's ability to recruit and retain the employees who have the qualifications and abilities to carry out the important responsibilities necessary to the preservation of the Government.

As the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, I was the first Member of the House to join our colleague, Representative THOMPSON, in signing the discharge petition which succeeded in bringing this bill before us, a discharge petition I am glad to say that I persuaded many other Members of the House also to sign. It is unfortunate that we had to take this unusual means of obtaining signatures from a majority of the membership in order to overcome obstructions to the orderly consideration of this bill under normal procedures.

Those of us who favor fair treatment for Uncle Sam's rank-and-file employees have had to wage a constant battle against an unsympathetic administration which flatly opposes pay raises for the average worker. This has been the policy from President Eisenhower on down. Week after week, we sat in committee listening to the pros and cons on this legislation, and throughout the period of the hearings there was a constant drumbeat of administration propaganda against any pay increase whatsoever.

At this moment, we are being told that if we reduce the size of the proposed increase even further—say to 5 percent—and perhaps add higher postal rates to it, there is a possibility, or a remote outside chance, that the President may sign such a bill. It is all very nebulous. Yet, all of the time we were considering this legislation in committee, the administration laid down a flat rule of no raise at all for the rank-and-file of employees.

On the other hand, no administration has ever worked harder at trying to obtain pay increases for the policymakers of the Government—particularly those in politically appointive offices. The top level of civil service, in these recent years of the Eisenhower administration, has been changed almost entirely into a patronage pool for the Republican National Committee. Career Government employees are given to understand that it helps to have Republican ties if they expect to obtain promotion to the top posts in what is supposed to be the career service. I am sure if it could find a way to provide pay increases only for Government employees in so-called policymaking jobs—and under this administration that covers a multitude of employees with political sponsorship—the administration would gladly support such a bill. But this bill—to reward the entire classified and postal services—is bitterly opposed on grounds that the cost of living has not risen enough since the last pay raise to justify the proposed increases so why enable any Government worker to get ahead?

When organized labor was fighting for the principle of wage escalation to meet increases in living costs, many of the same people now deciding policy for this administration bitterly opposed the idea as something right out of Moscow. Actually, of course, collective bargaining as we know it is the farthest thing away from the Russian system, but you would not think so to hear some of the complaints about unions—all unions.

It is now an accepted part of our industrial economic structure, of course, that cost-of-living increases should be reflected in wage settlements. But that is by no means the only measure of justifiable wage settlements in industry. Industry and labor also agree on increases reflecting increased productivity, on increases based on increased complexity of the work, on increases based on higher educational requirements or longer periods of training and so forth.

Now why should none of these things be taken into consideration in determining the wages of our Government employees? According to the administration, the only gage should be living costs. I disagree. I do not believe we must have a static wage structure in Government since we certainly do not have one in any other field. It is not enough, under the American system, that a worker stay even with his earning power of 10 or 20 years ago in terms of real income. Our economy has prospered because most workers steadily, over the years, have been able to improve their standard of living—which requires increase over and beyond living cost increases.

In the postal system, I can say from firsthand knowledge that low wages are a major cause of poor employee morale and much turnover in personnel. We are forcing out good people who had intended to make their careers in the postal service. They cannot afford to remain. Those who take pride in the service, who have long years of seniority, and who grew up in the post office and have developed a dedication to the public service, have suffered real financial hardship in recent years as workers in other fields obtained, through collective bargaining, far better pay scales than the postal employee. Many postal workers are on double duty, taking other off-hour jobs in order to make ends meet. This is not fair to them or to their families, and it is not fair to the taxpayer who wants and expects alert and wide awake and conscientious service from the post office.

This is not the time, perhaps, to go into the other problems of the postal people under the weird operational policies now in effect, but the combination of low pay in comparison to other workers plus the aggravations of trying to keep up with the razzle-dazzle of post office directive and guidelines and ex-

perimentation in mail routing policies—policies which seem to be based on a program of change merely for the sake of change—make the postal service a most unhappy place these days. A wage raise will help, at least, to make it a little pleasanter until we can get rid of bungling and chaos in the Department.

For the career classified employee, the situation has not been quite as unhappy as it has been for the postal employee in recent years. The people brought in by the Eisenhower administration to run the other Government departments nearly all started out on the assumption that Government workers were drones and morons, but gradually changed their opinions after discovering to their surprise the quality of work done by the career employees and their conscientious devotion to duty. So it has not been fashionable lately in most agencies—as it has been during the past 7 years in the Post Office Department—to regard the Government employee as a brainless, slipshod, disinterested worker. Nevertheless, Government employment has not yet been restored to the professional prestige it enjoyed prior to this administration, and pay scales have not kept pace with the rates paid to people with similar skills in industry and the professions. This bill now before us will help to correct some of the inequality.

It is on the whole a good bill. We on the committee worked long and hard on it. It deserves not only the votes it will receive to assure its passage here today but sufficient additional votes to show we can overcome a veto. I hope every Member who sincerely believes in the importance of the work done by our classified and postal employees will make his convictions meaningful by supporting this bill. Regardless of our politics, we all know how devoted our postal employees have been in the past—how careful and conscientious and dedicated to service. That spirit is now unfortunately going out of the postal service—has been going out of the service—because of the way the career people have been treated by their top bosses in Washington. Many postal workers more and more take the attitude of "What's the use?" This trend must be reversed. The place to start is on pay scales—right now. I hope with new leadership in the Department in Washington we can take care of the other side of this problem—the operational chaos and bungling. Congress cannot solve that problem right now—the voters must act first. But we will solve it, I hope, next year.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The Clerk will read the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"TITLE I—POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

"Short title

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Postal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'.

"Postal field service schedule

"SEC. 102. The Postal Field Service Schedule contained in section 301(a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended (72 Stat. 145, 215; 39 U.S.C. 971 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

" 'Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$3,520	$3,635	$3,750	$3,865	$3,980	$4,095	$4,210
2	3,755	3,875	3,995	4,115	4,235	4,385	4,495
3	4,020	4,150	4,290	4,430	4,570	4,710	4,850
4	4,415	4,565	4,715	4,865	5,015	5,165	5,315
5	4,660	4,815	4,970	5,125	5,280	5,435	5,590
6	5,040	5,210	5,380	5,550	5,720	5,890	6,060
7	5,440	5,625	5,810	5,995	6,180	6,365	6,550
8	5,920	6,120	6,320	6,520	6,720	6,920	7,120
9	6,355	6,575	6,795	7,015	7,235	7,455	7,675
10	6,965	7,205	7,445	7,685	7,925	8,165	8,405
11	7,670	7,930	8,190	8,450	8,710	8,970	9,230
12	8,450	8,735	9,020	9,305	9,590	9,875	10,160
13	9,290	9,600	9,910	10,220	10,530	10,840	11,150
14	10,230	10,565	10,900	11,235	11,570	11,905	12,240
15	11,230	11,595	11,960	12,325	12,690	13,055	13,420
16	12,375	12,740	13,105	13,470	13,835	14,200	14,565
17	13,695	14,060	14,425	14,790	15,155	15,520	15,885
18	15,375	15,740	16,105	16,470	16,835	17,200	
19	16,815	17,180	17,330				
20	17,440						

"Rural carrier schedule

"SEC. 103. (a) The Rural Carrier Schedule contained in section 302(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 145; 39 U.S.C. 972(a)), is amended to read as follows:

" 'Rural carrier schedule

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,291.00	$2,362.00	$2,433.00	$2,504.00	$2,575.00	$2,646.00	$2,717.00
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65.00	67.00	69.00	71.00	73.00	75.00	77.00
For each mile of route over 30 miles	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	2,291.00						
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65.00						
For each mile of route over 30 miles	24.00						
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

" '1 Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.'

"(b) Section 302(c) of such Act, as amended (69 Stat. 119, 72 Stat. 145; 39 U.S.C. 972(c)), is amended by striking out '$5,165 during the period referred to in section 304(c) or $5,035 thereafter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the basic salary for the maximum step in the Rural Carrier Schedule for a route sixty-one miles in length'.

"Fourth-class office schedule

"SEC. 104. The Fourth-Class Office Schedule contained in section 303(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 973(a)), is amended to read as follows:

" '4th-class office schedule

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$3,023	$3,123	$3,223	$3,323	$3,423	$3,523	$3,623
$900 to $1,299.99	2,768	2,860	2,952	3,044	3,136	3,228	3,320
$600 to $899.99	2,267	2,343	2,419	2,495	2,571	2,647	2,723
$350 to $599.99	1,761	1,819	1,877	1,935	1,993	2,051	2,109
$250 to $349.99	1,261	1,302	1,343	1,384	1,425	1,466	1,507
$200 to $249.99	1,007	1,040	1,073	1,106	1,139	1,172	1,205
$100 to $199.99	755	779	803	827	851	875	899
Under $100	505	521	537	553	569	585	601'

"Related provisions covering postal field service employees

"SEC. 105. (a) Section 304(c) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 974(c)), is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 401 of such Act, as amended (39 U.S.C. 981), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

" '(d) Any increase in basic salary granted by law on or after the effective date of this subsection shall not be deemed to be an

equivalent increase in basic salary within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section.'

"(c) The annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose basic salary, immediately prior to the effective date of this subsection, is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate, in the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, whichever may be applicable, is hereby increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this title in the next lower rate of the appropriate level in such schedule. As used in this subsection, the term 'basic salary' has the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"(d) Section 204(b) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended (39 U.S.C. 964(b)), is amended by striking out 'thirty' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'.

"(e) This title shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"TITLE II—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

"Short title

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'.

"Salary increase for employees subject to Classification Act of 1949

"SEC. 202. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 203; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"'Grade	Per annum rates					
GS-1	$3,310	$3,405	$3,500	$3,595	$3,690	$3,785	$3,880
GS-2	3,605	3,700	3,795	3,890	3,985	4,080	4,180
GS-3	3,845	3,940	4,035	4,130	4,230	4,335	4,440
GS-4	4,105	4,200	4,305	4,410	4,515	4,610	4,725
GS-5	4,405	4,570	4,735	4,900	5,065	5,230	5,395
GS-6	4,895	5,060	5,225	5,390	5,555	5,720	5,885
GS-7	5,430	5,595	5,760	5,925	6,090	6,255	6,420
GS-8	5,965	6,130	6,295	6,460	6,625	6,790	6,955
GS-9	6,525	6,690	6,855	7,020	7,185	7,350	7,515
GS-10	7,095	7,260	7,425	7,590	7,755	7,920	8,085
GS-11	7,665	7,930	8,195	8,460	8,725	8,990	------
GS-12	9,080	9,345	9,610	9,875	10,140	10,405	------
GS-13	10,785	11,050	11,315	11,580	11,845	12,110	------
GS-14	12,380	12,645	12,910	13,175	13,440	13,705	------
GS-15	13,920	14,250	14,580	14,910	15,240	------	------
GS-16	15,470	15,735	16,000	16,265	16,530	------	------
GS-17	16,760	17,025	17,290	17,555	17,820	------	------
GS-18	19,000	------	------	------	------	------	------

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such Act, as amended.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 and by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, (C) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and (D) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this title or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of such Act of Septembr 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

"Employees subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946

"SEC. 203. (a) The third sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended by striking out '$19,250' and inserting in lieu thereof '$19,800'.

"(b) The fourth sentence of section 412 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$17,510	$17,990	$18,470	$18,950	$19,430	$19,650	$19,700	------
Class 2	15,110	15,470	15,830	16,190	16,550	16,910	17,270	------
Class 3	12,710	13,070	13,430	13,790	14,150	14,510	14,870	------
Class 4	10,795	11,095	11,395	11,695	11,995	12,295	12,595	------
Class 5	8,875	9,175	9,475	9,775	10,075	10,375	10,675	------
Class 6	7,315	7,555	7,795	8,035	8,275	8,515	8,755	------
Class 7	6,115	6,295	6,475	6,655	6,835	7,015	7,195	------
Class 8	5,160	5,340	5,520	5,700	5,880	6,060	6,240	$6,420'

"(c) The second sentence of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870) is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum rates of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$12,830	$13,210	$13,590	$13,970	$14,350	------	------
Class 2	11,905	12,235	12,565	12,895	13,225	------	------
Class 3	10,935	11,245	11,555	11,865	12,175	------	------
Class 4	9,915	10,225	10,535	10,845	11,155	------	------
Class 5	9,155	9,420	9,685	9,950	10,215	$10,480	------
Class 6	8,385	8,620	8,855	9,090	9,325	9,560	------
Class 7	7,620	7,855	8,090	8,325	8,560	8,795	------
Class 8	6,855	7,090	7,325	7,560	7,795	8,030	------
Class 9	6,090	6,325	6,560	6,795	7,030	7,265	------
Class 10	5,580	5,775	5,970	6,165	6,360	6,555	$6,750
Class 11	5,070	5,225	5,380	5,535	5,690	5,845	6,000
Class 12	4,560	4,715	4,870	5,025	5,180	5,335	5,490
Class 13	4,070	4,225	4,380	4,535	4,690	4,845	5,000
Class 14	3,600	3,760	3,920	4,080	4,240	4,400	4,560
Class 15	3,370	3,490	3,610	3,730	3,850	3,970	4,090
Class 16	3,135	3,215	3,295	3,375	3,455	3,535	3,615
Class 17	2,900	2,980	3,060	3,140	3,220	3,300	3,380
Class 18	2,680	2,760	2,840	2,920	3,000	3,080	3,160
Class 19	2,445	2,525	2,605	2,685	2,765	2,845	2,925
Class 20	2,210	2,290	2,370	2,450	2,530	2,610	2,690
Class 21	1,975	2,055	2,135	2,215	2,295	2,375	2,455
Class 22	1,745	1,825	1,905	1,985	2,065	2,145	2,225'

"(d) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the step rates provided by section 412 or section 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation on or after the effective date of this section at the corresponding step rate as provided by such section 412 or 415 as amended by this section.

"Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

"SEC. 204. (a) Section 4103(b) of title 38 of the United States Code, prescribing the annual salary of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '$19,580' and inserting in lieu thereof '$21,345'.

"(b) Section 4103(c) of such title, prescribing the annual salary of the Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '$18,480' and inserting in lieu thereof '$20,145'.

"(c) Section 4103(d) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant Chief Medical Directors and the directors of service or chiefs of division of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$17,380' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,945'; and

"(2) by striking out '$14,545 minimum to $16,500 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,855 minimum to $17,985 maximum'.

"(d) Section 4103(e) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of

Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$12,770 minimum to $13,970 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '$13,920 minimum to $15,230 maximum'; and

"(2) by striking out '$11,355 minimum to $12,555 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,380 minimum to $13,685 maximum'.

"(e) Section 4103(f) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietitian, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, the chief pharmacist and the chief dietitian shall be paid a salary of $13,920 minimum to $15,230 maximum a year and the chief physical therapist and the chief occupational therapist shall be paid a salary of $12,380 minimum to $13,685 maximum a year.

"(f) Section 4107 of such title, relating to the maximum and minimum rates of annual salary of certain employees of the Medical Service, the Dental Service, and the Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"'(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"'*Medical service*

"'Chief grade, $13,920 minimum to $15,230 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $12,380 minimum to $13,685 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $10,785 minimum to $12,090 maximum.

"'Full grade, $9,080 minimum to $10,390 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $7,665 minimum to $8,975 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $7,095 minimum to $8,075 maximum.

"'*Dental service*

"'Chief grade, $13,920 minimum to $15,230 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $12,380 minimum to $13,685 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $10,785 minimum to $12,090 maximum.

"'Full grade, $9,080 minimum to $10,390 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $7,665 minimum to $8,975 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $7,095 minimum to $8,075 maximum.

"'*Nursing service*

"'Assistant Director, $9,080 minimum to $10,390 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $7,665 minimum to $8,975 maximum.

"'Full grade, $6,525 minimum to $7,505 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $5,675 minimum to $6,720 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $4,825 minimum to $5,870 maximum.

"'*Administration*

"'(b) Notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of physicians, dentists, and nurses.'

"(g) Section 4108(d) of such title, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Any person, rated as a medical, surgical, or dental specialist under the provisions of this section, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 15 per centum of such pay, but in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed $17,440 per annum.'

"Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

"SEC. 205. (a) The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(b)(1) Section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) This Act shall apply to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)), subject to the following requirements:

"'(1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this Act with respect to such employees;

"'(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to accept the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee with respect to service, for purposes of this Act, rendered by such employees prior to the effective date of this amendment; and

"'(3) Service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment as an employee of a county committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be included in computing length of creditable service for the purposes of this Act only (A) if the employee has to his credit a total period of not less than five years of allowable service under this Act (including service allowable under this amendment) and (B) if, within two years after the effective date of this amendment, the employee shall have deposited with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the fund, a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts which would have been deducted from his basic salary during the period of service claimed under this paragraph if during such period he had been subject to this Act.'

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of this subsection shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

"(c) Section 2 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall, under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, come within the purview of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons.'

"(d) Section 3 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (5 U.S.C. 3002) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) may, in such manner and under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, enroll in an approved health benefits plan described in section 4 either as an individual or for self and family, under the same terms and conditions as apply to other employees who are eligible to enroll in such a plan under this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons.'

"Employees in the judicial branch

"SEC. 206. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604(a)(5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or section 107(a)(6) of the Act of July 31, 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2206(a)(6)), are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 202 of this title in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this title.

"(c) Section 753(e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out '$7,095' and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,735'.

"Employees in the legislative branch

"SEC. 207. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 9 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

"(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on July 1, 1960, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate (except the Presiding Officer of the Senate), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief

Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 9 per centum.

"(d) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 510; Public Law 242, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended to read as follows:

" 'No officer or employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of $8,880 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of $17,900 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law. This paragraph shall not apply to employees whose rates of compensation are subject to the limitations provided by the amendments made by subsections (g) and (h) of section 207 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960.'

"(e) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 9 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

"(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a).

"(g) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (69 Stat. 505; Public Law 242, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended (1) by striking out '$8,040 per annum' and inserting 'any amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized for grade 16 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended', (2) by striking out '$8,460 per annum' and inserting 'any amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized for grade 17 of the General Schedule of such Act', and (3) by striking out '$8,880 per annum' and inserting 'any amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the General Schedule of such Act'.

"(h)(1) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U.S.C. 60f), is amended to read as follows: *'Provided*, That no salary shall be fixed under this section at a basic rate of more than $5,100 per annum, except that (1) the salary of one employee may be fixed at a basic rate which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate provided by the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, (2) the salary of one other employee may be fixed at a basic rate which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate provided for grade 17 of such schedule, and (3) the salary of one other employee may be fixed at a basic rate which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate provided for grade 16 of such schedule'.

"(2) The basic clerk hire allowance of each Senator is increased by $1,020.

"(i) The basic compensation of the Administrative Assistants to the Speaker, Majority Leader, Minority Leader, Majority Whip, and Minority Whip, and of the Administrative Assistant to any Member of the House who has served as Speaker of the House, shall be at a per annum basic rate which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, is equal to the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(j) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended (1) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,' and (2) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(k)(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Clause 28(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended (A) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,' and (B) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(l) Each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased automatically, or is not permitted to be increased administratively, by reason of any other provision of this section, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 9 per centum of the rate of his total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

"(m) The limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 9 per centum. The amount of each such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(n) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

"TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Effective date

"SEC. 302. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1960."

Mr. MORRISON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment in the reported bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, for the present, I object.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the committee amendment.

Mr. MORRISON (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment in the reported bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MORRISON as a substitute to the committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I—SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

"Part A—Postal field service employees

"Short Title

"SEC. 101. This part may be cited as the 'Postal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'.

"Postal Field Service Schedule

"SEC. 102. The Postal Field Service Schedule contained in section 301(a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended (72 Stat. 145, 215; 39 U.S.C. 971(a)), is amended to read as follows:

" 'POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

Level	Per annum rates and steps							Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$3,415	$3,545	$3,675	$3,805	$3,935	$4,065	$4,195	11	$7,560	$7,820	$8,080	$8,340	$8,600	$8,860	$9,120
2	3,670	3,805	3,940	4,075	4,210	4,345	4,480	12	8,320	8,605	8,890	9,175	9,460	9,745	10,030
3	3,955	4,100	4,245	4,390	4,535	4,680	4,825	13	9,160	9,470	9,780	10,090	10,400	10,710	11,020
4	4,345	4,505	4,665	4,825	4,985	5,145	5,305	14	10,075	10,410	10,745	11,080	11,415	11,750	12,085
5	4,605	4,765	4,925	5,085	5,245	5,405	5,565	15	11,075	11,440	11,805	12,170	12,535	12,900	13,265
6	4,975	5,150	5,325	5,500	5,675	5,850	6,025	16	12,205	12,570	12,935	13,300	13,665	14,030	14,395
7	5,370	5,555	5,740	5,925	6,110	6,295	6,480	17	13,505	13,870	14,235	14,600	14,965	15,330	15,695
8	5,790	5,995	6,200	6,405	6,610	6,815	7,020	18	15,165	15,525	15,885	16,245	16,605	16,965	16,965
9	6,255	6,480	6,705	6,930	7,155	7,380	7,605	19	16,585	16,945	17,095				
10	6,870	7,110	7,350	7,590	7,830	8,070	8,310	20	17,200						

"Rural Carrier Schedule

"SEC. 103. (a) The Rural Carrier Schedule contained in section 302(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 145; 39 U.S.C. 972(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"'RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

"'Per annum rates and steps

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,053	$2,132	$2,211	$2,290	$2,369	$2,448	$2,527
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	71	73	75	77	79	81	83
For each mile of route over 30 miles	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	2,053	------	------	------	------	------	------
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	$71	------	------	------	------	------	------
For each mile of route over 30 miles	24	------	------	------	------	------	------
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

"'1 Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.'

"(b) Section 302(c) of such Act, as amended (69 Stat. 119, 72 Stat, 145; 39 U.S.C. 972 (c)), is amended by striking out '$5,165 during the period referred to in section 304(c) or $5,035 thereafter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the basic salary for the maximum step in the Rural Carrier Schedule for a route sixty-one miles in length'.

"Fourth-class office schedule

"SEC. 104. The Fourth-Class Office Schedule contained in section 303(a) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 973(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"'FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps							Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,979	$3,078	$3,177	$3,276	$3,375	$3,474	$3,573	$250 to $349.99	$1,242	$1,282	$1,322	$1,362	$1,402	$1,442	$1,482
$900 to $1,299.99	2,730	2,820	2,910	3,000	3,090	3,180	3,270	$200 to $249.99	993	1,025	1,057	1,089	1,121	1,153	1,185
$600 to $899.99	2,234	2,309	2,384	2,459	2,534	2,609	2,684	$100 to $199.99	745	769	793	817	841	865	889
$350 to $599.99	1,737	1,794	1,851	1,908	1,965	2,022	2,079	Under $100	495	511	527	543	559	575	591'

"Related Provisions Covering Postal Field Service Employees

"SEC. 105. (a) Section 304(c) of such Act, as amended (72 Stat. 146; 39 U.S.C. 974(c)), is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 401 of such Act, as amended (39 U.S.C. 981), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(d) Any increase in basic salary granted by law on or after the effective date of this subsection shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase in basic salary within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section.'

"(c) The annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose basic salary, immediately prior to the effective date of this subsection, is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate, in the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, whichever may be applicable, is hereby increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this part in the next lower rate of the appropriate level in such schedule. As used in this subsection, the term 'basic salary' has the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"(d) This part shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"Part B—Government employees generally

"Short Title

"SEC. 111. This part may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960'.

"Salary Increase for Employees Subject to Classification Act of 1949

"SEC. 112. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 203; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"'Grade	Per annum rates							"'Grade	Per anum rates						
GS-1	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395	$3,500	$3,605	$3,710	$3,815	GS-10	$6,995	$7,160	$7,325	$7,490	$7,655	$7,820	$7,985
GS-2	3,500	3,605	3,710	3,815	3,920	4,025	4,130	GS-11	7,560	7,820	8,080	8,340	8,600	8,860	------
GS-3	3,760	3,865	3,970	4,075	4,180	4,285	4,390	GS-12	8,955	9,215	9,475	9,735	9,995	10,255	------
GS-4	4,040	4,145	4,250	4,355	4,460	4,565	4,670	GS-13	10,635	10,895	11,155	11,415	11,675	11,935	------
GS-5	4,345	4,510	4,675	4,840	5,005	5,170	5,335	GS-14	12,210	12,470	12,730	12,990	13,250	13,510	------
GS-6	4,830	4,995	5,160	5,325	5,490	5,655	5,820	GS-15	13,730	14,055	14,380	14,705	15,030	------	------
GS-7	5,355	5,520	5,685	5,850	6,015	6,180	6,345	GS-16	15,255	15,515	15,775	16,035	16,295	------	------
GS-8	5,885	6,050	6,215	6,380	6,545	6,710	6,875	GS-17	16,530	16,790	17,050	17,310	17,570	------	------
GS-9	6,435	6,600	6,765	6,930	7,095	7,260	7,425	GS-18	18,500	------	------	------	------	------	------'

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such Act, as amended.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of

1955 and by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, (C) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and (D) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this title or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of such Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

"Employees Subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946

"SEC. 113. (a) The third sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended by striking out '$19,250' and inserting in lieu thereof '$19,800'.

"(b) The fourth sentence of section 412 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$17,250	$17,650	$18,050	$18,450	$18,850	$19,250	$19,650	-------
Class 2	14,900	15,255	15,610	15,965	16,320	16,675	17,030	-------
Class 3	12,535	12,890	13,245	13,600	13,955	14,310	14,665	-------
Class 4	10,645	10,945	11,245	11,545	11,845	12,145	12,445	-------

Class 5	$8,755	$9,055	$9,355	$9,655	$9,955	$10,255	$10,555	-------
Class 6	7,215	7,455	7,695	7,935	8,175	8,415	8,655	-------
Class 7	6,035	6,215	6,395	6,575	6,755	6,935	7,115	-------
Class 8	5,085	5,265	5,445	5,625	5,805	5,985	6,165	$6,345'

"(c) The second sentence of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870) is amended to read as follows: 'The per annum rates of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$12,655	$13,030	$13,405	$13,780	$14,155	----------	----------	----------
Class 2	11,740	12,065	12,390	12,715	13,040	----------	----------	----------
Class 3	10,785	11,095	11,405	11,715	12,025	----------	----------	----------
Class 4	9,780	10,909	10,400	10,710	11,020	----------	----------	----------
Class 5	9,025	9,285	9,545	9,805	10,065	$10,325	----------	----------
Class 6	8,270	8,500	8,730	8,960	9,190	9,420	----------	----------
Class 7	7,515	7,745	7,975	8,205	8,435	8,665	----------	----------
Class 8	6,760	6,990	7,220	7,450	7,680	7,910	----------	----------
Class 9	6,005	6,235	6,465	6,695	6,925	7,155	----------	----------
Class 10	5,500	5,690	5,880	6,070	6,260	6,450	$6,640	----------
Class 11	5,000	5,155	5,310	5,465	5,620	5,775	5,930	----------

Class 12	$4,495	$4,650	$4,805	$4,960	$5,115	$5,270	$5,425	----------
Class 13	4,010	4,165	4,320	4,475	4,630	4,785	4,940	----------
Class 14	3,550	3,705	3,860	4,015	4,170	4,325	4,480	----------
Class 15	3,325	3,440	3,555	3,670	3,785	3,900	4,015	----------
Class 16	3,095	3,175	3,255	3,335	3,415	3,495	3,575	----------
Class 17	2,860	2,940	3,020	3,100	3,180	3,260	3,340	----------
Class 18	2,640	2,720	2,800	2,880	2,960	3,040	3,120	----------
Class 19	2,410	2,490	2,570	2,650	2,730	2,810	2,890	----------
Class 20	2,180	2,260	2,340	2,420	2,500	2,580	2,660	----------
Class 21	1,950	2,030	2,110	2,190	2,270	2,350	2,430	----------
Class 22	1,720	1,800	1,880	1,960	2,040	2,120	2,200	----------

"(d) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the step rates provided by section 412 or section 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation on or after the effective date of this section at the corresponding step rate as provided by such section 412 or 415 as amended by this section.

"Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

"SEC. 114. (a) Section 4103(b) of title 38 of the United States Code relating to the annual salary of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '$19,580' and inserting in lieu thereof '$21,050'.

"(b) Section 4103(c) of such title, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '$18,480' and inserting in lieu thereof '$19,870'.

"(c) Section 4103(d) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant Chief Medical Directors and the directors of service or chiefs of division of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$17,380' and inserting in lieu thereof '$18,685'; and

"(2) by striking out '$14,545 minimum to $16,500 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,640 minimum to $17,740 maximum'.

"(d) Section 4103(e) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$12,770 minimum to $13,970 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '$13,730 minimum to $15,030 maximum'; and

"(2) by striking out '$11,355 minimum to $12,555 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,210 minimum to $13,510 maximum'.

"(e) Section 4103(f) of such title, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietitian, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, the chief pharmacist and the chief dietitian shall be paid a salary of $13,730 minimum to $15,030 maximum a year and the chief physical therapist and the chief occupational therapist shall be paid a salary of $12,210 minimum to $13,510 maximum a year.'

"(f) Section 4107(a) of such title, relating to the maximum and minimum rates of annual salary of certain employees of the Medical Service, the Dental Service, and the Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"'(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"'Medical Service

"'Chief grade, $13,730 minimum to $15,030 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $12,210 minimum to $13,510 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $10,635 minimum to $11,935 maximum.

"'Full grade, $8,955 minimum to $10,255 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $7,560 minimum to $8,860 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $6,995 minimum to $7,985 maximum.

"'Dental Service

"'Chief grade, $13,730 minimum to $15,030 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $12,210 minimum to $13,510 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $10,635 minimum to $11,935 maximum.

"'Full grade, $8,955 minimum to $10,255 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $7,560 minimum to $8,860 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $6,995 minimum to $7,985 maximum.

"'Nursing Service

"'Assistant Director, $8,955 minimum to $10,255 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $7,560 minimum to $8,860 maximum.

"'Full grade, $6,435 minimum to $7,425 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $5,600 minimum to $6,630 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $4,760 minimum to $5,790 maximum.

"'Administration

"'(b) Notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of physicians, dentists, and nurses.'

"(g) Section 4108(d) of such title, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Any person, rated as a medical, surgical, or dental specialist under the provisions of this section, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 15 per centum of such pay, but in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed $17,200 per annum.'

"Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee Employees

"SEC. 115. (a) The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by this title for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(b)(1) Section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2252), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) This Act shall apply to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)), subject to the following requirements:

"'(1) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this Act with respect to such employees;

"'(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to accept the certification of the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee with respect to service, for purposes of this Act, rendered by such employees prior to the effective date of this amendment; and

"'(3) Service rendered prior to the effective date of this amendment as an employee of a county committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be included in computing length of creditable service for the purposes of this Act only (A) if the employee has to his credit a total period of not less than five years of allowable service under this Act (including service allowable under this amendment) and (B) if, within two years after the effective date of this amendment, the employee shall have deposited with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the fund, a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts which would have been deducted from his basic salary during the period of service claimed under this paragraph if during such period he had been subject to this Act.'

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of this subsection shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

"(c) Section 2 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b) shall, under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, come within the purview of this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons.'

"(d) Section 3 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (5 U.S.C. 3002) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) may, in such manner and under such conditions of eligibility as the Commission by regulation may prescribe, enroll in an approved health benefits plan described in section 4 either as an individual or for self and family, under the same terms and conditions as apply to other employees who are eligible to enroll in such a plan under this Act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of this subsection with respect to such persons.'

"Employees in the Judicial Branch

"SEC. 116. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604(a)(5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or section 107(a)(6) of the Act of July 31, 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2206(a)(6)), are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 612 of this part in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this part.

"(c) Section 753(e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out '$7,095' and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,630'.

"Employees in the Legislative Branch

"SEC. 117. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

"(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on July 1, 1960, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate (except the Presiding Officer of the Senate), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 7.5 per centum.

"(d) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 510; Public Law 242, Eighty-fourth Congress), is amended to read as follows:

"'No officer or employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of $8,800 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of $17,525 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law.'

"(e) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 7.5 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

"(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employers in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a).

"(g) Each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and it is not increased automatically, or is not permitted to be increased administratively, by reason of any other provision of this section, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 per centum of the rate of his total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

"(h) The limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 7.5 per centum. The amount of each such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(i) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

"Part C—General Provisions

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 121. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and title II.

"Effective Date

"SEC. 122. The foregoing provisions of this title and the provisions of section 201 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1960.

"TITLE II—EXECUTIVE AND SUPERGRADE POSITIONS

"SEC. 201. The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 be amended as follows:

"(1) Section 106(a) is amended by adding the following new subparagraph after subparagraph (45):

"'(46) Legal adviser, solicitor, or general counsel of an executive department (excluding the Department of Justice)'.

"(2) Section 106(b) is amended by deleting the present subparagraph (9) and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(9) General counsel of a military department'.

"SEC. 202. There shall be in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the classified civil service, who shall perform such duties as the Secretary shall prescribe, and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be $19,000.

"SEC. 203. (a) Subsection (b) of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out 'fourteen hundred and twenty-nine' and inserting 'fourteen hundred and nine', (2) by striking out 'three hundred and seventy-one' and inserting 'three hundred and sixty-three', and (3) by striking out 'one hundred and fifty-three' and inserting 'one hundred and fifty-two'.

"(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(l) The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized, subject to the standards and procedures prescribed by this Act, to place a total of two positions in grade 18, ten positions in grade 17, and thirteen positions in grade 16 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b).'"

Mr. MORRISON (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the rest of it is, just briefly?

Mr. MORRISON. If the gentleman had remained here during general debate he would have heard it. It was debated for 2 hours, and we told exactly what was in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I heard it all right, but it was kind of difficult to understand the way you put it.

Mr. MORRISON. I will try to do better next time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up the Committee's time. I am sure they have heard everything contained in this substitute amendment. It in effect changes the amount of the pay raise from 9 percent across the board to 7.5 percent across the board salary raise for all Federal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] as a substitute to the committee amendment.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion comes too late.

The Committee will rise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the Chairman could explain that, why it is too late, under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion is in order only when amendments are in order, and under the rule amendments are not now in order.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9883) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 537, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REES of Kansas moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 9883, to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with instructions to report it back forthwith with a salary increase for those covered under the bill of 5 percent in lieu of the increase provided in the amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there can be only a straight motion to recommit on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The rule specifically provided otherwise. The rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 94, nays 324, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—94

Abbitt	Fisher	Mumma
Abernethy	Flynt	Nelsen
Alexander	Ford	O'Konski
Alger	Frelinghuysen	Passman
Allen	Gary	Pilcher
Andersen, Minn.	Goodell	Pillion
Andrews	Griffin	Poage
Arends	Haley	Poff
Avery	Halleck	Ray
Baker	Hardy	Reece, Tenn.
Barry	Harrison	Rees, Kans.
Bass, N.H.	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bates	Herlong	Robison
Bennett, Fla.	Hess	St. George
Berry	Hiestand	Scherer
Betts	Hoeven	Schneebeli
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Ill.	Short
Budge	Hoffman, Mich.	Sikes
Brynes, Wis.	Jackson	Siler
Cederberg	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Chamberlain	Keith	Smith, Miss.
Colmer	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Curtis, Mo.	Kitchin	Taber
Dague	Lafore	Teague, Calif.
Derwinski	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Devine	Langen	Thomson, Wyo.
Dorn, S.C.	Latta	Tuck
Dowdy	McCulloch	Westland
Downing	McIntire	Wharton
Elliott, Pa.	McMillan	Whitten
Everett	Matthews	Winstead
	Meader	

NAYS—324

Adair	Blatnik	Burke, Mass.
Addonizio	Blitch	Burleson
Albert	Boggs	Byrne, Pa.
Alford	Boland	Cahill
Anderson, Mont.	Bolling	Canfield
Anfuso	Bolton	Cannon
Ashley	Bonner	Casey
Ashmore	Bosch	Celler
Aspinall	Bow	Chelf
Auchincloss	Bowles	Chenoweth
Ayres	Boykin	Chiperfield
Bailey	Brademas	Church
Baldwin	Bray	Clark
Baring	Breeding	Coad
Barr	Brewster	Coffin
Barrett	Brock	Cohelan
Bass, Tenn.	Brooks, La.	Collier
Baumhart	Brooks, Tex.	Conte
Becker	Broomfield	Cook
Beckworth	Brown, Ga.	Cooley
Belcher	Brown, Mo.	Corbett
Bennett, Mich.	Broyhill	Cramer
	Burke, Ky.	Cunningham
Curtin	Karsten	Powell
Curtis, Mass.	Karth	Preston
Daddario	Kasem	Price
Daniels	Kastenmeier	Prokop
Davis, Ga.	Kearns	Pucinski
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Quie
Dawson	Kelly	Quigley
Delaney	Keogh	Rabaut
Dent	Kilday	Rains
Denton	Kilgore	Randall
Derounian	King, Calif.	Reuss
Diggs	King, Utah	Rhodes, Pa.
Dingell	Kirwan	Riehlman
Dixon	Kluczynski	Riley
Donohue	Knox	Rivers, Alaska
Dooley	Kowalski	Roberts
Dorn, N.Y.	Kyl	Rodino
Doyle	Landrum	Rogers, Colo.
Dulski	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Dwyer	Lankford	Rogers, Mass.
Edmondson	Lennon	Rogers, Tex.
Elliott, Ala.	Lesinski	Rooney
Evins	Levering	Roosevelt
Fallon	Libonati	Rostenkowski
Farbstein	Lindsay	Roush
Fascell	Lipscomb	Rutherford
Feighan	McCormack	Santangelo
Fenton	McDonough	Saund
Fino	McDowell	Saylor
Flood	McFall	Schenck
Flynn	McGinley	Schwengel
Fogarty	McGovern	Scott
Foley	McSween	Selden
Forand	Macdonald	Shelley
Forrester	Machrowicz	Sheppard
Fountain	Mack	Shipley
Frazier	Madden	Simpson
Friedel	Magnuson	Sisk
Fulton	Mahon	Slack
Gallagher	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Garmatz	Marshall	Smith, Iowa
Gathings	Martin	Spence
Gavin	Mason	Springer
George	May	Staggers
Giaimo	Merrow	Steed
Gilbert	Metcalf	Stratton
Glenn	Meyer	Stubblefield
Granahan	Michel	Sullivan
Grant	Miller, Clem	Teller
Gray	Miller, George P.	Thomas
Griffiths	Miller, N.Y.	Thompson, La.
Gross	Milliken	Thompson, N.J.
Gubser	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Hagen	Minshall	Thornberry
Halpern	Mitchell	Toll
Hargis	Moeller	Tollefson
Harmon	Monagan	Trimble
Harris	Montoya	Udall
Hays	Moore	Ullman
Healey	Moorhead	Utt
Hébert	Morgan	Vanik
Hechler	Morris, N. Mex.	Van Pelt
Hemphill	Morrison	Van Zandt
Hogan	Moss	Vinson
Holifield	Multer	Wainwright
Holland	Murphy	Wallhauser
Holt	Murray	Walter
Holtzman	Natcher	Wampler
Horan	Nix	Watts
Hosmer	Norblad	Weaver
Huddleston	Norrell	Weis
Hull	O'Brien, Ill.	Whitener
Ikard	O'Brien, N.Y.	Widnall
Inouye	O'Hara, Ill.	Wier
Irwin	O'Hara, Mich.	Williams
Jarman	O'Neill	Willis
Jennings	Oliver	Wilson
Jensen	Osmers	Withrow
Johansen	Ostertag	Wolf
Johnson, Calif.	Pelly	Wright
Johnson, Colo.	Perkins	Yates
Johnson, Md.	Pfost	Young
Johnson, Wis.	Philbin	Younger
Jones, Ala.	Pirnie	Zablocki
Jones, Mo.	Porter	Zelenko
Judd		

NOT VOTING—14

Barden	Durham	Moulder
Bentley	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Rivers, S.C.
Burdick	Loser	Taylor
Carnahan	Morris, Okla.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. JENNINGS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on this I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 40, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—378

Abbitt	Daddario	Hull
Abernethy	Dague	Ikard
Adair	Daniels	Inouye
Addonizio	Davis, Ga.	Irwin
Albert	Davis, Tenn.	Jarman
Alexander	Dawson	Jennings
Alford	Delaney	Jensen
Andersen, Minn.	Dent	Johnson, Calif.
	Denton	Johnson, Colo.
Anderson, Mont.	Derounian	Johnson, Md.
	Derwinski	Johnson, Wis.
Andrews	Devine	Jonas
Anfuso	Diggs	Jones, Ala.
Ashley	Dingell	Judd
Ashmore	Dixon	Karsten
Aspinall	Donohue	Karth
Auchincloss	Dooley	Kasem
Avery	Dorn, N.Y.	Kastenmeier
Ayres	Dowdy	Kearns
Bailey	Downing	Kee
Baker	Doyle	Keith
Baldwin	Dulski	Kelly
Baring	Dwyer	Keogh
Barr	Edmondson	Kilday
Barrett	Elliott, Ala.	Kilgore
Barry	Elliott, Pa.	King, Calif.
Bass, N.H.	Evins	King, Utah
Bass, Tenn.	Fallon	Kirwan
Bates	Farbstein	Kitchin
Baumhart	Fascell	Kluczynski
Becker	Feighan	Knox
Beckworth	Fenton	Kowalski
Belcher	Fino	Kyl
Bennett, Fla.	Fisher	Lafore
Bennett, Mich.	Flood	Landrum
Betts	Flynn	Lane
Blatnik	Fogarty	Langen
Blitch	Foley	Lankford
Boggs	Forand	Latta
Boland	Forrester	Lennon
Bolling	Fountain	Lesinski
Bolton	Frazier	Levering
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Libonati
Bosch	Friedel	Lindsay
Bow	Fulton	Lipscomb
Bowles	Gallagher	McCormack
Boykin	Garmatz	McCulloch
Brademas	Gary	McDonough
Bray	Gathings	McDowell
Breeding	Gavin	McFall
Brewster	George	McGinley
Brock	Giaimo	McGovern
Brooks, La.	Gilbert	McMillan
Brooks, Tex.	Glenn	McSween
Broomfield	Goodell	Macdonald
Brown, Ga.	Granahan	Machrowicz
Brown, Mo.	Grant	Mack
Brown, Ohio	Gray	Madden
Broyhill	Griffiths	Magnuson
Burke, Ky.	Gubser	Mahon
Burke, Mass.	Hagen	Mailliard
Burleson	Haley	Marshall
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Martin
Cahill	Hardy	Mason
Canfield	Hargis	Matthews
Cannon	Harmon	May
Casey	Harris	Meader
Celler	Hays	Merrow
Chamberlain	Healey	Metcalf
Chelf	Hébert	Meyer
Chenoweth	Hechler	Michel
Chiperfield	Hemphill	Miller, Clem
Church	Henderson	Miller, George P.
Clark	Herlong	
Coad	Hess	Miller, N.Y.
Coffin	Hiestand	Milliken
Cohelan	Hoeven	Mills
Collier	Hoffman, Ill.	Minshall
Conte	Hogan	Mitchell
Cook	Holifield	Moeller
Cooley	Holland	Monagan
Corbett	Holt	Montoya
Cramer	Holtzman	Moore
Cunningham	Horan	Moorhead
Curtin	Hosmer	Morgan
Curtis, Mass.	Huddleston	Morris, N.Mex.
Morrrison	Robison	Thomas
Moss	Rodino	Thompson, La.
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Thompson, N.J.
Mumma	Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, Tex.
Murphy	Rogers, Mass.	Thomson, Wyo.
Natcher	Rogers, Tex.	Thornberry
Nelsen	Rooney	Toll
Nix	Roosevelt	Tollefson
Norblad	Rostenkowski	Trimble
O'Brien, Ill.	Roush	Udall
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rutherford	Ullman
O'Hara, Ill.	St. George	Utt
O'Hara, Mich.	Santangelo	Vanik
O'Konski	Saund	Van Pelt
O'Neill	Saylor	Van Zandt
Oliver	Schenck	Vinson
Osmers	Schneebeli	Wainwright
Ostertag	Schwengel	Wallhauser
Passman	Scott	Walter
Pelly	Selden	Wampler
Perkins	Shelley	Watts
Pfost	Sheppard	Weaver
Philbin	Shipley	Wels
Pirnie	Sikes	Westland
Porter	Siler	Wharton
Powell	Simpson	Whitener
Preston	Sisk	Whitten
Price	Slack	Widnall
Prokop	Smith, Calif.	Wier
Pucinski	Smith, Iowa	Williams
Quie	Smith, Miss.	Willis
Quigley	Spence	Wilson
Rabaut	Springer	Winstead
Rains	Staggers	Withrow
Randall	Steed	Wolf
Reuss	Stratton	Wright
Rhodes, Pa.	Stubblefield	Yates
Riehlman	Sullivan	Young
Riley	Teague, Calif.	Younger
Rivers, Alaska	Teague, Tex.	Zablocki
Roberts	Teller	Zelenko

NAYS—40

Alger	Gross	Poage
Allen	Halleck	Poff
Arends	Harrison	Ray
Berry	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece, Tenn.
Budge	Jackson	Rees, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Johansen	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cederberg	Jones, Mo.	Scherer
Colmer	Kilburn	Short
Curtis, Mo.	Laird	Smith, Kans.
Dorn, S.C	McIntire	Smith, Va.
Everett	Murray	Taber
Flynt	Norrell	Tuck
Ford	Pilcher	
Griffin	Pillion	

NOT VOTING—14

Barden	Durham	Moulder
Bentley	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Rivers, S.C.
Burdick	Loser	Taylor
Carnahan	Morris, Okla.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, just prior to the vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1863)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 21.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 31, and 32, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$68,827,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,053,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,553,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$56,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,265,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,515,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$940,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$31,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,488,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "one hundred seventy four thousand and seven hundred and thirty six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "eighty-seven thousand and three hundred and sixty-eight"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4 and 6.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
LISTER HILL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2—Research: Appropriate $68,827,200 instead of $67,934,000 as proposed by the House and $70,247,600 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes the following increases above the funds approved by the House:

(1) $500,000 for research on spray residues, making a total of $750,000 additional for this purpose;

(2) $250,000 for utilization research, making a total increase of $950,000 for this purpose;

(3) A total of $272,500 for advance staffing of the cotton insect research laboratory and for additional research at three branch stations;

(4) $60,000 for initial staffing of two corn insect laboratories authorized last year;

(5) $350,000 for increased vegetable crops research;

(6) $75,000 for the Newell, S. Dak., research station;

(7) $20,000 for research on weeds of sugarcane at Houma, La.;

(8) $25,000 for pecan insect research at Albany, Ga.;

(9) $25,000 for research studies on salt cedars and other phreatophytes;

(10) $60,000 to increase poultry disease research at Athens, Ga.;

(11) $455,700 for staffing soil and water laboratories, which provides a total of $40,000 for the Humboldt River watershed in Nevada and $200,000 to expand research on hydrology problems in Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 3—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Appropriates $52,236,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $52,011,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—Plant and animal disease and pest control: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5—Special fund: Restores House language stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Construction of facilities: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House intend to offer a motion to recede and agree to the sum of $2,550,000 instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to provides funds for various research facilities as follows:

(1) $300,000 for initiating construction of the main laboratory and headquarters at the National Arboretum at a total cost of not to exceed $1,500,000;

(2) $250,000 for tobacco research facilities as provided in the House bill;

(3) $300,000 for planning and initiating construction of a facility at Athens, Ga., at not to exceed a total cost of $950,000 to conduct research on diseases and related problems affecting poultry;

(4) $200,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of $400,000 at Mississippi State University to conduct research in management and structures in relation to the prevention and control of disease and related methods of improving poultry quality in the Southeast;

(5) $300,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of $2,000,000 at or near the North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station at Fargo, N. Dak., for research on metabolism of agricultural chemicals in insects, plants, and livestock, and to develop sterility techniques for control of insects;

(6) $250,000 for research facilities on improved practices for conservation farming and ranching at Bushland, Tex., as provided in the House bill;

(7) $200,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of $400,000 to conduct basic research on tillage, traction, and transport equipment and its effect on soil conservation at Auburn, Ala.;

(8) $250,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of $850,000 to develop technology for sound conservation practices in the Snake River Valley;

(9) $350,000 for planning and initiating construction of a laboratory at not to exceed a total cost of $500,000 to conduct research on plants, soil, and nutrition at Ithaca, N.Y.;

(10) $150,000 for construction of a laboratory to study soil and water management practices of the Northwest at Pullman, Wash.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—State experiment stations: Appropriate $32,553,000 instead of $31,553,000 as proposed by the House and $32,553,708 as proposed by the Senate.

Extension service

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11—Payments to States and Puerto Rico: Appropriate $56,715,000 instead of $55,715,000 as proposed by the House and $57,715,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have eliminated from the bill the requirement that the use of the additional funds be limited to the county level. The conferees are in accord, however, that such increase should be used in accordance with such provision. A number of States have used the substantial increases made in this item in recent years for additional personnel at the State and county levels. Many of these States have failed to maintain the salaries of county agents at a level comparable with agents in other States. In such States the funds in this bill should be used for the present number of employees at the county level to place salaries at a level comparable with other States. Testimony before the House committee indicates that salary increases are needed in 22 States to maintain comparable levels.

Amendment No. 12—Retirement costs for extension agents: Appropriates $5,961,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,875,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Federal Extension Service: Appropriates $2,265,000 instead of $2,255,000 as proposed by the House and $2,275,000 as proposed by the Senate. The extra $10,000 is provided for the employment of an additional auditor.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 14—Watershed protection: Appropriates $35,000,000 instead of $32,000,000 as proposed by the House and $37,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that $4,900,000 shall be used for investigations and planning.

Amendment No. 15—Flood prevention: Inserts statutory reference.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 16—Marketing research and agricultural estimates: Appropriates $16,515,000 instead of $16,315,000 as proposed by the House and $16,605,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount agreed to includes funds to initiate lamb-on-feed reports, research on vegetables in the Southeast, and a pilot operation on estimates for tomatoes and celery. The conferees agree that the full $750,000 allowed by the House should be used to initiate the long-range program designed to modernize and improve the entire system of agricultural estimates.

Amendment No. 17: Changes punctuation.

Amendment No. 18—Marketing services: Appropriates $26,579,900 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have allowed the full budget estimate for poultry inspection. The funds so approved are for poultry inspection as proposed by the budget.

The conferees have agreed to an increase for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act in view of the Department's in-

creased regulatory responsibilities over livestock transactions at country points. However, concern has been expressed by livestock producers, country buyers, and local sales operators regarding the possible imposition of administrative regulations on selling and buying practices at the farm or local level which perhaps are appropriate for the larger markets but which are completely contrary to long-established and accepted customs, arrangements, and practices by parties at interest. It is the consensus of the conferees that vast differences have prevailed and will continue to prevail between sales by private treaty or at local community sales and transactions at the organized public and terminal markets. For this reason care should be exercised in the development of applicable regulations governing livestock transactions to provide for meeting these different situations in order that the right and freedom of producers to negotiate, bargain, and decide in their best interests shall be protected.

Foreign Agricultural Service

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,487,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,447,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize the transfer of $2,539,000 from section 32 funds as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,493,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21—Special foreign currency program: Eliminates language inserted by the Senate relative to the purchase of foreign currencies.

Commodity Exchange Authority

Amendment No. 22—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $940,000 instead of $930,000 as proposed by the House and $941,325 as proposed by the Senate.

Commodity Stabilization Service

Amendment No. 23—Conservation reserve program: Appropriates $330,000,000 instead of $310,000,000 as proposed by the House and $335,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the funds included for administrative expenses, not less than $10,000,000 shall be used for county expenses. Reductions required under the balance of the administrative funds shall be made primarily at the Washington level.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 24—Loan authorizations: Authorizes $60,000,000 for the contingency fund for each program as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Farmers Home Administration

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $31,050,000 instead of $30,500,000 as proposed by the House and $31,467,650 as proposed by the Senate and authorize the transfer of $1,050,000 from the farm tenant mortgage insurance fund instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Information

Amendments Nos. 27, 28, 29, and 30—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $1,488,000 instead of $1,478,000 as proposed by the House and $1,523,000 as proposed by the Senate and provide for the printing of 174,736 copies of the 1961 yearbook "Seeds" and the reprinting of 87,368 copies of the 1959 yearbook "Food."

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 31—Limitation on administrative expenses: Authorizes $45,726,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $44,726,000 as proposed by the House, which provides an additional $1,000,000 for the contingency fund. The conferees are in agreement that cotton-quality evaluation and other research to be performed under CCC contracts should not be charged to this limitation. They further agree that all such research undertaken in fiscal year 1961 should be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate when initiated and should be provided for in the budget for fiscal year 1962.

Amendment No. 32—Limitation on administrative expenses: Eliminates language inserted by the House. The conferees have eliminated the following language from the bill: *Provided further,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to formulate or administer any program which does not provide for maximum use of Government-owned facilities for storing surplus commodities, consistent with the economical operation of the Corporation.

The charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation states: "That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall limit the duty of the Corporation, to the maximum extent practical consistent with the fulfillment of the Corporation's purposes and the effective and efficient conduct of its business, to utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities and arrangements of the trade and commerce in warehousing commodities * * *." The conferees agree that commercial warehouse space for storing commodities be given preference, other things being equal; however, when existing Government storage is available and can be effectively used at less cost, taking into consideration all cost factors involved, including risk incurred, such space should be used in the interest of protecting the Treasury. Such practices as moving commodities from existing Government storage into commercial warehouse space is certainly not in the interests of protecting the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation and is a waste of tax dollars. The conferees do not favor construction of further Government-owned storage facilities.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I am a little concerned about one sentence in the report, the very last sentence which says that the conferees do not favor construction of further Government-owned storage facilities.

I would like to cite as the background for my question the fact that last year, the first year of the Benson corn program, we produced 4.4 billion bushels of corn. We consumed 3.8 billion bushels. Obviously the CCC is obligated under these circumstances to take over a considerable amount of corn. There is some doubt there is sufficient properly located storage in existence today, even when you add the commercial together with the Government-owned storage. This means that the Commodity Credit Corporation must secure some additional storage somewhere. If they cannot secure the storage at a reasonable price from the trade, obviously they are going to have to or should provide it with some Government-owned facilities.

In order to make the language in the report more clear, did the gentleman intend to discourage the construction of more Government-owned storage under these circumstances, or where it is necessary?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] offered the amendment commonly known as the Yates amendment. I think he rendered a real service in offering that amendment. I think it was beneficial to the conferees in writing the conference report. Generally we have tried to carry out the intent of that amendment in our report, as I understand the intent, though the conference language speaks for itself.

As to the language to which the gentleman refers, I call attention again to the fact that we did not say government storage could not be built. We said only that we did not favor the construction of further Government-owned storage facilities. The intent, as I understand it, was that where commercial facilities can be made available or where the Government can promote the construction by commercial enterprise, on a reasonable cost basis, in those cases it should be done. But I do agree with the gentleman that under the price-support laws storage space must be made available in order to provide for the price-support program. In those cases where storage is not otherwise available the CCC would be duty bound to use this means of providing the price support benefits. Thus we come back to the fact that if commercial enterprises do not meet this need on a reasonable basis, there would be an obligation on the part of the Government to meet it. We do not favor doing that unless it should be necessary either because commercial warehousing was unavailable or because exhorbitant rates were demanded.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Let me first thank the gentleman for his gracious comments on my amendment. I am still not clear as to what the meaning of the language used by the conferees is. I read from the conference report:

> The conferees agree that commercial warehouse space for storing commodities be given preference, other things being equal.

Suppose you have two facilities in an area. You have a Government-owned facility and you have a commercial facility, both of which are empty. It would be cheaper to store the surplus commodity in the Government facility. Is it the intent of your amendment that the Commodity Credit Corporation should store such grain as requires storage in the Government facility under those conditions?

Mr. WHITTEN. If we presume that it would be more economical to use the Government storage, it is our intent that it be used. We do point out in the language we use that there are certain cost

factors that should be taken into consideration in making the decision as to "most economical." The commercial warehouse agrees to deliver the same quality grain without deterioration. On the other hand, the Government under some circumstances might have no provision for loading and unloading and no provision for turnover. That in itself would not preclude Government-owned storage, but in determining which is most economical those different factors should be taken into account. Primarily what we say in the report is what I think the gentleman really intended in his amendment. We spell out some of the factors which are involved in the word "economical."

Mr. YATES. That was the intent of the amendment, to make the program be operated in the most economical way possible, and that is still the intent of the conference report, that the program be operated on the most economical basis possible, and that if the corporation has a choice between commercial and Government facilities and it would be more economical to use the Government facilities, the corporation is to use the Government facilities.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my belief that would be required under the words of the charter, "Consistent with the efficient operation of the corporation." May I say the gentleman's efforts, I believe, will lead to considerable savings to the Government.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Has the action of the conferees been discussed with the officials of the Department of Agriculture having to do with the storage of grain, and do they think that this compromise arrangement is reasonably satisfactory from the standpoint of the farmer, the warehouse man, and others involved?

Mr. WHITTEN. We have not discussed this with the Department officials. We had quite lengthy hearings with the departmental officials earlier. This in my judgment is in line with the sound operation of the corporation. I do not believe anybody in the Department could differ with the language. After all, the Department's handling of the matter led to the adoption first of the amendment and now of the report. I think it is in line with what sound-thinking people in the Department believe, and I think it is thoroughly workable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the conference committee on their splendid report and to say that I appreciate their cooperation in having the funds for marketing services restored in the bill. As I told the House on May 11, the elimination of the appropriations for Federal compulsory poultry inspection would have a serious impact on the important poultry industry of the First Congressional District of Maryland. Members of the committee assured me that efforts would be made to restore these funds amounting to some $26 million, and I am happy that this has been accomplished.

We are proud of our Eastern Shore poultry industry. Our producers have remarkably increased their efficiency in the use of inputs in feed, labor, capital, and management, which have resulted in lower production costs. Our breeders and hatcheries have provided improved meat-type strains, and our processors have adopted modern methods and techniques. Collectively, the industry has promoted its products in the Nation's marketplace. In spite of these economies and good market practices, the margin of profit to the poultry industry has been reduced to the point where further investments in capital assets have been questioned.

For the past year, I have been pressing for more favorable freight rates on feed ingredients shipped from midwestern grain terminals to our district. Freight rates to other geographic areas of the same distance or more which produce poultry are for the most part considerably lower than those prevailing in my district. This inequity and discrimination is definitely unfair to the poultrymen on the Delmarva Peninsula. As an example, the Memphis area was at a $1.97 a ton advantage over our poultry district. A study is now under way on freight price differential in the northeast area and I see some hope that our great poultry industry will obtain this needed relief.

Another problem confronting the great Delmarva poultry-producing area is the need to deepen channels and improve harbor facilities in order to take advantage of cheaper water freight rates.

The Eastern Shore is one of the largest broiler-producing areas in the United States. Despite higher feed ingredient costs, higher freight rates, and higher operation costs generally, our poultry industry has held a respectable position because of its high degree of efficiency, good management, and quality birds. This great industry is and will continue as an important segment of the general economy of the district.

Mr. YATES. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, when the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill was on the floor, I offered an amendment to require the Commodity Credit Corporation to use Government storage facilities to the maximum extent possible, consistent with economical operation of the Corporation, for the storage of surplus agricultural commodities. The reason for the amendment was obvious. As the committee pointed out, the storage charges for fiscal year 1959 totaled almost $482 million. For 1960, the storage charges for surplus commodities were estimated to be $612 million. For the next fiscal year, storage charges were expected to exceed $700 million. The Government itself owns facilities in which 985 million bushels of surplus commodities can be stored. According to the committee's hearings, these facilities are being used only to the extent of 65 percent.

Why is this important? Because of the great disparity between the costs of storage in Government facilities and commercial facilities. According to the hearings, the cost of using Government facilities is 5.1 cents per bushel as opposed to a cost of 16.3 cents per bushel in commercial facilities. And even with this tremendous difference in cost, it is the policy of the Department of Agriculture to require storage in commercial bins, even though empty Government storage space is available. It is clear that millions of dollars in storage charges can be saved if Government facilities are used to a greater extent.

Now the conferees have returned with their conference report which has stricken the amendment I offered in the House and which the House accepted. I know that the conferees had a most difficult task in trying to reconcile their support for the Yates amendment with the views in opposition of the Senate. However, after speaking to several of them earlier today on the intent of the language in the conference report which was substituted for my amendment, I believe its intent is the same. The language may be different, but the purpose is the same.

The purpose of the Yates amendment was to save money for the taxpayers through the efficient and economical operation of the Corporation's storage program. It had been shown that the Corporation was not making adequate use of Government facilities. On the contrary, it was utilizing much more expensive commercial facilities, when Government storage facilities were available. As I indicated before, the hearings of this subcommittee and of the Fountain Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations show that the cost of storage was 5.1 cents for Government facilities, as opposed to 16.3 cents for commercial storage. No one on this subcommittee—not even those who objected to the Yates amendment when it was proposed, took issue with these costs when they were considered in committee.

In view of the statements just made by the chairman of the subcommittee that it is the intention of the conferees that the storage program be operated on the most economical basis, it would seem to me that the new language in the conference report must be construed to require practices which encourage economy. If Government facilities and commercial facilities are both available, and it is more economical to store the surplus commodities in Government facilities, I understand it to be the intention of the conferees that the commodities should be stored in Government warehouses. If in fact it can be shown that it is more economical to store the commodities in commercial facilities, the commodities should be stored in commercial facilities.

I have been assured by the chairman that the subcommittee intends to review the storage practices of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the next fiscal

year to see whether it will abstain from the extravagant practices of which it has been guilty in the past. I have been assured further that the committee intends to make sure that Government facilities are utilized in a manner which will permit the storage program to be operated as efficiently and economically as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Yates amendment is a common sense amendment. The taxpayers are entitled to the protection it contains. I am sure the farmers themselves want the taxpayers to have such protection so that the entire farm program is not jeopardized by unnecessary and unwarranted expenditures. I am sure that they do not intend that the farm price-support program be a storage price-support program, as well. Common sense dictates that such costs be kept to a minimum. Common sense should be used in administering the surplus commodity storage program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this opportunity to commend and compliment the leadership and those advocating the measure for the speed with which the pay-raise legislation for Government employees was brought to the floor and approved.

Just a few days ago a discharge petition was filed, and the Members stood in line in the well of the House to sign, and in 2 days the required number of signatures was obtained.

The pay-raise measure that we have approved has merit, and in addition it has popular appeal for more than 2 million Government employees. But what about the farmers, Mr. Speaker? Are American farmers any less deserving of their day in court?

It should be noted that the lowest entrance salary for civil service employees is now $2,960. That is a rather low salary today with the high cost of living and industrial wages averaging more than $90 per week. So we have just agreed to give all Government employees with salaries ranging from $2,960 to $17,500 a year a substantial raise. I believe they deserve it or I assure you I would not have voted for the bill.

But what about our farmers whose average net income per family is only $2,380 per year? The average farm operator and family today earns for labor, investment, and management ability a total amount $580 a year less than the lowest paid civil service employee to whom we have just voted a raise.

Two-thirds of the American farms, about 3 million of them, had incomes from farming last year amounting to $3,000 or less, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The average return to the dairy-farm operators and their families in the Central Northeast is below the present minimum civil service salary. The average return to cotton-farm operators in the southern Piedmont is only a fraction of that, and the average return to wheat-farm operators is also below the minimum civil service salary. They, too, must live off their dollar income like anybody else.

Are farm families any less deserving of consideration at our hands than the families of Government employees?

An income-reducing wheat bill was approved in the other body just the other day by a vote of 44 to 36 after an amendment sponsored by the majority to reduce price supports another 5 percent below the committee bill had been approved by a record vote of 48 to 34. Wheat farmers were shocked last week by the action in the other body and all farmers are appalled by the lack of any action here in the House of Representatives.

I am told that the Committee on Rules, with an 8 to 4 membership dominated by Democrats, has still not acted on the pending bill. I repeat, I am told that the Committee on Rules, with an 8 to 4 membership, dominated by Democrats, has still not acted on the pending farm bill. But I do not see the advocates of farm legislation, of that particular bill, filing a discharge petition, nor do I see the majority in control of the Congress by virtually a 2-to-1 margin doing anything about the farm-income problem.

On the one hand we see this quick and decisive action on behalf of 2 million Government employees, with salaries ranging from $2,960 to $17,500 a year, and on the other hand we see nothing being done—nothing being done for the 3 million farm families with incomes at or below the minimum civil service salary.

When I plead for action on a worthwhile farm measure, the leaders in control of legislation alibi that it might be vetoed. But the threat of a possible veto did not dismay a great majority of our colleagues here today when they signed the discharge petition earlier and now have cast their votes for a civil service pay raise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that motion and make a point of order that the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that if the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are not interested in farm legislation, that is their business. If their lack of order indicates their lack of interest in farm problems, let the record speak for itself. I am merely expressing my opinion here today in behalf of the farmers of the Nation. If some Members are not concerned, that is their business. That is about what the Democratic majority has done this year; they have not listened and they have not acted. They have that bill bottled up in the Rules Committee. They are waiting until the wheat bill comes over from the Senate and then they will say that our corn and feed grain green acres proposal is not germane because the bill would be wholly limited to wheat. That will be their strategy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is talking about the Rules Committee and our friends on the right over here. I was not thinking of them; I would like to hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Thank you, sir.

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

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is talking about the Rules Committee.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I am just criticizing the Rules Committee, eight Democrats and four Republicans, for lack of action. We have been here more than 5 months, adjournment is staring us in the face with the turn of the page of our calendar, and campaign promises to the farmer apparently have been forgotten. The time for action on farm legislation is long overdue, Mr. Speaker. The House has just shown the Nation how fast it can act when the majority decides to do so, with little or no concern for a threatened veto.

Mr. Speaker, there is no alibi left for the dismal failure of this Congress in the field of farm legislation. The last, lame excuse of a possible veto was swept aside by the action of the House today in passing the pay raise bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 5, insert ": *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for fiscal year 1962 that does not require minimum matching by any State of at least 40 per centum;".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure 1962 in said amendment insert "1963".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 6, line 1, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation or exchange, $3,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $300,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for payment of expenses for construction of a headquarters-laboratory building at the National Arboretum, which is hereby authorized to be constructed under contract authorization in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by donation or exchange, $2,550,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely gratified that, in accepting the conference report on the agriculture appropriations bill, the House of Representatives today included the sum of $150,000 for the establishment of a soil and water conservation research laboratory facility at Washington State University at Pullman.

This facility, one of five authorized for construction in fiscal year 1961, will enable scientists to cope with an acute erosion problem which is causing the loss of soil at an alarming rate, particularly in the rolling Palouse hills near Pullman where much of our Northwest wheat is grown.

As I pointed out in testimony before the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, I have heard from a great number of individuals and interested farm organizations who believe, as I do, that a special laboratory for soil and water conservation research should be established within the State of Washington, and that it should be in harmony with the comprehensive report on "Facilities Needs—Soil and Water Conservation Research," the report of findings by the working group appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Within the State of Washington, our most urgent need is to expand materially Federal efforts in soil and water research.

I wish to commend the House and Senate for its action in approving this facility.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12620) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 1959, the House passed H.R. 7577, a bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes. This bill was the culmination of much thought and serious consideration after full and complete hearings were held by the Judiciary Committee and all interested governmental departments were heard. All departments were generally in harmony in approving the nature and purpose of such legislation.

That bill was then passed by the Senate with an amendment in which the House concurred so that legislation, long sought and much needed, would not be deferred and on the further premise that the amendment by the other body is applicable only to the procedural aspects of the bill and not to the essence of the proposed legislation.

On June 11, 1960, H.R. 7577, as amended by the Senate, was vetoed by the President who in his veto message stated, among other things:

This amendment is unfortunate.

And:

Although unwilling, therefore, to approve this bill, I would gladly sign new legislation corresponding to H.R. 7577 as first passed by the House of Representatives.

H.R. 12620 is identical in every respect with H.R. 7577 which, before amendment, was pleasing and acceptable, in the main, by all interested parties who are concerned with the matters covered thereby, pondered the problems and considered their solutions and, as indicated in the veto message, was also acceptable to the President. I wish to express my appreciation to the Members of this House who, I hope, will give unanimous consent to its passage as it indicates that the Members are alert to speedy action when the need is evident and the merit of legislation is apparent.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2679 of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof and (2) by adding immediately following such subsection (a) as hereby so designated, four new subsections as follows:

"(b) The remedy by suit against the United States as provided by section 1346(b) of this title for damage to property or for personal injury, including death, resulting from the operation by any employee of the Government of any motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his office or employment, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against the employee or his estate whose act or omission gave rise to the claim.

"(c) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action or proceeding brought in any court against any employee of the Government or his estate for any such damage or injury. The employee against whom such civil action or proceeding is brought shall deliver within such time after date of service or knowledge of service as determined by the Attorney General, all process served upon him or an attested true copy thereof to his immediate superior or to whomever was designated by the head of his department to receive such papers and such person shall promptly furnish copies of the pleadings and process therein to the United States attorney for the district embracing the place wherein the proceeding is brought, to the Attorney General, and to the head of his employing Federal agency.

"(d) Any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceedings deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of this title and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merits that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (b) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court.

"(e) The Attorney General may compromise or settle any claim asserted in such civil action or proceeding in the manner provided in section 2677, and with the same effect."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to be in effect six months after the enactment hereof but any rights or liabilities then existing shall not be affected.

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

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it has been reported that we might come in early tomorrow to consider the foreign handout bill and an effort will be made to rush it through in 1 day. Will the gentleman enlighten me as to whether there will be any attempt made to come in early tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was going to follow this request with another one that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock. Whether we get through in 1 day or not is something I cannot foretell. I want to frankly advise the gentleman in response to his inquiry what my intentions are.

Mr. GROSS. I might say that if we do come in early tomorrow it would seem to me that would be an invitation to ram the bill through in 1 day. I am opposed

to that, and I would be constrained to object to any request to come in early.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say in response to the gentleman from Iowa that I appreciate his frankness. The gentleman says if I make the unanimous-consent request to meet at 11 o'clock on tomorrow he will object, is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall not make the request in view of the fact that my friend has so frankly advised me.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION

Mr. GARY. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have called special executive sessions of the House Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations to begin next Tuesday, June 21, to take testimony regarding contracts let by the Post Office Department.

Information which the Department provided to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service indicates that the Department may be circumventing the law regarding consultant services. The law sets a maximum limit of $100 per day which can be paid to individual consultants by the Department; however, by making contracts with consulting firms, the Department has been able to pay at much higher rates.

For instance, the Department has paid one firm $400 per day, for 71 days, for the services of a survey director; and from $125 to $250 a day for associates. They were supposed to be studying "the effect of postal services and the impact of postal rates and fees on the users of the mail."

It is obvious, from such outlandish rates of pay for management consultant surveys, that the whole Post Office Department contract system must be thoroughly investigated by the Congress.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, that if the facts are as stated by him the meeting of our subcommittee scheduled for next Tuesday is very much in order.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman, and I will say that so far as the facts are concerned they are recorded. If there is any reasonable explanation the Post Office Department will have an opportunity to make it. Personally, I cannot see how there can be any.

D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM CHARTER AND SIGHTSEEING OPERATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 525 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4815) to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order, with 2 hours of general debate, the bill entitled "To insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation here is that some years ago, several years ago, in fact, Congress granted a monopoly of mass transportation to the Capital Transit System. Some time ago my attention was called to the situation which prevailed with respect to sightseeing transit where it appears that the Capital Transit Corp., not satisfied with the monopoly on mass transportation, is now seeking through the use of its facilities, to also engage in a situation with respect to sightseeing buses, and to run out of business these numerous little corporations that operate sightseeing facilities here in the District. They are doing it because of the fact that under their charter they are granted certain privileges and immunities by reason of their charter on mass transportation. They are using those privileges and immunities in order to drive the little sightseeing people out of business. I do not think that ought to be permitted. For instance, they have a certain provision in their charter which relieves them of the gasoline tax, which is quite a considerable item in the matter of the expense of operation of both mass operation and sightseeing transportation. Now, the sightseeing corporation, the little fellow, does not have that tax exemption of their gasoline. The transit system is using its mass transportation facilities, such as buses, help, and so forth, in the operation of this effort to drive the little people out of business.

I think the situation should be corrected. The committee having jurisdiction of this matter is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They went into the matter at considerable length with the Public Utility Commission and with others interested, including the mass transportation company itself. They came up with the proposal that the mass transportation company, which is the Capital Transit Co., should be prohibited from exercising this right to use its mass transportation facilities with the objective of destroying the small business people who are engaged in the sightseeing business. That is the sole object of the bill. It is very brief.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. Under the strike settlement of some years ago the Capital Transit Co. was given certain privileges in operating its buses and streetcars, privileges having to do with the gasoline tax, among other things.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WIER. I am told that the company has no intention of exercising those privileges of using untaxed gasoline in its chartered buses. They have two kinds of buses, sightseeing buses and buses which are chartered for these large groups that come to Washington and want certain bus service. I am told that they do not enjoy that privilege as to those buses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am informed that they not only enjoy them but exercise them to the fullest. I may have been misinformed, but the gentleman who held the hearings on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee can advise the gentleman better than I can on that subject.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, although I understand there is some opposition to the bill itself, I know of no opposition to the rule. I have no requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4815) to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4815, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill H.R. 4815 with the recommendation that it be approved. This bill, as was stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in his statement on the rule, provides that all assets and personnel of the D.C. Transit System of the District of Columbia used in providing mass transportation service shall be so used exclusively and shall not be used in any other service in competition with the service of any other company.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, was introduced and sponsored by our colleague, a member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS]. He has given a great deal of study to it and will amplify the statement and explain further the costs. However, I should like to give you a little of the background from my own experience with the problem.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. How extensive were the hearings before the gentleman's committee on this legislation, and were the organized operators and workers on the D.C. Transit System permitted to testify, and did they testify?

Mr. HARRIS. The hearings were quite extensive and, as the gentleman will see by observing the printed hearings, the organization referred to by the gentleman from West Virginia did have ample opportunity and did testify at some length.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. The subcommittee under the direction of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], held extensive hearings on this subject. The subcommittee did a good job in developing the record. The full committee considered the bill at some length in executive session. I will get back to the bill after I give you the background of this problem.

I would not want by what I am about to say to have anyone think I am not going to vote for the bill. The committee voted this bill out of committee and reported it to the House by an overwhelming vote. I feel somewhat obligated to support the committee in its action in view of the fact that as chairman at that time I did not take an adverse position under the circumstances. So regardless of what I am about to say, I am going to support the bill.

I think probably there is some merit in the contention of the sponsors and those who are interested in it.

This is a fight primarily and principally between the D.C. Transit Co. sightseeing and charter operation and the Gray Lines sightseeing and charter operation. It goes back to 1956 and prior to that time, when we had over a period of at least 2 or 3 years a terrific argument in this Congress over the D.C. Transit operation.

If you will recall back to 1953 or 1954 along in there, there was a request and urgency that we in the Congress approve a $20 million operation of a Federal Government transit operation for the District of Columbia. I was one of those who were opposed to that program. A majority of the District Committee, of which I was a member at that time, were likewise opposed to it. Under the leadership and direction of the then chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], we adopted what I believe could be referred to as stopgap legislation for a period of a year or 2 years until we could have time to resolve the question.

Then the District Commissioners came up with their proposal to take over the D.C. Transit business and operate it with funds appropriated out of the Federal Treasury, the sum of about $20 million, and that went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I, of course, was at that time a member of this committee also, and our late beloved friend Percy Priest at that time was chairman of the committee. We had quite a lengthy controversy and consideration. Finally, we came up with a plan to give a franchise to the present management, as they had offered to buy or purchase from the former management the transit system for the District of Columbia. Under that contract they had to purchase the D.C. Transit operation. We gave to the present D.C. Transit Co. a franchise. That franchise has a provision in it, I think it is section 6, whereby the transit company could continue or have the privilege to engage in sightseeing and charter operations. That is part of the franchise. The former company, Capital Transit Co., operated a limited service of charter and sightseeing operation. The old company did not engage to any extent in sightseeing and charter business.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. What I want to do is keep the record completely straight on this. The gentleman said the sightseeing and charter provision was a privilege in the previous franchise that was held by the Capital Transit Co.

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have never seen that franchise, and if my recollection serves me correctly it was never found out that there was any specific provision granting that to the former transit company. No one has ever produced it for me to see, even at the time that we were having the meeting in committee. I would like to see that provision if it is available.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand it is part of the old franchise or so interpreted. That is the reason this was included in the new franchise in 1956 as it was considered to be in the old franchise. The gentleman can get that. It is a matter of record.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman would tell me where it is, I would love to see it, because I have hunted for it and have been unable to find it, and the staff has been unable to find it for me. I have requested it in the last 3 weeks and I have not found it. If the gentleman will recall, the matter was discussed in the joint committee that handled this situation of which both you and I were members. If I could see it, I would like to see it.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman will recall that during the course of the hearings on this bill it was discussed. They had this privilege before, and they had engaged only to the extent of about $40,000 a year in such business.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is correct.

Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It was determined at that time, so far as the record shows, that it was a matter of sufferance and was not a specific grant of a franchise. If there is any difference in that I would like to see the record on it, but I have not seen it yet.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is as familiar with the record of the hearings as I am, and I am trying to relate the facts as they happened. If there is any question about the present franchise, I refer you to section 6 of the franchise itself which specifically authorizes it in the act of 1956. The gentleman has that and he is familiar with it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the provision that was placed in this present franchise which is in existence today. What I am referring to is the previous franchise held by the Capital Transit Co., which was a Wolfson enterprise.

Mr. HARRIS. The hearings developed that the Wolfson group operated sightseeing and charter business to the extent of only about $40,000 a year.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. Now that is the fact—they were not engaged to any extensive degree, but when the present management, under the franchise of 1956, took over, they started to increase the operation of sightseeing and charter business. In doing so they became competitive with the other smaller sightseeing operators in the metropolitan area. What they have done in doing this is to use their equipment in competition with the regular sightseeing and charter business.

In other words, they would take the personnel and equipment and put them on during the rush hours of the day, that is, the early morning and the late afternoon, and then during the other part of the day they would use the same equipment and the same personnel in their sightseeing and charter business.

In this kind of operation, and I emphasize it, the present D.C. Transit operation now is engaged to the extent of some $600,000 a year. Similar lines, the Gray Line and others around here, in their competitive situation claim that it is an unfair advantage and by their using personnel which they have to pay for anyway and equipment which they have to maintain anyway they virtually

operate it without additional cost and therefore can competitively put them out of business.

That is simply the argument that we have, that is the whole question.

We asked the Commissioners to deal with this problem, and I think under present law they can. The Commissioners failed to assume the responsibility that we thought they had and deal with the problem.

We reported this bill out last year. At the same time we adopted the resolution requiring that the Commissioners give us a report on the problem with the understanding that we would not file the report with the House until we had received this interim report. We were unable to get an interim report until the first part of this year, sometime about January February, or even later, I am not sure just when. But at that time they submitted a voluminous report and about all it said was that they were not in position to do anything about it, that they were not taking a tax advantage, that they had looked over their method of competition as it is explained in the report, how they arrived at the tax base, and so forth. Consequently they said that under the circumstances they were not going to do anything about it. Therefore, the question still remains unsolved.

Then we held up the report trying to work it out an even longer period of time, but nothing could be done. Therefore, I had no alternative except to file this report with the House and to consider it; and that is the sole question we have here today: Whether or not D.C. Transit System under the franchise of 1956 may now continue to operate a sightseeing and charter business with the same equipment and same personnel it uses in its regular D.C. Transit operations. This bill says they cannot do so.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was asked a question about exemptions. I would like to set the record straight. I quote from the testimony of Mr. James H. Flanagan, vice president, comptroller, and treasurer of the D.C. Transit System, Inc. He said at page 207 of the hearings:

> The allegation so often made that D.C. Transit System, Inc., is tax-exempt deserves some attention.
>
> Congress did relieve the company from liability for the antiquated gross receipts tax which formerly existed. Other bus companies in this area paid a 1-cent tax per mile of operation within the District in lieu of the gross-receipts tax. Congress has now relieved these other companies from liability for this 1-cent tax. Therefore, we are all even in this respect, so far as exemption from taxation is concerned.

He further states:

> The Commission found that the fuel tax payable by the company for July and August 1958 was $827.04, and so certified to the District Commissioners. This amount was paid immediately upon presentation of a bill by the District tax collector early in this month of May.
>
> I do not know of any other tax benefit enjoyed by D.C. Transit System, Inc., which gives it an unfair advantage in its charter and sightseeing operations over any other bus company similarly engaged.

There is indicated here the taxes which they pay, totaling some $1 million.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the interim report to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on page 11 says:

> As hereinbefore indicated, the question of tax advantage under section 8 is of no substantial significance.

During the course of the hearings the attorney for Gray Line, Mr. Arnold, also testified that the tax exemption and the tax question was of no significance in connection with this bill, am I right?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct. This is a fight principally between Gray Line and D.C. Transit. It is a fight between business organizations. What this bill does is to try to tell the head of a business how he can use his equipment and his personnel to his economic advantage or disadvantage. Being one who is interested in maintaining private enterprise I am against the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this bill is constitutional. I think it is special legislation; it is in the form of a private bill for the benefit of Gray Line and the other companies who agree with Gray Line.

To show you how discriminatory this bill is, may I quote from the testimony of Walter J. Bierwagen, president, National Capital Local Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, appearing on page 180 as follows:

> It should be noted that several competitors of D.C. Transit System for sightseeing and charter work in this area use their mass transportation equipment, assets, and personnel in sightseeing and charter service in the District of Columbia.
>
> These include the Washington, Virginia & Maryland Coach Co., which furnishes mass transportation service in Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va., and between these points and the District of Columbia. Another competitor for sightseeing and charter work is the Alexandria, Barcroft & Washington Transit Co., which furnishes mass transportation in Alexandria, Va., and between Alexandria and downtown Washington. Another is Washington, Marlboro & Annapolis Transit Co., which furnishes mass transportation service in parts of Prince Georges County, and between points in Prince Georges County and downtown Washington. Still another is Suburban Transit Co., now being operated by Inter-County Transit Corp., which furnishes mass transportation service in parts of Montgomery County, Md., and between points in that county and downtown Washington.

A simple and logical question to be asked is, Why should there be different rules for the use of a company's equipment and personnel?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is it not true, as is my understanding, in the 1956 franchise this was specifically spelled out as being something that the D.C. Transit Co. should be allowed to do while under the proposal and under this legislation that right would be removed which was granted upon which the present interests in control of D.C. Transit went into the business?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. My recollection of the record is that the gentleman is correct. In fact, the head of D.C. Transit, Mr. Chalk, testified this was a very vital part of his consideration in purchasing D.C. Transit; that is, the fact they would have sightseeing and charter privileges.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is not correct. This does not put the D.C. Transit Co. out of the sightseeing business. It prevents the use of the District of Columbia franchise for the purpose of promoting the sightseeing business. It provides they will have to separate their sightseeing business from their other franchise business.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. If that is the case, this is the first time in mass transportation history that this is being done in the United States, because from available information all charter companies and sightseeing companies that are engaged in mass transportation use their equipment in the manner D.C. Transit is using theirs.

Mr. Chairman, this is an unfair way to legislate. This is a bad bill.

Let us give the Public Utilities Commission of the District the authority and let us jog them into doing the right thing. If the D.C. Transit is not accounting for its revenues properly, that is one thing, but let us not take corrective action which is unconstitutional and discriminatory. The Gray Line is the greatest monopoly there is in the United States so far as sightseeing and charter is concerned. They control about 12,000 hotel rooms in the District of Columbia alone.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, all I know is what I read. On page 6 of the hearings the gentleman from Mississippi stated:

> It is apparent that the purpose of the bills is to restrain the transit system from engaging in sightseeing or charter operations.

Now, that is the plain fact. It is there.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I think the effect of this bill would be exactly that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, if they were knocked out at this time, at least a profitable part of this system would be knocked out, and it would almost, of necessity, raise the fares which, it seems to me, are already high enough.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The gentleman's point is well taken, because the chairman of the Committee on Legislation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Hon. Kenneth H. Tuggle, said this on

page 5, of the hearings, talking about getting separate equipment for sightseeing:

Such duplication of facilities and restrictions against the interchange of personnel and equipment as between the types of services rendered would of course result in increased costs and possibly have an overall effect of giving rise to a need for increased fares for transit, or "mass transportation," services. The competitive advantage of D.C. Transit's tax exemptions would, however, appear to remain unaffected.

We shall not forget that we have to consider the people of the District of Columbia, their mass transportation system and the effect upon them. I am not worried about the Gray Line, D.C. Transit, or anybody else, but I do not want to pass any pointless legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman stated that this was operated like all other mass transportation systems throughout the country engaging in charter and sightseeing.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I said that this is the modus operandi of mass transportation systems throughout this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Does the gentleman have any documentation to support that statement of fact in regard to other cities?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I think you will find it in the record. I think our late departed colleague, Mr. Bush, who used to be in the bus business, asked searching questions about this, and I think the replies brought forth the situation as it exists.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think you will find that this is a very unique situation and that there are only one or two companies in the United States that have any tax exemption coupled with a monopoly. This is a very unique situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to know whether we are going to finish this legislation tonight or what the program is. That is what I want to find out. Will somebody on the majority side tell us? Some of your Members have been coming over here asking us to make a point of no quorum. I know you know how to do that. Are you going to finish tonight or what?

Mr. HARRIS. I have not had an opportunity to confer with the leadership, and at this moment I do not know just what this plan is. I will be glad to try to find out, I will say to the gentleman.

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

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Do I understand the gentleman to be saying that this legislation would compel the D.C. Transit Co., if it is to engage in sightseeing and charter operations, to operate in an uneconomical fashion?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. It would do exactly that. It would have to buy new buses if it wanted to transport children from Alexandria to Washington. It could not use the same driver, not the same bus, not use the same man to paint the different signs. It is ridiculous. It certainly does not militate in favor of efficient operation.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman if the record shows anywhere what proportion of the sightseeing and charter business is now enjoyed by D.C. Transit and how much by Gray Lines? How much do the other operators in the District enjoy?

Is there evidence that D.C. Transit is using some favored position to drive others out of business?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. For the last available period Gray Lines showed twice the amount of charter and sightseeing business as did D.C. Transit. But, talking about a monopoly, here are some interesting statistics. Let us look at the wages that these various companies pay. D.C. Transit pays its employees in its sightseeing business $2.82½ an hour; W.B. & M. pays $2.65; A.B. & W. $2.56 an hour; Gray Lines, the main protagonist for this bill $2.27 an hour; W.M. & A. pays $1.87 and Suburban Transit pays $1.74. So that D.C. Transit pays the highest wages.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] asked a question a few moments ago about how long we planned to run. I thought under the circumstances we could go until about 5:30. We could get that much of the debate behind us.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, may I say for the edification of the chairman of the committee that I have only one more request for time; this is an indication of how long we will take on this side.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in his usual fair and forthright manner, has presented to you precisely the issue that this legislation brings before the House. During the course of the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in his presentation under the rule, he was asked about the facts underlying this legislation and he very properly said that he was stating the facts as they were submitted to him. Without in any way attempting to criticize the gentleman for his statement—and I am sure he presented the facts as they were submitted to him—I say that his presentation is not in accordance with the record. When I talk about the record, I want you to bear in mind that this matter was first presented to the Committee on the District of Columbia. And that is where it belonged. The Committee on the District of Columbia saw fit to take no action. Then it was presented to the Small Business Committee. The Small Business Committee conducted rather lengthy hearings, on May 12, 16, and 19, 1958. They were printed in two parts, aggregating 208 pages. The Small Business Committee rendered a report on the matter which was subsequently submitted to the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. In his letter of transmittal of August 20, 1958, he said, "I am glad to transmit the report as the report of this committee."

There was no dissent to that report. The report confirmed the fact precisely as stated to you by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], that this legislation is the result of the fight waged by the Gray Lines, the biggest sightseeing company in the country, against D.C. Transit Co., a mass transportation company which also engages in sightseeing operations. Those operations are on a much smaller scale than that of Gray Lines.

The Small Business Committee indicated in its report that the law and the regulations vested with the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia and with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia ample power to do anything and everything that might need to be done in order to prevent any unfair competition. They can regulate rates, if necessary, and do whatever might be called for in connection with that business to promote and protect the public interest.

There was an effort made throughout those hearings before the Small Business Committee—as there was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] submitted his bill, H.R. 2316, identical with the Rogers bill which is before us here as H.R. 4815—the effort was made to show that there is some tax exemption or advantage given the D.C. Transit Co. that gives it an unfair competitive advantage over all of its competitors. When the facts were adduced at both sets of hearings, at which appeared representatives of the Gray Lines, their lawyers, and others, all concerned—and you will find this in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which is before you—that there is no tax consequence here that gives any unfair advantage to anybody.

As a matter of fact, everybody agreed that if D.C. Transit were losing money and therefore would get some tax exemption that might be an advantage to it but that would hurt no competitor. On the other hand if it were making money and paying taxes again no disadvantage accrued against a competitor. All affected had to agree that if there were tax benefits, then the solution was not try to change the D.C. franchise, or to change the law that gave them the franchise. The way to correct the unfairness to the other fellows, small or large, was either to give them the same tax exemptions or to take them away from D.C. Transit Co. We did enact legislation to give such tax exemption to the other sightseeing companies competing with D.C. Transit Co. But there are no taxes and no tax exemptions in this bill.

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

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. The gentleman mentions the Small Business Committee report on this matter. That committee in its report at page 3 stated:

Gray Lines, Inc., is the largest of the sightseeing and bus chartering services in the District of Columbia when measured by volume of business derived from those services. No other operator has as farflung associations and affiliations throughout the country. No other has as many hotels in or out of the District tied up by exclusive contracts. Gray Lines, Inc., alone controls almost 12,000 hotel rooms in the District. Its nearest competitor, the D.C. Transit System, Inc., controls less than 1,500.

Mr. MULTER. Those are the facts that existed then, they are the facts that exist today, and they are the facts as they existed during the course of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If you want to compare size, the Gray Lines in 1957 had a gross income of almost $1,300,000 and paid taxes and license fees of only $48,054. Compare that with taxes and fees of $364,270 paid by D.C. Transit Co. for the same period. During that period the sightseeing service of the D.C. Transit Co. was less than $500,000.

What is behind this? The facts and the documents before the various committees established beyond any peradventure of a doubt that Gray Lines is trying to use this legislation—and I cast no aspersion on any Member of the House who favors this legislation—to force D.C. Transit Co. to buy them out at an exorbitant price. That is the only reason for this legislation.

Permit me to direct your attention to these facts: The Small Business Committee has recommended against this legislation, the Public Utilities Commission has recommended against it, the District Commissioners have recommended against it, the District of Columbia Committees of both Houses have refused to take any action on it, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, while taking no position on the bill, says that to enact this bill, and I quote from page 5 of the hearings, "would of course result in increased costs and possibly have the overall effect of giving rise to a need for increased fares for transit or mass transportation services."

If you want to see the fares for the District of Columbia populace go up, then enact this bill. I hope you will not do so.

This bill is in fact a private bill which takes from D.C. Transit System, Inc., its charter and sightseeing operations. It does so at the instance of Gray Line, which is the largest sightseeing operator in the District of Columbia metropolitan area. It deprives D.C. Transit System of its property without due process of law and without compensation.

The technique employed by the bill is bad; the precedent dangerous. The public interest is best served by integrated mass transit and charter and sightseeing service. This is the longtime custom not only here but in practically every comparable community. Under this bill, other local transit companies may continue in the future, as they have in the past, to perform both operations. Only D.C. Transit and its employees—who will lose work opportunities—are discriminated against.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say something about the Gray Line trying to force D.C. Transit to buy them out?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I should like to read a telegram I have received, because that statement was made to me several times and I made an investigation of it. This is a telegram that was addressed to me. It reads:

This is to inform you that the undersigned and Col. Harry J. Dooley, president, and Miss Jewel Burton, secretary, were approached at least four separate occasions by D.C. Transit officials who sought to obtain the Gray Line franchise in Washington, D.C. The initial request for an appointment came from Morris Fox, first vice president of D.C. Transit, in May 1957. Mr. Fox sent representatives Leonard Wolf and Clayton S. Wells to our Chicago office following the May request. Messrs. Wolf and Wells stated that D.C. Transit had advantages in the sightseeing industry in Washington with which other operators could not compete. They also stated that these advantages were driving the Gray Line in Washington to failure and that D.C. Transit was therefore the logical representative in Washington. Messrs. Wolf and Wells sought to persuade Gray Line Sightseeing Cos., Associated, to transfer the franchise from the present member in the District of Columbia to D.C. Transit. D.C. Transit's proposal was rejected out of hand but subsequent requests were made by D.C. Transit in 1958 and in 1959.

GRAY LINE SIGHTSEEING COS.,
ASSOCIATED,
JOHN A. CHAPIN, *Vice President.*
CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MULTER. What is the date of that telegram?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is dated June 6, 1960.

Mr. MULTER. May I say to my colleague I have no doubt the telegram was received by him and of course the gentleman quoted it accurately. But I would say to you, sir, and I say to this House that that is a belated effort by them to cover up their real purpose in sponsoring this legislation. I repeat that the testimony adduced before the Small Business Committee on which I then served and still serve established that Gray Lines sought to force D.C. Transit Co., Inc., to buy it out. Those efforts by a representative of the Gray Lines (of Washington—not of Chicago) continued after the filing of the Small Business Committee report on August 20, 1958, and I can personally attest to that fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see where the pressures are coming from with reference to this particular matter. As part of the printed record, we find this memorandum made by the gentleman who was in attendance at a meeting between Mr. Chalk and the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], on July 10, 1958. This is an official memorandum of the conversations had at that time which are printed as part of the record. This is what the memorandum says, and I quote:

The chairman mentioned that he had hoped some arrangement could be reached whereby the sightseeing business could be surrendered by Mr. Chalk (that is the D.C. Transit Co.), it being understood that he would be compensated therefor in some fashion which was appropriate.

It hardly comes with good grace to follow that with a bill, H.R. 2316, to strip D.C. Transit Co. of its sightseeing business and that without compensation and without due process of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer in a moment to the unconstitutionality of this bill. But, first, I want to call your attention to some further testimony, in addition to what the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] read from the opening statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], when the hearings got on the way.

The first witness in support of the bill was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. He was asked by the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]:

In looking over these bills, it appears to me that the bills would provide that the transit system be restricted entirely to the transit operations, and not permitted, or not be permitted to engage in any other activity.

Is that the purpose?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] responded:

The bills provide that the corporation shall not use its mass transportation facilities in competitive business. That is what is intended, Mr. Chairman.

In other words, competitive business will be competitive. It will not put them out of business. It will not put the D.C. Transit out of business in any of these businesses, but it will place them on the same plane, with no special advantages.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, if these bills should become law, the D.C. Transit System would enjoy its special statutory tax privileges, insofar as mass transit is concerned, or public transit is concerned. However, in regard to its sightseeing operations and these other operations which you mentioned, it would not receive these tax benefits, but would be placed on exactly the same plane as competing systems.

Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated to you that all the parties involved must agree that there is no tax involvement in this bill. If you read the bill you will see there is not a word mentioned about taxes nor even any reference thereto.

All the bill seeks to do is to take from the D.C. Transit Co. its right to operate its sightseeing services.

As to the unconstitutionality of the bill, you will find on pages 368 and 369 of the printed record an opinion from the Library of Congress. It is fairly

long, but I will quote but one short excerpt from it and will omit the citations to the court decisions. The opinion concludes and I quote:

As property is the sum of all the rights and powers incident to ownership, including the right to control its use, and as confiscation may result from a denial of the "use of property" as well as from a taking of the "title to property," I believe S. 304 is unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, the bill S. 304 is the Senate counterpart of the bills H.R. 2316 and H.R. 4815, which is before you now.

There can be no doubt that this is not an attempt to help small business as against big business. This is not an attempt to create tax equality.

This is an attempt to take by so many words and by mention of the company—a right given by the Congress in its franchise to D.C. Transit, Inc. It is an attempt to take out of that franchise without compensation, without due process of law, by, if you please, a bill of attainder, to take from it, a very valuable property right, which it has acquired at the invitation of the Congress and which with its own money it has built up.

Mr. Chairman, we all remember that the transit situation in the District of Columbia was in one awful mess when Mr. Chalk was asked to come in, and he did come in. He took over a company that was inoperative, it was strike bound, it had old obsolete equipment. The service had been the worst in the country. He is now giving us good, clean transit facilities in the District of Columbia; we are getting good service at reasonable fares.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I only want to dwell on one point as to why I believe this legislation is not generally in the public interest as far as the District of Columbia is concerned. There are several hundred pages of testimony in book form. In other words, the hearings were quite complete. The testimony that struck me most forcefully was that which dealt with why it was important for D.C. Transit to engage in the sightseeing business, and that may occur to you also. Why was that necessary? Why is it necessary today?

In the very nature of the transit business you have peaks and valleys in the use of your personnel and in the use of equipment. I think this will be admitted by both sides, that beginning at about 6:30 to 7 o'clock in the morning the peak starts from down at a low level, and it reaches this peak, according to my recollection, between 9 and 10 o'clock in the morning; then it goes down into the valley, which is quite sharp, between the hours of 10 and about 3:30. Now, here is an area, here is a time when there is almost no use of either personnel or equipment. It is this equipment and this personnel that D.C. Transit uses during these valley periods when there is little if any transit business.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I will yield; yes.

Mr. COLLIER. Is it not true that there are many different mass transit companies across the country who are faced with the same problem of peaks and valleys, that do not engage in extra curricular activities? And is it not also true that the D.C. Transit Co.'s fare of 25 cents is about the second highest of any mass transportation system in this country?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman will find if he goes into the thing deeply enough, that there are many transit systems that do engage in it. On the other hand, I will say there is probably an equal number that do not. So to that extent the gentleman is correct.

I remember testimony and the gentleman probably will remember having received telegrams from transit companies over the country who do engage in the sightseeing business during the daytime and who have vested interests, they say, in the retention of the sightseeing business.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for a further observation?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. The point I was trying to make is that there are other mass transportation systems in the country which do not engage in sightseeing or chartered transportation, who are rendering service at fares less than those charged by D.C. Transit and who are still in operation notwithstanding the fact they, too, have problems of peaks and valleys.

Mr. SPRINGER. The problem of peaks and valleys is in any system, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. I merely bring it up today as a problem in discussing the cost. This is a very substantial amount. The gross revenue from this, according to my recollection of 2 years ago was about $520,000 a year.

That is a half million dollars. When you think of a gross revenue of the D.C. Transit System being probably in the neighborhood of $25 million a year, you can see that this is approximately 3 percent which would be taken away in the form of gross revenue. I believe this is an important property right they have. It is necessary for them to have it if you are to take the best advantage of the equipment and personnel that the company has.

There is just one other thing. There has been one rate increase last year. The D.C. Transit has given notice that if this right is taken away there will be no other alternative except to bring this to the attention of the Public Utilities Commission. I take it that means in case this right is taken from them in the form provided in this bill they intend to come in and ask for another fare increase.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a practical matter which the people of the District of Columbia, in my estimation, are immediately faced with and which the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia will be faced with if this right is taken away in the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I know the gentleman from Illinois has always been a great champion of small business, as is the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who brought that same matter up a few minutes ago about the need for a mass transportation system to have these fringe benefits, so to speak, in order to operate at a profit.

Here is what you are doing when you take that position: You are saying that in order to provide a mass transportation system you have to furnish a corporation with the right to put a bunch of little independent businessmen out of business by undercutting them in every way in order to take over their business as a supplement to the mass transit system. If a subsidy is needed to provide a mass transit system it ought to be paid by all of the people and not by the people who are engaged in sightseeing and in the charter business and in the limousine business which the D.C. Transit Co. is moving into. That is exactly what is being done in this particular situation. They are using the tax exemption, they are using their equipment to undercut these smaller people in the business, including the little fellows at the foot of Capitol Hill and in front of the White House, they are practically putting them out of business. I have some letters I am going to read when my time comes which will show you what is happening to the little people.

Mr. SPRINGER. Here is my answer to the gentleman from Texas: If this sort of thing exists today, as the gentleman contends, then this right should not have been given to them in the first place. It is my belief, and I am not a great constitutional lawyer, in spite of what has been written in here on page 5 with reference to constitutionality, it would appear to me as a former judge, for whatever that title is worth, that there is a serious question of constitutionality when you take away from a company a right which they had at the inception and was vested in them. Now you seek to come along 3, 4, or 5 years later and take the right away without reimbursement. I think it is a question probably of what he is legally entitled to. If he is legally entitled to engage in it, it should have been enforced. That is a question for the future. But I think there is a serious question. This taking away, of course, is going to wind up in the courts anyway.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The matter was brought up about this right by the joint committee when Mr. Wolfson went out of business and the D.C. Transit took over. Mr. Chalk at that time stated in answer to queries by me as to why he wanted to go into the business and he said he wanted to do about what the Capital Transit is doing, which was about $40,000 a year.

He has taken this situation and he has abused a privilege and a right that was given him in good faith by the Con-

gress. He is putting people out of business. The gentleman spoke about the constitutionality of it. If the Congress granted the right under section 6 of the franchise this is not taken away from him. He still has the right to operate any kind of a charter or sightseeing business he wants to, but he does not have the right to have an unfair advantage over his competitors. This bill would stop that.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order to express my vigorous opposition to this piece of legislation which, on the face of it, shows it is a violation of the franchise granted by the Congress to the D.C. Transit Co. only 4 years ago. It also brings in the question that it interferes with the bargaining agreement existing now between the D.C. Transit Co. and its several hundred employees here. The hearings disclose that the D.C. Transit Co. is paying as high as 80 cents an hour more than some of these other companies that desire to take over the business or take this business away from the D.C. Transit Co. I am speaking on behalf of the union members of the Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Bus Operators and their contract with the D.C. Transit Co. Even if it is only 5 percent, as the gentleman who just preceded me said, that it is going to cost, overall, the D.C. Transit System, it will affect scores of the present employees of the D.C. Transit Co., who will lose their jobs.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The fact of the matter is this, that the people I want to protect by this bill are the people who are small independent business people and who want to work, and they want to work for whomever they choose. But, as this matter turns out, it will not be long that they will not be able to work for anybody except the D.C. Transit people. I have had letters from people that had to give up stands on the corner because of the manner in which this thing has been operating, cutting underneath their prices, increasing the granting of these places for the use of their leads to where these people had to go to work for the D.C. Transit Co.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep concern over this piece of legislation. I am opposed to it and I shall vote against it. My reasons primarily are because—and God forbid that we have another streetcar strike in this community that we had to wrestle with for about 8 months a few years ago—this action on this bill could be a lead in that direction. As most of you know, I come from the city of Minneapolis. Minneapolis has a population of pretty close to 600,000. We have the Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co. in Minneapolis which serves both Minneapolis and St. Paul, intercity. We also have the independent bus companies there. And the fare for our riding public is 25 cents. I want to say, too, that we would be in a bad way because of the many events we have in the city of Minneapolis if we did not have the facilities of the Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co. in this very charter and sightseeing bus business. That applies also to the conventions that we have. These little bus lines are not able to take care of the conventions that come to Minneapolis, neither are the taxicabs nor any other mode of transportation able to take care of the Saturday afternoon crowds at big events. The Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co. is available to all who want to use the service on any occasion.

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

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Do they separate their physical facilities and their workmen for these two operations?

Mr. WIER. No. The very buses that carry the passengers to work in the morning go out to the baseball game in the afternoon. Our baseball park is quite a little distance outside the limits of Minneapolis; the same with our university football crowds. So, I hope that this bill is defeated.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4815) to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE ITEM VETO IN THE STATES

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in further support of my efforts to convince the Congress that approval of the item veto authority for the President is an important step forward in achieving fiscal stability at the Federal level, I wish to review the history of the item veto as it has been used in the various States.

As you know, I have had my legislative research team at the State University of Iowa studying the item veto issue for over a year, and as a result of this study, I have introduced three joint resolutions as approaches the Congress might use in authorizing its use by the President.

On June 8 I addressed this body on the history of the item veto from the very inception of our Government. Today, I wish to dwell upon the wide use the item veto has had in most of the States. In doing this, I again want to call attention to the research which has made these remarks possible. The young men working for me at the State University of Iowa, under the direction of Dr. Russell Ross, have done a thorough and noteworthy study. I have had their findings checked by authorities in this field, and have been gratified with the praise which has been directed to the members of the team.

The veto of specific items in appropriation bills is very predominate in State constitutions. At the present time 42 of the 50 States have provisions for the item veto in their State constitutions. These States are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The item veto was first adopted in the United States in the Provisional Constitution of the Confederacy. Article I, section 5 of that document states that—

> The President may veto any appropriation or appropriations and approve any other appropriation or appropriations in the same bill.

This was continued in the Permanent Constitution of the Confederacy, which states in article I, section 7, that—

> The President may approve any appropriation and disapprove any other appropriation in the same bill. In such case he shall, in signing the bill, designate the appropriations disapproved, and shall return a copy of such appropriations with his objections to the House in which the bill originated and the same proceedings shall then be had as in case of other bills disapproved by the President.

Only North Carolina of the Confederate States does not now have the item veto in its State constitution.

The first two States to adopt the item veto were also in the Confederacy. These were Georgia and Texas, both of which adopted it in 1868. Other early States to adopt it were West Virginia in 1872, Pennsylvania in 1873, Arkansas and New York in 1874, Alabama, Missouri, Nebraska, and New Jersey in 1875, Colorado and Minnesota in 1876, California in 1879, and Illinois in 1884.

State constitutions vary on the majority necessary to override the Governor's veto of an item in an appropriation bill. Thirty of the 42 States require two-thirds majority for overriding. Some require two-thirds of the total membership, some require two-thirds of members present and voting, and others make no definite provision for either. Those requiring two-thirds majorities are Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Those specifying two-thirds of the members present

are Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Those with provisions for two-thirds of the total membership are Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Wyoming. In Alaska vetoed appropriation items become law by affirmative vote of three-fourths of the membership of the legislature.

Six States, Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia, have item vetoes which can be overridden by a majority of each house. Alabama, Arkansas, and West Virginia provide for a majority of total membership being necessary, while the others do not further define a majority.

Five States provide for a three-fifths majority. A three-fifths vote of the members present is sufficient in Rhode Island; a three-fifths vote of the members elected, in Delaware, Maryland, Nebraska, and Ohio.

Only one State, Virginia, provides for a different majority for overriding appropriations items than is necessary for overriding vetoes of other bills. A majority is required to override item vetoes, while two-thirds of members present is necessary to override vetoes of bills other than appropriations items. No State allows the veto of items in nonappropriation bills, which are generally required to be limited to one subject which must be expressed in the title of the bill. This provision in many cases gives the Governor and the people some protection, since it makes it impossible for the legislative body to lump two or more subjects together in a given bill. That is why there is less need in the States for an item veto for a nonappropriation bill.

Two States on which a considerable amount of study has been given to the workings and history of the item veto are Illinois and Pennsylvania.

Illinois adopted the item veto in 1883, under Gov. Shelby M. Cullom. Illinois mayors had been given this power in 1875, and an item veto bill narrowly missed being enacted in the 1881 session of the Illinois General Assembly. Governor Cullom advocated it to the assembly in 1883, and it was adopted, 35 to 7, in the State senate and, 107 to 2, in the house of representatives. It was approved by the people by a vote of 428,831 to 60,244 and, therefore, was formally placed as an amendment to the Illinois constitution in 1884.

The amendment stated:

> Bills making appropriations of money out of the treasury shall specify the objects and purposes for which the same are made, and appropriate to them, respectively, their several amounts in distinct items and sections; and if the Governor shall not approve any one or more of the items or sections contained in any bill, but shall approve the residue thereof, it shall become law as to the residue in like manner as if he had signed it. The Governor shall then return the bill with his objections to the items or sections of the same not approved by him to the house in which the bill shall have originated, which house shall enter the objections at large upon its journal and proceed to reconsider so much of said bill as is not approved by the Governor. The same proceedings shall be had in both houses in reconsidering the same as is hereinbefore provided in case of an entire bill returned by the Governor with his objections; and if any item or section of said bill not approved by the Governor shall be passed by two-thirds of the numbers of those elected to each of the two houses of the general assembly, it shall become part of said law, notwithstanding the objections of the Governor.

At first this provision was used very little in Illinois. Between 1884 and 1903, 19 years and nine sessions of the general assembly, the item veto was used only once. In 1899, Governor Turner rejected a $99,166.61 appropriation for the University of Illinois. Since then, however, there has been a close relationship between the increase in size of State budgets and the more extensive use of the item veto.

Illinois Governors have interpreted liberally the authorization to veto distinct items in appropriation bills. There are two ways in which this was liberally interpreted: Governors have stricken the phrase "per annum" in biennial appropriation bills, and in the reducing of items.

In December 1915, the Illinois Supreme Court in the case Fergus against Russel held that these two liberalizations were unconstitutional. The court also ruled that, since these reductions were unconstitutional and that no outright veto had been made, the entire appropriation should be permitted to stand.

The item veto in Pennsylvania is probably stronger than that of any other State. There the veto power includes the power to reduce any item. No other State has a constitutional provision that will permit this. The Governor may veto a bill within 10 days of passage. If he does not do so, the bill is approved automatically and becomes law unless this 10-day period falls, within 10 days of adjournment of the legislature. Bills passed less than 10 days before the end of the session become law 30 days follow-in adjournment unless they are vetoed. Even though the item veto in Pennsylvania includes the power to reduce items, it does not include the power to veto certain items of nonappropriaiton bills.

From 1939 to 1946 the Pennsylvania Legislature passed 2,174 bills, of which 229 were vetoed, 330 appropriations were reduced, and 23 appropriations struck out. During all but 2 years of that time both the legislature and the governorship were in the hands of the Republican Party. From 1941 to 1942 the Democratic Party controlled the house of representatives.

Because of the item veto and the reduction power the Governor's budget is enacted into law in much the same form as it is proposed:

[In thousands of dollars]

Session	Governor's budget	Amount passed by legislature	Amount vetoed	Total
1939	377,171	386,290	10,225	376,065
1941	361,944	408,102	50,990	357,112
1943	345,335	383,399	1,695	381,704
1945	479,688	538,651	21,808	516,842

Governors of Pennsylvania customarily do not give detailed reasons for vetoes of specific items or reduction in items. Only once has the legislature overridden a veto even though many items have initially passed the legislature by more than the required two-thirds majority. One reason for this is that few bills, and particularly appropriation bills, are passed until the last 10 days of the session. In 1924, 98 percent of all appropriation items of bills vetoed or reduced occurred in the 30-day period following adjournment. In 1945 only 14 of the 224 vetoes and 17 of the 337 item vetoes or reductions reached the legislature before adjournment.

The item veto has been used as a means for breaking deadlocks between the two houses of the legislature. In 1941 the Democratic-controlled house of representatives and the Republican-dominated senate were deadlocked on appropriations. The Republican senate passed an appropriations bill in the same form as the house of representatives "objectionable as some provisions are" and "left it to the Governor's constitutional power to correct such conditions as it can."

The growth of the item veto has been quite spectacular considering that in 92 years 42 States have adopted it. Most States writing new constitutions include it, as did our two newest additions to the Union, Alaska and Hawaii.

Next Wednesday, June 22, I have been granted permission to take the floor again so that I can review the arguments pro and con on the item veto. After the presentation of all of these facts, it is hoped that other colleagues will join me to press for action on this legislation.

DR. THOMAS DOOLEY, A MAN OF GOD, A SPLENDID AMERICAN, A DEDICATED DOCTOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the unselfish expression of love for our fellow man occurs with varying frequency in most of our lives. Few of us, however, can boast the daily devotion to humanity of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. His dedication to the task of helping those in need knows no limit and the sacrifice of his personal safety to the cause of helping others to know a better and safer life is an example of human greatness which fills us with awe. I can think of no more fitting recipient of the Lay Churchman Award, and it gives me great pleasure to see the recognition given this great humanitarian by the Religious Heritage of America, Inc.

Dr. Dooley's recent personal tragedy has highlighted for the entire world his tremendous achievements in wiping out disease and sickness in Laos and other countries. Needless to say, Dr. Dooley's courage and devotion to humanity did not originate with his operation for cancer in August of last year. Since 1954, he has struggled against disease in Indochina—first as a Navy physician after

the fall of Dienbienphu and, after his discharge from the Navy in 1956, under the auspices of Medico in setting up his first hospital in Laos.

The magnitude of the challenge which faced Dr. Dooley in Indochina defies our imagination. As he describes it:

These people have always thought that having something wrong with them is natural. Malaria is endemic here, and they don't think anything at all of some fever. We are changing that.

I find Dr. Dooley's description of his Navy experience in Indochina especially moving. He states:

We saw simple, tender, loving care, and the crudest kind of medicine, inexpertly practiced by mere boys, change a people's fear and hatred into friendship. We saw it transform the brotherhood of man from an ideal into a reality. To me, that experience was like the white light of revelation. It made me proud to be a doctor—an American doctor who had been privileged to witness the enormous possibilities of medical aid in all its Christlike power and simplicity.

Instead of being discouraged by the enormity of the task before him, Dr. Dooley was fired up with hope and with practical energy. He founded a nonprofit, nonsectarian organization, Medico, to gather money, equipment, and personnel to enable him to do the work he saw must be done. He opened hospitals first in Laos and later six others in Asia, Africa, and South America.

Dr. Dooley's love for humanity, and his great vision of human needs is combined with a down to earth sense of what is possible. He says:

I believe that those of us who attempt to aid in a foreign land must be content with small achievements.

He makes use of local residents as practical nurses, midwives, and orderlies whenever he can. He keeps the cost of the medical care he practices to a bare minimum—last year he treated more than 36,000 persons at a little less than $1 a year for each patient. But in a sense his very great realism in viewing his tremendous goals make his successes all the greater.

Dr. Howard Rusk writing on two different occasions in the New York Times has pointed up the tremendous potential of Dr. Dooley's contribution for the entire world. On August 23 he wrote of Dooley's work:

His own fight against cancer he considers just a skirmish, when the tools of health and healing can combat the international cancer of communism.

One week later, Dr. Rusk stated:

Tom Dooley has awakened anew our realization that healing is a priceless tool in the winning of men's minds for freedom. He has been not only a great emissary for healing, but for peace.

For Dr. Dooley, the fruits of his work are in themselves a sufficient reward. He describes his attitude with these words:

All our Medico doctors are happy men. They have the happiness that comes to people who have found the path, the path that leads out of themselves and into involvement with mankind. They will be able to look back at the end of their lives and feel they've accomplished something important.

I wish to add my congratulations and admiration to those of many others who feel as I do that this award is richly deserved by a splendid American, Dr. Thomas Dooley. He has heard and truly followed the lesson of the two great commandments—love of God and love of neighbor.

In my remarks, I include a news item appearing in a recent issue of a Washington newspaper:

DR. DOOLEY, LAOS HOSPITAL FOUNDER, TO RECEIVE HERITAGE AWARD HERE

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, the founder of jungle hospitals in Laos, will come to Washington June 16 to receive the annual Lay Churchman Award of Religious Heritage of America, Inc., the organization announced yesterday.

Others who will receive awards are: Ruth Youngdahl Nelson, churchwoman of the year; D. Elton Trueblood, clergy churchman of the year; and George W. Cornell, faith and freedom award in religious journalism.

The awards will be presented at a dinner in the Statler-Hilton Hotel. Paul Wooton, Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, will be toastmaster.

Dr. Dooley, a graduate of the University of Notre Dame and the St. Louis School of Medicine, gained fame when his book "Deliver Us From Evil," describing his fight against disease in Haiphong, North Vietnam, became a best seller. He founded his first hospital in Laos with proceeds from the book and help from U.S. drug firms.

He returned to the United States last summer for a cancer operation and again this spring for a checkup. He is going back to Laos at the end of the month.

Mrs. Nelson is a writer of inspirational religious books. She was District of Columbia Mother of the Year in 1953, and Scandinavian Woman of the Year in 1954. She is a member of the National Board of Christian Higher Education of the Augustana Lutheran Church. Her husband, the Reverend Dr. Clarence T. Nelson, is president of the Council of Churches, National Capital area. She is a sister of Federal Judge Luther W. Youngdahl.

Dr. Trueblood interrupted a career as religious author and professor of philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Ind., in 1954, to serve 2 years as chief of religious information for the U.S. Information Agency. He is a former executive secretary of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting of Friends. His latest book, a religious best seller, is "Confronting Christ."

Cornell, a religious writer for the Associated Press since 1951, writes a weekly column called "Religion Today." His book, "They Knew Jesus," was published 2 years ago.

Announcement of the awards was made by Lisle M. Ramsey, president of Religious Heritage.

The awards dinner is a highlight of the Heritage's annual 3-day Washington pilgrimage. Previous award winners include President Eisenhower, Evangelist Billy Graham, and the late Cecil B. de Mille.

THE INTER-AMERICAN PEACE COMMITTEE'S HISTORIC REPORT ON TRUJILLO; IS CASTRO NEXT?

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today the Inter-American Peace Committee transmitted its report of its investigation into "the flagrant violations of human rights by the Government of the Dominican Republic," to use the words of the charge made by Ambassador Marcos Falcon-Briceno for the Government of Venezuela.

While very important, the condemnation of Trujillo's barbaric tyranny by this distinguished Committee acting for the Organization of American States is secondary to the precedent established. If we are to have peace with freedom in the world, we will attain it only through this kind of collective intervention on behalf of the principles of freedom and democracy.

This historic report stands as a proud achievement for the OAS as it seeks to fulfill its purpose, the promotion of representative democracy and human rights in a peaceful, thriving hemisphere.

The United Nations can profit by this example. A world shocked by the abortive summit conference can properly take comfort from this action by the Inter-American Peace Committee.

This report, of course, is not the end in any sense. It is the basis and the beginning of further action with respect to Trujillo's foul government and others resembling it in the hemisphere. This collective intervention is only by words—strong, authoritative words, the power of which should not be underestimated. Steps should be taken now to publicize this report throughout Latin America and particularly in the Dominican Republic.

PUBLICIZE THE CHARGES

Let radio stations in Puerto Rico, Florida, Honduras, Cuba, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and elsewhere be the Joshua's trumpets to blast down the crumbling walls of Trujillo's doomed government. This clarion call comes, not from one individual or from one or two nations, but from virtually the entire hemisphere.

Trujillo refused to allow the Peace Committee to enter the Dominican Republic. He was, understandably, afraid. The committee heard testimony from many exiles and from others. It was my privilege to have a small part in helping some of these witnesses come before the committee.

The conclusion was no surprise:

That international tensions in the Caribbean region have been aggravated by flagrant and widespread violations of human rights which have been committed and continue to be committed in the Dominican Republic.

What were some of these violations by Trujillo and his gang? They include denial of free assembly and of free speech, arbitrary arrests, cruel and inhuman treatment of political prisoners, and the use of intimidation and terror as political weapons.

These acts—

Said the report—

constitute the denial of fundamental rights set forth in the American Declaration of the

Rights and Duties of Man, as well as of principles of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

TRUJILLO'S CRIMES ABROAD

The Committee found that these systematic violations by the Trujillo government increased the tensions existing in the Caribbean region. Reference was made to the illegal activities of agents of the Dominican Government abroad. I can cite, among others, the case of Jesus de Galindez, in which my own constituent, Gerald Lester Murphy, was unwittingly and fatally involved.

Trujillo gave the United States an insultingly false explanation of Murphy's death, an explanation which we formally rejected. No other was ever submitted.

The entire text of this epoch-making "Report of the Inter-American Peace Committee on the Case Presented by the Government of Venezuela" is set forth at the conclusion of these remarks. It is a document worth the close attention of every Member of Congress.

The Inter-American Peace Committee members, all outstanding men, were Ambassador John C. Dreier, representative of the United States, Chairman of the Committee; Ambassador Hector David Castro, representative of El Salvador; Ambassador Vicente Sanchez Gavito, representative of Mexico; Ambassador Carlos A. Clulow, representative of Uruguay; Minister Santiago Salazar Santos, representative of Colombia.

Hemispheric opinion, when expressed by these men in their roles as official investigators for the Organization of American States, can and should be very powerful. Wide and repeated publicity may be sufficient to finish the Trujillo government.

If more action is necessary to gain respect for human rights, the means are at hand. Once, not long ago, such a report could not have been made. Even to propose such a committee would have been to call down emphatic objections of intervention, followed by the express or implied statement that the United States was again interfering in the affairs of its sister states.

The United States has changed its ways in this respect. The OAS is not a facade for U.S. imperialism. It is a sovereign body of which the United States is one member. We can and we do lead on occasion but we have learned not to push or to try to dominate.

TRUJILLO SOON TO FALL

Other measures against the Trujillo Government can take the form of diplomatic and commercial sanctions, but these need not be considered at this time because it appears that they will not be necessary. Trujillo has his bags packed.

There are other nations in the hemisphere where systematic violations of human rights are being perpetrated and thus increasing tensions. Nicaragua and Paraguay both have governments which should be investigated by the Inter-American Peace Committee, but first its attention should be turned toward Castro's Government of Cuba. It is different but, in terms of tensions affecting the peace of the hemisphere, no less important.

Castro's promises of elections in 18 months have been laid aside in favor of mob approval. His one-time respect for a free press has vanished along with all the free newspapers. Anyone who disagrees out loud goes to jail.

Castro promised to carry out land reform under his law providing for inventories and payment, but many takings are confiscations from law-abiding citizens, or foreigners who have good records of productivity in the use of their lands and who did not support Batista.

Castro often said that he would protect the 26th of July revolution from being taken over by any other faction, including the Communists. Serious questions for investigation are whether Castro is allowing the transshipping of Communist arms to Communist-directed revolutionaries elsewhere in Latin America, and whether he is allowing Cuban anti-Americanism, in part understandable, to be exaggerated and used by the international Communists.

CASTRO IS NOT TRUJILLO

Would Castro allow an OAS Peace Committee to carry on an investigation in Cuba? I have heard that he would not. I hope I have heard wrong. Cuba today is not the Dominican Republic, and Castro with all his shortcomings as a chief executive, is no Trujillo.

Not long after I returned from a visit to Cuba in January 1959, shortly after Batista's overthrow, I said on the floor of the House that many Cubans who hated Batista were "sickened by the thought that Fidel Castro, perhaps in spite of himself, may end up just another Latin American strong man ruling for an interval by terror and tribute. This is by no means impossible."

Castro does not, as yet anyway, rule by terror in the way Batista ruled and Trujillo rules. He does use a lot of intimidation and this can all too easily and quickly edge into terror. Nearly everyone concedes that Castro is personally honest and that his government is incredibly uncorrupt. He is not "just another Latin American strong man."

Cuba was overdue for a social and economic revolution. The question is whether Castro's headlong and headstrong leadership can lead to anything but disaster. For the asking he could have had the strong and invaluable help of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, former President Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, and Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela. They hated Batista and they favored a social revolution in Cuba, but they like most Americans believe in free elections and individual rights.

Castro could have had friendly, generous help from a United States whose policies about dictators were, at the very moment when Castro came to power, changing drastically. Cuba would have profited by our improved policies and by our embarrassment for past shameful support of Batista. But public opinion in the hemisphere has turned against Castro. Unless he changes his attitude about free elections and individual rights, Cuban public opinion also will turn against him.

We have to face the situation as it is. An accurate, authoritative assessment can be made by the OAS Inter-American Peace Committee, preferably by an investigation within the boundaries of Cuba but, if necessary, right here in Washington by interviewing exiles and others with firsthand information about the state of human rights in Cuba today.

THE ROLL OF THE OAS

The historic precedent has been set by the report issued a week ago. The OAS must now continue to fulfill its great obligations to the peoples of this hemisphere in accordance with the principles set forth in its charter.

The hemisphere needs a definitive report about the tensions apparently emanating from Castro's government of Cuba. I wish I could be as calm and undisturbed about Cuba's immediate future as some seemingly well-qualified observers appear to be. Too many democratic friends of mine have been forced out of the Government or have withdrawn their support. Castro's repeated irrational rantings against the United States and his tolerance of Communists makes me shudder, not for our dignity but for what must soon be the sorry consequences in Cuba. There is much trouble ahead for the people of Cuba under a government led by a man who misrepresents and distorts facts, ignores his own laws, and fails to recognize that communism is a tyranny.

I have asked him many times, personally, by mail and by cablegram, about setting a date for elections, about permitting freedom of the press, about opposing Communist tyranny as he opposed Batista tyranny, about enforcing the terms of his own agrarian reform law, and about many other measures which I along with others felt in the best interests of the Cuban people. My suggestions and criticisms have largely been ignored.

No doubt there is much I do not know, perhaps much I cannot understand, about Cuba's deep, broad, and intense revolution. That is why I hope that the OAS Inter-American Peace Committee will go forward to carry on its historic mission and to proceed to investigate the status of human rights in Cuba.

The following, in addition to the complete text of the report by the Inter-American Peace Committee, are one editorial and several articles about Cuba. To some extent they only add to my mystification about Castro's government and the Cuban revolution, but the authors appear to be qualified, sincere witnesses whose testimony should be heard and evaluated along with testimony of those who hold different opinions.

REPORT OF THE INTER-AMERICAN PEACE COMMITTEE ON THE CASE PRESENTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VENEZUELA

The Government of Venezuela, in a note of February 17, 1960, signed by its representative on the Council of the Organization of American States, requested the Inter-American Peace Committee to investigate "the flagrant violations of human rights by the Government of the Dominican Republic, which are aggravating tensions in the Caribbean."

The Committee decided, first, that in view of the powers and functions which were

given it in resolution IV of the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, it was within its competence to consider the request of the Government of Venezuela. As will be recalled, that resolution, in entrusting to the Committee the study of the questions that were the subject of the convocation of the meeting of consultation, provides in article 1, paragraph (b), that the Inter-American Peace Committee shall examine—

"The relationship between violations of human rights or the nonexercise of representative democracy, on the one hand, and the political tensions that affect the peace of the hemisphere, on the other."

In this determination regarding its competence the representative of Venezuela, who had withdrawn from active participation as a committee member at the time when he presented his Government's request, did not take part. Colombia was designated as a substitute by the Council of the Organization, on March 1, 1960, in accordance with article 11 of the statutes of the Committee.

In order to gather as much reliable information as possible with respect to this case, the Committee requested information from the member states in a circular note of February 25, 1960, sent to all the representatives on the Council except those of the Dominican Republic and Venezuela, with whom the Committee has remained in contact.

The Committee considered that it would be desirable to visit the Dominican Republic in order to investigate on the scene the situation exising in that country. For that purpose the Committee decided to exchange points of view with the representative of the Dominican Republic on the Council. The corresponding invitation was extended by means of a note dated February 19, 1960, with which the Dominican representative received a copy of the note from the representative of Venezuela. The resultant conversations were initiated on February 24, 1960.

In the course of these conversations with the Dominican representative, the Committee requested and obtained from him information regarding the case under study and, in accordance with the provisions of article 2 of resolution IV of the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, asked him if his Government would be prepared to give its consent for the Committee to visit the Dominican Republic in order to carry out the investigations that it considered necessary.

During the session held on March 8, 1960, the representative of the Dominican Republic stated that his Government, in the exercise of its option provided for in article 2 of the above-mentioned resolution IV, did not give its consent for the Committee to visit the Dominican Republic. The reasons given by the representative of the Dominican Republic, on informing the Committee of the decision of his Government, were reiterated in a note which he sent to the chairman of the Committee on March 24, 1960.

In view of the interest which existed regarding its actions in this case, the Committee decided to issue a press release on March 18, 1960, making public the negative reply of the Dominican Government.

In its conversations held with the representative of the Dominican Republic, the Committee expressed its natural and particular interest in obtaining information regarding the arrests in his country of persons involved in the subversive movement put down by the Dominican authorities in January 1960. The Committee had received reports on this matter to the effect that there had been more than a thousand such arrests. In this regard, the representative of the Dominican Republic said that, in accordance with official reports of his Government, the number of persons who had recently been arrested in his country for activities directed against the security of the state amounted to 222; he referred to the acts of clemency of the Dominican Government in favor of these persons, such as the release of the women who had participated in the movement and the reduction of some of the sentences imposed by the lower courts; he gave the Committee a memorandum containing a chronological account of the cases of amnesty and pardon of persons condemned in the course of the last 25 years for acts against the security of the Dominican State; and he suggested the desirability of the Committee's studying the question of violations of human rights in the Caribbean region in its general aspects and not in relation to only one of the countries comprising that region.

In view of these statements of the Dominican representative and taking into account various reports and documents which by then had been received by the Committee—for example, the second pastoral letter of the Dominican bishops, dated February 28, 1960—the Committee believed that there was reason to hope that the Dominican Government would decree an amnesty for the political prisoners or would adopt some other measure of clemency in their favor, on the occasion of Easter, April 17, 1960. Desirous of avoiding any step which might adversely affect the fate of the political prisoners, the Committee deemed it desirable not to make any pronouncements on the case under study during the first days of April and decided in favor of issuing a report of a general nature, dated April 14, entitled "Special Report on the Relationship Between Violations of Human Rights or the Non-Exercise of Representative Democracy and the Political Tensions that Affect the Peace of the Hemisphere," in which, among other matters, questions related to the existence of political prisoners in the American Republics are considered.

The Committee's hopes regarding an amnesty turned out to be unfounded. In fact, it was not until May 31 that the Committee received a note from the Dominican representative, dated May 30, in which the Committee was informed that "within the Dominican Government's process of carrying out acts of clemency in behalf of persons involved in the subversive plots discovered at the beginning of the year, another group of 63 of the persons sentenced was set free on Saturday, May 28, 1960."

Despite the Dominican Government's having declined to give its consent for the Committee to visit its territory, the Committee decided to obtain, through means available to it, reliable information regarding the subject of the request presented by the Venezuelan representative.

The Committee received testimony from Dominican exiles who had recently left that country, as well as from nationals of other American countries who had been in the Dominican Republic during, or just after, the events which gave rise to the arrests that occurred beginning in the month of January 1960. Among the Dominican exiles interviewed by the Committee were representatives of different social and economic spheres of the country, such as educators, workers, former members of the armed forces, industrialists and businessmen. These interviews were held in closed sessions and the Committee does not consider it desirable to make public the names of the witnesses or the text of their statements.

In addition to the testimony of actual witnesses of the situation existing in the Dominican Republic, the Committee examined extensive and reliable press material and also made use of valuable information provided it by certain representatives of member states.

On the basis of the evidence which it has been able to gather, the Committee has reached the conclusion that international tensions in the Caribbean region have been aggravated by flagrant and widespread violations of human rights which have been committed and continue to be committed in the Dominican Republic. Among these violations, mention must be made of the denial of free assembly and of free speech, arbitrary arrests, cruel and inhuman treatment of political prisoners, and the use of intimidation and terror as political weapons. Some of the victims of these grave acts appeared before the Committee and made statements. These acts constitute the denial of fundamental rights set forth in the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, as well as of principles of the charter of the Organization of American States.

The relationship between the systematic violation of human rights and international political tensions that affect the peace of the hemisphere was analyzed by the Committee in its above-mentioned special report of April 14, 1960—Document CIP–2–60. The case which is the subject of the present report confirms, in the judgment of the Committee, the conclusions which it reached as a result of the above-mentioned analysis since it is evident that the violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic, just alluded to, have increased the tensions existing in the Caribbean region.

In the above-mentioned special report some observations were also made regarding the problems confronting the governments which give territorial asylum to the citizens of the countries governed by dictatorial regimes that do not respect the fundamental rights of the human individual. Those observations are particularly applicable to the situation created by the presence, at the current time, of many Dominican exiles in the countries of the Caribbean region, by the circumstance that in recent months there has been an increase in the number of Dominican nationals seeking refuge in foreign countries, and by the appreciable intensification of the activities of the exiles directed toward effecting a change in the government of their native country. Likewise, it should be mentioned that these groups of Dominicans, as well as numerous persons and organizations of different nationalities, are requesting, through the press and in public demonstrations, the adoption of international measures against the present Government of the Dominican Republic. This situation is the cause of serious concern, and has created difficult problems, for the governments of the countries receiving the refugees, where public opinion has for some time been aroused over the state of affairs in the Dominican Republic.

Regarding the foregoing, the committee must also refer to the repercussions resulting from the circumstance that public opinion has linked certain violent acts which have occurred in different American countries with illegal activities of agents of the Dominican Government abroad. The Committee has received and continues to receive reports concerning these cases, but, independently of any conclusions which it may reach on the matter, it considers it to be its duty to point out that existing tensions in the Caribbean have been heightened in an exceptional manner by this public reaction.

The Dominican Government has reacted very adversely to these developments. Among the manifestations of the foregoing are the attacks in the press, by radio and other means of propaganda of the Dominican Republic against those governments and chiefs of state who have shown sympathy for the cause of the Dominican exiles. As this subject exceeds the limited scope of the present report, the Committee will not analyze it at present. It must, however, express its opinion that this course of action, in turn, constitutes an additional element of disturbance in international relations in the hemisphere.

In view of all that which has been stated above, the Committee stresses the fact that international tensions in the Caribbean area, far from diminishing, have been increased and that, in its view, these tensions will continue to increase so long as the flagrant violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic persist.

JOHN C. DREIER,
Ambassador, Representative of the United States; Chairman of the Committee.
HECTOR DAVID CASTRO,
Ambassador, Representative of El Salvador.
VICENTE SANCHEZ GAVITO,
Ambassador, Representative of Mexico.
CARLOS A. CLULOW,
Ambassador, Representative of Uruguay.
SANTIAGO SALAZAR SANTOS,
Minister, Representative of Colombia.
JUNE 6, 1960.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 9, 1960]

CUBA: RESTRAINT BUT NOT INACTION

Cuba's Premier Castro is in much the same position as a little boy who knows that grownups aren't supposed to strike children who play pranks.

His recent announcement that Soviet Premier Khrushchev will visit Cuba—plus broad hints that Chinese Premier Chou En-lai may follow—constitutes a sort of diplomatic hotfoot for Uncle Sam.

The question is how serious a hotfoot is it? And how do Latin American onlookers interpret it?

Many persons in the United States have jumped to the conclusion that the danger from a major Cuban-Soviet or Cuban-Chinese tie lies mainly in the field of mysterious submarine or missile bases.

Such speculation tends to divert attention from more likely dangers: (1) that Dr. Castro can be persuaded by his Marxist allies to act as a transshipper of arms to Communist-directed revolutionaries elsewhere in Latin America; and (2) that his newly established network of Cuban propaganda offices and radio stations may sow anti-Americanism there.

It is easy to see that these two areas might tempt the Cuban revolutionary hero. Since his rise to power he has gradually moved away from strictly internal reform and begun dabbling in big-power politics—first as a declared neutralist, currently as a man determined to give Moscow the benefit of the doubt and Washington doubt for every benefit.

In the process, he has shown an increasing faith in the exportability of his revolution, which has meanwhile moved away from moderate socialist reforms toward arbitrary extremism.

This is a harsh assessment of a revolution that started out to be a new deal for Cuba, and has, in fact, made much desirable progress against illiteracy and an underdiversified economy. But it is an assessment that is becoming more widely recognized among leaders in the hemisphere. And the Khrushchev visit tends to confirm it.

But if this hotfoot is a symptom of something serious—and it is recognized as such by many Latin democratic leaders—what can be done?

Certainly economic or military retaliation against Havana is not the answer. Dr. Castro still maintains wide support at home. His reform successes, loudly trumpeted, are still magnetically popular with many constituents of the very democratic leftist reformers in Latin America who have themselves become disenchanted with Castro. U.S. intervention would martyrize Dr. Castro and reverse the eye-opening now going on.

But there are several other fields for positive action:

1. The United States can present more undistorted information about its support for reform and human rights, both by radio and in print in local languages of the landless and downtrodden. (It should not continue to let Moscow broadcast in Latin-American Indian dialects without competition.)

2. Working through the Organization of American States, Washington can support a tightened arms limitation agreement (limitation, not prohibition). It can help organize joint patrolling against sea- or air-borne arms smuggling.

3. Congress can give the President discretionary power to adjust sugar quotas should the hotfoot get too hot.

4. Washington can do much more through coordinated economic aid to help new democratic reform governments gain support from the underprivileged and discontented.

[From Social Order magazine, March 1960]

CASTRO AND CUBA—THE POLITICS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By William P. Glade, Jr.)

Only a year ago cheers and applause greeted Castro's appearance in our movie newsreels. They have now, reports Miss Dorothy Kilgallen, changed to boos and hisses, the popular expression of a disenchantment daily more widespread.

Journalists who praised the barbudo's early successes have become vocal in opposition.[1] Congressional affirmations of sympathetic interest gradually diminished to a whisper, to be submerged altogether in recent weeks by mounting criticism and none-too-subtle references to sugar import quotas. After months of what appeared to be a studiously patient and conciliatory policy, toward the end of this past October, the State Department's attitude stiffened markedly and the first of a number of official protests was made.

The events underlying this growing apprehensiveness are, in their externals at least, too well known to require more than the briefest recapitulation.

After the first shock of the trials and executions, Castro's reckless call for an $80 billion Western Hemisphere "Marshall plan" seemed to epitomize the general disorganization of Cuban government. Promises of free elections grew increasingly vague and the suppression of dissent took on a harsher tone. A further ominous note was added by reports of a new secret police and neighborhood spy network. Censorship and bullying of the Cuban press together with mistreatment of U.S. correspondents virtually assured a bad press abroad.

Charges of Red influence came to seem plausible as the Cuban labor movement, crying American imperialism, pulled out of the ICFTU, as new laws expanded the scope of government intervention in the economy, and as expropriation of agricultural and mineral properties began. All the while, anti-U.S. feeling was being whipped up at mass rallies by a strident demagoguery reminiscent of Peron in his heyday.

In short, the bewhiskered youthful heroes of December 1958 came by December 1959 to seem to many rather more like aging juvenile delinquents, attired in jungle costumes and beatnik beards and with a strong bent for histrionics and violence.

The simplest interpretation of these events is that put forward by newsmen such as Dubois and Novins and by defecting revolutionaries aided by the publicity of congressional hearings: the Cuban revolution is being taken over by Communists and fellow travelers.

It would be foolish to deny the presence of Communists in Cuba.[2] They have been there for years and the deteriorating political and social conditions of the past decade were ready made for their agitation. Doubtless, too, many of the Communists are now wearing beards. Yet to call the Cuban developments communistic is, because of the emotion-arousing quality of that term, dangerously misleading as a guide to policy, for there is nothing in the changes effected so far which is distinctively or even primarily Marxist.

The potential menace of Communist infiltration which has been outlined in recent CIA reports is one thing; "leftist" policies which are not in and of themselves Marxist are quite another. To construe them as evidence of Red influence is to obfuscate important aspects of contemporary Cuban developments and to play into Communist hands by identifying communism with all important social change.

In part, this Marxist-in-the-sugarcane-field view probably stems from a failure to appreciate the singular differences between the Anglo-American approach and the Byzantine-Hispanic approach to economic matters. The wide latitude for intervention in economic affairs, for example, seems no more than a contemporary expression of the historic Iberian propensity to rely heavily upon state action to promote the public good. While state-operated enterprises have been set up to sell goods (largely foodstuffs) at prices designed to force drastic reductions in high retail markups, this sale of goods from public stores is an anti-inflation technique with repeated precedents throughout the long era of Spanish colonial rule. As such, it reflects not so much an ideological antipathy to private enterprise as a healthy and well-founded skepticism about the degree of competition prevailing in the market.

Similarly, the laws on expropriation and agrarian reform reflect essentially the contingent (rather than absolute) nature of property rights in the Hispanic legal tradition, a functional concept of property which stems from Byzantine law and medieval Catholic teaching.[3] Certain key sections of the agrarian reform law are, in fact, hardly more than restatements of land reform instructions issued two centuries ago by the

---

[1] Jules Dubois, a veteran correspondent who was one of Castro's stanchest supporters and who authored a highly complimentary biography of the Cuban leader, "Freedom Is My Beat" (Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1959), published a series of articles in late November 1959 (Chicago Tribune Press Service) entitled "Cuba's Tragedy"—a bitter denunciation of allegedly "totalitarian" and "communistic" aspects of the revolution.

[2] "Reds Stealing Cuba's Revolution, Editor Reports," is a headline in the Jan. 15, 1960, Catholic diocesan press. The story is written by Jaime Fonseca, editor of Notiticias Catolicas, Spanish and Portuguese language service of NCWC News Service. Based on three visits to Cuba since Castro came to power, Mr. Fonseca reports that "there is a formal understanding between the Castro regime's leaders and the agents of international communism, according to keymen close to the Castro brothers during the underground days."—Ed.

[3] Readers unfamiliar with 19th and 20th century developments in Latin America should bear in mind, too, that, in the first place, the validity of most land titles to the larger estates is extremely questionable and that, in the second place, over against the present day expropriation of the landowner's property must be set the generations of landowner expropriation of the suprasubsistence production of rural labor.

Spanish crown to the intendants (high officials of the imperial bureaucracy). They are about as communistic as those notorious old Marxists, the Bourbon kings.

Even anti-U.S. sentiment can be discounted as evidence of Marxism, for it too has roots deep in the neo-Iberian culture of Latin America, reinforced in Cuba's case by the natural resentment a small and poorer country feels for its rich and dominating neighbor.[4]

Since at least the Moorish occupation and possibly during the anterior Visigothic invasions, a certain cultural arrogance and xenophobia have been characteristic of the Hispanic world. In modern times Latin Americans of a wide diversity of views on other subjects have united in seeing the Western Hemisphere in terms of civilized, Catholic Latin society of the south versus the barbarian, Protestant commercialism of the "Colossus of the North."[5] Nowhere has this view been better expressed than in the Uruguayan José Enrique Rodo's unforgettable portrayal of the Latin "Ariel" confronting the materialistic U.S. "Caliban."

Here again geography functions to reinforce a cultural bias, for the green shores of the Antillean pearl are only a U.S. rocket's range away from the neon-lit hedonism of Miami, while yanqui tourism, a basic prop of Havana's economy, and the main contact of many Cubans with U.S. life, has been notable for its focus on bordellos and gaming tables. These, in turn, have constituted in large part the foreign investment activities of U.S. gangster elements. Both the sugar and spice of Cuban life have been, therefore, ever-present reminders of yanqui control.

THE BASIS OF ANTI-AMERICANISM

Lastly, at least a part of the popular anti-Americanism in Cuba today can be explained by the simple expedient of placing our reiterated statements regarding the "traditionally cordial relations between the Governments of the United States and Cuba" against the historical record of the corrupt and dictatorial Cuban regimes with which, by self-admission, we have maintained such warm relations. The Cuban masses may well be excused for a certain skepticism about the keen interest of the United States in democracy and social justice. It is worth noting in this context that if the United States should persist in unrealistic and unreasonable demands for compensation for expropriated properties, as it has lately given evidence of doing, the situation could worsen materially. The plain fact is that there exists a real basis for Castro's charges that the United States has attempted to interfere with the internal affairs of Cuba, an accusation to be appraised later.

An alternative explanation of the events rests on historical precedent. What are involved, according to this view, are just the "normal" Jacobin excesses prior to the Thermidorean reaction, for as the historians of revolution have noted, the enthusiasm of the fighting spirit not infrequently carries over under its own momentum into the period of triumph. The positive, constructive tasks of political direction, of course, suffer distortion by subordination to the negative logic of combat.

In such cases, nationalistic leaders, imbued with plans to rebuild society, are quite apt to pull down the old abode before working out plans for building the new. Latin America, with its tradition of youthful radicalism among university students and its caudillo tradition, in which leaders are prone to succumb to the old Hispanic weakness of seeing themselves as actors in a drama, would seem to be especially susceptible to this sort of revolutionary excess.

So chaotic may be the consequences of this situation that one writer has aptly made reference to a "Samson complex" whereby nationalist leaders flex their muscles, lean against the economic pillars, and bring the house down on those whom they regard as the source of their troubles—and on their own heads at the same time.[6]

A closely related interpretation is the scapegoat theory which has been expounded, among other places, in the pages of the Wall Street Journal.[7] According to this view, antiforeign sentiment has been whipped up to conceal either a poverty of constructive ideas or of failures of domestic policy.[8]

The difficulty with the first variation, however, is that even if the Cuban leaders had no ideas of their own, by now the world is surfeited with proposals for reform and change. There exists, as it were, a vast inventory of social engineering projects, a common pool or stockpile upon which the would-be reformer is free to draw. In any case, moreover, the current objection to the Cuban revolution would seem pretty clearly to be not that it is directionless but that its direction is unacceptable (to the United States and to upperclass Cubans).[9]

As for the second variation—that anti-U.S. feeling is, along with repressive rule, a device for covering up failure—evidence of any really substantial failure is simply lacking.

It is perfectly true that various Havana business indicators are down—reflecting mainly a massive turnover in the civil service, high unemployment in the construction industry, and the slump in the tourist industry and auxiliary services—and that examples of economic gaucheries are not lacking in the agricultural field. But none of this is sufficient to indict the present Cuban Government as a failure. All are attributable to rather special circumstances.

REGIME IS HONEST

Because the old civil service was composed almost entirely of notoriously corrupt political appointees of the Batista regime, it was imperative to "clean house" and provide public functionaries loyal to the objectives of the new government. In recording the achievements of the Castro government, it is indicative of its high moral tone that even its bitterest critics have not accused it of the most glaring defect of previous regimes: a scandalously pervasive dishonesty in all branches of government. Efficient bureaucratic teamwork, however, is largely a matter of accumulated experience and ought not, therefore, to be expected while the new government is still in its infancy.

Construction, in prerevolutionary Cuba as elsewhere in Latin America, consisted primarily of urban work of an essentially nonproductive nature—the erection of palatial homes, luxury apartment houses, and overly elaborate office buildings—the cessation of which reflects no consequential loss in productive output to the national economy. Already some of the urban construction labor force (along with underemployed rural labor) have been directed into activities of a socially more constructive character. There is no real economic reason why the rest of the unemployed should not be similarly reabsorbed over the month ahead.[10]

Taking a long view, one is probably safe in assuming that the decline in tourism is only a temporary phenomenon. As domestic conditions become more stable and as the U.S. press turns its search for sensationalism to other areas of the globe, the food of dollar-toting travelers will in all likelihood resume, for the substantial natural advantages of the island have, of course, remained intact and the Government has slashed prices to add to their attractiveness. Insofar as a certain sedateness repels the tourist, the revival of this key sector of the economy may be somewhat delayed; but who would wish to quarrel with the Cubans on this score? Some of the auxiliary tourist services of the past, such as prostitution and wide-open gambling, rested on such a dubious moral basis that a return to the status quo ante is unthinkable.

Finally, it must be noted that neither is there to be detected evidence of any significant failure in agriculture. Some dislocations and maladjustments are inevitable during a period of sweeping change, but various reports would seem to indicate that while land redistribution is taking place quite quickly and, in some cases rather informally, all things considered, the transition seems on the whole remarkably smooth. Wages in agriculture have risen somewhat above their previously meager level (an essential step in creating a stronger internal market and providing more effective incentives for the rural labor force) and some of the new agricultural cooperatives appear to be receiving expert technical assistance.

In all of this the role of government has bulked large. Substantial governmental tutelage is likely to be a basic ingredient of agricultural reform for some time to come, and this for reasons which have little to do with ideology. Generations of peonage have

---

[4] Cuba gained its independence from Spain only to fall promptly under the influence of the United States. U.S. investments in sugar, minerals, tobacco, and public utilities came rapidly to control the Cuban economy and on several occasions provided the excuse for American military occupation of the island—all this, it must be remembered, in the 20th century. Today some 75 percent of Cuba's imports comes from its powerful neighbor and around 65 percent of its exports goes to the U.S. market.

[5] According to Tad Szulc, New York Times, Nov. 5, 1959, most of the current anti-U.S. feeling throughout Latin America is found among non-Communist groups.

[6] Indonesia might well provide the neatest "fit" to this concept. After first pulling down the Dutch pillar and finding that the house neither collapsed nor became noticeably roomier, the nationalist Samson has turned his attention recently to pulling down another major prop—the Chinese business community.

[7] See p. 1 of the issue of Oct. 27, 1959. The fairly extensive Cuban coverage in Time and U.S. News & World Report also plays heavily on this theme.

[8] Similar, for example, to the scapegoat use of Israel by the backward regimes of Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

[9] As Harold Lavine has pointed out in a noteworthy article in Commentary ("Social Revolution in Cuba," October 1959, pp. 324–328), the upperclass supporters of the Castro movement in its early days were aiming for the establishment of a conventional liberal democracy rather than the basic social revolution which has emerged increasingly as the paramount objective of the new regime.

[10] Some observers have charged, rather unconvincingly, that the Government's public works outlays are unproductive. It is difficult to see why the construction of rural roads and bridges does not represent important investments in social overhead capital and why even the provision of better worker housing should not be considered as directly conducive to higher levels of economic welfare and, very probably, indirectly productive because of the effect on worker morale. Such criticism stems in part from the old confusion between money costs and real costs and in part from a failure to contrast this type of expenditure with the prerevolutionary alternatives noted above. Is public expenditure on worker housing necessarily a less productive use of resources than private expenditure on fancy apartments?

scarcely prepared the impoverished and uneducated Cuban rustic [11] to assume forthwith the role of an independent rural entrepreneur; stern economic necessity therefore dictates the use of state controls to gear the output of new agricultural entities to overall objectives as well as to prevent the peasantry from consuming too much of its output. That mistakes will be made in this governmental guidance is a certainty, a fact which demonstrates merely the unavoidably experimental nature of initial planning efforts rather than the futility of such intervention.[12]

It should be observed in passing that a future decline in sugar output cannot be taken ipso facto as evidence of failure, though it is certain that a sizeable portion of the U.S. press will so interpret it in order to discredit the land reform program. Because of world market conditions, sugar sales were already sluggish in 1957 and 1958 while domestic stockpiles were growing. It is entirely conceivable, then, that sound economics might call for reductions in sugar output and increases in other crops, particularly since the premium price paid for Cuban sugar may no longer be forthcoming when the U.S. sugar interests are replaced by Cuban ownership.

ECONOMY FOUNDERING DOUBTED

In short, it is hard to find conclusive evidence that the revolutionary government is foundering on economic difficulties of its own making, though it is necessarily tackling sizeable economic problems inherited from the previous era and is up against some extraordinary difficult tasks in effecting the changes it has as its goals. Fundamental reorganization of a national economy is obviously not an overnight transformation.

All this is not to deny the possibility that the revolutionary program may eventually fall amidst general economic chaos, in which case either a Communist takeover or a reactionary coup would be a strong probability. It is, however, far too premature to pass such a judgment at present. To do so is to misread the record—or to betray either undue pessimism or wishful thinking.

It is the main contention of this article that the growing anti-United States feeling and the intensity of opinion formation by the Cuban Government reflect the successes of the revolution rather than its failures and are, moreover, well-nigh indispensible instruments in that success.

The present government stands publicly dedicated to two main projects: 1. effecting basic social reforms and 2. undertaking a reorientation of the economy by a development program of industrialization and diversification. Neither task is easy under the most favorable circumstances; both are of a sort to generate, even as they are successful or perhaps to the extent that they are successful, substantial stresses and strains within the socioeconomic structure. A somewhat leftist and highly regimented state is, in all probability, the most effective instrumentality for this simultaneous restructuring of both the economy and Cuban society.

Seen in this light, anti-Americanism and calls for continued revolutionary discipline may well be interpreted as means of masking, not failures in dealing with problems, but rather the necessarily painful nature of the solution of those problems. They are techniques, that is, for creating a popular rationale for the inevitable austerity period and the requirements of heightened effort and sacrifice during the difficult transition phase in agricultural reform and industrialization.

What has been largely obscured by the headline-winning flamboyance of the barbudos is the fact that side-by-side with the events noted at the outset of this article the Government has been making a serious and fairly consistent effort to move toward its chosen goals.[13]

In its monetary stabilization program, for example, the Government has succeeded, by means of strict controls over its dollar exchange reserves and other policies, in reversing the serious drain on gold and dollar reserves which developed during the Batista days—and this despite a sizeable capital flight as the moneyed classes voted, in effect, no confidence in the program of social reform.

RADICAL REFORM

In a related move, to carry through its economic programs in the face of a severe dollar shortage, the Government has imposed strict controls and high duties on various items to discourage the squandering of foreign exchange reserves on imports of consumer superfluities and to save funds for necessary investment in imports related to the development program.

Rent controls appear to have been used to halt the characteristically Latin American propensity to pour funds into luxury real estate construction and to free resources thereby for the public works program noted above.

Impending reforms in the banking system are likely to result in a more satisfactory distribution of credit to the rural sector than hitherto, formerly, as well as to the new industrial undertakings. The whole matter of savings, in fact, is apt to come up for review shortly, for with workers and peasants investing their limited capacity to save in "industrialization bonds," it will not be possible for the wealthy and middle classes to continue to drag their feet.

FORCED INDUSTRIALIZATION

An important move has been made in the industrialization program with the passage of the new mining law which, by levying a 5-percent tax on minerals extracted for sale in Cuba and a 25-percent tax on raw minerals extracted for export, seems designed to force the construction in Cuba of smelting and refining facilities. Mineral exports, it should be recalled, rank after sugar and tobacco as the third biggest dollar earner, though the nickel and cobalt exports have almost entirely been exported in raw form for processing in the United States. Where feasible, of course, the logical place for industrialization to begin is in the processing of a nation's raw materials.

Though land reform has moved swiftly (to prevent opposition to it from consolidating and retarding or halting it) and agricultural cooperatives have been established (to give the peasantry a "stake" in the new system), agrarian reform has been geared to development plans by the provision of technical advice and the establishment, for the time being, of delivery quotas at fixed prices for various crops.

FEVER VERSUS DISEASE

The objection has sometimes been raised that land reform per se merely treats the fever (agrarian discontent) without touching the disease (social and economic backwardness).[14] Apart from the fact that in Cuba the "disease" is also being treated, it is perhaps relevant to note that it is not unsound medical practice in many cases to bring down the fever as soon as possible, even independently of the treatment of the disease itself. The analogy would seem to apply in economics, for the social costs of continuing peasant unrest—the absence of what John R. Commons called "industrial goodwill"—can result in a sizable though hidden charge (in lackadaisical productive efforts and rural strife with its attendant damage to capital and output and lost man-hours of labor power) against the output of the economy. And it is only after the rural populace has been "won over" that further constructive changes stand much chance of success.

Obviously, the foregoing and other measures for accelerating socially beneficial economic growth entail both a considerable sacrifice on the part of the hitherto privileged groups and a greatly increased productive effort on the part of all. As Ruby H. Phillips recently observed:

"The launching of Castro's austerity program has jolted the free spending, free-wheeling Cubans, and they are already beginning to grumble. The people of this island have often known poverty but they are not conditioned to planned austerity." [15]

Against this background, three discernible functions emerge for the anti-United States and anticounterrevolutionary campaign.

PLANNED AUSTERITY

First, it serves as a sort of catalyst in effecting a revolution in cultural attitudes, a means of rousing the masses from their past apathy and limited mental horizons and emphasizing cooperative effort for new social goals.

Secondly, these campaigns are merely an application in the Cuban context of what other nations, including our own, have learned and employed before with respect to the psychology of production; namely, that there is nothing like the threat of an enemy from without (whether real or imaginary is beside the point) and his allies from within to create an esprit de corps and mobilize popular support behind a crash program to lift production to higher levels, and this either to win a war or to break through to sustained economic development.

Such a personification of the threat posed by the backwardness of inherited institutional arrangements is probably essential when dealing with an unsophisticated population little conditioned to self-discipline for abstract long-term goals. Without a concrete and continuing menace, it is likely

---

[11] It is significant that in his radio message to Cuba's first national Catholic convention, attended by more than 500,000 (including Fidel Castro), Pope John XXIII felt compelled to emphasize: "The face of the world could change if true charity were to reign. * * * It is the charity of the Christian man convinced that his wealth has a social function, and that it is his duty * * * to give what is above his own needs to those deprived of the bare necessities of life."

[12] Father E. K. Culhane, S.J., writing in America ("'Big Brother' Comes to Cuba," Jan. 23, 1960, pp. 502–503), deals vigorously but exclusively with these transitory difficulties, attempting thereby to build a case against the Cuban land reform program.

[13] Business Week is outstanding for having discerned this behind-the-scenes progress at an early date. See "Castro: Political Fireworks but Clear Economic Goals," August 1, 1959, pp. 70–74, for a sympathetic account of the constructive aspects of the economic recovery program: Labor peace, appointment of competent experts to key positions, the work of the Banco de Fomento Agricola y Industrial de Cuba.

[14] Archbishop Antonio José Plaza of La Plata, Argentina, told a national conference on agrarian reform sponsored by the Association of Professionals of Catholic Action last fall: "Lands that have been abandoned or virtually so, and lands which because of their owners' neglect have low yields, can legitimately be expropriated by the state—provided a just indemnity is given—and the ownership transferred to capable, enterprising families."—Ed.

[15] "Castro Gets the Bill," the Reporter, Oct. 29, 1959, pp. 23–24.

that such a population, holding the mistaken notion that the solution for its predicament is easy, might become impatient with the necessarily slow progress of the development program and overthrow the whole plan before it could begin to demonstrate its value. While it is certain that Cuba cannot in the long run sever its close economic ties with the United States, it may well be that in the attempt to reduce U.S. influence, the population can achieve a substantially higher level of productivity and economic welfare.

Moreover, as suggested earlier, the external threat is not altogether fictitious. Despite the nominal stand of the United States that Cuba has a clear right to undertake internal social and economic reforms, the official American position on the compensation issue must be viewed as inimical to the democratization of the Cuban economy.

The Cuban Government has already offered compensation for expropriated properties in 20-year Government bonds based upon valuations arrived at by mutual consent between U.S. interests and the Batista government. Unless, therefore, U.S. concerns wish to concede that they conspired with the Batista government to defraud the Cuban economy (which is very likely the case), the present quarrel must perforce focus upon the manner of payment rather than the amount of payment.

To press, as the U.S. Government has done, for immediate cash-on-the-barrelhead payment is manifestly so far out of the question in a country embarking upon a development program that it is tantamount to opposing redistribution of the land in the first place.[16] Such a policy of nominal neutrality but practical opposition is likely to fool no one—least of all in Cuba—and only confirms the impression abroad that the U.S. State Department is the political arm of U.S. corporations.[17]

Finally, it must not be forgotten that even if the threat of yanqui imperialism is partially fabricated, the threat of internal counterrevolution is undoubtedly real.

An abiding threat to Latin American movements such as Castro's has been the opposition to change on the part of the oligarchy (a Latin American expression for the entrenched elite of landowners, merchants, high military brass, and foreign capitalists). More than one Latin American social revolution has foundered as a consequence of delay in taking immediate steps to eliminate the power base of this opposition. Most often the delay proved fatal as it gave the oligarchy the opportunity to gather forces and, through the machinations of military cliques and palace revolts, to annul the revolution.

Psychological reconditioning and tight discipline become, therefore, indispensable instruments for consolidating the social gains of the revolution by holding in check the hostility of the privileged classes. In this transitional period, a free press and free elections, in both of which oligarchic influence would be paramount, are impractical until such time as the revolution is stabilized.

NO PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES

U.S. readers who, from the comfort of their affluent society, cavil at the seeming harshness of Cuban policies for keeping down the opposition might well ponder the practical alternative of liquidation of the opposition through a resumption of internecine strife. Dislocations and stresses are bound to take place as reorganization of the socio-economic structure proceeds apace. To allow defectors and reactionary dissidents to prey upon them to undermine the basic goals of the revolution would appear unreasonable. The struggle has been too long and bitter and has cost too many lives already.

[From the Nation, May 28, 1960]

DIALOGS IN CUBA

(By Barbara Deming)

"In all my 38 years on the New York Times, I have never seen a big story so misunderstood, misinterpreted, and badly handled as the Cuban revolution."—Herbert Matthews.

Before my recent 3-week stay in Cuba, I had never played the role of journalist, and I had certainly never tried to play the role of amateur ambassador; but after a few days there, I found that I was exerting myself in both roles. The fact that I did so tells something about Cuba at this present moment. Nothing is more possible than to engage a Cuban these days in earnest conversation about the new regime, and about the misunderstandings between his country and ours. You have only to ask one question of a stranger sitting next to you in a bus, and before a minute is out, the bus will be a hubbub of discussion—every passenger eager to add his word. The only obstacle to communication that I encountered (aside from the fact that I speak a minimum of Spanish, and not all Cubans speak English) was that they are so eager to talk to Americans about what is happening, that I sometimes found myself trying to listen to two or three people at once. No one was indifferent. What is happening there is not something to which they passively submit, but something in which the great majority of Cubans feel actively engaged.

There is no blind following of Castro. Those who are most enthusiastic freely describe him as "loco" about some particular project, or term him "Superman" for wanting to think about everything himself. "We make jokes about everything, in Cuba," a young volunteer government worker told me. "Our joke about Castro is, we call him our kid. 'That kid, he's working too hard,' we say. It's very, very strange; we feel responsible for him." That attitude is also strangely contagious—so much so that, at the end of a week, having by then strong feelings about Cuba's relations with the United States, I found myself stepping into a taxicab and telling the driver that I would like, please, to talk with Fidel Castro.

When I admitted that I had no idea where Castro might be found, the driver pulled up to the curb and consulted some men who were chatting together. They advised me to ask directions at the main police station. There the matter was discussed again in an astonishingly informal fashion. I was advised to apply for an interview at the INRA building where, after explaining something of my purpose before a casual jumble of reception desks, I was suddenly taken in tow by a stranger who turned out to be an engineer, there this day to submit a rural electrification project to the government. Overhearing my explanations, he had decided that I had "good feelings" and so took it upon himself to steer me to the appropriate officials. It was not, of course, as easy as all that. The men in question were naturally busy. But I was asked to come back again; and the difficulty of getting to see Castro was explained to me in the simplest human terms: he'd been up working, the night before, until 5 a.m. Meanwhile the engineer led me off to meet some other people, of the press and radio, who might be able to arrange the interview for me.

It should be apparent to the reader by now that one widespread impression among us is mistaken: Cubans may be loudly critical of the present policy of our government, but they are not hostile toward the American people. Nor is their friendliness simply the friendliness of a people who want tourists. It is quite unstrained. No Cuban with whom I spoke treated with scorn my determination to try to see Castro. And when I finally did manage an interview in the manner that a number of people had begun to suggest—by catching his eye in a public place and asking whether I could talk with him—the attitude of the small crowd that soon surrounded us was curiously protective. After Castro left, many of them stayed round me for an hour more—asking me about myself and elaborating upon the words he had spoken.

The specific event that had caused me to prolong my stay in Cuba was the speech Castro made on March 6 at the funeral for the men killed in the explosion of the munitions ship, *La Coubre*. He had declared that he couldn't help suspecting that those who had tried to halt all shipments of arms to Cuba (which is to say, U.S. officials) were somehow responsible. His words had filled me with confusion. Back home, I had seen him described in public print as a little dictator in the making. But the vision of him in this role had been dissolved for me by then—confronted as I was by a population enthusiastic, yet without fanaticism. From one person after another I had heard, in effect, the same words: "For the first time we are full of hopes, we feel that life is possible." Even those few people with whom I had talked who were critical of Castro acknowledged that he was helping the great majority and that his regime was absolutely honest. A taxi driver who was furious at him, because he, the driver, depended on tourists for a living—"And they're not coming, they're not coming!" and Castro was to blame—described him, in his wrath, in these terms: "This island has always been called a paradise. Now he wants to actually make it one. He wants to make it a gol-den saucer. a gol-den saucer." (I told the cabbie I had never heard that expression. "It's my own," he said proudly.) The day of the funeral speech, however, revived in me the old doubts. Why should Castro mouth such suspicions—even while he admitted that he had no proof?

I had not been staying in Havana itself up to now, but now I moved in, and my second night there I suddenly had a chance to voice the objections of an American to Castro's charges. I wandered by chance into a crowd of people on the Prado who were being solicited for contributions for arms for Cuba. Everyone who donated something was allowed to speak a few words into a microphone, and a TV camera mounted on a truck would catch his picture for watchers throughout Cuba. Still troubled by my doubts, I hesitated to make my own contribution, but the eager faces of the girls asking for donations made my hesitation seem foolish, and I gave a few pesos. Instantly a number of people standing in line to take

---

[16] As most readers probably know, under the best of circumstances a program of rapid economic development is apt to create severe strains on a nation's balance of payments. Earnings of foreign exchange must by and large be earmarked for financing imports of capital goods and similar items needed to accelerate growth of domestic output. To divert a sizable portion of vital foreign exchange earnings into compensation payments means simply that capital is being repatriated at just the time when the need is greatest for more capital. Cash compensation would therefore be detrimental to Cuba's economic program while additional capital aid at this time would go far toward insuring the ability of Cuba to make good on bond redemptions later on.

[17] The expropriation-compensation issue also explains the above-noted forebearance of the State Department in the early days of the revolution: it was patient while the reform program was still in the talking stage but protested when the revolution began to make good its promises for economic and social reform.

their turns at the microphone, waved and smiled at me. "You are an American? That's wonderful. Thank you, thank you!" —and all beckoned to me to say something too. One after another of these people was crying a little speech into the microphone. Even little children squeaked out something with no shyness. (Fiery oratory, I noticed, is a national habit here.) I instinctively shook my head as they invited me to say my word. Then I decided that if I had a protest to make, I should make it here. So I asked the man who was passing the microphone whether he could translate for me, and I said: "Here's to Fidel Castro, and here's to your revolution. But may Castro come to speak less violently against the United States, and it may yet change its heart toward him." I rather expected my words to be disliked, but when I looked about me, people waved at me and cried again "Thank you!" and the next day, when I went to the Western Union office to send a cable, the head of the office hurried toward me, beaming, hand outstretched: "I want to thank you for your cooperation with the Cuban people. If I am not mistaken, I saw you on television last night."

That night, too, I began methodically to ask everyone I found who could speak English: Why did Castro make such violent charges? I had started asking this question on the day he made the speech, and the first answer I had been given had seemed strange to me. "Don't you see? He was so hurt," a young woman had explained to me. It had seemed strange to hear the statements of a head of state explained in such personal terms. And, I told her, most Americans felt that, in the face of Castro's abuse of us, our Government had behaved with astonishing restraint. In the coming days, however, I was to hear repeatedly the same expression, "You must understand, he was hurt," and to mark a look of wonder that I could not appreciate that human fact. Over these next 2 weeks—while I persisted, too, in my attempt to manage a conversation with Castro himself—I had long conversations about the relations between our two countries with scores of Cubans from all walks of life.

They would usually speak first of the refusal of our Government to sell Cuba arms, and of the strong pressure we had put on other governments to refuse them also. "Why are we not to be allowed to defend ourselves?" they would ask. Then they would bring up the raids over Cuba by planes flying from airfields in Florida. There was not a day, I was told, when at least one plane did not come over. Many acres of sugarcane had been destroyed by fire bombs "and sugar is our livelihood"; sugar mills had been attacked; even 100-pound bombs had been dropped; and a raid on Havana on October 21 had caused the death of 2 people, the wounding of almost 50. The United States did little to prevent these flights. I assured them: Our Government naturally deplored the raids, but it wasn't easy to prevent them. How was one to keep a pilot from lying about his destination? Again the response was a look at me and a smile—as though I were a child. If planes had been making similar raids into Canada, they said, they couldn't help feeling that the U.S. Government would have managed by now to stop them.

Everyone with whom I spoke would bring up the subject of the Batista henchmen to whom we allow asylum: Ventura, Laurente, Masferrer, Pedraza, others. These are not political refugees, they would say; they are known mass killers and sadists. There is a gesture in Cuba where the speaker touches the corner of his eye, meaning: I have seen it. This gesture was repeated for me many times. There is scarcely a person to whom one speaks whose family has been untouched by Batista's torturers. About 19,000 Cubans were murdered by them. In Havana alone, they castrated 300 men and boys, so people said. Some of the tortures they perfected are almost unspeakable. One woman told me with emotion of the treatment dealt out to her cousin. A Batista henchman had had a man jump up and down on the boy's stomach until everything inside him was broken. The fellow responsible "is now a leader of the anti-Communists in Miami," the woman told me. "There is your anti-Communist man. You must try to understand why we are so hurt."

When the Batista men were mentioned, I would urge the difficulties of forbidding asylum. And it was through a mistake, I would point out, that Pedraza had been allowed to enter the country. No such mistakes seemed to occur, they pointed out, when anyone tried to enter whom the United States had named a Communist. And the United States knew, they all said, that Batista's men were not idle there. Men known to be plotting against, say, the Government of England, would never be given such freedom.

It seemed unreal to all these people that we should be indifferent to the nature of these men now in our midst; and it seemed unreal, too, that we should be indifferent to the contrast between the Batista regime and the regime now. That contrast is for them a cause, still, of happy wonder. Person after person would remark to me how amazing it was to be able to look at a soldier or a policeman without fear. And in their eyes the youth I saw drilling in the streets have a very different significance than for the casual visitor. As one of the Catholic priests with whom I talked explained to me with feeling: Army barracks are being converted into schools all over the island. (This is one of the changes people talk most about.) And the militia that one sees everywhere is voluntary—"the first completely voluntary army in history," the priest boasted. "The army can no longer threaten the people of Cuba. The people of Cuba are the army."

It is not only the disappearance of terrorism that they speak of with wonder. Terrorism under Batista was matched by corruption. The facts of this, too, are vivid in every mind. Over and over someone would name for me the exact figures of some monstrous example of graft. Under Batista, a social worker told me, it used to be that a man would go into the government and within 6 months you could count on his being a millionaire. It was something strange, she said, if this didn't happen. One of the first things the heads of the present government did was to reduce their own salaries. Pride in this new honesty is one of the most conspicuous elements in the revolutionary movement. A man pointed out to me the little boxes being passed about for contributions for arms. "And nobody touches a penny," he cried; "this is holy." A girl opened one of the boxes to show me a diamond ring among the pesos contributed.

And so they look about with pride and relief at the difference between the two regimes, and cannot understand why we are suddenly full of protests about this one. They all conclude that the United States does not want Cuba to be independent; that it wants her to remain in the position of a colony.

By now I knew to what they referred when they explained Castro's words about the United States in terms of "hurt." It still seemed to me a strange explanation. Did they not expect diplomacy of their Prime Minister? When I finally did, by chance, late one afternoon, catch sight of him standing on the sidewalk outside the Sevilla Biltmore Hotel, I stepped up to him and asked my questions directly of him.

I introduced myself as an American distressed at the poor relations existing between our two countries. I did understand, I told him, that he had cause for bitterness; but, I said, his angry words were losing him friends in the United States—even those who might well be his friends. For several minutes his answers to me were a prolonged echo of all I had been hearing from other Cubans. "How would you feel—?" he asked me, and again: "How would you feel—?" naming again for me all the damaging acts, or omission of acts, that had been named for me by one person after another. "How would you feel?" His hand touched my arm. His appeal to me was personal—quite as though I had been trying, say, to reconcile him to a mutual friend who had disappointed him.

I reiterated: I understood why he was bitter. But wasn't he letting bitterness confuse his own actions now—when he went so far as to accuse the United States of complicity in the munitions-ship explosion, of actual crime? He was quick to deny this: he had not accused them. "The people around me, advising me, would never have let me say such a thing. I said that I had no proof. But," he added, "I have a right to wonder." A right to wonder out loud? I asked. The point was, he tried to explain, that if the United States had not attempted so persistently to block all sale of arms to Cuba, such a thing could never have happened. U.S. hostility had created an atmosphere in which the crime was possible.

I told him that I had recently read the speech he had made in October 1953, before the court which tried him for his early rebellion against Batista. (This speech, published under the title "History Will Absolve Me," I recommend to anyone wishing to make a considered judgment of Castro.) He said that I had often heard Americans worry that the might be a potential Mussolini or Hitler; I had decided that one who spoke as he did in that speech never could become another such figure. But listening to his words at the funeral, I had not been sure. Again, he looked at me hard.

The crowd had pressed us close together by now, and someone behind me was holding onto my waist, with warm hands, as though I were a child she or he were helping to speak up. It seemed to me, I said, that in his fight against Batista, his genius had been to win new adherents to his cause from the ranks of the opposition. That is how his army had grown. And in a recent talk to schoolchildren, I reminded him, he had urged the children, in their dealings with the children of those who spoke against the revolution, to "win them over with friendliness, not with contempt." Was he not forgetting that principle in his dealings with the United States?

In the beginning, he answered me now with emphasis, he had done just this—had tried to ask for understanding. But how was he to hope to reach the people of the United States, he asked, when between him and the American people was the American press? He spoke with a hopelessness conspicuously sincere. I persisted: it was not impossible to communicate with the American people. Must he not continue to try to make himself clear—thinking always, when he spoke, of those Americans who could understand him? He had gone on trying for a long time, he said. I asked, must he not keep on trying still? He looked at me then and shrugged his shoulders forward eloquently, "You would like me to be like Christ," he said. I answered: "I would like you to be like Gandhi in his conversations

with the British." "The people of Cuba are like Gandhi," he answered quickly.

I had referred once more to his funeral speech, when he suddenly put his hand on my arm again: "Don't you see? It is not to the United States that I am talking. I am talking to the people of Cuba." He spoke now at length and with feeling: "Don't you understand? I have to build up in the Cuban people a national conscience. I have to teach them what their true situation is. I have to make them aware of what lies before them, to be done and to be suffered. How did George Washington have to speak to his soldiers at Valley Forge?"

He was elaborating upon this theme when two NBC men, who had found their way through the crowd, asked him if he would grant them a televised interview the next day. He tried at first to decline; he was terribly busy; also, he spoke awkward English, and he might not say things well. I asked whether there couldn't be a chance for him to see the interview played back first, before approving it. Impossible, the reporter said, shortly. Castro turned to me suddenly now and patted me on the shoulder: "She's a good girl. She advises me not to get angry."

The newsmen then, pencils in hand, began to ask some of their own questions. The revolution, Castro tried to explain, was not really against the interests of the American people. It was true that a very small group of them would lose something. "We can't help this," he said. "You had a revolution once. There were changes, weren't there? And didn't the British lose something?" "We're reporters," said the NBC man. "We're here to ask you questions." Castro looked surprised. But he went on: The revolution was hurting the interests of a small group of monopolists. "Are you against monopolists?" asked the newsman quickly. "I'm not against!" Castro cried, with a helpless emphatic gesture; "I am for the Cuban people." (I noted that this outcry was omitted from the account of the interview in next morning's Havana Post, an English-speaking publication there.) "We are in favor of the Cuban people. We are against those who are not," he was simply reported as saying. Nor was there any account of what had been, for me, the heart of his self-explanation: His comparison of his own role to that of Washington at Valley Forge.

I came to believe that afternoon that Castro's words are not really weighed in terms of a reaction to them in the United States. I came to realize also that his very lack of diplomacy in speech, so disastrous where the relations between our two countries were concerned, had for his Cuban audience a special value. "Would you want him to be a hypocrite?" people had been asking me all these days. Batista had indeed been a "good politician," quite able to keep his mouth shut when it was diplomatic to do so. With Castro, Cubans feel secure in the knowledge that whatever comes into his head, he will say. When this leads to some exaggeration, they make allowances: "Remember, he is young." The point is: He is not trying to keep anything back from them. They feel that they share, for the first time, in what is going on. An edge of pride is no doubt involved, too. As the French wife of an exiled Haitian newsman said, with delight: "They have had to speak carefully for so long. This is an important moment for them."

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO THE FAR EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a picture that appeared in the Washington Post of President Eisenhower saying goodby to his little grandson at a Washington airport. In the picture are Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, Homer Gruenther, assistant to the President, Mary Jean and Barbara Ann Eisenhower, granddaughters of the President, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and Mrs. Herter, wife of the Secretary of State.

You see it is a very moving picture. You can just see him saying goodby and telling his grandson to be a good soldier. That, of course, is what the President was when he started off on his extremely dangerous trip to foreign countries where there are inhospitable groups with vicious threats against him awaiting him. I know he was telling David to be brave and a good soldier, because that is what he has been always. He told his little grandson he would then be acting as the head of the family, since his mother and father, Colonel Eisenhower, the President's son, were going with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read a letter addressed to the President by the American Legion Auxiliary, department of Massachusetts. It reads as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,
Boston, Mass, June 7, 1960.

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: At the 41st annual department convention of the Massachusetts American Legion Auxiliary held at New Ocean House, Swampscott, on June 3, it was unanimously voted to adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the dignity, patience, and understanding of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, during and subsequent to the ill-fated summit conference, has impressed us with his sincere desire for a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas he has been subjected to indignity uncalled for in his position as President of the United States of America: Be it

"Resolved, That we express to the President our faith in his efforts and our admiration of his report to the Nation."

May we assure you of the love and devotion of 25,000 members of the Massachusetts department during the trying days you spent in Paris and may you be given the health and strength under God's guidance to meet the grave responsibilities which lie ahead.

Cordially yours,
ADELAIDE L. FITZGERALD,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very fine resolution. It is entirely nonpartisan, and there are probably more Democrats than Republicans. I rejoice in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, but I deplore that there are those today in this country who criticize the President of the United States. It is terribly belittling of them, instead of resenting with all their being the attacks by Khrushchev on the President of the United States, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. He is our symbol of our country—he is our President. And in insulting him they insult the United States. No red-blooded, strong, loyal American, I think, can criticize the President or find excuses for Khrushchev. There is no redblooded, strong, loyal American who should not stand up for the integrity and honor and respect due to the United States of America.

REPORTING EXPENSES BY HOUSE MEMBERS

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], a member of the House Administration Committee, and a public accountant, introduced a bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress.

The bill deals with an area where we have long needed reform. I am today introducing an identical bill to that of the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], and I trust the House will move rapidly ahead to tighten up in this area.

LITHUANIANS AND THEIR FATE IN 1940

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people have had more than their share of misfortune and misery in their modern history, but the fate that was theirs in June of 1940 proved to be truly tragic. These robust and stout-hearted fighters for freedom had suffered under the oppressive Czarist regime of Russia for more than 100 years, and had regained their independence at the end of the First World War. Thenceforth, for about two decades, they were happy in their homeland, and in that relatively short time they had made Lithuania a model democracy in northeastern Europe. On the eve of the last war helpless Lithuanians were in a precarious position; they were not strong enough to defend themselves against their arch enemy, the Soviet regime. Soon after the outbreak of the war, Lithuania was attacked, overrun, and occupied by the Red army, and then the country became part of the Soviet Union. In attaining their goal, Soviet authorities resorted to some outrageous and inhuman methods. They deported all

able-bodied men whom they suspected of opposing Communist dictatorship and enslaved the rest of the population.

Even now it is impossible to say how many hundreds of thousands were uprooted from their native Lithuania and, in a mass deportation unprecedented in modern history, were driven to distant parts of the Soviet Union. On this day, 20 years after their deportation, we commemorate that day as one of misfortune and pray for those who died in some desolate part of the Soviet Union.

THE HONORABLE MRS. GRACIE PFOST

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST] on her overwhelming renomination to the Congress of the United States. She is a great and able Member of the Congress and a very loyal friend and loyal American. She is always very fair to Members on the Republican side as well as Members on the Democratic side. She sincerely wants to be helpful and just.

I know we in Massachusetts are deeply grateful to her. She has aided us in the passage of meritorious legislation in Massachusetts and in my own congressional district. She does this for both sides of the aisle, regardless of party, because she is dedicated to the proper development of this great country of ours. She is a great stateswoman and a great American. The Democrats can be extremely proud of her; I know I am, as a Republican. She is fortunate to have a fine husband who has great pride in her achievements and is constantly by her side, helping her in every possible way. I hope the citizens of Idaho appreciate her many talents, and her fairness in the great legislative job she is doing in the Congress.

Mrs. PFOST. I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. Those kind words coming from our dean of the women in the House of Representatives mean much to me. She has been a Member of this distinguished body for more than 35 years. She has served the people of her district faithfully and well. We, who know her, love her. I am gratified to be the recipient of her generous remarks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ULLMAN) for today, June 15, 1960, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. MULTER, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(At the request of Mr. CURTIN the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the RECORD:)

Mr. CANFIELD.

Mr. DOOLEY.

(At the request of Mrs. PFOST and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. ALFORD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 10000. An act to amend further certain provisions of the District of Columbia tax laws relating to overpayments and refunds of taxes erroneously collected;

H.R. 10183. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act regulating the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10684. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 10761. An act to provide for the representation of indigents in judicial proceedings in the District of Columbia.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1185. An act to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might otherwise be lost as the result of the construction of a dam;

S. 1358. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 1892. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Norman project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

S. 2327. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

S. 2954. An act to exempt from the District of Columbia income tax compensation paid to alien employees by certain international organization;

S. 2439. An act to authorize certain teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to count as creditable service for retirement purposes certain periods of authorized leave without pay taken by such teachers for educational purposes; and

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to establish an objective for coordinating the development of the District of Columbia with the development of other areas in the Washington metropolitan region and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 16, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2266. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) negotiated fixed-price contract AT(05-1)-36 with the Union Carbide Nuclear Co. (Carbide), Uravan, Colo., for the procurement of uranium concentrates, December 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2267. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to furnishing reports of additional facts in numerous cases involving the provisions of section 13 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2268. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2269. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a juvenile division within or in connection with the District of Columbia Youth Correctional Center, and to authorize the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia to commit to such juvenile division, subject to the provisions of the Juvenile Court Act, children 15 years of age or older"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12483. A bill to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; without amendment (Rept. No. 1874). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12552. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 9600. A bill to authorize

and direct the transfer of certain personal property to State and county agencies engaged in cooperative agricultural extension work; without amendment (Rept. No. 1876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 7593. A bill to amend sections 101 and 401(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of service authorized, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 11499. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 12273. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 12604. A bill to amend the "antikickback statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9079. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11486. A bill for the relief of Richard J. Power; without amendment (Rept. No. 1870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4981. A bill for the relief of Mina and Henek Sznaider; with amendment (Rept. No. 1871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9960. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tze I. Chiang; with amendment (Rept. No. 1872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10376. A bill for the relief of Adolf B. Jochnick; without amendment (Rept. No. 1873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 103. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9042. A bill for the relief of Anna Semechole Marcolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 1882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12653. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 12654. A bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12655. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 12656. A bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 12657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12658. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 12659. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on heptanoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12660. A bill relating to the application of the excise tax on club dues to amounts paid for certain capital improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12661. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12662. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act so as to prohibit any person, partnership, or corporation from disseminating advertisements falsely representing the prices at which commodities are offered for sale to be the wholesale prices of such commodities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 12663. A bill to preserve the rates of basic salary of postal field service employees in certain cases involving reductions in salary standing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 12664. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 12665. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12666. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 12667. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 12668. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act by adding certain requirements with respect to low-rent housing projects in the southeast quadrant of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12669. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12670. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with each of the States, Commonwealths, territories, and the District of Columbia to provide for a private, voluntary medical care insurance program for certain persons over the age of 65, and to authorize payments by the Secretary to States to cover part of the costs of such insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12671. A bill to change the definition of a nonqualified corporation, with respect to the allowance of 8-year carryovers of operations losses in computing the income taxes of new life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 12672. A bill relating to the reporting by Members of the House of Representatives of expenditures from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 12673. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported wines; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H.R. 12674. A bill to require full disclosure of expenditures of Government and counterpart funds by Members of Congress traveling in oversea areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 12675. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 12676. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 12677. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide

coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the Act of $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12678. A bill for the relief of Kazimiera Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 12679. A bill for the relief of George Sauter also known as Georgois Makkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 12680. A bill for the relief of Arthur N. Baril; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 12681. A bill for the relief of Manfull Dairy Farm, Inc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 12682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Stavros N. Nicolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12683. A bill for the relief of Mr. Earl H. Pendell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

494. By Mr. MONAGAN: Petition of Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association in support of the Keating-Celler bill with regard to admissible wiretap evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

495. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of 203 citizens of the 32d Congressional District of New York urging speedy enactment of H.R. 4700, the so-called Forand bill, providing health insurance and other benefits for persons eligible under the old age and survivors insurance benefit program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Federal Employees' Pay Increase Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I manifested my support of the Federal employees' pay increase legislation by signing the discharge petition some time ago. While I do not favor the discharge petition method of operation in the Congress, I think the situation was urgent enough in this case to warrant this procedure.

My interest in the legislation was motivated largely by reason of the fact that the postal workers in my area, at all levels, are receiving inadequate compensation for the job they do, particularly in the light of today's high cost of living and the depreciated value of the dollar.

The postal workers are among the most loyal of our Government employees. They perform arduous and trying tasks with great patience and skill. They are devoted to their jobs and to the Government which they serve. It is incumbent upon that Government, our Government, to see to it that they are properly compensated so that their families can live in reasonable comfort and not have to be harassed by the vexations of penury.

I know of cases where postal workers are working at two jobs in order to keep their households together, feed their families, and educate their children.

Fine men though they are, they are limited in their opportunities for financial growth because of the peculiar nature of their field of activity. The postal workers' one source of relief is in the hands of the Congress.

I am delighted that the motion to recommit was overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of 324 to 94 and that the motion to pass the measure finally was carried by such a convincing margin.

I would have voted for a 9-percent increase, but the Post Office committee thought it more equitable to reduce the amount to 7½ percent across the board.

Not only postal workers but all Federal employees will benefit by this measure if it becomes a law, and my feeling is that that is as it should be. Federal workers should be compensated at a rate comparable to that in private industry.

Mr. Jozsef Kovago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting Mr. Jozsef Kovago when he came to my district to speak under the auspices of Crusade for Freedom last month. Twice the freely elected mayor of Budapest, Mr. Kovago deeply impressed me and all those who were privileged to see and hear him.

I understand that this longtime fighter for democracy, who now resides in Wilmington, Del., will address the Federation of Women's Clubs tomorrow in the Sheraton Park Hotel here.

From my experience at Camp Kilmer in 1957 when the Hungarian refugees came to our shores, I know and will never forget the suffering they endured and the depth of their dedication to democracy. Mr. Kovago was a leader of these people. Last year he wrote a moving book about his struggles called "You Are All Alone."

That book recounts the story of Hungary from 1950 through the noble revolution of 1956, and it is at the same time the personal biography of Mr. Kovago. For more than 6 years this patriot suffered the agonies of imprisonment by the Communists—and he did not break. Released just before the outbreak of the revolution, he again placed himself in danger by working for the establishment of a multiparty system. On November 1, 1956, he was elected mayor of Budapest—the second time he had held the office—and 4 days later Soviet tanks rolled into Budapest and the revolution was crushed. With his wife and daughter, Mr. Kovago escaped to Austria.

In the years that have followed Mr. Kovago has become a leading spokesman for Hungary's case. He has told an eloquent story of his shackled, freedom-loving country in his book, in the United States and Europe, and before the United Nations.

One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Anniversary of the Admission of Arkansas Into the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 124th anniversary of the admission of Arkansas into the Union. On June 15, 1836, Arkansas became the 25th State. It is fitting indeed that we should pause and recognize this anniversary, for Arkansas has indeed been hailed as one of the outstanding States of this country.

Rich in heritage, Arkansas was first visited by the early European explorers in 1541 when Hernando de Soto crossed the Mississippi River and entered the Arkansas country. This early expedition occurred appoximately a half century after America was first visited by Columbus.

Other explorers who followed de Soto were Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet. Then on April 9, 1682, Robert Caveleir, Sieur de la Salle claimed all the land drained by the Mississippi River for France. Henri de Tonti established Arkansas Post in 1686 and this became the oldest permanent white settlement west of the Mississippi. De Tonti has often been called the Father of Arkansas.

After Arkansas was admitted to the Union 124 years ago today, the State government was housed in the Old State House which now stands as one of the outstanding examples of Old South antebellum architecture. In the Old State House one finds one of the finest existing State museums, with a record of the var-

ious roles played by Arkansas in the history of America.

Arkansas today is rapidly gaining stature in many fields—industry, agriculture, education, recreation, and so forth. The State's official nickname, "The Land of Opportunity," was adopted in 1953 in recognition of the vast potential in Arkansas and the citizens of Arkansas have not been disappointed in this selection, as evidenced by a rapid and steady economic growth.

Arkansas rivers and springs provide one of the State's major resources. The primary rivers of the State are the Mississippi, St. Francis, White, Arkansas, Red, and Ouachita Rivers and their tributaries. All of these offer ample surface water for industrial and recreational use.

The variety of Arkansas' minerals is almost unlimited. The State is blessed with rich deposits of bauxite, coal, chalk, manganese, natural gas, petroleum, clay, gypsum, glass sand, novaculite, nepheline, and syenite. These minerals are now being produced on a commercial scale and several others are awaiting development. Arkansas is the only State in the Union with a diamond mine.

There are numerous other resources with which Arkansas is more than amply endowed and I think that most of us readily realize that Arkansas stands as a true land of opportunity in America. Arkansas looks to the future full of confidence and optimism, and I am most proud to call this anniversary to the attention of this great body.

The Fullness of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last Sunday the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by Tufts University, in recognition of his notable achievements as lawyer, businessman, and legislator. I wish to take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to my distinguished colleague on being selected for this honor.

I also wish to commend Tufts University for strengthening the ties that bind Hawaii to New England. It is not well enough known that from 1820 to 1835 groups of Congregational missionaries from New England journeyed to Hawaii, where they settled permanently, teaching Christianity and contributing to the development and stability of Hawaii in education, government, and social responsibility.

In his address to Tufts graduates at the 104th commencement exercises, Senator FONG paid tribute to those New England missionaries who helped to create in the Pacific, "out of diverse tongues and cultures," a homogeneous American community. He urged college men and women to serve "in the noblest tradition of America as 20th century missionaries sowing the seed of neighborly love and freedom in other lands, bringing hope of a better life to a needy world, and laboring in the vineyard for peace on earth, good will to men."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this stirring address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE FULLNESS OF LIFE

(Address by U.S. Senator HIRAM L. FONG at Tufts University commencement exercises, Medford, Mass., June 12, 1960)

President Wessell, distinguished guests, members of the faculty, candidates for degrees, students, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very happy to be here with you on this joyous occasion of your 104th commencement. I am grateful and thankful for the honorary doctor of laws degree you are bestowing upon me. To be associated with you as an honorary alumnus of Tufts University with its 107 years of glorious history is for me a high privilege and a great honor.

Having been advised that I will receive from you a diploma, without attending classes, study, examinations, and anxiety leaves me with a mixed feeling of guilt, delinquency, and immorality, especially when I know how hard you have worked for your diploma and how hard I worked as a Harvard Law School student. Your bestowing upon me this honor will continue what has been for me a happy and most rewarding association with New England.

Since early childhood, long before I attended Harvard, New England has been a part of me, for the influence of New England has been felt in my native Hawaii for 140 years. From 1820 to 1835, 12 groups of Christian Congregational missionaries left their homes in New England by sailing ships to bring the Christian Gospel to Hawaii. Their voyages by way of the Cape of Good Hope covered a distance of over 12,000 miles and took 5½ months to complete. Their journeys were fraught with much seasickness and hardship. The contributions of these sturdy New England missionaries you sent us have been enduring and many. They and their descendants have contributed greatly to our development and stability and their Puritan philosophy has deeply influenced our outlook and life.

Through their influence, the Hawaiian language was reduced to writing, the Bible was translated, and schools were established. Through their influence, the first written constitution was approved in 1840, creating a supreme court and a representative body of legislators elected by the people.

Through their influence, prohibition was placed on immorality, gambling, drunkenness, theft, and violation of the Sabbath. These prohibitions were strongly resisted by the sailing men. They demonstrated on several occasions against these Christian influences by armed riots, not against the natives, but against the missionaries and on one occasion they fired several cannon shots into the home of one of them.

Architecturally, too, New England has left its visible mark on Hawaii. Even today, it is not unusual to see a Cape Cod cottage on any one of the seven inhabited islands.

New England's influences on me have been quite personal. Besides being a graduate of the Harvard Law School, I am a graduate of the public school system which the Congregational missionaries helped to inaugurate. My name of Hiram is taken from the Reverend Hiram Bingham, leader of the first group of missionaries. By now you have surmised my religion is Congregational.

So, it is indeed a distinct honor and a great privilege for me to be speaking here today in New England, for to me it is in a sense in more ways than one, like returning home.

To me, it is opportune and seemly for you at this commencement occasion, to pause and thank with gratitude this school, its faculty, its benefactors, and all those who have contributed to its facilities to enable you to receive the learning and the knowledge you now possess.

It is opportune and seemly for you also to pause here and pay homage to parents, family, and friends who have labored and sacrificed for you to receive this day your degrees.

Today, you are, as college graduates and as men and women, the possessors of a great fortune. You are the inheritors of the accumulation over centuries of man's vast wealth of knowledge and culture, the beneficiaries of the civilizations which have preceded you.

The rights and privileges of freedom of speech, press, worship, and assembly and all of the freedoms and rights that your forefathers shed blood and died for—are yours full-blown, not by sufferance or whim, but by long-established law.

Educationally comprising the upper 5 percent of our population, you, as college graduates will have a decided advantage in potential earning power and in regularity of employment over noncollege workers. The job outlook this June for college graduates is excellent, with starting salaries higher by some 4 to 8 percent over a year ago. Long-range prospects are likewise auspicious. It is anticipated that within a few years if we do not have new methods and new machinery, there will be a shortage of manpower to produce the goods and services needed to sustain the American standard of living. Your talents will be in greater demand than ever.

The startling and provocative economic indicators of the next 15 years show that we will be a Nation of 240 million people, 60 million more than today, with a labor force of about 95 million producing goods and services totaling $900 billion.

Translated into other tangibles, these vital statistics mean that we will build millions of dwelling units, thousands of miles of roads, and many, many bridges, dams, and flood control projects. We will need some 77,000 more doctors, 34,000 more dentists, and a third of a million more nurses than we have today.

To educate 15 million more children, we will need 600,000 new schoolrooms in public schools alone and 500,000 additional teachers. We will have to triple the capacity of our present colleges and universities.

We will need a greater output of foodstuffs and of most basic raw materials, nearly three times our present production of electric power, and double the supply of our fresh water.

Not only are there jobs for everyone, but there is also a wide choice of careers. A few years ago, there were no electronics industries, no atomic energy projects, no missiles or rockets or space vehicles. New vocations created in the past 10 or 15 years run the full spectrum of man's pursuits and offer careers undreamed of only a few decades ago.

Sitting here today, as graduates, you are on the threshold of a very interesting, fascinating, and rewarding era, witnessing what promises to be the birth of a new golden age.

All around you life's pace has quickened. From sails to steamboats and from pushcarts to motor vehicles embraced thousands of years. Today, speed and power change within decades or less. In the first six decades of this century in America, changes have been greater than in all the thousands of years of mankind's history. It was only 18

years ago in 1942 that Enrico Fermi discovered the principle of atomic chain reaction that launched us into the atomic age. Scarcely had this era dawned when 15 years later in 1957, we found ourselves in the space age with the first sputnik.

Fifteen years from now, supersonic airplanes will bring Paris within 2 hours from New York and Geneva about 3 hours from Los Angeles. Space travel will approach reality. In 1961 we hope to launch our first man into space with safe return; about 1970, to transport an American astronaut to the moon; and perhaps by 1975, to other places.

Life's expectancy now has approached the seventies and will be longer once we conquer cancer and diseases of the circulatory system as we soon may do. Social security, unemployment compensation, and promised old-age health insurance have materially lessened the anxieties of unemployment and old age.

With minimal efforts, 5 days of work and 2 days of leisure per week, you can expect to meet the material needs of yourself and your family, home, food, car, vacation, and the upbringing and education of your children. Never before in the history of mankind have college graduates been more richly endowed than you nor more likely to succeed.

By now our 5-day workweek is typical of our contemporary American life, but, as educated men and women from whose ranks will be chosen many of our future leaders, you ought to be willing to devote to whatever you may choose to do longer hours and greater dedication. These extra efforts on your part, accompanied by further technological progress which we expect, will help to increase our Nation's productivity resulting in more leisure time for future generations.

Men of wisdom and learning throughout the ages have cautioned that the use of leisure time wholly for fun, pleasure, and comfort renders life narrow and empty. Gratifying only material wants does not satisfy the soul. Lasting satisfaction contributing to the fullness of life comes from cultivating in one's heart a spirit of charity and service toward all men and from devoting a portion of one's life to benefit mankind. Look to the lives of our great moral teachers, Jesus Christ, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammed, and others.

Therefore each of you ought to ponder how, with your particular talents and in your particular circumstances, you can serve family, friends, community, Nation, and mankind.

As long as millions of people in the world still suffer from the ravages of disease, from malnutrition, from undernourishment, and illiteracy, you, as favored men and women, owe a duty to extend a helping hand to those less fortunate than yourself. More than 90 percent of the world is less fortunate than you.

Last October and November, I made a 45-day tour of 14 countries of the Far East. The trip was most enlightening—it was fascinating—and yet somewhat disturbing. The Far East is a fantastic area. Here is situated more than one-half of the entire world's population—the new throbbing core of our continuing global struggle for peace. It is vast beyond our imagination. It is diverse to the extremes of ultramodern and utter primitive. We know it too little; we understand it far less.

With rare exception, I found mass poverty, illiteracy, economic and political instability, inadequate capital and technical know-how.

Prospects for improving the well-being of fellow men such as I found in the Far East fundamentally rest upon a world at peace, for war would further impoverish them. Indeed, the well-being of all of us likewise depends upon a world at peace. Each of you, therefore, has an abiding stake in preserving world peace.

Of paramount necessity to the preservation of peace are substantive actions to nourish, to clothe, to shelter, to heal, and to educate those in want. Men released from the grinding struggle for mere existence are more likely to possess the will to be free and to join other free men determined to strengthen the deterrent to war. Thus as we raise the standard of living of the less fortunate so will the prospects of peace be raised.

Similarly essential to lasting peace with justice are the easing of international tensions, the devising of enforcible bans on nuclear weapons tests, and the accepting of valid steps leading to disarmament.

In every conceivable way consistent with our national honor you should explore the possibilities not only of avoiding war but also of diminishing the threat of war.

Simultaneously as you work for peace maintain a watchful eye on your Government, insist on honesty and integrity in public and private matters, give loyalty and respect to government and keep on being a student.

By cultivating in your heart the spirit of charity and by contributing generously of your time and effort in the service of mankind to alleviate suffering, want, and disease, you will do your share for the molding of a peaceful, homogeneous world community, although diverse in nationality and culture but firmly unified with the love of freedom and liberty.

Thus, in some measure, you will be treading in the worthy footsteps of your illustrious forebears, those hardy, self-sacrificing New England missionaries who journeyed 5½ months—one-half way around the world, by sailing ships, to bring to Hawaii the concept of universal love, brotherhood of man, and fatherhood of God and who helped so substantially to create in the middle of the Pacific, out of diverse tongues and cultures, a happy, homogeneous American community living in understanding, amity, and concord.

You, as college men and women and as the elite of our country, even without leaving home, will be serving in the noblest tradition of America as 20th century missionaries sowing the seed of neighborly love and freedom in other lands, bringing hope of a better life to a needy world, and laboring in the vineyard for peace on earth, good will to men. A life thus spent will indeed be a full life.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 1960

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who across the ages hath put down the mighty from their seat and hath exalted the humble and the meek. In times heavy with crises Thou hast called us to play our part in this creative hour in human history, as testing problems seek out our every weakness.

We beseech Thee give understanding, humility, and charity to those who in Thy name and for the Nation's sake are entrusted in this Chamber with the power to act and speak for the Republic.

As stewards of the world's future, give them, O Lord, a steadfast faith, a firm hope, and a will to labor valiantly for the things for which we pray. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 15, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12620) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 12117) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12620) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee be au-