

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be not to exceed 1 hour of debate on the bill and not to exceed 30 minutes of debate on any amendment thereto, and that the usual form in connection with unanimous-consent agreements be followed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, August 25, 1960, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3625) to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the morning business, we may have a call of the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1911, Senate bill 3524, for the taking of action on the measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, August 25, 1960, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Galatians 6: 2: *Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.*
O Thou gracious Benefactor, we rejoice that daily Thou art supplying us

with many blessings but we confess with shame that we are often so thoughtless and selfish in our appropriation and use of them.

May we strive to solve the problems of economic distress and social maladjustment on the levels of a hallowed respect for the dignity of man, created in Thy own image and destined for immortality.

Show us how we may help to remove from the minds of men those attitudes of bigotry and prejudice which engender strife and may they be supplanted by the virtues of forbearance and good will.

To Thy name we shall ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12580. An act to extend and improve coverage under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12580) to extend and improve coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to remove hardships and inequities, improve the financing of the trust funds, and provide disability benefits to additional individuals under such system; to provide grants to States for medical care for aged individuals of low income; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; to improve the unemployment compensation provisions of such act; and for other purposes, together with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following

conferees: MESSRS. MILLS, FORAND, KING of California, O'BRIEN of Illinois, MASON, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and BAKER.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11666) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies 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 New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I trust that the gentleman from New York will take ample time before we are called upon to vote on the adoption or rejection of the conference report to explain what transpired in conference.

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly shall do so.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2136)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11666) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies 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 6, 11, 12, 19, 25, 26, 33, and 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 34, 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 matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "ten"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$115,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$500,000"; 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 "\$2,000"; 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 "\$650,000"; 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 "\$4,000,000"; 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 "\$5,705,000"; 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 "\$1,568,750"; 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 "\$22,085,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,785,000"; 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 sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,292,940"; 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 "\$2,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$102,557,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,185,848"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 22.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,

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. 11666) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies 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:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Provides for the purchase of ten passenger motor vehicles instead of nine as proposed by the House and thirteen as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$115,000,000 instead of \$113,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$117,377,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Representation Allowances

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$850,000 instead of \$835,000 as proposed by the House and \$875,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Extension and Remodeling, State Department Building

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$500,000 instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House and \$595,200 as proposed by the Senate.

International organizations and conferences

Missions to International Organizations

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$1,868,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,835,000 as proposed by the House.

International Tariff Negotiations

Amendment No. 6: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate for the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle.

Amendment No. 7: Provides a limitation of \$2,000 for representation instead of \$1,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$650,000 instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House and \$700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International commissions

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$1,982,000 for "Operation and maintenance" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$4,000,000 for "Construction" instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12: Strike out the proposals of the Senate relative to "Con-

struction" since they were provided for in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961.

Educational exchange

International Educational Exchange Activities

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$25,705,000 instead of \$23,210,000 as provided by the House and \$28,200,000 as provided by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Provides a limitation of \$1,568,750 for administrative expenses instead of \$1,437,500 as proposed by the House and \$1,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Presentation of a statue to Uruguay

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$18,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Pan American Health Organization Building site

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$875,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Payment to the Government of Japan for Bonin Islanders' claims

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—Department of State

Amendment No. 19: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to the importation or reimportation into the United States of certain firearms.

TITLE II. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$13,375,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,175,000 as proposed by the House.

Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys and Marshals

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$23,310,180 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$23,010,180 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$59,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$57,800,000 as proposed by the House.

General provisions—Department of Justice

Amendment No. 24: Strikes out the proposal of the House relative to the compensation of certain Commissioners appointed in lands cases.

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States

Miscellaneous Expenses

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$69,800 as proposed by the House instead of \$87,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Care of the Building and Grounds

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$287,200 as proposed by the House instead of \$290,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services

Salaries of Supporting Personnel

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$22,035,000 instead of \$22,035,520 as proposed by the House and \$22,235,520 as proposed by the Senate.

Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$3,785,000 instead of \$3,665,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,999,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative Office of the United States Courts

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$1,292,940 instead of \$1,238,400 as proposed by the House and \$1,470,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the total amount allowed, \$79,540 is for the "Rules group."

Salaries of Referees

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$2,125,000 instead of \$2,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Expenses of Referees

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$3,300,000 instead of \$3,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

United States Information Agency

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$102,557,300 instead of \$101,557,300 as proposed by the House and \$103,557,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Provides a limitation of \$90,000 for representation as proposed by the House instead of \$135,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Philippine-American Cultural Foundation

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$1,365,740 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that \$500,000 of this sum is to be made available in fiscal year 1961 to support the issuance of additional Informational Media Guarantee Contracts.

Payment to Informational Media Guarantee Fund

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$3,691,680 as proposed by the House instead of \$4,691,680 as proposed by the Senate.

Funds appropriated to the President

President's Special International Program

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$7,185,848 instead of \$6,935,848 as proposed by the House and \$7,435,848 as proposed by the Senate. The increase allowed is for the trade fair program including labor missions.

Amendment No. 37: Provides a limitation of \$30,000 for representation instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House and \$70,700 as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the pending conference report on the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill for 1961 fiscal year recommends funds in the amount of \$705,032,567. This total amount is \$27,997,828 below the amount of the total budget requests of \$733,030,395. It is \$28,467,760 above the House bill, unfortunately. However, there were supplemental estimates sent to the other body following the House action on this bill in the amount of \$19,226,640. The agreed-upon amount as compared with the Senate bill is \$13,236,580 less than it. Moneywise, the total amount arrived at represents trading at a ratio of 8 to 13. I think the House conferees did a pretty fair job of trading.

The following summary indicates last year's appropriations, the requests for 1961 fiscal year, the amounts contained in the House and Senate bills, and the conference action thereon:

Summary of bill H.R. 11666

Activity	1960 appropriation	1961 estimate	1961 House bill	1961 Senate bill	Conference action	Comparison of conference action with—		
						1961 estimate	House bill	Senate bill
State	\$229,802,564	\$262,361,610	\$223,769,754	\$257,471,954	\$247,172,754	-\$15,188,856	+\$23,403,000	-\$10,299,200
Justice	206,935,000	283,200,000	278,220,180	280,320,180	280,320,180	-2,879,820	+2,100,000	
Judiciary	49,120,300	52,714,865	49,800,045	50,836,445	50,149,065	-2,565,800	+349,020	-687,380
USIA	118,234,746	125,158,920	116,988,980	121,354,720	119,354,720	-5,804,200	+2,365,740	-2,000,000
President's fund	6,145,500	8,600,000	6,935,848	7,435,848	7,185,848	-1,414,152	+250,000	-250,000
Civil Rights Commission	780,000	995,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	-145,000		
Total	671,018,110	1,733,030,395	676,564,807	718,269,147	705,032,567	-27,997,828	+28,467,760	-13,236,580

¹ Supplemental estimates totaling \$19,226,640 were sent to the Senate subsequent to the passage of the bill by the House.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I see that the conferees did a fair job in offering some of the Senate increases, but \$28 million above the House figure is a pretty substantial increase.

Mr. ROONEY. I have just pointed out that there were supplemental requests, not submitted to the House, inserted in the bill by the other body, amounting to \$19,226,640.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by "supplemental requests"?

Mr. ROONEY. There were quite a number of such items. For instance, there was an item of \$6 million for payment to the Government of Japan, recommended by the Department of Defense, which every member of the conference agreed could not be reduced or deferred. I cite that as an example of just one of them.

There was an item of \$875,000 for acquisition of property for the Pan American Health Organization Building which was authorized by the House not too long ago.

There was an item of \$10 million for a center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West to be given as a grant to any appropriate agency of the new State of Hawaii. This is the brainchild of the distinguished majority leader of the other body, Sena-

tor LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. He has labored long and arduously to create such a cultural and technical interchange center, which I understand is to be located at the University of Hawaii. In the present state of international affairs this center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West is highly essential and can make an important long-term contribution to the promotion of better relations and understanding between this country and the people of the Far East. The amount \$10 million carried in the pending conference report is the first year's cost of a 3-year program which will total approximately \$31 million.

In giving Senator LYNDON JOHNSON this deserved credit to which he is entitled for the establishment of this cultural and technical interchange between East and West I should also say that he is a great American, one of the finest, fairest, and most capable men I have ever met in my life. As a "damnyankee" who has known him for over 16 years I can say that there is not an ounce of discrimination against any race, creed, or color in his ample Texas frame.

Incidentally, my good friend LYNDON JOHNSON has sure been one powerful representative of the State of Texas in his years in Washington. I have learned this appropriationwise after my years of service on the House Committee on Appropriations.

I assure my colleagues the House conferees did the best they could under all the circumstances to save some of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GROSS. I notice that the liquor funds went up too.

Mr. ROONEY. With reference to representation funds, I shall say to the distinguished gentleman there was an increase by the other body of various representation items in this bill totaling \$134,700 over the House figures. The conference agreed to but \$21,000 over the House figures. I think that was a pretty fair trade.

Mr. GROSS. I thought they already had too much liquor to wallow around in, in the amount the House appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY. This is only \$21,000 worth of wallowing.

Mr. GROSS. There is \$10 million for a cultural set-up in Hawaii added to this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct. I am 100 percent in favor of it. If we are going to have a cultural and technical interchange center for East-West relations it could not be better situated than at the University of Hawaii in Honolulu.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I do not think we are in any position financially in this Government of ours to be spending \$10 million on a cultural center anywhere.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman will agree that a little culture will not hurt anyone.

Mr. GROSS. We have had quite a little culture, have we not? Then I notice a statement there is an additional \$225,000 for remodeling the State Department building. Was that because of an underestimate of their needs or some additions to that fancy top floor?

Mr. ROONEY. The conference amount is a reduction of \$96,200 below the Senate amount, as I recall.

All in all, we did the best we could on every item in disagreement and now bring you the result for your approval.

Mr. GROSS. I am sorry this bill is \$28 million above the House bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the distinguished gentleman that I am too.

Mr. GROSS. Let the record show I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I am pleased to announce to the House that the Senate conferees have agreed to completely delete from this bill section 107 thereof which stated that it was the sense of the Senate that in the administration of section 414 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the Secretary of State should take such action as may be necessary to prevent the importation or reimportation into the United States—other than for use by the Armed Forces of the United States—for resale of firearms manufactured for the armed forces of any country, or parts thereof for reassembly, except those which are curios or antiques or weapons of obsolete ignition incapable of using a fixed cartridge or fixed shotgun shell. This language might raise havoc with the small sporting goods dealers and gunsmiths all over the country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the final passage of the fiscal year 1961 appropriation for the Department of State, I would like to emphasize the importance of the Department and its Foreign Service in these critical days. The conferees on this bill have agreed to some additional appropriations in support of the programs many of us consider to be of vital importance to our national interests. I refer particularly to the increases for the opening of new posts and the elevation of posts in seething Africa and to the funds for increased activity in Latin America. Certainly the increasing importance of Latin America and of Africa adds to the opportunities and the responsibilities of U.S. diplomacy.

This will be a momentous year for all of us. It will be a year of decision, domestically and internationally. It is a presidential election year. It is also the year when the entire membership of the House of Representatives and one-third of the membership of the Senate will be chosen by the people. It is

a year that will mark the end of the incumbent administration. In January of next year a new administration will take over. There will be new leaders in the executive branch. And there will be new faces in Congress.

Regardless of the political coloration of the new administration, regardless of the changes in Congress, we must continue to demonstrate to the free peoples of the world—and to the captives as well—that this great land of ours is resolute in the aspiration of peace and friendship in freedom.

Undoubtedly this is the great challenge of the new decade and I realize that, as Secretary Herter has said, it will take courage of a high order and strong nerves to construct a new relationship between antagonistic systems of free men and of communism, but that this must be done if civilization is to survive.

Recent events and daily headlines give emphasis to the need for supporting and strengthening the Department of State, which has the responsibility for the apparatus of American diplomacy.

The Department has been described as America's first line of defense in peacetime. We must be able to rely upon this diplomacy and this first line of defense to protect our well-being and our security as a nation.

Our efforts to strengthen and unify the free world economically or politically, and our attempts to cope with the diplomatic hoodlumism of the Soviets depend in large measure upon the apparatus of American diplomacy.

The machinery of the past will not serve us well today or in the future. The task of representing the United States abroad in today's highly technological world presents a challenge that increases in complexity with every passing day. Recent weeks have shown again and again the magnitude of the propaganda challenge.

Adequate representation abroad clearly demands adequate material support in matters ranging from housing and education of dependents to language training and the hiring of specialists in a wide variety of fields. Our representatives abroad contend with a range of problems from atomic energy to agricultural surpluses, from educational exchange to currency stabilization, from immigration matters to the impact of nationalism upon the climate of investment.

Almost hourly from all corners of the globe the Department is presented with problems of a most delicate character. Its farflung responsibilities and needs are with it 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. This big job is done on less than one-third of 1 percent of the total Federal budget.

Those who must assist in finding the answers have a very great responsibility. Manifestly, they should be provided with the means and facilities necessary for the execution of the tasks assigned them.

Many of us are at times critical of some aspects of the Department and its administration. There are oftentimes reasons for criticism. But it would be folly to deny that it is important for us to build up and support the State Department and to have a first-rate diplomatic corps

around the world. The Department of State carries out the Nation's foreign policy. It provides the President with the information he needs for major policy decisions. It negotiates treaties and trade agreements. It represents the United States at the United Nations and at most international conferences.

In these critical times there is need for a constantly improved State Department. Its job becomes more difficult all the time as new pressures are built up all around our perimeter by the Soviets. The Congress should provide adequate funds for the job that must be done. However, no amount of money is in itself sufficient to do this job. An understanding of the job, esprit de corps, and downright determination not to let this Nation be outraded, outmaneuvered, or outbluffed, are more essential than appropriations. There is the feeling that the United States is losing ground diplomatically in the worldwide contest with Communist forces. I hope before we are back here with another bill next year for funding State Department operations that we can say that trend has definitely and positively been reversed.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 20, line 1, insert: "Provided further, That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for payment of compensation and expenses of Commissioners appointed in condemnation cases under rule 71A(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the conference report and including extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF 15 APPROPRIATION BILLS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a summary of the 15 appropriation bills passed up to this time, including the conference report just presented by the gentleman from New York.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, so that the membership may have up-to-the-minute information on the status of the appropriation bills in comparison with the President's budget requests, I include a summary tabulation.

The 15 bills completed, including the conference report of today, are below the budget requests of the President. But the few remaining bills, hiked far above House totals by the other body, afford opportunity for substantial cuts.

The tabulation, limited to the regular appropriation bills, follows:

Status of the appropriation bills for the 86th Cong., 2d sess., as of August 24, 1960

	Bills compared with House	Bills compared with budget
Net total for the 15 session bills enacted.....		-\$32,328,403
Loan authorizations.....		(+211,400,000)
Pending:		
1. Labor-HEW, as passed by the Senate.....	+\$301,766,200	+465,566,950
2. Public works, as passed by the Senate.....	+115,211,620	+25,869,425
Subtotal.....	+416,977,820	+459,107,972
3. Mutual security, as reported by Senate committee.....	+399,304,000	-292,650,000
As the bills now stand (appropriations).....	+816,281,820	+166,457,972

NOTE.—Supplemental bill is yet to come.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL MADE IN ORDER ON FRIDAY, AUGUST 26

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Friday next for the Committee on Appropriations to submit and for the House to consider the last of the appropriations bills, the supplemental appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE MINERAL LEASING ACT OF FEBRUARY 25, 1920

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10455) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 23, 1960.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous report of the conference committee on H.R. 10455 marks the culmination of the successful and cooperative efforts of many persons to further perfect the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and adapt it to the changing conditions.

This is another step ahead in the conservation and use of natural resources.

The author of the bill, our colleague from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS], the senior Senator from Wyoming, Senator O'MAHONEY, and others too numerous to mention, deserve appreciation for the constructive results to be derived.

Representatives of the Department of the Interior, as well as industry spokesmen, have been helpful to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in studying mineral leasing problems.

Under its policy of operation, this legislation was referred for hearings to the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, under the chairmanship of our colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL]. During part of the hearings, the subcommittee met under the acting chairmanship of our colleague from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Six days of hearings were held on H.R. 10455 and similar bills. Full opportunity was given for the receipt of suggestions and comments from the public and all comments were carefully considered.

The bill reflects a wide area of agreement on the substantive points considered and fully modernizes four sections of the basic act.

It has been a personal satisfaction to me as committee chairman to have had a part to play in this constructive legislation.

Interest and activity under the Mineral Leasing Act is increasing constantly. As my colleagues know, mineral leasing, in addition to developing a natural resource, is a revenue-producing activity. Receipts in the year ended in June 1959, were nearly \$96 million. The major portion of this was from oil and gas rentals and royalties.

In approaching this legislation—H.R. 10455—it is well to bear in mind that mineral leasing is a highly technical operation. The laws, regulations, and procedures are very complex and the activity touches many States and many individuals. As of June 30, 1959, there were in effect over 141,000 mineral leases, permits, and licenses affecting nearly 117 million acres of Federal lands. Nearly 98 percent of these cases and over 95 percent of the acreage involve oil and gas.

This is legislation that the President should promptly sign to benefit not only those engaged in the mineral industry but the entire country.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased with the adoption of this conference report. This

represents a culmination of many months of effort on the part of Members of Congress and those in our oil and gas industry, to effect much-needed and necessary amendments to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

The act is not exactly as I would have preferred, and I suppose the same might be said as to everyone else. It does, though, represent good and much-needed legislation. It will remove the confusion in the distinction between land chargeable directly under lease and indirectly under option, and by so doing, will prevent that confusion from thwarting the further exploration and development of oil and gas resources on the public lands.

Time does not permit reviewing the legislation in detail. There are, though, a couple of points that I would like to specifically mention.

In the first place, I would like to commend the conferees on the language they have worked out as a substitute for the Senate language contained in section 5, providing for a new "section 42" to be added to the act. Under the conference committee language, all suggestion that Congress gives approval to the theory of administrative cancellation or forfeiture of or title to any oil and gas lease, is removed. The Senate language expressly mentioned such administrative cancellation or forfeiture. The language worked out by the conferees deletes any such reference. The question of administrative cancellation or forfeiture is presently in litigation before the courts. As I covered at length when the bill was being considered in the House, on the basis of the legislative history and the action of this Congress, I am confident that the courts will find no such authority. It is my firm conviction that cancellation or forfeiture should only be by court action, as presently provided in the act.

I also want to commend the committee for adding the word "promptly" in the bona fide purchaser portion of section 3, amending section 27 of the act. This would cause section 27(i) to read "shall have the right to be dismissed promptly as such a party upon showing that he holds and acquired as a bona fide purchaser the interest involving him as such a party without violating any provisions of this Act."; and further, for the provision that—

No hearing upon any such showing shall be required unless the Secretary presents prima facie evidence indicating a possible violation of the Mineral Leasing Act on the part of the alleged bona fide purchaser.

It has recently come to our attention that regional solicitors and representatives of the Department in the field may be imposing unreasonable requirements upon those who are joined as party defendant, simply because they have had some dealings with the principal party accused of violation of the act. This should make clear the intention of Congress and bring a halt to any such practices. It is hoped that the Department, as time permits and in the near future, will work out regulations providing for a procedure for release of such a party,

upon their filing a statement of ultimate facts, showing them to be a bona fide purchaser and not to have been otherwise in violation of the act in the acquisition of the particular lease or leases involving them as a party. I am advised that the Department is working on this. This problem came to our attention only recently, and it was impossible to have spelled out such a procedure in the short time remaining for consideration of this legislation. If such action is not taken, it may well be that the Congress will have to further consider this in the next session. That, however, should not be necessary, for the intention of Congress to provide for a simple and prompt disposition is made clear by these amendments to the act of September 21, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this legislation provides amendments much needed for a healthy oil industry in the public land areas and the economic well-being of the Nation. It is deserving of support, and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members desiring to do so may have permission to extend their remarks immediately following approval of the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

ALASKAN VESSELS INSPECTION EXEMPTION ACT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2669) to extend the period of exemption from inspection under the provisions of section 4426 of the Revised Statutes granted certain small vessels carrying freight to and from places on the inland waters of southeastern Alaska, 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 Maryland?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Maryland as to whether or not during the consideration of this conference report he intends to yield time so that anyone in opposition to the report may express their views?

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I will yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2086)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2669) to extend the period of exemption from inspection under the provisions of section 4426 of the Revised Statutes granted certain small

vessels carrying freight to and from places on the inland waters of southeastern Alaska, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment of the House, amend the Senate engrossed bill by striking out line 3 on page 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "striking out 'March 15, 1960' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1962.'"; and the House agree to the same.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
FRANK M. CLARK,
JOHN H. RAY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,

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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 2669) to extend the period of exemption from inspection under the provisions of section 4426 of the Revised Statutes granted certain small vessels carrying freight to and from places on the inland waters of southeastern Alaska, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the Senate amended section 2 of the act of August 23, 1958, to extend for four years (from March 15, 1960, to March 15, 1964) the provisions of present law granting an exemption from inspection and manning requirements otherwise applicable to certain vessels under 150 gross tons, owned by or demise chartered to any cooperative or association engaged solely in transporting cargo owned by any one or more of the members of such cooperative or association on a nonprofit basis between places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and between such places in the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or places within the inland waters of the State of Washington.

The amendment of the House would have limited the extension of such exemption for two years (or until March 15, 1962).

The conference agreement extends the exemption granted under the act of August 23, 1958, until December 31, 1962.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
FRANK M. CLARK,
JOHN H. RAY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the bill S. 2669 should be rejected.

As the House passed this bill on June 24, 1960, it would have extended for 2 years the exemption from Coast Guard inspection granted to certain vessels under 150 gross tons operated by a cooperative association between the State of Washington and Alaska.

As passed by the Senate the bill called for an extension of 4 years.

This conference report represents a compromise. But there is no justification for a compromise.

Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard opposed the original bill which granted exemption from inspection and safety regulations to vessels operated by the Ketchikan Merchants Cooperative Association. Likewise the Coast Guard is in opposition to S. 2669 and to an extension of that law.

As my colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and I stated in filing minority views on S. 2669, safety at sea and proper manning are not luxuries to be provided only when convenient, but rather are requirements imposed by law because they are necessary to the protection of life and property.

When S. 2669 was considered by the House Merchant Marine Committee I told my fellow members of the committee that anyone voting for this measure would have to accept responsibility in the event of an accident or disaster.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been a disaster. It occurred on July 19, 1960, less than 1 month after the House passed S. 2669.

The incident I refer to is the burning and total loss of the motor vessel *Coral Sea* which was one of the boats exempted from Coast Guard inspection by this legislation.

Fortunately no lives were lost, but Mr. Speaker, the report of the Coast Guard shows that the presumed cause of fire under usual Coast Guard safety requirements would have been corrected.

There is no justification of the Congress waiving safety requirements.

This conference report should be rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a letter date August 17, 1960, of J. A. Hirshfield, vice admiral and acting commandant, to me regarding the loss of the *Coral Sea*.

And likewise I ask to include the report of the investigating officer and the finding of facts on the burning and loss of the uninspected freight vessel *Coral Sea*.

This conference report should be defeated. A 3-year lull would mean a continuation of this unwholesome situation. The 2-year lull at least could be justified somewhat on the basis of providing a reasonable period for the operator to adjust its affairs.

MV "CORAL SEA,"
August 17, 1960.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: In further reference to our telephone conversation of August 11, 1960, there is enclosed a copy of the Coast Guard investigation concerning the burning and loss of the MV *Coral Sea*, O.N. 254813.

The *Coral Sea* was being operated as an uninspected freight vessel, serving southeastern Alaskan ports in accordance with a waiver of the vessel inspection and navigation laws granted by section 2 of Public Law 85-739, which amended 46 U.S.C. 404.

The investigating officer, in his "conclusions," states that the fire originated in the engine room in way of the main engine exhaust piping. Under the provisions of our marine engineering regulations, it is probable

that the exhaust system of the *Coral Sea* did not fully comply with Coast Guard requirements.

Title 46, Code of Federal Regulations, section 57.10-5(d)(1)(iii) requires the woodwork within 6 inches of the exhaust pipe shall be protected by ¼-inch asbestos board covered with not less than No. 22 USSG galvanized sheet iron. Further, subparagraph 2 of this paragraph also requires that the exhaust pipe shall be properly supported by noncombustible hangers or blocks. Neither of these requirements were met on the *Coral Sea*, as pointed out in paragraph 4 of the investigating officer's findings of fact. Sincerely yours,

J. A. HIRSHFIELD,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Acting Commandant.

U.S. COAST GUARD,

Juneau, Alaska, July 27, 1960.

From: Investigating Officer, Juneau, Alaska.
To: Commandant (MVI).

Via: (1) Officer in Charge, Marine Inspection, Juneau, Alaska; (2) Commander, 17th Coast Guard District (m).

Subject: *MV Coral Sea*, O.N. 254813; burning and loss of.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On 19 July 1960 the *MV Coral Sea*, burned and was lost off Cape Fanshaw, Alaska. There were no injuries and no loss of life. Monetary amount of loss was given as \$82,000.

2. The *MV Coral Sea* was built of wood in 1943 and was of 148 gross tons, 96 feet in length, 21-foot beam, 10-foot depth, and propelled by a 400-horsepower oil screw engine. The vessel was owned by the *Coral Sea Boat Co., Inc.* (Washington), 509 East Northlake Avenue, Seattle, Wash., and at the time of the casualty was being operated under charter by Ketchikan Merchants Cooperative Association, Inc., Box 1051, Juneau, Alaska, formerly Ketchikan Merchants Charter Association.

3. The *MV Coral Sea* was being operated as an uninspected freight vessel, serving southeastern Alaska in accordance with a waiver of the inspection laws granted by section 2 of Public Law 85-739 which amended 46 U.S.C. 404.

4. At the time of the casualty the vessel was under way, without cargo, en route from Juneau to Wrangell, Alaska, with a crew of four. Firefighting equipment consisted of one 15-pound CO₂ extinguisher in the wheelhouse, one 15-pound CO₂ extinguisher in the galley, two 15-pound CO₂ extinguishers in each end of the lower engine room, and two 100-pound CO₂ extinguishers located outside of the engine room forward access door. These latter extinguishers were provided with a single length of hose and a horn for application of the extinguishing agent. The extinguishers were not connected together. This required that the hose be disconnected from the expended bottle and connected to the full bottle, in order to use both, an operation requiring approximately 1 minute. There was one separately driven, combination fire and bilge pump in the engine room with one hydrant and hose located on deck. There were also two fire axes. The engine room, all service spaces, and living quarters had been completely repainted recently, the painting having been completed approximately 1 week prior to the casualty. The main engine was in good operating condition, although in the past there had been some difficulty experienced with sticking valves which caused vibration in the main engine and its connected piping. The main engine exhaust pipe was approximately 8 inches in diameter and extended vertically from the engine room in an exhaust trunk to the muffler and stack. The exhaust trunk was about 3 feet square, constructed of wood

and covered with sheet asbestos. At the engineroom overhead and also at the top of the deckhouse the clearance between stack and woodwork reduced to about 3 feet forward and aft due to a shelflike projection to which the exhaust pipe supporting brackets were secured.

These brackets were connected to collars around the exhaust pipe and were not insulated from the exhaust pipe nor from the woodwork. The exhaust piping was covered with insulation material throughout its length. Approximately 2 years prior to this casualty, the woodwork in the exhaust trunk became charred from the heat of the hot exhaust gases escaping through a deteriorated section of the exhaust pipe in way of a flange. Following this incident, all the exhaust piping, flanges, muffler, and charred woodwork were replaced. Main engine exhaust temperature under normal operating conditions was about 650° F.

5. The weather at the time of the casualty was good, with a calm sea, light airs, low overcast, and good visibility.

6. At approximately 0345 on July 19, 1960, the vessel was under way in the waters of Frederick Sound approximately 3 miles due west of Cape Fanshaw, Alaska, with the following persons on board:

Master: Harold F. Green, license 201812, chief mate, steam or motor vessels, any gross tons, oceans.

Mate: Hardy Hofstad, MMD, Z-1006673, endorsed able seaman, any waters, unlimited.

Chief engineer: John A. Boberg, MMD, Z-1106800, endorsed ordinary seaman and wiper. Assistant engineer: Arthur M. Larson, MMD, Z-1067368, endorsed ordinary seaman and wiper.

7. Hofstad had the deck watch and was at the wheel. Larson had the engineroom watch. Green and Boberg had retired to their quarters. Larson customarily stood his watch by making a tour of the machinery spaces each half hour, attending to the propulsion machinery and auxiliary equipment as necessary. He had made his last round at 0330, finding all in order, and was in the wheelhouse talking to Hofstad, when they heard a popping sound from the engineroom. Larson went to the engineroom and found the overhead forward of the exhaust trunk to be on fire. He went back up the stairs, notified Hofstad, called Boberg, got a fire extinguisher from the galley and returned to the engineroom to fight the fire. Hofstad called the master and the three men fought the fire with the equipment they could reach, which consisted of both of the 100-pound CO₂ extinguishers and three of the 15-pound extinguishers. The flames spread rapidly and the heat and smoke became very intense forcing the men out of the engineroom. They then closed all hatches, secured the engineroom vent motor, and covered all ventilators and the stack with canvas and plywood to exclude the air. The master contacted the Coast Guard by radio, requesting help. CG-65401-D from Petersburg and CG-95301 from Juneau were ordered to assist. About 1 hour later smoke began issuing from the fuel tank vents and the crew abandoned ship in a skiff. At about 0615, no increase in fire activity being noted, the four crewmembers returned to the vessel. The deck was very hot in way of the stack. Efforts were made to keep it cool with buckets of water. At about 0800, the CG-65401-D arrived on the scene. The master gave permission to O/C CG-65401-D to take whatever action he thought necessary to put out the fire. Three coastguardsmen went aboard the burning vessel with one OBA and two firehoses with spray nozzles. Hatches were removed to provide access and the men entered the area and proceeded to fight the fire. However, the smoldering woodwork burst into flame almost immediately and the men were forced to back out and fight the fire from the deck.

The fire got progressively worse especially in way of the fuel tanks, and because of fear of an explosion, all hands went on board the CG-65401-D and pulled off to await the arrival of CG-95301, with additional firefighting equipment. At approximately 1000 the CG-95301 arrived and assumed on-scene command. Both vessels conducted combined firefighting operations. However when it became apparent that the vessel could not be saved, the master gave permission to beach the vessel in shallow water and attempt to flood it. The vessel was pushed aground on the beach in position 57°08' 2" N. and 133°24' W. at approximately 1500. The hull was holed at the waterline in several places and streams of water were directed on the burning vessel from portable pumps on the beach. The vessel continued to burn until all superstructure and most of the hull were consumed. At 2345, after all fire was out and the hulk was secure on the beach, CG-95301 left the scene and returned to Juneau with the four survivors.

CONCLUSIONS

8. It is concluded that the *MV Coral Sea* burned to a total loss off Cape Fanshaw, Alaska on July 19, 1960, as the result of a fire originating in the engineroom in way of the main engine exhaust piping. It is further concluded that the fire was the result of hot exhaust gases acting on the woodwork of the exhaust trunk; that the gases escaped from the pipe through a fracture in way of the flange at the bottom of the exhaust trunk; that the fracture was caused by metal fatigue from vibration, extreme temperature changes, and hot gas erosion; that the fact that all spaces had been freshly painted contributed to the rapid spread of the fire; that inability to operate the fire pump seriously hampered the crew's firefighting efforts; that the close proximity of the woodwork to the exhaust piping contributed to the cause; that none of the personnel of the Coast Guard or any other Government agency contributed to the casualty; and that no Coast Guard-approved or inspected equipment was involved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

9. It is recommended that no further action be taken and that the case be closed.
A. E. HAMPTON.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I arise in vigorous support of the approval of this conference report on S. 2669 which would extend an existing waiver of Coast Guard inspection and manning requirements for another 2 years and 9 months with regard to a few small cargo boats operating between Seattle, Wash., and certain points in southeastern Alaska. Since these vessels include in their service certain small outports with virtually no other service, and since the forthcoming 2-year-and-9-month period is required for the effectuation of other arrangements, it appears obvious that this waiver should be granted, notwithstanding the fact that one of the small vessels recently suffered destruction by fire, which, as I understand it, could have happened even if that vessel had been under the Coast Guard requirements which I have mentioned. This matter has been carefully

considered by the appropriate committees of both Houses and overwhelmingly approved despite certain opposition. I urge that the House approve this conference report.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTEMPT CITATIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to sundry resolutions of the House, he has, today, made certifications to the U.S. attorney, District of Columbia, and the U.S. attorney, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as follows:

To the U.S. attorney, District of Columbia:

House Resolution 606, the refusal of Austin J. Tobin to furnish certain documents to the Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 607, the refusal of S. Sloan Colt to furnish certain documents to the Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 608, the refusal of Joseph G. Carty to furnish certain documents to the Committee on the Judiciary.

To the U.S. attorney, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico:

House Resolution 609, the refusal of Jose Enamorado Cuesta to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 610, the refusal of Manuel Arroyo Zeppenfeldt to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 611, the refusal of Consuelo Burgos De Saez Pagan to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 612, the refusal of Juan Saez Corales to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 613, the refusal of John Peter Hawes to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 614, the refusal of Gertrudis Melendez Perez to answer a question before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 615, the refusal of Ramon Diaz Cruz to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 616, the refusal of Frank Ruiz to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 617, the refusal of Juan Emmanuelli Morales to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 618, the refusal of Cesar Andreu Iglesias to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 619, the refusal of Pablo M. Garcia Rodriguez to answer

questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 620, the refusal of Cristino Perez Mendez to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 621, the refusal of Juan Santos Rivera to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 11390), making appropriations for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor for the fiscal year 1961.

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

There was no objection.

THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2339), to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 39 of the United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 8, in line 3 of section 705(e), strike the words "the Territory of".

Page 9, in the fourth line of § 710, strike the word "it" and insert in lieu thereof the word "they".

Page 26, in the fourth line, strike the word "termination" and insert in lieu thereof the word "determination".

Page 35, in the last line, strike the word "Controller" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Comptroller".

Page 47, in the first line of § 3313, following the word "and" insert the word "any".

Page 47, in the third line of subsection (a) (1) of § 3315, strike the words "spectator or other special agent" and insert in lieu thereof the words "post office".

Page 47, in the second line of subsection (a) (3) of § 3315, following "spectator", insert the words "or other special agent".

Page 112, in the second line of § 4053, strike the words "and a postmark".

Page 123, in the last two lines of § 4302(b), strike the words "He shall provide for the treatment of unpaid or short-paid air parcel post".

Page 124, in the second and third lines of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of § 4302, strike the words "event shall it be less than the rate provided for first-class surface mail," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "case shall be less than 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

Page 124, in line 1 of subsection (d) (3) (A) of § 4303, strike the word "continental".

Page 124, in line 1 of subsection (d) (3) (B) of § 4303, strike the word "continental".

Page 128, in the last two lines of subsection (c) (3) of § 4358, strike the words "the rates under paragraph (1) hereof" and insert in lieu thereof the words "those rates".

Page 129, strike out subsection (a) of § 4359 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Except as provided in sections 4358, 4361, and 4362 of this title, the rates of post-

age set out in this section are applicable to copies of publications entered as second-class mail when (1) mailed by the publisher thereof from the post office of publication and entry or other post office where entry is authorized and (2) when mailed by news agents, registered as such under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, to actual subscribers thereto or to other news agents for the purpose of sale and (3) sample copies to the extent of 10 per centum of the weight of copies mailed to subscribers during the calendar year."

Page 129, in the third line of subsection (b) of § 4359, strike out "subsection" and insert in lieu thereof the word "subsection".

Page 129, in the last line of the table of rates contained in subsection (b) of § 4359, strike the words "Publications of nonprofit organizations" and insert in lieu thereof the words "A publication of a qualified nonprofit organization".

Page 129, strike out paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of § 4359 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) 'a publication of a qualified nonprofit organization' means a publication published by and in the interest of one of the following types of organizations or associations if it is not organized for profit and none of its net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual: Religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', and fraternal; and".

Page 133, in the first line of § 4421, strike the word "that" and insert in lieu thereof the word "which".

Page 133, strike the word "are" in paragraph (4) of § 4421 and insert in lieu thereof the words "may be".

Page 133, in the first line of § 4422, strike the word "rates" and insert in lieu thereof the word "rate".

Page 133, in the third line of § 4422, following the word "title" insert the following: "when mailed in the manner prescribed by the Postmaster General,".

Page 134, in the first line of § 4452, strike the word "rates" and insert in lieu thereof the word "charge".

Page 134, in the second line of subsection (b) of § 4452, strike the word "rates" and insert in lieu thereof the word "charge".

Page 134, in the table in subsection (b) of § 4452, insert the word "qualified" immediately after the word "than".

Page 134, in the table in subsection (b) of § 4452, insert the word "Qualified" immediately preceding the word "nonprofit" in the second line of the table.

Page 134, in the footnote to the table in subsection (b) of § 4452, strike the word "rate" and insert in lieu thereof the word "charge".

Page 134, in the first line of subsection (d) of § 4452, insert the word "qualified" immediately preceding the word "nonprofit".

Page 135, in the sixth line of § 4452(e), strike the word "mail" and insert in lieu thereof the word "mailed".

Page 137, amend § 4554(a) (4) by inserting in the last line immediately following the word "answer" the following words: ", test scores, or identifying information recorded thereon in writing,".

Page 138, in the first line, strike the word "matter".

Page 138, in the first line of subsection (c) of § 4554, strike the words "film strips" and insert in lieu thereof the word "filmstrips".

Page 138, in the first line of subsection (c) of § 4554, insert a comma following the word "projection".

Page 159, in the third line of § 6211, strike out "economis" and insert in lieu thereof the word "economies".

Page 164, in paragraph (b) (3) of § 6352, strike the word "charges" and insert in lieu thereof the word "changes".

Page 164, in the second line of paragraph (b) (4) of § 6352, strike the word "services" and insert in lieu thereof the word "service".

Page 166, in the first line of subsection (a) of § 6403, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Page 183, in the first line of section 11, strike "1959" and insert in lieu thereof "1960".

Page 195, under "1916-July 28" delete the last line.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 12580.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason] and myself have permission to extend our remarks with respect to the several bills that are about to be called up.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCLUSION OF LOCAL ADVERTISING CHARGES FROM MANUFACTURERS SALE PRICE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12536) relating to the treatment of charges for local advertising for purposes of determining the manufacturers sale price, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4216 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of price for purposes of the manufacturers excise tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) EXCLUSION OF LOCAL ADVERTISING CHARGE FROM SALE PRICE.—

"(1) EXCLUSION.—In determining, for purposes of this chapter, the price for which an article is sold, there shall be excluded a charge for local advertising (as defined in paragraph (4)) to the extent that such charge—

"(A) does not exceed 5 percent of the price for which the article is sold (as determined under this section by excluding any charge for local advertising),

"(B) is a separate charge made when the article is sold, and

"(C) is intended to be refunded to the purchaser or any subsequent vendee in reimbursement of costs incurred for local advertising.

In the case of any such charge (or portion thereof) which is not so refunded before the first day of the fifth calendar month following the calendar year during which the article was sold, the exclusion provided by the preceding sentence shall cease to apply as of such first day.

"(2) AGGREGATE AMOUNT WHICH MAY BE EXCLUDED.—In the case of articles upon the sale of which tax was imposed under the same section of this chapter—

"(A) the sum of (1) the aggregate of the charges for local advertising excluded under paragraph (1), plus (2) the aggregate of the readjustments for local advertising under section 6416(b)(1) (relating to credits or refunds for price readjustments), shall not exceed

"(B) 5 percent of the aggregate of the prices (determined under this section by excluding all charges for local advertising) at which such articles were sold in sales on which tax was imposed by such section of this chapter.

The preceding sentence shall be applied to each manufacturer, producer, and importer as of the close of each calendar quarter, taking into account the items specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) for such calendar quarter and preceding calendar quarters in the same calendar year.

"(3) NO ADJUSTMENT FOR OTHER ADVERTISING CHARGES.—Except to the extent provided by paragraphs (1) and (2), no charge or expenditure for advertising shall serve, for purposes of this section or section 6416 (b) (1), as the basis for an exclusion from, or as a readjustment of, the price of any article.

"(4) LOCAL ADVERTISING DEFINED.—For purposes of this section and section 6416 (b) (1), the term 'local advertising' means only advertising which—

"(A) is initiated or obtained by the purchaser or any subsequent vendee,

"(B) names the article for which the price is determinable under this section and states the location at which such article may be purchased at retail, and

"(C) is broadcast over a radio station or television station or appears in a newspaper."

Sec. 2. The first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 6416 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits or refunds for price readjustments) is amended by inserting after "or allowance," the following: "including (in the case of a tax imposed by chapter 32) a readjustment for local advertising (but only to the extent provided in section 4216 (f) (2) and (3))."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning more than twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12536, which was reported by your Committee on Ways and Means, without amendment, deals with so-called cooperative advertising arrangements under which manufacturers—or producers or importers—of products subject to the manufacturers' excise tax make a separate charge to, or agree to reimburse, the retailers—or other distributors—for all or a part of the costs incurred by the latter in locally advertising the manufactured products. The question is whether the amount paid for the local advertising is to be excluded from the manufacturer's price on which the tax is based, or in the

case of reimbursements for this advertising, whether the price on which the tax is based is to be readjusted for this amount.

In 1932 the Internal Revenue Service ruled that specific additional charges billed by a manufacturer to a distributor for advertising were to be excluded from the sales price for purposes of a manufacturer's excise tax. Since that time the Internal Revenue Service has issued numerous private rulings permitting readjustments of sales price for local advertising expenses incurred by retailers or other distributors.

Then in the forefront of 1956, in testimony before the Forand subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems, the Internal Revenue Service indicated that it was planning to issue a ruling with respect to cooperative advertising which in general would have excluded such amounts from the tax base, or permitted a private readjustment for them where the reimbursement procedure was followed. However, late in 1956 the Commissioner of Internal Revenue informed the subcommittee that it could no longer go forward with the publication of such a ruling. Finally in 1958, the Treasury Department issued a regulation denying taxpayers an exclusion from, or readjustment of, the sales price for advertising charges or expenditures. In the case of those who had specific private rulings, this applied only prospectively. However, many other taxpayers had not themselves obtained private rulings but instead relied on information generally available to the effect that cooperative advertising charges were excludable—or that price readjustments attributable to such charges would result in refunds of taxes. For them the new regulation was applied on a retroactive basis.

In addition, in May of this year the Court of Claims in General Motors Corp. against United States held that the taxpayer in that case could properly readjust its sales price for articles sold, to the extent of the amount it paid dealers for the cost of local advertising under a cooperative advertising plan.

Because of this confusion as to the status of advertising charges in determining the tax base for manufacturers' excise taxes, your committee has concluded that statutory clarification is needed on this point and also provision for some limitations on the extent to which advertising charges can be excluded from the tax base for purposes of the various manufacturers excise taxes.

Your committee concluded that it was appropriate to exclude from the manufacturers' sales price a reasonable amount of local advertising where such advertising is under the control of the local retailer—or other distributor—since such an expense customarily is one incurred by the retailer and not the manufacturer. Therefore, it is more appropriately reflected in the retail distributors' price rather than in the manufacturers' sales price.

Accordingly, the bill provides that where a manufacturer—or producer or importer—makes a separate charge for

local advertising of a taxable product, or reimburses the local retailer—or other distributor—for all of the part of the expenses incurred by the latter for local advertising of the taxable products, such charge is to be excluded from the manufacturers' sales price and hence excluded from the base of the manufacturers' excise tax. The amount excluded is limited to radio, television, and newspaper advertising, the cost of which does not exceed 5 percent of the sales price of the articles, excluding the local advertising charges where a separate charge is made. The bill provides that the 5 percent limitation is to be initially computed on the basis of sales made during a calendar quarter but also takes into account sales in prior quarters in the same year to the extent the 5 percent ceiling did not apply in those quarters.

The amendment provided in this bill is to apply with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning more than 20 days after the date of enactment of this bill.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it does not object to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of the legislation to clarify the excise tax consequences of cooperative advertising arrangements. The bill would provide that amounts expended for local advertising under cooperative advertising programs may be excluded from a manufacturer's selling price for excise tax purposes and that amounts refunded to customers by manufacturers for local advertising are to be considered as price readjustments of the manufacturer's sales price.

This amendment providing a solution to the difficult problems arising from cooperative advertising arrangements has been worked out in close cooperation with the Treasury Department.

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.

ACCEPTANCE BY GOVERNMENT OF GIFTS TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6292), to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to afford to the people of the United States an opportunity to make gifts to the Government of the United States to be used for the purpose of reducing the public debt—

(a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States (1) any gift of money made on the

sole condition that it be used to reduce the public debt of the United States, (2) any gift of obligations of the United States included in the public debt of the United States, if made on the sole condition that the obligations be canceled and retired and not reissued, or (3) any gift of other intangible personal property made on the sole condition that it be sold, and the proceeds realized from the sale be used to reduce the public debt of the United States; and

(b) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States any gift of other property, real or personal, made to the United States on the sole condition that it be sold and the proceeds realized from the sale be used to reduce the public debt of the United States: *Provided, however, That the Secretary of the Treasury or the Administrator of General Services, as the case may be, is authorized to reject any gift under this section whenever he determines such action to be in the interest of the United States.*

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall convert into money, at the best terms available, any gift accepted by him under the provisions of paragraph (a) (3) of the first section of this Act; and the Administrator of General Services shall convert into money, at the best terms available, any gift accepted by him under the provisions of the first section of this Act.

Sec. 3. If under applicable law any gift accepted under section 1 is subject to a gift or inheritance tax, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Administrator of General Services, as the case may be, is authorized to pay such tax out of the proceeds of the redemption, or sale, of any such gift.

Sec. 4. There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury a special account into which shall be deposited all money received as gifts under this Act and all money received as a result of the conversion into money of gifts of property other than money received under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time utilize the money in the special account for the payment at maturity or the redemption or purchase before maturity of any obligations of the United States included in the public debt of the United States. All obligations of the United States paid, redeemed, or purchased with money out of the special account shall be canceled and retired and shall not be reissued. All money deposited in the special account is hereby appropriated and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of the Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6292, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means, specifically authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services to accept gifts of money or other property which are made on the sole condition that they are to be used for the reduction of the public debt. This bill provides that gifts made on this condition shall be deposited in a special account on the books of the Treasury and the money in this account shall be utilized solely to retire obligations of the United States which are part of the public debt. However, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services are also given authority to reject any such gifts whenever they determine such action to be in the interest of the United States.

At the present time, when gifts of money or other property are made to the U.S. Government for the purpose of re-

ducing the public debt, no absolute assurance can be given that the gifts will be so used since such gifts are generally treated as unconditional gifts and have been deposited in the general fund of the Treasury. Your committee has been advised, however, that the donors of such gifts may prefer to provide specifically that their gifts shall be used solely for reduction of the public debt and not for incorporation in the general funds of the Treasury.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objections to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6292 provides specific authority for the U.S. Government to accept gifts which are to be used for the reduction of the public debt. Existing law gives to the Treasury Department no authority to use gifts that are given on condition that the gift be used to reduce the public debt. The absence of such authority leaves the possibility that a question could be raised by other possible claimants to property as to whether the Government was fulfilling the conditions of the gift. This legislation will clarify the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to accept such gifts and devote the gifts to a specific purpose.

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.

CERTIFICATION OF QUOTAS ON CERTAIN PHILIPPINE TOBACCO

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3392), relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the duty-free treatment provided for in paragraph 2 of article II of the agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines concerning trade and related matters during a transitional period following the institution of Philippine independence, signed at Manila on July 4, 1946, as revised by the agreement of September 6, 1955, shall apply to only such Philippine articles falling within the class specified in item B in the schedule to that paragraph 2 of article II as are certified by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines to have been allocated for exportation to the United States of America free of duty under the paragraph.

Sec. 2. This Act will enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "in paragraph 2" and insert "scrap tobacco and filler tobacco described in item B in the schedule to paragraph 2."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3392, which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable JOHN WATTS, of Kentucky, is to limit imports of certain Philippine tobaccos that may be charged to the United States duty-free quota on such products to those Philippine tobaccos exported from the Philippines which have been specifically licensed by the Philippine Government for export to the United States under the quota.

In the trade agreement between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States, there is a provision for a duty-free import quota of 6,500,000 pounds of imported scrap and filler tobaccos of Philippine origin each year. This quota is to be progressively reduced until January 1, 1974, when the amount of the quota becomes nil. The present quota is 5,850,000 pounds per year.

There is no provision in the trade agreement or in the U.S. legislation authorizing the Philippine-U.S. trade agreement regulating the types of tobacco that can be entered duty-free under the quota, other than that the tobaccos shall be of Philippine origin and it shall be scrap and filler tobaccos. Historically the trade in Philippine tobaccos has been of the cigar-filler type and it was understood when the trade agreement was negotiated that the U.S. duty-free quota would be filled by the importation of this traditional type of tobacco. This was in the interest of U.S. cigar manufacturers and of domestic tobacco growers who were anxious to see that cigarette tobaccos would not be imported duty-free under the quota.

Recently, however, considerable quantities of low-quality, flue-cured tobacco, grown in the Philippines have been exported to the United States. Although such tobacco was not licensed by the Philippine Government it was shipped to a third country and later transhipped to the United States. The United States Customs authorities have not, under existing law, been able to exercise discretion and were obliged to admit such tobacco duty-free under the quota. As a result, the quantities of duty-free tobacco which licensed exporters in the Philippines might otherwise have shipped to the United States has been reduced. This has adversely affected the traditional trade in cigar tobaccos and has caused concern to the U.S. tobacco growers.

Your committee's bill would merely give effect to the basic purposes of the United States-Philippine trade agreement by providing that only those tobacco exports licensed by the Philippine Government for shipment to the United States would be eligible for admission into the United States under the duty-free quota applicable to Philippine tobacco. Any nonlicensed Philippine tobacco would be subject to duty.

Your committee was advised by the Department of State that the Philippine Government has requested assistance in administering its regulations on tobacco exports to the United States and that the enactment of your com-

mittee's bill would serve that purpose.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 3392.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, there is in effect between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines a trade agreement which among other things governs the amount of tobacco that may be brought into the United States from the Philippines on a duty free basis. The present quota is slightly less than 6 million pounds a year.

The Philippine Government has controlled exports of tobacco to the United States through an export licensing arrangement. Recently tobacco that has not been licensed for export to the United States by the Philippine Government was shipped to a third country and later transhipped to the United States. The transshipment of this tobacco under the quota arrangement served to reduce the duty free quantities which the licensed exporters in the Philippines might ship to the United States duty free. H.R. 3392 would prevent circumvention of the licensing procedures prescribed by the Philippine Government on exports of tobaccos to the United States. This would be accomplished by providing that U.S. customs authorities will admit duty free under the Philippine tobacco quota only such tobacco as has been licensed for export to the United States by the Philippine Government.

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.

EXCISE TAX ON CIGARS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10960) to amend section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the excise tax upon cigars, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the portion of section 5701(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which follows paragraph (2)(G) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"In determining the retail price, for tax purposes, regard shall be had to the ordinary retail price of a single cigar in its principal market, exclusive of any State or local taxes imposed on cigars as a commodity. Cigars not exempt from tax under this chapter which are removed but not intended for sale shall be taxed at the same rate as similar cigars removed for sale."

With the following committee amendment:

That the next to the last sentence of section 5701(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on cigars) is amended by striking out "exclusive of any State or local taxes imposed on the retail sale of cigars" and inserting in lieu thereof "ex-

clusive of any State or local taxes imposed on cigars as a commodity".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to cigars removed on or after the ninth day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10960, which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable SID HERLONG, and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means, with amendments, deals with the determination of the tax base for purposes of the imposition of the Federal excise tax on cigars. This bill provides that there shall be excluded from this tax base any State or local taxes imposed upon cigars as a commodity.

The Federal excise tax on cigars is paid by manufacturers but the amount of such tax is based on the intended retail price of the cigars. Although under present law any State or local retail sales taxes are excluded from this tax base, State or local taxes imposed at any other level, such as at the manufacturers' or wholesalers' level, are not excluded.

The bill provides that for the purposes of the imposition of the Federal excise tax on cigars, any State or local taxes imposed on cigars as a commodity, regardless of the level at which imposed, are to be excluded in determining the retail price at which the cigars are intended to be sold. This removes discriminatory Federal tax treatment of cigars based solely on the happenstance as to whether State or local taxes are imposed at the retail or wholesale or other level.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it is in favor of the enactment of this bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under existing law the Federal excise tax applicable to cigars is affected by the differences in State or local taxes imposed on cigars. This has resulted in competitive discrimination in certain States and to remove this discrimination the Committee on Ways and Means has approved H.R. 10960 to provide that in determining the retail price of cigars for tax purposes the price shall be determined exclusive of any State or local taxes imposed on cigars as a commodity.

The Treasury Department has favored the enactment of this legislation and the Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting it favorably to the House.

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.

PREPAID DUES INCOME OF CERTAIN MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11266) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations to

be included in gross income for the taxable years to which the dues relate, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this refers to certain organizations. What organizations?

Mr. MILLS. Primarily it would apply to organizations like the Triple A that collect dues from members of the organization and render services over a 12-month or a 24-month period. The question arises, when do you report the income, in what taxable year? The bill would permit the income to be prorated over the period of time during which the service is to be rendered to the dues-paying members.

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

The was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart B of part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to taxable years for which items of gross income are included) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 456. PREPAID DUES INCOME OF CERTAIN MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATIONS.

"(a) YEAR IN WHICH INCLUDED.—Prepaid dues income to which this section applies shall be included in gross income for the taxable years during which the liability described in subsection (e) (2) exists.

"(b) WHERE TAXPAYER'S LIABILITY CEASES.—In the case of any prepaid dues income to which this section applies—

"(1) If the liability described in subsection (e) (2) ends, then so much of such income as was not includible in gross income under subsection (a) for preceding taxable years shall be included in gross income for the taxable year in which the liability ends.

"(2) If the taxpayer ceases to exist, then so much of such income as was not includible in gross income under subsection (a) for preceding taxable years shall be included in gross income for the taxable year in which such cessation of existence occurs.

"(c) PREPAID DUES INCOME TO WHICH THIS SECTION APPLIES.—

"(1) ELECTION OF BENEFITS.—This section shall apply to prepaid dues income if and only if the taxpayer makes an election under this section with respect to the trade or business in connection with which such income is received. The election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe. No election may be made with respect to a trade or business if in computing taxable income the cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting is used with respect to such trade or business.

"(2) SCOPE OF ELECTION.—An election made under this section shall apply to all prepaid dues income received in connection with the trade or business with respect to which the taxpayer has made the election; except that the taxpayer may, to the extent permitted under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, include in gross income for the taxable year of receipt

the entire amount of any prepaid dues income if the liability from which it arose is to end within 12 months after the date of receipt. An election made under this section shall not apply to any prepaid dues income received before the first taxable year for which the election is made.

"(3) WHEN ELECTION MAY BE MADE.—

"(A) WITH CONSENT.—A taxpayer may, with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate, make an election under this section at any time.

"(B) WITHOUT CONSENT.—A taxpayer may, without the consent of the Secretary or his delegate, make an election under this section for its first taxable year (1) which begins after December 31, 1959, and (2) in which it receives prepaid dues income in the trade or business. Such election shall be made not later than the time prescribed by law for filing the return for the taxable year (including extensions thereof) with respect to which such election is made.

"(4) PERIOD TO WHICH ELECTION APPLIES.—An election under this section shall be effective for the taxable year with respect to which it is first made and for all subsequent taxable years, unless the taxpayer secures the consent of the Secretary or his delegate to the revocation of such election. For purposes of this title, the computation of taxable income under an election made under this section shall be treated as a method of accounting.

"(d) TRANSITIONAL RULE.—

"(1) Amount includible in gross income for first election year. If a taxpayer makes an election under this section with respect to prepaid dues income, such taxpayer shall include in gross income, for the taxable year to which such election first applies, not only that portion of prepaid dues income received in such year otherwise includible in gross income for such year under this section, but shall also include in gross income for such year an additional amount equal to the amount of prepaid dues income received in the 2 preceding taxable years which would have been included in gross income in the year for which the election is made had the election been made 2 years earlier.

"(2) DEDUCTION OF AMOUNT INCLUDED IN INCOME MORE THAN ONCE.—A taxpayer who makes an election with respect to prepaid dues income, and who includes in gross income for the taxable year to which the election first applies an additional amount computed in accordance with subsection (d) (1), shall be permitted to deduct, for the taxable year to which the election first applies and for each of the 4 succeeding taxable years, an amount equal to one-fifth of the additional amount computed under subsection (d) (1), but only to the extent that the additional amount included in gross income under subsection (d) (1) was also included in the taxpayer's gross income during either of the 2 taxable years preceding the taxable year to which the election first applies.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

"(1) PREPAID DUES INCOME.—The term 'prepaid dues income' means any amount (includible in gross income) which is received by a membership organization in connection with, and is directly attributable to, a liability to render services or make available membership privileges over a period of time which extends beyond the close of the taxable year in which such amount is received.

"(2) LIABILITY.—The term 'liability' means a liability to render services or make available membership privileges over a period of time which does not exceed 36 months, which liability shall be deemed to exist ratably over the period of time that such services are required to be rendered, or that such membership privileges are required to be made available.

"(3) MEMBERSHIP ORGANIZATION.—The term 'membership organization' means a corporation, association, federation, or other organization—

"(A) organized without capital stock of any kind, and

"(B) no part of the net earnings of which is distributable to any member."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 456. Prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 16, strike out "An" and insert "Except as provided in subsection (d), an".

Page 4, strike out line 19 and all that follows down through line 21 on page 5, and insert:

"(1) AMOUNT INCLUDIBLE IN GROSS INCOME FOR ELECTION YEARS.—If a taxpayer makes an election under this section with respect to prepaid dues income, such taxpayer shall include in gross income, for each taxable year to which such election applies, not only that portion of prepaid dues income received in such year otherwise includible in gross income for such year under this section, but shall also include in gross income for such year an additional amount equal to the amount of prepaid dues income received in the 3 taxable years preceding the first taxable year to which such election applies which would have been included in gross income in the taxable year had the election been effective 3 years earlier.

(2) DEDUCTIONS OF AMOUNTS INCLUDED IN INCOME MORE THAN ONCE.—A taxpayer who makes an election with respect to prepaid dues income, and who includes in gross income for any taxable year to which the election applies an additional amount computed under paragraph (1), shall be permitted to deduct, for such taxable year and for each of the 4 succeeding taxable years, an amount equal to one-fifth of such additional amount, but only to the extent that such additional amount was also included in the taxpayer's gross income during any of the 3 taxable years preceding the first taxable year to which such election applies.

Page 6, line 19, strike out the quotation marks and, after line 19, insert:

"(4) RECEIPT OF PREPAID DUES INCOME.—Prepaid dues income shall be treated as received during the taxable year for which it is includible in gross income under section 451 (without regard to this section)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11266, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable JOHN BYRNES, and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means, with amendments, provides that prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations may, at the election of such organizations, be included in their gross income ratably over the period of time during which such organizations are under a liability to provide services to their dues-paying members.

The membership organizations to which this bill applies are limited to those which have no capital stock and which make no distributions of net earnings to members. Furthermore, in order for this bill to apply, the liability of such

organizations to provide service to their members must extend beyond the end of the current year but may not extend beyond a period of more than 36 months. Finally, since under present law it has been held that such organizations must include the full amount of any prepaid dues in income in the year of receipt, in order to mitigate the effect of the revenue loss involved, the bill contains a special transitional rule which operates to spread the revenue loss attributable to any given year over a 5-year period.

The bill would be effective for taxable years beginning in 1960 and provides substantially similar treatment to that provided for prepaid subscription income in the Technical Amendments Act of 1958.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 11266 pertains to the way in which prepaid membership dues shall be treated for income tax purposes by the receiving membership organization.

It will be recalled that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as originally enacted contained section 452 which gave an election to taxpayers to report prepaid income over the period of time that the prepaid income was being earned. This section was subsequently repealed by the Congress retroactively. At the time of taking this retroactive action the Congress indicated its intention to give further study to the tax treatment of prepaid income as well as prepaid expenses with a view to developing appropriate accounting provisions for the tax treatment of these types of transactions.

In the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code was approved which provided for the spreading forward of prepaid subscription income in the case of newspapers and periodicals. The bill that has just passed the House would provide that prepaid membership dues may be spread over the period during which there is a liability on the part of the membership organization to provide a service to its members. This tax treatment is limited to those membership organizations which have no capital stock and make no distributions of net earnings to members.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting this legislation favorably to the House.

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.

FOREIGN TAXES PAID BY CERTAIN PREDECESSOR CORPORATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12036) to amend section 902 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign taxes paid by certain predecessor corporations, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have a brief explanation of this bill?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I will be glad to advise the gentleman as to that.

There is a provision of law which permits a domestic corporation to obtain an intercorporate deduction of 85 percent with respect to dividends received from another domestic corporation. In other words, one domestic corporation receiving a dividend from another domestic corporation is required to include only 15 percent of that dividend in income for tax purposes in order to avoid further doubling of the tax. However, in the case of dividends received from certain foreign corporations, there is at the present time a doubling of the tax since the intercorporate dividends received deduction does not apply to such dividends. This bill, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH], is designed to eliminate that situation where the profits out of which the dividends are paid by a foreign corporation were accumulated by a predecessor domestic corporation which was subject to the regular U.S. corporate income tax while such profits were being accumulated.

Mr. GROSS. Is it bad to have some of these foreign corporations paying a tax?

Mr. MILLS. They pay the tax, of course, in the foreign country, and the domestic corporation gets what is left. However, in the circumstances contemplated in this bill the profits out of which the dividend would be paid to the domestic corporation would, but for this bill, be taxed twice by the United States—once when accumulated by the domestic predecessor of the foreign corporation, and again when distributed to the U.S. parent.

Mr. GROSS. They are not taxed twice in the foreign country?

Mr. MILLS. No; but there could be a doubling of the U.S. tax in some instances.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the bill have anything to do with implementing the bill H.R. 5?

Mr. MILLS. Nothing whatsoever.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credit for corporate shareholder in foreign corporation) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) For purposes of this section, a foreign corporation shall be deemed to have paid any income, war profits, or excess profits taxes paid or deemed to be paid by any predecessor corporation to any foreign country or possession of the United States. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'predecessor corporation' means any corporation all of the assets of which were acquired (subject to liabilities) by the foreign corporation."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to dividends received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for dividends received by corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) CERTAIN DIVIDENDS FROM FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—For purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of this section and for purposes of section 245, any dividend from a foreign corporation from earnings and profits accumulated by a domestic corporation during a period with respect to which such domestic corporation was subject to taxation under this chapter (or corresponding provisions of prior law) shall be treated as a dividend from a domestic corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter."

"Sec. 2. Section 861(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to treatment of dividends as income from sources within the United States) is amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof ', or', and by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) from a foreign corporation to the extent that such amount is required by section 243(d) (relating to certain dividends from foreign corporations) to be treated as dividends from a domestic corporation which is subject to taxation under this chapter, and to such extent subparagraph (B) shall not apply to such amount."

"Sec. 3. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to dividends received after December 31, 1959, in taxable years ending after such date."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12036, which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable ALBERT BOSCH, and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means with amendments, would provide that the 85 percent intercorporate dividends received deduction shall apply to dividends received by a domestic corporation from a foreign corporation if such dividends are paid by the foreign corporation out of earnings and profits accumulated by a domestic predecessor of the foreign corporation during a period that such domestic predecessor corporation was subject to the regular U.S. corporate income tax.

This bill is designed to provide relief from double taxation in a situation in which a domestic subsidiary of a U.S. corporation which, after having accumulated profits abroad is merged into or is reincorporated as a foreign corporation for other than tax avoidance reasons such as a foreign government requirement of local incorporation. In such case, the accumulated profits or the predecessor domestic corporation are carried over to the successor foreign corporation. Under present law, any dividends paid from such profits by the foreign corporation to the U.S. parent are fully taxable even though such profits had previously been taxed to the predecessor domestic corporation during the period in which they were accumulated.

H.R. 12036 relieves this double U.S. taxation by providing that dividends paid by a foreign corporation out of the previously taxed profits of a predecessor domestic corporation shall be treated as if they had been paid by such predecessor domestic corporation. That is, the 85-percent intercorporate dividends received deduction is available for any dividend received from a foreign corporation which is paid out of profits accumulated by a domestic corporation during a period in which the domestic corporation is subject to the regular U.S. corporate income tax.

The amendments contained in this bill will be effective with respect to dividends received after December 31, 1959 in taxable years ending after that date. The Treasury has indicated that it does not object to the enactment of this bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the bill which has just passed the House with amendment would provide that the 85 percent intercorporate dividend received deduction is to be available when a foreign corporation pays a dividend out of earnings and profits if such earnings and profits were accumulated by a predecessor domestic corporation which was subject to the regular U.S. corporate income tax.

The bill as originally introduced would have amended section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code by deeming the payment of taxes by a foreign corporation that was a successor to a predecessor corporation that paid the tax. The amendment adopted by the committee was developed in cooperation with the staff of the Treasury Department.

In discussing this matter the committee gave consideration to the problem that arises with respect to a successor foreign corporation and whether or not a foreign tax credit would be available to the extent that a predecessor foreign corporation had paid or was deemed to have paid a tax. In regard to this problem the committee was advised that existing law is adequate to provide relief for such situations that arise in connection with a change of corporate character in respect of wholly owned foreign subsidiaries of U.S. parent companies. For example, if a foreign corporation which has paid creditable foreign taxes transfers its assets to a new foreign corporation in a tax-free reorganization, such creditable foreign taxes would transfer over to the new foreign corporation. By recommending passage of the present bill it is not intended to disturb such relief available under existing law.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain dividends paid by foreign corporations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAXES PAID BY STATE LIQUOR STORES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9000) to pro-

vide that States and political subdivisions which operate liquor stores shall not be required to pay more than one tax as a retail dealer in liquor, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5123(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to application of special tax on retail dealers in liquor where business is conducted in more than one location) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) LIQUOR STORES OPERATED BY STATES, POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS, ETC. No liquor store which is operated by a State, by a political subdivision of a State, or by the District of Columbia, shall be required to pay any special tax imposed under section 5121 if such State, political subdivision, or District has paid the applicable special tax imposed under section 5121."

(b) Section 5113(b) of such Code (relating to application of special tax on wholesale dealers in liquor to liquor stores operated by States, political subdivisions, etc.) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or Territory" and "Territory," each place such terms appear, and

(2) by striking out "if such liquor store" and inserting in lieu thereof "if such State, political subdivision, or District."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on July 1, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out line 8 on page 1 and all that follows through line 4 on page 2, and insert:

"(3) LIQUOR STORES OPERATED BY STATES, POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS, ETC.—A State, a political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia shall not be required to pay more than one special tax as a retail dealer in liquors under section 5121(a) regardless of the number of locations at which such State, political subdivision, or District carries on business as a retail dealer in liquors."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9000, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, Hon. WILLIAM GREEN, of Pennsylvania, as reported by your Committee on Ways and Means, with amendments, would provide that only one retail liquor dealer's tax must be paid by any State or political subdivision which operates retail liquor stores, regardless of the number of stores operated.

Under present law, States and political subdivisions that operate retail liquor stores are, like private retail liquor dealers, required to pay a retail liquor dealer tax for each store location. In the case of private liquor dealers, the requirement that a tax be paid with respect to each store location prevents discrimination in favor of dealers having multiple locations. However, since retail liquor stores operated by governmental entities are invariably operated on a noncompetitive or monopoly basis, a tax on each

store location is not required to prevent competitive discrimination.

Accordingly, effective July 1, 1960, H.R. 9000 merely requires that States and political subdivisions that operate retail liquor stores need only pay one retail liquor dealer's tax.

The committee was unanimous in ordering this bill reported.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, section 5121 of the Internal Revenue Code requires retail liquor dealers to pay an annual occupational tax of \$54 for each location in which they carry on their business. This occupational tax applies to State and local government stores as well as to stores that are privately owned.

The Committee on Ways and Means has learned that in 16 States retail liquor outlets are operated by the respective State governments and in two other States they are operated by county governments. The fact that the occupational tax is applicable to each retail outlet results in the imposition of a significant tax on the respective State and local governments involved. Under the bill, H.R. 9000, the tax as it applies to retail outlets owned by State or local governments will be changed so that the occupational tax would apply only once with respect to a State or political subdivision or the District of Columbia regardless of the number of locations of retail outlets.

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.

LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION IN CASE OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS TO CERTAIN CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6066), relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to charitable organizations whose sole purpose is making distributions to other charitable organizations, contributions to which by individuals are deductible within the 30-percent limitation of adjusted gross income, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 170(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitation on amount of deduction for charitable contributions by individuals) is amended by striking out "or" at the end of clause (ii), by inserting "or" at the end of clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

"(iv) a corporation, trust, fund, or foundation exempt under section 501 and not denied exemption under section 502 (relating to feeder organizations), 503 (relating to

organizations engaged in prohibited transactions), or 504 (relating to organizations accumulating income) which is organized and operated exclusively for the purpose of distributing its net earnings for any taxable year on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year and such portion of the principle as may be deemed desirable to one or more of the organizations referred to in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of this subparagraph."

(b) Section 170(b)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by striking out "any charitable contributions to the organizations described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii)" and inserting in lieu thereof "any charitable contributions described in subparagraph (A)".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 22, line 22, strike out "1958" and insert "1960".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6066, which was introduced by our late colleague on the Committee, the Honorable Richard Simpson, and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means, with amendments, would increase the limitation on the amount that individual taxpayers are permitted to deduct as contributions to certain charitable organizations.

Under present law, individuals are generally permitted to deduct up to 20 percent of their adjusted gross income for contributions made to, or for the use of, charitable organizations. However, if such contributions are made directly to churches, operating schools or hospitals, or related medical research organizations, this limitation is increased to 30 percent of their adjusted gross income.

The bill provides that for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960, this 30-percent limitation shall also apply to contributions made to charitable organizations which are organized and operated exclusively for the purpose of distributing currently their entire net earnings to charitable organizations to which, under present law, contributions are subject to the 30-percent limitation. This permits taxpayers to be subject to the same deduction limitation whether they make direct gifts or indirect gifts to the organizations that qualify as recipients entitling the taxpayers to the maximum 30-percent limitation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is concerned with the limitation on the deductibility of charitable contributions by individuals.

It will be recalled that under present law individuals may deduct up to 20 percent of their adjusted gross income for charitable contributions with this maximum increased to 30 percent if the additional 10 percent goes directly to churches, educational institutions, hospitals, or affiliated medical research organizations. H.R. 6066 would allow the additional 10-percent deduction to be available in the case of contributions to foundations if such foundations are organized and operated exclusively for

the purpose of giving to churches, educational institutions, hospitals, or medical research organizations. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting this legislation favorably to the House.

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.

GIFT AND ESTATE TAX TREATMENT OF RELINQUISHMENT OF CERTAIN POWERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12329) relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishment of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1000 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the imposition of gift tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) CERTAIN RECIPROCAL AND OTHER TRUSTS.—In the case of property in a trust created prior to June 7, 1932, if and to the extent that such property may be deemed to have been transferred to such trust by the spouse of the nominal grantor of such property by reason of the fact that such spouse has furnished in whole or in part the consideration for the creation of such trust, a relinquishment by such spouse on or before December 31, 1961, of any interest in or power over such property or the income therefrom shall not be deemed a transfer of the property for the purposes of this chapter. This subsection shall not apply to the relinquishment of either an unconditional right to receive principal or income or a general power of appointment (as defined in subsection (c)(3) over principal for income exercisable by such spouse alone."

(b) (1) Subchapter B of chapter 12 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to transfers for purposes of the gift tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 2518. Certain Reciprocal and Other Trusts.

"In the case of property in a trust created prior to June 7, 1932, if and to the extent that such property may be deemed to have been transferred to such trust by the spouse of the nominal grantor of such property by reason of the fact that such spouse has furnished in whole or in part the consideration for the creation of such trust, a relinquishment by such spouse on or before December 31, 1961, of any interest in or power over such property or the income therefrom shall not be deemed a transfer of the property for the purposes of this chapter. This subsection shall not apply to the relinquishment of either an unconditional right to receive principal or income or a general power of appointment (as defined in section 2514 (c)) over principal or income exercisable by such spouse alone."

(2) The table of sections for such subchapter B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 2518. Certain reciprocal and other trusts."

(c) In the case of a decedent who relinquished on or before December 31, 1961, a power or interest described in section 1000 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 2518 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, such relinquishment, for the purposes of sections 2036, 2037, and 2038 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, shall be deemed not to have been made in contemplation of the death of such decedent and shall be deemed not to have been a transfer of property by such decedent if such relinquishment, by virtue of the enactment of this Act, is not deemed a transfer of property for the purposes of the gift tax. In the case of a decedent who died after August 16, 1954, and prior to December 31, 1961, without relinquishing such a power or interest, the existence of the power or interest shall not cause the trust property to be includible in the decedent's gross estate under section 2036, 2037, or 2038 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "on or before December 31, 1961."

Page 2, line 25, strike out "subsection" and insert "section".

Page 3, line 18, strike out "prior to" and insert "on or before".

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12329, which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable JACKSON BETTS, and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means with amendments, deals with the gift and estate tax treatment of certain interests in and powers over property which was transferred in trust prior to June 7, 1932, and which, under subsequent court decisions, was deemed to have been transferred to such trust by the spouse of the nominal grantor under the reciprocal trust doctrine.

The bill provides, with certain exceptions, that the release of any such deemed interest in or power over the trust property prior to December 31, 1961, shall not be considered a transfer for gift tax purposes, nor shall any such release be considered a transfer in contemplation of death for estate tax purposes. The bill further provides that if the holder of any such interest or power dies at any time during the period from August 16, 1954, to December 31, 1961, without having released his rights in the property, the property shall not be included in his estate for estate tax purposes.

The relief provided in this bill is somewhat similar to that provided in the Technical Changes Act of 1949 except that the 1949 act for the most part dealt with reciprocal trusts created after June 7, 1932, while this bill is concerned with trusts created before that date.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the legislation which has just passed the House is to alleviate a possible tax hardship by extending relief from gift and estate taxes to a person who is not the nominal grantor of a

trust but is considered the grantor because the trust was created by such person's spouse. The bill would permit such a person who is considered the grantor to relinquish the power of property or to relinquish an interest in property without incurring liability for gift tax. The bill also provides that if the power or interest is relinquished before January 1, 1962, the relinquishment will not be considered a transfer of the property by such person for estate tax purposes.

The bill is limited in its applicability to trusts created before January 7, 1932. 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.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 902(B) OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11681) to amend section 902(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation 20 percent or more of the voting stock of which is owned by another foreign corporation in which a domestic corporation has a substantial stock interest, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could we have a brief explanation of this bill since it deals with foreign corporations?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11681, which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable Victor Knox, and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means without amendment, deals with the allowance of the foreign tax credit in a situation in which a domestic corporation owns stock in a foreign corporation which, in turn, owns stock in a second foreign corporation or in a "sub-of-a-sub" as it is sometimes called.

Under present law, the domestic corporation cannot claim a credit for foreign taxes paid by the second foreign corporation unless the first foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the stock of the second foreign corporation. Your committee has been advised, however, that a number of foreign countries prohibit a 50-percent ownership of the stock of their corporations by other foreign corporations and that the present 50-percent requirement raised problems and inequities where there was multiple ownership of a foreign corporation by two or more other foreign corporations.

Accordingly, H.R. 11681 is designed to overcome these objections by reducing the present 50-percent stock ownership requirement in the second foreign corporation to 20 percent.

The change made by this bill is to be effective with respect to dividends received by domestic corporations in taxable years ending after date of enactment.

Mr. GROSS. I see the gentleman from West Virginia on the floor. Perhaps he would like to ask the question he did a moment ago with respect to the bill, H.R. 5.

Mr. MILLS. This has nothing to do with H.R. 5. The bill, H.R. 5, did not deal with foreign corporations. That bill, H.R. 5, dealt with the situation of an American corporation doing business in a foreign country.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 902(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to foreign tax credit for corporate shareholders in foreign corporations) is amended by striking out "50 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent".

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to dividends received by domestic corporations described in section 902(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in taxable years of such corporations ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, present law permits a domestic corporation owning 10 percent or more of the voting stock of a foreign corporation to claim a foreign tax credit for foreign income taxes paid by the foreign corporation. Present law also allows a foreign tax credit to a domestic corporation with respect to foreign taxes paid by a subsidiary that is owned 50 percent or more by another foreign corporation which in turn is owned 10 percent or more by the domestic corporation.

H.R. 11681 would reduce the 50 percent ownership requirement in the case of a subsidiary of a subsidiary to a 20 percent ownership test. It is the national policy in several foreign countries to preclude ownership by a non-national of as much as 50 percent interest in one of their domestic corporations. Such a policy makes it impossible for an American corporation to operate a foreign subsidiary in these countries and receive a foreign tax credit with respect to dividends of any foreign corporation. Another meritorious aspect of the change proposed in the bill H.R. 11681 is that it will provide to American business increased opportunity to participate in world commerce through the partial ownership of foreign economic enterprises.

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PROGRAM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, those are the bills that will be called from the list read by the majority leader on Monday. It is not my purpose today to call up the bill, H.R. 3176, or the bill, H.R. 11584, which are two bills which are on that list, because notice has been served that there will be objections to those bills—one by the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. AYRES] and the other by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

MARKING OF NEW PACKAGES FOR IMPORTED ARTICLES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5054) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after "account." insert "This subsection shall not apply in cases where the Secretary of the Treasury finds that compliance with the marking requirements of this subsection would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship and that repackaging of the article in question is otherwise than for the purpose of concealing the origin of such article."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the amendment at this point, and also that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may have the same permission.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House will recall, H.R. 5054 amended section 304(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, to provide that articles of foreign origin whose container must be marked, if removed from that container, repackaged, and offered for sale in the new package by an importer, jobber, distributor, dealer, retailer, or other person, such new package shall be marked in such a way as to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of the article. The importer's liability would be limited to the repackaging done by him or for his account.

As indicated in the report of the Senate Finance Committee, as the bill passed the House, it could possibly result in hardship on some items, even though customary procedures were followed and there was no intent to conceal the country of origin of the imports. Accordingly, the Committee on Finance adopted an amendment, which was accepted by the Senate, which provides that in cases where the Secretary of the Treasury finds that compliance would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship and that the repackaging in question was otherwise than for the purpose of concealing the origin of the article, the requirements of H.R. 5054 would not apply. A number of cases would thus be excluded from the requirements of the

bill. For example, the cleaning and mixing of spices and subsequent repackaging in the same type of packages that have, for a long time, been recognized by ultimate purchasers and consumers, would not come under the purview of the bill as amended. The same would apply to the packaging of such items as tea, chocolate, mixed nuts, olive oil, and related products.

I urge that the House accept the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have concurred in the request of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that the House accept the Senate amendments to H.R. 5054. This amendment is essentially to improve the House bill and has been explained by my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. The Senate amendment would alleviate some hardships that might result from the House approved language and would improve the administrative requirements under the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

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

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand you are clearing the calendar of the Ways and Means Committee on a series of pieces of legislation. I would just like to remind my colleagues in the House that I have had pending before the Ways and Means Committee since sometime in February a request for a hearing on House Concurrent Resolution 512, which would make no further reduction in our import duties for a period of 2 years. That request was signed by 42 Members who introduced the same sort of resolution, and it was also signed by 112 additional Members of Congress, making a total of 154.

I am curious to know why I have not been granted an opportunity to be heard by the Ways and Means Committee on legislation which is of so much interest.

Mr. MILLS. The committee has had a great many matters referred to it that it has not been able to consider, including the proposition discussed by the gentleman from West Virginia. The committee has spent all of its time on something during the year, but we have not been able to consider everything we have been asked to consider.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the gentleman that perhaps that be placed on the agenda of the committee when the Congress reassembles in January?

Mr. MILLS. Not for the remainder of this session, and I cannot make any statement as to the next session because I might not be here.

Mr. BAILEY. There will be some other present member of the committee who will be here.

Mr. MILLS. That person would have to make the statement.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I notice that in the medical aid bill passed by the other body there is a provision for increasing the amount that may be earned.

Mr. MILLS. Without any provision for an increase in taxes. Yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to express the hope that the House conferees look with sympathy upon the Senate amendment, because I believe the amendment has considerable support in the House.

Mr. MILLS. We look with a great deal of sympathy on any suggestion by the other body.

U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 587 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 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 United States delegates to such convention, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is 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. 190]

Andrews	Kearns	Murray
Barry	Kee	Nix
Baumhart	Kilburn	Norrell
Bentley	Kirwan	Powell
Bolling	Landrum	Preston
Bowles	Lankford	Quie
Celler	Loser	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Smith, Kans.
Dawson	McDowell	Smith, Va.
Durham	McSween	Spence
Grant	Macdonald	Thompson, La.
Healey	Magnuson	Thompson, N.J.
Hébert	Mahon	Tollefson
Hess	Mitchell	Vinson
Ikard	Morrison	Withrow

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). On this rollcall, 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 587 provides for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 170, a resolution 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 rule is open with 1 hour of general debate.

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.

Since the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization 11 years ago, the principal focus of the organization has been on greater military cooperation and collaboration among the signatories. This was, and still is, a necessary function. During the past several years there has developed within the NATO community a recognition that such cooperation and collaboration should extend into the political and economic areas, not only to counter the stepped-up Soviet bloc economic offensive, but to add strength to NATO's military efforts.

It is clearly the intent of the Congress that the citizens appointed to the Commission are not to be spokesmen for the U.S. Government. The executive branch is the recognized channel for official communications between governments.

Members of the Commission would serve without compensation but would be reimbursed for their expenses. They 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 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.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 587.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea where the pressure comes from for this junketing organization?

Mr. MADDEN. I have no idea where the pressure came from for the organization of these proposed conventions, but I think it has been too long delayed. It has been several years ago, when we had legislation on the floor pertaining to our foreign problems, when I made the suggestion that we should have some kind of a convention or committee of free nations to combine our efforts against the economic pressures of the Communists. This is similar to the organization we have under NATO against the military pressure of the Communist organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us how many of these advisory commissions we already have in the international field?

Mr. MADDEN. I only know of one, and that has made a very valuable contribution to the cold war and that is the Atlantic Alliance. That organization has made a great contribution in combating the Soviets in the cold war, but I think we have delayed too long in having an organization of representatives of free nations working together to combat the political and economic encroachments of Communist nations. I think this is the beginning of a program that has been too long delayed.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether this is another General Draper proposition?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think there would be any question but what the Members who know the purpose of this organization will believe that it will be highly effective in aiding our trade and international relations. It would not cost a great deal outside of the expenses of these conventions or meetings.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows this will cost \$300 million?

Mr. MADDEN. I think compared with the \$40 billion that we appropriate annually for armament this represents a small contribution in an effort for preservation of the free world.

Mr. GROSS. General Draper is one of the main springs in promoting this.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no knowledge about General Draper, but I do know that the purpose of these conventions will certainly contribute a great deal toward curbing the Communist economic aggression.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the same General Draper who was or is chairman of the board of a power company in Mexico?

Mr. MADDEN. I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. GROSS. I hope before the debate is over somebody will give us a little information as to who is promoting this enterprise and the real reason for it.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is a very laudable and economical program, compared with the billions we are spending on armament. We should spend a few

million dollars to help curb the global economic expansion of the Communists.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might desire.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has explained, this resolution makes in order consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 170, with 1 hour general debate, and it is an open rule.

The purpose of the Senate Joint Resolution 170 is to name a U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO, made up of 20 individuals who will have no power to commit the U.S. Government, according to the resolution, but will be authorized, after they have been appointed by the Speaker of the House and by the President of the Senate, to enter into negotiations with other nations belonging to NATO for the holding of conferences and conventions to discuss matters affecting the NATO nations, although, as I said a moment ago, the Citizens' Commission will have no authority to commit the U.S. Government in any way.

The joint resolution further provides this special Commission of 20 citizens, which will have no power or authority to bind the United States in any way, according to the resolution, will be provided with a temporary professional and clerical staff of not more than 10 persons, whose compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of Congress, which runs up to, I believe, \$16,000 or \$18,000 a year per individual.

It further provides the U.S. Government, through the Treasury, shall pay up to \$100,000, but not in excess of that amount, toward the cost of holding these joint international conferences of citizens representing the various NATO governments.

Finally, it provides the members of the Commission shall serve—that is, the 20 to be appointed—without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for, or shall be furnished with, travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties under this resolution, but not to exceed \$300,000.

Frankly, I am not as well informed on some of our foreign relations or our activities in the diplomatic field as I would like. I noted a moment ago the question was asked as to what Americans might be supporting this legislation. I notice in the committee report that Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, who I understand is a very able educator, is one; Percival F. Brundage, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget is another; and Clarence K. Streit who, I believe, was a sponsor of the "union now" movement, is another. If this resolution prevails, I hope it will not result in our giving up any of our national sovereignty under a "union now" arrangement of any kind. I notice Mr. HAYS, our colleague in the House, and an able member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, was another witness. The committee also had statements filed by William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State, and others.

This is the type legislation I feel should be debated fully, freely, and frankly, so all the Members of the House may be well informed on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has been here a long, long time, and has rendered an exceptionally valuable service. The gentleman mentioned Mr. Streit. Does he happen to recall anything about his activities? The name has a familiar ring to me.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I said I understood he was the author of a number of books, and had also appeared before the Congress, in favor of some sort of a plan of union now, or an Atlantic Union, or something of that sort, in which there was some question involved as to whether or not the Government of the United States, by joining such a movement, might not surrender some of its sovereignty. Of course, that is something with which I cannot agree.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That was some years ago. Is he the gentleman who advocated this one world organization that we had shown here on the floor some time ago?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is my understanding, from the testimony given before the Rules Committee when this legislation was before that committee some time before the recess, or the present summer session of Congress was even thought of.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did he advocate that plan? The gentleman will remember that our great President Roosevelt had a birthday and at that time there came before the House a resolution to appropriate a million dollars to provide a sort of a constitution for that organization, then \$100 million to put it into effect. Is that the same outfit?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman's memory is much better than mine. I do not recall the details of the legislation mentioned, and I am certainly not an authority on all the many activities of Mr. Streit. I would not want to pose as an authority of Mr. Streit, or his position on American or world activities.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 2 of the resolution this provision:

The U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO is not in any way to speak for or to represent the U.S. Government.

Now, is this not a strange situation wherein we have private citizens on private missions, paid for out of Government funds?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think I made it clear in my statement that under the provisions of the resolution this Citizens Commission would have no authority to bind the U.S. Government in any way.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, how, under the Constitution of the United States,

can Federal funds be used to pay the expenses of private citizens on private missions?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is a matter the gentleman himself will have to pass upon. Sometimes I wonder if the Constitution is still in effect in this country. The gentleman will have to decide the answer to his question himself.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to say, to clear the matter up, that that was put in deliberately to make it crystal clear that while this Commission could make recommendations, it had no authority to commit the Government to those recommendations, and I think that is the way everybody would want it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe such testimony was presented to the Committee on Rules, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and this bill. I am fearful that too many Americans do not recognize that NATO is the sword and the shield of the free world and that everything possible that can be done to strengthen that alliance is a blow against communism.

Mr. Speaker, I know very definitely that the one thing that the Communist conspiracy would most like to accomplish is the destruction of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Consequently, when we have an opportunity to draw together responsible citizens from all of the NATO countries, and when we have an opportunity to benefit from their thinking on political and economic and social matters, and when we recognize that this can be done for a cost not to exceed \$300,000 it looks like a real bargain. In view of all of our numerous expenditures on foreign aid of all kinds, this resolution and this bill presents an opportunity that this Congress and this Nation cannot well afford to sacrifice.

There has been some questions raised about where this idea originated. I can tell you that in the Parliamentarian's Conference in 1957 it was unanimously recommended that such a conference as this be held and such a conference was held in 1959. Again, the Parliamentarian's Conference in 1959 reaffirmed the value of the citizens conferences and requested that such a conference be held in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to this House that it act favorably upon the rule and upon the bill and in doing so recognize further that this is one of the finest things that the Congress can do to help stop the Communist threat in the free world.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with many of the purposes that have been mentioned with respect to this proposed legislation.

However, whenever I find more commissions to be appointed, particularly commissions to serve without compensation, I must say I tend to have some misgivings. It seems to me that that experience shows that they tend to become a lobby for a certain position. I rather prefer to see people who are going to serve the Government of the United States paid for their services. Then I know that all people who are available to serve can serve. Further, they are then obligated to serve the interests of all the people of the United States who are paying them.

Another thing that concerns me about this legislation as I listen to this debate is this: As politics has become more intense, I have heard some Democrat critics of the foreign policy of this country charge that there is no positive clear position of this country. If such a body as this were appointed, one that is not responsible to anyone, speaks for no one, how can what they do be correlated with the activities of the State Department, with the activities of the executive branch? I do not mean that in criticism of anyone who may serve, but it seems to me that if we are going to have a clear and positive foreign policy, we must have a well coordinated management of our foreign affairs with clear lines of responsibility and authority.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this question: Why cannot this work be done within the framework of our regularly constituted Government agencies? Why do we need what might be designated as rump organizations who may come up with separate and different ideas, are responsible to no one and speak for only themselves but are supported by all the taxpayers. May their positions not be fodder for Communist propaganda? I think this proposal needs to be explained and explained carefully. I shall vote for the rule and shall listen to the debate carefully, but I have a deep concern when I see a commission proposed to be appointed, such as this, without compensation and outside the direction of the people who are responsible for the foreign affairs of this country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was just leaving the floor for an office appointment, when by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], speaking on the rule, my attention was drawn to the resolution itself and to the fact that its purpose was but another enlargement of what since 1942 and perhaps before has been an ever-growing and continuing effort to give away parts of our national sovereignty, to, in addition, distribute abroad what some might assume to be surplus dollars. In truth and in fact our national and our per capita debt and individual tax-

payers' burden are both greater than that of any other nation, any other people.

To those familiar with the history of our country, with the suffering, the sacrifices, the cost our people endured through 8 long years of the War of Independence, there would seem to be neither logic nor good sense in surrendering any part of the independence then won from George III.

The Boston Tea Party has been forgotten by those who now participate in social functions, and tea is no longer the favorite beverage.

One bill passed this session carried a million dollars for entertainment.

We have had so much personal freedom, enjoyed so many material benefits, forgotten so many fundamental principles, that the sacrifices of the people of those days seem to have been in vain, our lofty statements insuring man's opportunity, prosperity, security, wholly forgotten.

All that was then won has from time to time been frittered away and what is the argument that is advanced to justify past and proposed expenditures and surrender?

Not once but many times have I listened to its advocates attempt to point out the benefits which we as a people and as a nation have received from the policy which they have advocated and forced upon our citizens and the expenditures which we have incurred under it.

Today, there was handed to me a statement showing that we had contributed to Latin nations somewhere between \$800 and \$900 million since 1946.

How much we have spent in attempting to carry out foreign policy no one is able to accurately state. We do know that our expenditures and obligations are running close to \$100 billion.

Let me repeat—what are our advantages? What have we won? We are told that we have avoided war. True, we have not as yet engaged in a shooting war. Whether war would have come had we not followed this policy is problematical. The answer is not certain.

Boiled down, the argument of the advocates of this measure is that, had it not been for our international policy, for our expenditures, we might have fared worse.

Logically the argument sums up to the familiar one that, if the individual did not each day carry an umbrella and a raincoat, he would continually be all wet. Yet even the advocates of this measure will admit that it does not rain every day and that there can be no worse fate befall us or our Nation than the surrender of our independence, of opportunity, of the acceptance of a dictator.

Instead of being free from fear, instead of being secure both as a nation and as individuals, instead of being free to govern ourselves, we find that we are so far committed to cooperation with other nations that those in authority in Cuba, just off our shores, are able to defy us.

We find we can take no action to protect either our citizens or their property in that island until we have secured the

consent of other members of the agreement into which we have entered, it is said, for national defense and security.

And what do the papers of today tell us? Is there peace throughout the world? Almost everywhere there is trouble, one nation at the throat of another. Nation after nation, no matter how small, threatening to involve us in another world war which the advocates of this measure seem to think can only be avoided by the creation of another advisory body and the expenditure of additional funds. F. D. R. told us we had nothing to fear but fear itself. Fear is with us all the time, forcing us each day into unsound action.

Just a few days ago a native of the Congo, reportedly without funds to even pay for his own transportation to this country, defied the United Nations and told it to get out of that country.

True, a few days later, realizing his impudence, his total lack of power, he withdrew his threat. But there is still with us the prospect of another world war. In an early August issue of *Life* my attention was drawn to a picture of a young American fleeing pursuit by natives of the Congo who carried spears. What was he doing in the Congo? He was an officer—a pilot—in charge of a helicopter, likewise shown in the picture, sent in by the United States to rescue a missionary.

We have dropped into the habit, as individuals, of assuming and believing that the disasters of our foreign policy will not affect us as individuals. But this young man was the son of next-door neighbors in my small home town of Allegan, Mich., Mr. and Mrs. Rock Myers. It was their son, a companion of my grandsons—one in the Navy, another in the Army in Germany—born and reared in that little town, who was fleeing for his life from natives who apparently, from all we can learn, are not capable of enjoying the independence, the freedom, the liberty, the opportunities, which the international organization has forced upon them.

The incident shows that we cannot with safety delegate to other nations the solution of the problems which affect us, which are brought upon us by our vain attempt to, by law, confer liberty and independence upon people who do not know their meaning, or endow others with the benefits of the civilization which we now enjoy and have earned through years of hardship and effort.

The chosen representative of the Congo who has so recently assumed to tell the United Nations what it should or should not do; the ruler of Cuba, just outside our door, who defies us when we attempt to protect our citizens, as well as others, are emboldened, encouraged in their unjustifiable assumptions by the fact that we can no longer exercise our own authority for our own protection and the protection of our people without the consent of other nations. We have lost our independence.

We seem to have completely forgotten the statement of Robert G. Harper, a Member of Congress from South Carolina, who said: "Millions for defense but not a cent for tribute."

We seem to have forgotten that a Teddy Roosevelt ever existed. We seem to have surrendered everything we won at the Boston Tea Party, by the War of Independence. And there seems to be nothing that a minority of us can do to prevent the repeated creation of a new commission, a new agency, a new department, a new appropriation running into billions of dollars.

As long ago as January 27, and again on January 30, 1942, it was my privilege to call to the attention of the Members of Congress what I considered to be the unsoundness of the move then on foot to create a one-world organization, the United Nations, to which we now turn as does an alcoholic to his bottle.

What was then said will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 1, 77th Congress, 2d session, pages 744 to 745, January 27, 1942; and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 88, part 1, 77th Congress, 2d session, pages 886 to 889, January 30, 1942.

I sent to the office and obtained a copy and will insert it at this point to show that today's proposal is but another step on the long and ruinous road then pointed out:

DON'T HAUL DOWN THE STARS AND STRIPES
(Remarks of CLARE E. HOFFMAN of Michigan,
in the House of Representatives)

(Jan. 27, 1942)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, on the assumption that, following the Declaration of Independence, guided by the principles enunciated in the Constitution, our people have established here a nation where the average man enjoys a greater degree of material prosperity, intellectual advancement, and religious freedom than in any other part of the world, the people of these United States of America are fighting a war, so it is said, to carry those blessings to all other people.

That war, the cost of which no man can estimate and which, if carried on according to present plans, will take the lives of millions of American men, the President and his supporters tell us, is being fought to bring to other peoples the same right of independence and self-government which we have enjoyed.

The hypocrisy of those who claim that to be the purpose of our present involvement in this war is clearly demonstrated when we receive from them a petition to repudiate our own independence, surrender our existence as an independent nation, and become a part of a United States of the World.

It is quite true that, under our Constitution, men have the right of a free press and free speech; that, under the provisions of that Constitution and the security granted by it, they may advocate its repudiation. Therefore, the man Streit and all those who join with him in asking us to surrender our independence and become a part of a world nation are within their legal rights.

However, Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito are, it is said, also seeking to destroy our independence and make us a part of a world group. Streit and his associates seek to accomplish the same end—the destruction of our independence—by a more subtle and a peaceful method, and they say for a different purpose.

Our Constitution was adopted in order that there might be formed a more perfect Union of the States. Streit and his adherents would destroy that Union. This Nation of ours is a Union of 48 States. The Civil War was fought to preserve that Union. Most of us many times have said:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which

it stands, one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

THEY WOULD BETRAY US

Streit and his associates now repudiate that pledge of allegiance to the Republic, "one nation indivisible," and would make it a part—and only a part—of a world nation.

Misapplied ambition is a ruinous thing. Unchecked, it destroys everything it touches, tearing down the good with the evil it seeks to end.

"To reign is worth ambition, although in hell. Better reign in hell than serve in heaven."

This country of ours, for more than 150 years, has not only been the haven but the heaven of those who in other lands were oppressed, enslaved, and denied opportunity. Yet Streit and Ickes and their associates, however distinguished they may be, would rather form and reign in a hell made up of all the nations of the world, of all the people of the world, than serve under the Constitution to which they have pledged allegiance, in a land where all have equal opportunity.

Ever since the President had his conference with Churchill on the high seas, we have been hearing from editorial writers, radio commentators, and New Deal spokesmen of the United Nations. Now comes a member of the President's Cabinet, Ickes; a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, Roberts; both of whom have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, and add their endorsement to the Judaslike betrayal of our people into and as one of a United States of the World.

While Germany, Italy, and Japan seek by force of arms to overthrow us as a nation, to make us subservient to a group of world powers headed by themselves, Streit and his associates seek, through propaganda, to accomplish the same thing and make us a part of a United States of the World, dominated by England, Russia, China, and whatever other nations may seek to participate in a world redistribution of the wealth of the United States and its people.

Alexander the Great wept because there were no other worlds to conquer. Is not Franklin Delano Roosevelt satisfied with being a third-time President of the United States, an honor which the patriotism of Washington forbade him to accept? Is he not satisfied with his opportunity of conquering the whole world, far greater than in Alexander's day? Are his spokesmen behind this move to surrender our independence, our national existence; become a part of a United States of the World, and make Franklin Delano Roosevelt the president of that world nation?

Yes; ambition is a cancerous growth and often in the past, as history discloses, has destroyed the one who harbored it. Alexander was ambitious. Caesar was ambitious. Napoleon was ambitious. Hitler was ambitious. But the people who were the playthings of their ambition suffered and died. So, too, if this move to make us a part of a world nation—and a subservient part at that—goes through, will our people suffer, our independence, our Nation die.

It is said that we are the richest nation in the world. It is undeniable that the average citizen of these United States of America enjoys more of everything that goes to make man contented and happy than the people of any other land or nation. And yet these men, like Judas, who betrayed his Master, would, before we are fairly in this war, betray our people; surrender our independence; connive to destroy our liberty and our freedom. They would surrender that for which the war is being fought—our national existence—before the war is fairly begun.

Let them be stripped of their hypocrisy. Let us expose them for what they are—enemies of the Republic, boring from within.

They seek to take advantage of our involvement in this war and while the attention of the people is directed to the winning of the war. They would do what the armies of the Confederacy could not accomplish—destroy us as a nation, one and indivisible; make us a part of the United States of the World, where the communistic Russian, who denies the existence of God, where the Chinese, the Hottentot, and the people of India would have equal voice in curtailing the liberties, spending the tax money, of American workers, farmers, and businessmen—a United States of the World where all the peoples of the world would be glorified participants in a WPA, a PWA, a Federal housing program, the triple A—a program to rebuild after the war all the cities, towns, and villages which may be destroyed in that war—and all at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Oh, that Streit and all his associates who are dissatisfied with our Declaration of Independence, with the working of our Constitution, with our country, would only go and take up permanently their residence in some one of the many countries whose system of government they evidently so greatly admire.

Let Streit go and live with the Chinese. Let Ickes go to Russia and live with the Communists, who tell us that religion is a fraud. Let Justice Roberts sojourn a while in India with Gandhi, who is demanding that Britain grant freedom to millions of the oppressed in his native land.

If the administration wants to win this war, let it put aside the ambition of the President's advisers to make him or one of themselves a president of the world. Let this administration get rid of the more than a thousand Communists on the Federal payroll—bloodsuckers seeking to destroy our national existence.

Let the ambitious politicians remember that the first thing, the important thing, is the winning of the war, and that the American people will only devote themselves enthusiastically and wholeheartedly to that purpose as they believe in our own Government, the maintenance of our own freedom and independence.

A BIRTHDAY GIFT (January 30, 1942)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is the President's birthday, it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that a birthday gift has been requested of Congress for the Chief Executive.

The 4th day of July 1776 was the day when our Declaration of Independence was adopted. Here is an organization which undoubtedly has expended considerable sums, which now proposes to celebrate the President's birthday by having Congress adopt a resolution doing away with the Declaration of Independence. I do not know; I have not been able to learn, whether any Member of the House has introduced such a resolution.

I have introduced a resolution—it was introduced yesterday—House Resolution 425—asking for the appointment of a committee to investigate the purpose and ascertain who are the members of these two or three organizations which advocate the surrender of our independence and the sources from which they derive the funds which they are spending.

This movement to surrender our independence and become a part of a world supergovernment has the support of Cabinet Member Ickes, Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, Federal Union, Inc., Red Christian Frontiers, and Communists.

While we are celebrating today the President's birthday we should have this other movement in mind. There are many of us who in the past have bitterly opposed some

of the President's political policies. There are some of us who will continue to oppose those domestic policies while giving him support in the effort to win the war. There is none, however, who should in my judgment at least not be able and willing to join in the hope that God will grant him many happier returns of the day. We can all join in the request that God give him wisdom, and strength, and courage to frown upon such efforts as the one which is here suggested.

THE DAY FIXED FOR OUR BETRAYAL

The people will now back this administration in this war effort, they will give wholehearted support to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; but how about the future when the people learn that there is in administration circles, or at least entertained by one member of the Cabinet the purpose to destroy our independence?

The answer to that question depends upon whether they consider the war a just war; a worthwhile war; a war to preserve our independence; a war to perpetuate our Nation; a war to protect our freedom and our liberty.

At the present time, our people believe that this war must be won. They are willing, even though it cost billions of dollars, millions of lives; even though it means the lowering of the standard of living for many generations to come in order to meet the tax bills which will follow this war, to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary to win.

But let our people once discover or arrive at the conclusion, sound or unsound, that they are being betrayed; that their sacrifices are in vain, that at the end of the war they will have lost their independence, our constitutional form of government, our existence as a free and independent Nation destroyed, and no longer will this administration have their support.

Of our more than 130 million people, those who think believe in some vague way that we today, as our forefathers in the Revolutionary War, as in the days of the Civil War, are not only fighting for the preservation of our Nation, but that, when we win, the freedom of the individual, the independence of the Nation, will be rendered more secure and its permanency insured.

We know that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, at the heads of their respective nations, are our enemies. They would destroy our national existence. They, according to this administration, would enslave us, destroy what has been described as the American way of life. There are other enemies who would accomplish the same purpose. These others are a greater menace than are Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, for they carry on their battle to destroy us, not directly, not openly, with announced purposes, but in an underhand, treacherous, traitorous way, pretending they would make secure the freedoms and liberties, the national existence which they seek to destroy.

Using the false plea that we can win the war and after it is over establish permanent peace throughout the world—a desirable objective—Federal Union, Inc., headed by Clarence K. Streit, by the expenditure of thousands of dollars, is carrying on a campaign of propaganda, the purpose of which is, while our attention is distracted by the war, to cause us to surrender our independence and our national existence and become the economic slaves of other world powers.

That organization would inveigle our citizens into a united states of the world where their property, their incomes, would be at the mercy of Old World politicians.

Federal Union, Inc., and World Fellowship, Inc., which has a similar objective, would make the American taxpayer the Santa Claus of the world; the peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa glorified members of a world

WPA. We Americans—workers, farmers, merchants, industrialists, professional men and women, all of us—would furnish the money for the boondoggling and the warring of princes, dukes, kings, and dictators.

We would, in addition, furnish the cannon fodder for the war games which they might play when they grew tired of boondoggling.

Is the foregoing but a creature of the imagination? In full-page ads in newspapers of the East the campaign to do the things just mentioned is being carried on.

Yesterday, January 29, to me, as a Congressman, and no doubt to every other Congressman and to every Senator, from World Fellowship, Inc., came propaganda asking that, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I support a joint resolution which this organization asks be passed on the President's birthday, January 30, 1942, as I quote, "a present to him, to us, to the world." The word "him" is capitalized. A proposal for a birthday gift which the President should lose no time in condemning.

That resolution proposes, as step 1, among other things:

"That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the United Nations of the World, and to that end it hereby gives to the President of the United States of America all the needed authority and powers of every kind and description without limitations of any kind that are necessary in his sole and absolute discretion to set up and create the Federation of the World, a world peace government under the title of the United Nations of the World, including its constitution and personnel and all other matters needed or appertaining thereto to the end that all nations of the world may by voluntary action become a part thereof under the same terms and conditions."

If you are an American citizen, willing to make the needed sacrifices to win this war, if you believe in the independence of our Nation, what do you think of this proposed grant of authority to the President of the United States to set up a United Nations of the World? Why should Congress grant to the President of the United States power to create a new world government, United Nations of the World, of which we would be a part?

By what stretch of the imagination can it be assumed that we, the people of the United States, have the right, or, for that matter, the power to set up a world government entitled "United Nations of the World," and to write and prescribe a constitution and to pick the officers of such a government?

If the President of the United States is not satisfied with the office which he holds, if he and his advisers and supporters or any of the rest of us are not content to live under the Constitution which we have sworn to maintain and uphold, then why does not he, his wife Eleanor, Ickes, Perkins, and the horde of Reds which surrounds him, and those of us who are not satisfied, emigrate to Russia, or to Germany for that matter—for Hitler has the same idea of uniting all the peoples of the world under his rule—and there establish the world government?

This proposed joint resolution contains this further provision:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$100 million or so much thereof as may be necessary to be extended by the President in his sole and absolute discretion to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution."

Consider this language. This organization asks, in this time of war, when every dollar is needed to support the Army, the Navy,

and the Air Force, for an appropriation of \$100 million to be expended by the President of the United States without accounting to anyone in any manner, for the purpose of establishing a United Nations of the World.

The resolution contains this further language, immediately following the foregoing: "And in addition the sum of \$1 billion for the immediate use of the United Nations of the World under its constitution as set up and created by the President of the United States of America as provided in this joint resolution."

While MacArthur is fighting in the Philippines; while American soldiers and sailors are dying there and in many, many places throughout the world in the belief that they are fighting for the preservation of our Government; for the safety and independence of the folks at home; for their parents, their brothers and their sisters, here at home, in America, through the mails of the U.S. Government comes this propaganda, which would destroy all that these boys have fought and died to save.

The Treasury of the United States is not only empty of funds, but in it are stored obligations which call upon future generations for the payment of billions of dollars in taxes. Yet this organization, these men and women who sponsor it, whose purpose is the surrender of our independence, the destruction of our constitutional form of government, destroy the morale of our fighting men. They sap the courage of our citizens. They create the feeling that this administration, by permitting their efforts to go unrebutted, may be charged with not carrying on a war to preserve the American way of life, to protect our people, to render our Government secure and permanent, but, driven by ambition, seeks to make us a part of a world power.

Let this administration—let the President of the United States—without delay, assure the American people that he wants no part in the creation of a united states of the world—in the formation of a United Nations of the World.

Let him assure us that when this war is won—that when this war is over—our independence as a Nation will be sacredly preserved and that we will not become a part of any world political union.

I append hereto, as exhibit A, excerpts from the full-page ad of Federal Union, Inc.; also appended, as exhibit B, are excerpts from World Fellowship, Inc.

Yesterday I introduced a resolution—House Resolution 425—calling for an investigation of this movement. I ask that a copy of that resolution be printed herewith as exhibit C.

Here we are—a Nation billions of dollars in debt, needing every resource at our command, not only to carry on a war, as the President said, on every continent and in every sea, but to prepare for our own national defense here at home; and yet come these men and ask that we appropriate \$100 million to aid in forming a united nations of the world, and an added \$1 billion to be expended by that organization when formed.

They ask that we surrender our independence, appropriate \$1,100 million, and offer it to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as his birthday gift on January 30, 1942.

Yes; I wish the President many returns of this birthday of his. I hope that each of those days will bring less for him to worry about; that the morning sun of each of those days will rise upon a world at peace—upon a United States of America still independent—indivisible.

God grant that each of those birthdays of our President and the dawn of many succeeding centuries will see us as a people free, independent, our liberties secure; our National Government, the United States of America, a republic, still the refuge, still

the hope, of the oppressed throughout the world.

Oh, I ask you, I appeal to the leaders of the House, to the dean of the House as he sits here, because he said he believes in the independence of our country, our institutions, and our form of government, are we going to let pass unchallenged such appeals as these, which have been sent to every Member of the House, undoubtedly, and to every Senator? This same proposition is being advocated by full-page advertising in the great daily newspapers. I ask you, Mr. Sabath, chairman of the Committee on Rules, to give us a rule in support of the resolution which I have introduced, and let us learn who is back of this movement and who is paying for it.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Evening Star of Jan. 5, 1942]

"IN UNION NOW LIES POWER TO WIN THE WAR AND THE PEACE—A PETITION"

"That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future;

"That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Erie, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis;

"We welcome President Roosevelt's conferences with Prime Minister Churchill and the 'declaration of united nations'."

(Churchill is the man who said, "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job," and who, since these remarks were made on the floor of the House and after the fall of Singapore, said, referring to the entry of the United States into the war:

"That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass.")

Referring to this proposed supergovernment, the advertisement continues:

"Now the responsibility is ours either to create or defer too long that 'common community or state' whose importance Mr. Churchill stressed in the Senate December 26.

"Organizing the democracies effectively in a union need take no longer than organizing them in an ineffective alliance or supreme war council, and will safeguard their national rights far more securely and equally. There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start."

THE SOVIET STATES HAVE A COMMON GOVERNMENT

(Note those who would pull down our flag and run up in its place the symbol of Union Now graciously tell us that, at the beginning, we are to have a majority vote in this new supergovernment. They fail to tell us that, shortly, outvoted by the more numerous peoples of Russia, the British Empire, and others, we would become but a vassal state.)

"We gain from the fact that all the Soviet republics are already united in one government, as are also all the Chinese-speaking people, once so divided. Surely we and they must agree that union now of the democracies wherever possible is equally to the general advantage."

(Yes, Union Now advocates suggest—in fact, they insist—that we now accept, as full partners and as participants, not only

in the carrying on of the war but in our domestic affairs, in our daily lives, Communists of Russia and the people of China.)

"Let us begin now a World United States.

"THIRTY MILLION AMERICANS FAVOR UNION

"Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune survey, already believe the United States 'after the war' should 'join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order.'

"The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves, and our friends and foes, that this war will end in a union of the free. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now."

(In other words, surrender our independence; burn the Declaration of Independence and substitute in its place a declaration of interdependence. Pull down the Stars and Stripes and run up the flag of Union Now. That is the plea these men are making.)

The advertisement continues: "As citizens to our fellow citizens, we recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

"Robert Woods Bliss, Grenville Clark, Gardner Cowles, Jr., Russell W. Davenport, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J. Roberts, Daniel Calhoun Roper, William Jay Schieffelin, John Foster Dulles.

"Inviting you to help create now a living, growing World United States.

"FEDERAL UNION, INC.,
"10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

"(A nonprofit membership association)

"Please put me, an American citizen, on record as favoring your petition for union—now, as explained in your advertisement in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., January 5, 1942.

"----- 1942.

"Name -----

"Street ----- City -----

"Check here for an enrollment card , literature , reprints of this advertisement .

"We need funds to carry on this campaign quickly. If everyone who believes in a World United States will give now what he can to help create it, we shall have it soon. Please insert here ----- the amount of any gift you enclose.

"Federal Union, Inc.: A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Streit, president; E. W. Balduf, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

"Philadelphia, Architects Building. Washington, D.C., 726 Jackson Place, Republic 2425. Chicago, 135 La Salle Street. St. Louis, Arcade Building. San Francisco, Russ Building. Los Angeles, 1717 North Vine Street, Hollywood.

"National Headquarters, 10 East 40th Street, New York City."

EXHIBIT B

IN TIME OF WAR PREPARE FOR PEACE—WORLD FELLOWSHIP, INC.

(Started in 1918—the armistice year)

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

We ask the Members of the Senate and House to take the three steps presented here for your consideration.

We hope these two joint resolutions will be introduced and passed by Congress on the President's birthday, January 30, 1942. A present to him, to us, to the world.

STEP 1

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to set up and create a Federation of the World, a World Peace Government, under the title of the "United Nations of the World"

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the United Nations of the World, and to that end it hereby gives to the President of the United States of America all the needed authority and powers of every kind and description, without limitations of any kind that are necessary in his sole and absolute discretion to set up and create the Federation of the World, a world peace government under the title of the "United Nations of the World," including its constitution and personnel and all other matters needed or appertaining thereto to the end that all nations of the world may by voluntary action become a part thereof under the same terms and conditions.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100 million or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the President in his sole and absolute discretion, to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution, and in addition the sum of \$1 billion for the immediate use of the United Nations of the World under its constitution as set up and created by the President of the United States of America as provided in this joint resolution.

The President may appoint such committees and summon such advisers, from any part of the world, as he may deem necessary to effectuate the foregoing purposes with all convenient speed.

EXHIBIT C

[H. Res. 425, 77th Cong., 2d sess.]

Whereas through full-page advertisements published in many great dailies, Federal Union, Inc., Clarence K. Streit, president, is now advocating the surrender of our national independence and our entrance into a United States of the world; and

Whereas World Fellowship, Inc., is now propagandizing Congress to appropriate \$1,100 million for the purpose of forming a United Nations of the world, which would involve the surrendering of our national independence; and

Whereas such activities tend to undermine the morale of our people and to raise in their minds a suspicion that there is on foot a powerful movement which, notwithstanding the winning of the war, would, if successful, result in the surrendering of our national independence, the destruction of the liberty of the citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of five members for the purposes of conducting an investigation to ascertain—

(1) The extent, character, and objectives of Federal Union, Inc.; of World Fellowship, Inc.; and of any and all similar organizations, and the members of such organizations in the United States;

(2) The sources from which such organizations and individuals receive the funds which enable them to carry on their activities; the amount and the date of contributions made for that purpose; and the names, places of residence, and occupation of the persons contributing; and

(3) All other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any advisable remedial legislation.

That said special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting,

has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 192).

Sec. 2. The committee shall file its report to the House on October 31, 1942, or may file same earlier in the event the House is not in session, with the Speaker of the House for printing as a public document.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I would certainly appreciate it if the gentleman who is a member of the committee would explain why in the committee report there is no written report from the departments and executive agencies concerned. I have looked over the hearings quickly and I find that no one from the executive branch of the Government, charged with the administration of our foreign affairs, testified on this. Could the gentleman explain this?

Mr. FULTON. I will be glad to answer that. The Secretary of State has favored this resolution. Because this is a Senate resolution, it has come over to us in the House and we reported out Senate Joint Resolution 170. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate sought the opinion of the Department of State. No witness appeared for the administration in either the Senate or House committee. The position of the Department of State has been stated in two letters of William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State dated May 28, 1959, and August 25, 1960, printed in the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of January 19, 1960, on page 1 and page 2. Also there is on page 60 of the Senate hearings, a statement received subsequent to the hearings of January 19, 1960, the statement by Ivan B. White, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

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

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Does this resolution contemplate the formation or the formulation of a basis for the Atlantic Union type of government, the one government authority of the Atlantic nations?

Mr. FULTON. This resolution is really in conformity with article II of the North Atlantic Treaty. It is following out the purposes of that, not only to have a military organization of the Atlantic

countries, each of which are sovereign, but to have cooperation among them on an economic and political basis. Article II of the North Atlantic Treaty states, which was agreed to by the signing nations in 1949:

The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

It has been pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] that this proposed conference is strengthening the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is one of the best defenses against aggression that we have. There are two facets: First, the economic and political cooperation under article II of the North Atlantic Treaty; and, second, cooperation in the context of what we could call the cold war.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman for the very general explanation and the general statement, but, specifically, does this contemplate a political union—one government of the Atlantic nations? Is that the purpose of this resolution—to formulate a base for that type of government? Could the gentleman answer me specifically and particularly with reference to that?

Mr. FULTON. This arose originally in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in 1957 not in connection with the Atlantic Union organization or the so-called union now. They unanimously recommended a conference with leading representative citizens from the NATO countries be convoked to examine this matter and make recommendations how greater cooperation and unity of purpose may best be developed.

In June 1959 the Atlantic Congress met for a week in London. I believe that various Members from this body were there. Its 650 delegates discussed a wide range of activities that could appropriately contribute to the end about which we are speaking. The Fifth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in 1959 reaffirmed its proposal for a citizens' meeting. So, you see, the basis of the initiation of this Commission, as well as the proposed Conference, is much broader than any particular organization or any special sponsorship. I would say to you that the goals of this Commission and Conference are not set. The proposal contains the idea that the Commission be organized for citizens to be appointed so that they will be of an advisory and not of a compelling nature to the U.S. Government, nor shall there be power to commit the United States or any other participating nation to any or all recommendations of the Commission or the Conference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I think in all fairness the gentleman is entitled to an answer to his question. As chairman of the U.S. delegation, I thought I had made it clear in the Atlantic Congress resolution that that was not the purpose of it; that this commission was not to favor a union now, or anything of that kind. It was merely to explore how foreign nations could closer cooperate under article II of the NATO Charter. How they could have closer economic and cultural cooperation, as well as military cooperation. So a definitive answer to the gentleman's question is "No."

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman is correct as to the origin, but we must remember that the U.S. commission and the convention are private citizens free to express any opinion, and make any recommendation.

Mr. PILLION. We have a Department of Commerce and various bureaus who can presently and efficiently explore the economical and political operations with other countries.

Mr. FULTON. The Hoover Commission was appointed from our U.S. citizens for just such purpose of making recommendations and nonbinding proposals to our U.S. Government agencies. There is to—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor because I do not understand this resolution and I am trying to get some information. To that end I have read the report, I have read the bill, and I read the rule, and I have listened to the debate thus far. These tell us little.

I realize that behind this could be a world of good will. The report says, "for the purpose of developing paths toward greater political and economic cooperation within the alliance."

That is wonderful. Then it says, "military cooperation and collaboration into the political and economic areas."

I thought we had a State Department to do that. Then on page 2 the report points out article II of the treaty which again sounds like the acknowledged purpose of the State Department. Maybe I am wrong. I do not know how the Hoover Commission gets in here except that the members served without compensation.

Then on the next page, page 3, we have an astounding thing, and I quote:

Some attention was given to the geographic extension of terms of the resolution in order to include representatives from countries other than the North Atlantic Community.

Geographic extension it is called. And the report says there was no basic opposition to that. When you talk about political and economic collaboration, does that mean that no one objected to taking in nations outside of the framework of free democracies, such as Socialist governments? I do not know what political and economic collaboration will be as it is used there, but I am very suspect about the political side. What is

political collaboration? What are we talking about? Are we suggesting here that we unite politically with other people, or is the course of the United States made stronger by protecting our sovereignty?

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman knows this is just another propaganda organization paid for by the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. ALGER. I would suspect that is possible.

Mr. GROSS. It is designed to propagandize Members of Congress as well as others. That is what it is for.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman referred to the paragraph at the top of page 3. In committee I suggested an amendment to make it possible for the representatives of the various NATO countries on this Commission to invite representatives from other countries if they saw fit to do so. The reason was very simple. All wisdom and experience are not in the North Atlantic Community. One of the greatest difficulties we face in the total world is that the Communists are trying to organize all non-Caucasian peoples against all Caucasian peoples. I felt it might well be considered desirable to have on the Commission some other countries, outside the NATO area, which have demonstrated stability and cooperation and devotion to democratic values and processes.

Mr. ALGER. May I point out to the gentleman that the things he is expressing to us now would certainly have been a help in the report so that we know what it is we are asked here to do and the functions of this Commission. The Hoover Commission had guidelines and goals. We need guidelines and goals for this Commission.

Mr. JUDD. The members of this Commission are to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. I cannot imagine they are going to appoint any citizens to the Commission who are not outstanding in their fields. I see no reason to be concerned about the qualifications of the people who will be appointed to it.

Mr. ALGER. It is not their qualifications here before us; rather that they should have something to guide them to know what is expected of them.

Mr. JUDD. These will be high-grade people who will approach the problem with unprejudiced minds. Let them report back what they think ought to be done. The Commission will give us a chance to look at our total relationships afresh.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 349, nays 39, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—349

Abbutt	Daddario	Jackson
Abernethy	Dague	Jarman
Adair	Daniels	Jennings
Addonizio	Dawson	Johnson, Calif.
Albert	Delaney	Johnson, Colo.
Alexander	Dent	Johnson, Md.
Allen	Denton	Johnson, Wis.
Andersen,	Derounian	Jonas
Minn.	Derwinski	Jones, Ala.
Anderson,	Diggs	Jones, Mo.
Mont.	Dingell	Judd
Andrews	Dixon	Karsten
Arends	Donohue	Karsh
Ashley	Dooley	Kasem
Aspinall	Dorn, N.Y.	Kastenmeier
Auchincloss	Downing	Keams
Avery	Doyle	Keath
Ayres	Dulski	Kelly
Baker	Durham	Keogh
Baldwin	Dwyer	Kilday
Baring	Edmondson	Kilgore
Barr	Elliott	King, Calif.
Barry	Everett	King, Utah
Bass, N.H.	Evens	Kitchin
Bass, Tenn.	Fallon	Kluczynski
Bates	Farbstein	Knox
Becker	Fascell	Kowalski
Beckworth	Fenton	Kyl
Belcher	Fino	Lafore
Bennett, Fla.	Fisher	Laird
Bennett, Mich.	Flood	Lane
Betts	Flynn	Langen
Blatnik	Flynt	Lankford
Blitch	Fogarty	Latta
Boland	Foley	Lennon
Bolton	Forand	Lesinski
Bonner	Ford	Levering
Bowles	Fountain	Libonati
Boykin	Frazier	Lindsay
Brademas	Frelinghuysen	Lipscomb
Breeding	Friedel	McCormack
Brewster	Fulton	McCulloch
Brock	Gallagher	McDonough
Brooks, La.	Garmatz	McDowell
Brooks, Tex.	Gary	McFall
Broomfield	Gathings	McGinley
Brown, Ga.	Gavin	McGovern
Brown, Mo.	George	McIntire
Brown, Ohio	Gialmo	Machrowicz
Broyhill	Gilbert	Mack
Burke, Ky.	Glenn	Madden
Burke, Mass.	Goodell	Mailliard
Burleson	Granahan	Marshall
Byrne, Pa.	Gray	Martin
Cahill	Green, Oreg.	May
Canfield	Green, Pa.	Meador
Cannon	Griffiths	Merrrow
Carnahan	Gubser	Metcalf
Casey	Hagen	Meyer
Cederberg	Halleck	Michel
Celler	Halpern	Miller, Clem
Chamberlain	Hardy	Miller,
Chelf	Hargis	George P.
Chenoweth	Harmon	Miller, N.Y.
Chiperfield	Harris	Milliken
Church	Harrison	Mills
Clark	Hays	Moeller
Coad	Hechler	Monagan
Coffin	Hemphill	Montoya
Cohelan	Hendersson	Moore
Collier	Herlong	Moorhead
Colmer	Hoeven	Morgan
Conte	Hogan	Morris, N. Mex.
Cook	Hollifield	Morris, Okla.
Cooley	Holland	Moss
Corbett	Holtzman	Moulder
Cramer	Horan	Multer
Cunningham	Huddleston	Mumma
Curtin	Hull	Murphy
Curtis, Mass.	Inouye	Natcher
Curtis, Mo.	Irwin	Nelsen

Norblad	Robison	Teague, Calif.
O'Brien, Ill.	Rodino	Teague, Tex.
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rogers, Colo.	Teller
O'Hara, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.	Thomas
O'Hara, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.	Thompson, Tex.
O'Neill	Rooney	Thomson, Wyo.
Oliver	Roosevelt	Thornberry
Osamers	Rostenkowski	Toll
Ostertag	Roush	Tollefson
Passman	Rutherford	Trimble
Patman	St. George	Tuck
Pelly	Santangelo	Udall
Perkins	Saund	Ullman
Pfost	Saylor	Vanik
Philbin	Schenck	Van Zandt
Pilcher	Scherer	Wainwright
Pirnie	Schneebeil	Wallhauser
Poage	Schwengel	Walter
Poff	Scott	Wampler
Porter	Selden	Watts
Powell	Sheppard	Weaver
Price	Shipley	Weiss
Prokop	Sikes	Whitener
Pucinski	Simpson	Whitton
Quigley	Sisk	Widnall
Rabaut	Slack	Wier
Rains	Smith, Iowa	Willis
Randall	Smith, Miss.	Willson
Ray	Smith, Va.	Wolf
Rees, Kans.	Spence	Wright
Reuss	Springer	Yates
Rhodes, Ariz.	Staggers	Young
Rhodes, Pa.	Steed	Younger
Riehlman	Stratton	Zablocki
Riley	Stubblefield	Zelenko
Rivers, Alaska	Sullivan	
Roberts	Taylor, N.C.	

NAYS—39

Alford	Felghan	Matthews
Alger	Forrester	Minshall
Bailey	Gross	O'Konski
Berry	Haley	Pillion
Bosch	Hiestand	Short
Bow	Hoffman, Ill.	Siler
Bray	Hoffman, Mich.	Taber
Budge	Holt	Utt
Byrnes, Wis.	Hosmer	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	Jensen	Westland
Devine	Johansen	Wharton
Dorn, S.C.	McMillan	Williams
Dowdy	Mason	Winstead

NOT VOTING—43

Anfuso	Ikard	Preston
Ashmore	Kee	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Kilburn	Rivers, S.C.
Barrett	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Baumhart	Landrum	Shelley
Bentley	Loser	Smith, Calif.
Boggs	McSween	Smith, Kans.
Bolling	Macdonald	Taylor, N.Y.
Buckley	Magnuson	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Mahon	Thompson, N.J.
Grant	Mitchell	Vinson
Griffin	Morrison	Withrow
Healey	Murray	
Hébert	Nix	
Hess	Norrell	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Anfuso with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Loser with Mr. Bentley.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Taylor of New York.
 Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Hess.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Quie.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Baumhart.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Boggs with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 joint resolution (S. J. Res. 170) to authorize the participation in an in-

ternational 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 United States delegates to such convention, 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 Senate Joint Resolution 170, with Mr. Bass of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution before the House, Senate Joint Resolution 170, was reported unanimously from the Committee on Foreign Affairs only after considerable thought and discussion. The events of the last few months, weeks, and days have pointed up the need for a more imaginative approach to the issues which confront our country today.

It must be readily apparent to even the most casual reader of the daily papers that the conduct of the Communist bloc places upon the nations of the non-Communist world a heavy responsibility to meet the challenges that are emerging on all sides. I say "Communist bloc" advisedly because we must consider Communist China, a rapidly developing threat.

Thus far much of the thinking on the ways and means by which we can counter the Communist threat has been in the military field. We and our North Atlantic allies have devised a strategy to combat military aggression. What we—and I include all the nations of the North Atlantic community—have neglected too long, is to devise a strategy that will be operative in times of peace. I am not arguing for a diminution of effort in the military field. On the contrary, I believe all of the nations must exert stronger efforts in that field. But we cannot rely on our weapons alone. They are necessary to defend that which we hold, but they are insufficient to advance the causes in which we believe. They are inadequate to meet the growing Communist threat in the economic and political fields.

The principal discussion within and outside of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has understandably been on the military side. Everyone who has followed NATO's progress in military collaboration must be heartened by how much has been achieved. For us in this country who have never had the experience of peacetime military alliances, it represents a triumph for our leadership and support. I know that the military

alliance has its shortcomings. Nor are the efforts of all parties equal to their responsibilities. If its strength were put to the test, it might reveal deficiencies that have not been anticipated. But I stress that it is making progress.

What is often overlooked when one talks about NATO is that those who drafted that plan had the vision to recognize that cooperation in nonmilitary fields is no less important than cooperation in military matters. I quote article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty:

The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

The purpose of the resolution now before the House is to give more meaning to that article.

Let me restate briefly what this resolution proposes so that there will be no misunderstanding about its scope or its implications in our foreign affairs.

The resolution would authorize the appointment of a Commission of not more than 20 private American citizens to be appointed jointly by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. This Commission would be directed to seek to arrange and to participate in a convention attended by similar citizens' commissions from the other NATO countries for the purpose of exploring and developing ideas that will result in greater political and economic cooperation by, with and among our allies. Members of the Commission would serve without compensation, but they would be reimbursed for their expenses. They would be authorized to employ and remunerate a staff of not more than 10 members. An amount not to exceed \$300,000 is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of the resolution. Of that sum not more than \$100,000 would constitute the share of the Commission's expenses in any international conference. The Commission would report and account for its expenditures to the Congress. All funds it expends would be subject to the rules and regulations governing the accountability of obligations and expenditures made under the jurisdiction of the Department of State. That means they will be subject to review by the Comptroller General. Wherever it is possible for the Commission to meet its expenses through the use of local currency, the Commission will use appropriated dollars to purchase such currencies thereby reducing its dollar outlay. The Commission would cease to exist on January 31, 1962. I wish to repeat that this is not a continuing commission. The Commission would cease to exist on January 31, 1962.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman is saying that he will not offer, nor does he anticipate anyone else will offer a resolution to continue this Commission?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Future Congresses will have an opportunity to study and review the progress, success, or failure of the Commission. Then we will be in a position to determine what course of action we will take respecting the future of the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. But you do not expect it to be discontinued?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We do not know what its future will be. This resolution specifically provides that the Commission will terminate on January 31, 1962. The Hoover Commission was continued only because it was successful. Personally, I would vote against the continuation of this Commission if it should prove to be a failure.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. TABER. How could this Commission operate without interfering with the responsibility that rests with the State Department to look after our foreign affairs? Is it not going to get us into more trouble rather than to help the situation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Assuming that other nations signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance are willing to cooperate by selecting comparable unofficial delegations to participate in the deliberations sanctioned by the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 170, it may be demonstrated that passage of such legislation will not seriously impede the normal conduct of foreign relations by the executive branch. Any recommendations emanating from negotiations in which such extra-legal commissions engage will be wholly advisory in character, and each member nation, including the United States, will retain undiminished freedom of discretion to accept or reject them as it sees fit.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman said he would not vote to continue the Commission unless it is determined to be a success. Do you have a predetermined policy by which you are able to determine whether the Commission is a success or a failure? How are you going to judge the failure or success of the Commission?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The Commission would make a report. If the Commission included in its report certain recommendations that were deemed to be unrealistic—or if it failed to make a report or any recommendation, it would be a failure. For example, if other foreign countries did not appoint comparable bodies or would not cooperate, then our Commission would not be in a position to meet in conference, and it would be a failure.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield for one further question. What if

the Commission should recommend large additional expenditures within the United Nations; would that be accepted as a successful Commission?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. One would have to study carefully the reasoning behind any additional expenditures.

Mr. PASSMAN. But if they should recommend large additional expenditures, made some reason for the expenditures, would that be a credit to the Commission?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Not necessarily. It would depend on the recommendation and to the extent that they are able to verify their findings and recommendations.

Mr. PASSMAN. Most of these commissions, as history will reveal, almost without exception have come back and have recommended huge additional expenditures. The Draper Committee is a recent example. It was supposed to make recommendations for savings, but it came back and recommended large additional expenditures. It was given much praise in certain quarters for that recommendation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I can assure the gentleman that whatever recommendations are made by this Commission, the proper committees of Congress will give proper attention to them.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman understands these are procedures, and that some of the recommendations are quite expensive.

Mr. CORBETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to say to the gentleman in reply to the remarks just made that we should remember that such a commission did exist in 1959. It made recommendations, and on the basis of the success of that body the NATO Parliamentarians' Meeting of 1959 recommended that another such conference should be held.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman is referring to the Atlantic Congress?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes. So I am saying that we already have proof of the success of this conference by the renewed recommendation, and I would like to say to the gentleman, if he will yield further, that even if the United States did not participate in this conference in 1960 the conference would be held anyway.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is very likely.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the approach proposed by this resolution has been the subject of consideration at several sessions of NATO parliamentarians. Last year an Atlantic Congress of 650 delegates met in London and strongly endorsed the idea of a citizens' study group. It may be asked whether these and similar organizations are not adequate or sufficient to make the necessary studies and recommendations envisioned by this resolution and thus make unnecessary this resolution. I do not think they are. All of these other groups meet for relatively brief periods ranging from a few

days to a week. They are concerned with a multitude of other issues.

Democracy has many admirable qualities, not the least of which is the hospitality it gives to new ideas. Its participants are given every encouragement to think about and to debate these ideas fully and freely. Some may question whether those who will be appointed to this Commission will be wiser than those who participate in existing parliamentary organizations. That is not the issue. Wisdom is not the monopoly of any one group in a democracy. The purpose of this resolution is to tap the vast human resources of our country and of other countries. I do not know who the participants will be. But I expect that they will not approach their assignment with fixed dogmas and static ideas. As we state in our report they should have a depth of knowledge and understanding and a flexibility of approach that would make it possible to develop reasonable and intelligent recommendations to achieve the objectives sought.

Further, in the platform of both parties adopted at the recent conventions this proposal was endorsed. Let me read from the Democratic platform:

To our friends and associates in the Atlantic Community: We propose a broader partnership that goes beyond our common fears, to recognize the depth and sweep of our common political, economic, and cultural interests.

We welcome the recent heartening advances toward European unity. In every appropriate way, we shall encourage their further growth within the broader framework of the Atlantic Community.

The Republican platform of 1960 contains this statement:

We will encourage the countries to initiate appropriate regional groupings to work out plans for economic and educational development. * * * We would propose that such groupings adopt means to attain viable economies following such examples as the European Common Market. And if from these institutions, there should follow stronger economic and political unions, we would welcome them with our support.

Congress should support this proposal. Both the Presidential nominees support it.

I cannot repeat too strongly that these citizens will not speak for our Government. Nothing in the resolution will disturb the well-established principle of our Government that the Executive is the recognized and proper channel for official expressions of our Government.

There is some precedent for this kind of approach. The Hoover Commission is one example. The Harriman Commission was set up to study the requirements of aid as a preliminary to the creation of the European recovery program. State governments often establish citizen groups to examine pressing public problems by individuals outside the mainstream of active politics. The novelty of the resolution before the House is only that it extends into the international arena a pattern which we have used profitably at home.

Some weeks ago I read a stimulating article in which the author made a clear and succinct distinction between the free world and the Communist world. He

said that the free world has liberty but lacks unity. The Communist world, on the other hand, has unity but lacks liberty. He then observed that whichever of these two competing systems is the first to achieve both liberty and unity would win the struggle for men's minds.

This resolution is intended to strengthen the unity of the non-Communist world. Through the familiar democratic process of orderly examination and rational discussion I expect that our citizens commission and individuals similarly appointed by other countries will be able to advance the unity of the non-Communist world.

There has been some concern that the geographical limitations of the resolution will have an adverse effect upon our friends and allies elsewhere in the world. It was the thought of the committee that if modest but solid accomplishments could be made among those who have had some experience in mutual cooperation the geographical boundaries could be enlarged to include like-minded groups from other non-Communist countries. But that is for the more distant future. The immediate problem is to make progress in the North Atlantic area.

The fact that the approach of this resolution is a novelty in the international field is no argument against it. We are living in a time when innovations are more a norm of action than ever before. Certainly in the physical sciences innovation is the order of the day.

I do not say to the Members of the House that this resolution is the panacea for all that besets us. But I do believe it offers a modest possibility. If it does nothing else, it will make known to us the depth and degree of differences that separate the nations and to which our Government and our people must give greater attention if we are to continue to enjoy our liberties.

I strongly urge the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 170.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. This will be a commission appointed by the joint action of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, as I understand it. There would be no executive department participation in the formation of this Commission; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman have any idea that the formation of such a commission might reduce some of the so-called ad hoc committees that the executive branch has been in the habit of appointing to send all over the world and to come back with predetermined reports to support a particular objective?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The idea of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was that this would provide a new and fresh look. It would not be a commission that had a predetermination on what it was to report. We hope that the Commission

will make a complete factual finding in the area of better political and economic relations and offer such recommendations as it believes appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 4 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. The point is this: So many of us have often had the feeling that some of these commissions and committees that have been appointed by the executive branch have come back with a report designed to support a particular objective that the executive branch had before they went over, and it seems to me we ought to try to avoid that. If this is going to be an objective commission without any predetermined ideas, but one that is coming back to make a factual report based on what is necessary and what is needed, we should support it. I would hesitate to support this kind of a move if it is merely going to be another form of commission to support some special preconceived idea.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I can assure the gentleman the committee does not want a commission that will report a preconceived idea. It will study all aspects and give the Congress a candid analysis of the problems with which it has dealt. Therefore, I strongly urge the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 170.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin has stated, this joint resolution has been passed by the Senate unanimously, I think, and recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The vote in the Senate committee was 8 to 7, the vote on the Senate floor on passage, surprisingly, was 51 to 44, a 7-vote margin.

Mr. JUDD. I stand corrected. I appreciate the gentleman's giving the actual vote to the House.

Mr. Chairman, what are the reasons for a resolution to establish a Citizens Commission of this sort? All the common people in the world want peace, and no one wants peace more earnestly than the American people. From Old Testament times to the present, people have cried, "Peace, peace," but there was no peace. So many still seem to think peace is attainable by wishing for it or by legislating it, or by talking about it. But the hard fact is that there never has been such a thing as a stable and enduring peace without, first, the establishment of an order.

Peace is the byproduct of order. The problem is how to get a stable order. Basically there have been only two ways of establishing order: one, when it is imposed from the top, and the other, when it comes up from the bottom by agreement of sovereign states or nations, as was the case with our Original Thirteen States when they formed the order known as the United States of

America. There was Pax Romana for several centuries, imposed by Rome. There was Pax Britannia the last century during which the world had probably the best period of peace and development in the history of mankind. It was policed and maintained by the British Navy. It was necessary for the British to do it if they were to maintain their empire. It was advantageous to them. It was advantageous to us. Everybody that did not want something other than peace benefited from it. Now, that old order is disappearing. The British Government advised us in the spring of 1947 that it was no longer in a position to maintain the world order that it had maintained for more than a century. Britain was too weakened abroad and in too great trouble at home in the terrible winter of 1947.

The U.S. Government to the eternal credit of President Harry S. Truman and the Department of State at that time said, "We have got to take over; somebody has to maintain order." There was nobody else in the world that had the strength or the wealth or the capacity to do so.

Now, we have carried most of that responsibility during the last 13 years. Some of us from the very beginning warned that it could be only a temporary arrangement. No country is strong enough or wise enough or good enough to maintain order indefinitely in our kind of world today. We do not have an empire to protect and the incentives which the British had, and scores of peoples which were docile in those years are not docile now.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I am just happy to hear the gentlemen give this credit to Mr. Truman, and I wish he had done it on television the other night.

Mr. JUDD. I have made the same statement many, many times, including here in the House. It was one of the great decisions of modern history, and Mr. Truman, fortunately, had a Republican Congress which cooperated, which adopted the legislation and put into operation the Greek program and the Marshall plan program which he proposed.

Now, the old order passeth away and the new order is not yet born. What is the new order to be, and how and by whom is it to be established? Well, there is in the world a force which knows the kind of order it wants to impose on the world and it has the will to do it. The Communist world conspiracy has organized, efficient, disciplined units in every other country.

When there is trouble in another country, its leaders do not say "We will pull out and go home." Rather, they rejoice that there is trouble and take advantage of it to try to impose their type of order which might be called "Pax Sovietica." It already controls one-third of the world. I do not hesitate to say that I must expect it to succeed worldwide, unless the free peoples of the

world, with imagination and determination, face up to this new situation. It is one that America in her whole 180 years of free existence has never faced before.

That is the reason for this piece of legislation. What kind of an order are we and other free peoples going to try, and please God, be able to set up by voluntary agreement in place of the old order in which we grew up and which is disintegrating with the breakup of the colonial system; and in place of the new Communist order which surely nobody here wants established?

I warned here back in 1948 that if we alone try to police the world and to support the world, we will not succeed, because no country has enough strength and resources for that. We could do it in the emergency, but we cannot do it indefinitely. I also said at that time that if we tried to do it indefinitely, we would wind up with most of the world hating us.

Just what is the future order going to be, and how is it to be established? I do not think anybody will stand up in this House and say he knows the answer. Is there any better thing for us to do than to authorize the Speaker of the House to choose 10 outstanding American citizens and the President of the Senate to appoint 10 outstanding citizens—not Government employees, not persons with axes to grind—but persons called to make a whole new study—to join with 80 similar persons from the NATO countries to constitute a temporary Commission to examine this total situation beginning with NATO? I have no idea what its recommendations will be. If I thought persons had recommendations already figured out ahead of time that they were going to try to find reasons to support, I would not recommend their being named to the Commission.

Surely the best place to begin is where there is already greatest experience in self-government, where there is already the greatest development—politically, socially, educationally, and economically. Most of the more highly developed countries in the world lie around the North Atlantic. On the west side, the United States and Canada have 200 million highly developed people, with stable institutions and economy, highly industrialized and all the rest.

On the other side of the North Atlantic, in Western Europe, are some 250 million people, as capable, as skilled, as experienced in self-government, and as well disciplined in orderly behavior as any people on the planet. Is it not good sense to explore ways to increase cooperation among these 200 million on our side and the 250 million on the other side? Surely we need to pool the strengths and experience of these 450 millions so that, instead of being divided, we may work more unitedly for a free-world order and against the type that a united enemy seeks to establish?

The Communist strategy everywhere is to try to divide the strong and subvert the weak. Our policy has to be to try to increase the unity of the strong and to help the weak become strong so that they then cannot be subverted, either.

In simple and broad terms, this is the rationale of this resolution. I do not know that anything useful will come out of the Commission's work. But when I see the kind of deterioration that is undeniably going on in much of the world, I cannot believe that it is wise for us to sit here and just continue to do what we have been doing in the past. It may have been adequate for a former day, but it is not adequate for this new day, especially with the new Soviet tactics since Paris. Surely no harm can come from setting up this kind of ad hoc commission to analyze, examine, study the whole situation, and perhaps come up with some new insights, some new approaches, some different strategies on our side. Our members on the Commission will then report to the Congress of the United States, with the citizens from the other countries reporting to their respective Parliaments with whatever proposals they may wish to recommend.

Maybe nothing important will come out of it; but I cannot see any possible reason for fearing that there is some concealed danger here. There is no commitment by the Congress or the executive branch. I cannot see any risk. For anyone to oppose this resolution because of something that he fears might happen under it is like the ancient comment of Jesus about those who strain at the gnat of what might happen while swallowing the camel of what most certainly is happening.

When I am faced with a malignant process, which is what the Communist cancer is, a new growth which encroaches on tissues that do not belong to it, which is never satisfied with the place where it starts and which spreads sometimes by direct invasion of neighboring organs, but preferably by metastases, daughter cells that spread to and work within other organs to weaken and consume them, when I am faced with such a malignant world process, proved by its doctrines and its history, I cannot sit down and do nothing. If there is risk in this proposal, the risk in just going on as we are is far greater. I cannot accept such a risk. So I urge approval of this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, if anyone wants to ask questions, I will be glad to answer them to the best of my ability. In essence, this is to be an ad hoc commission of distinguished private citizens appointed not by the State Department, not with preconceived ideas, but appointed by our own Speaker and by the President of the Senate to see what different or better ways might enable us to get greater security and surer peace at less cost and risk.

The need is real and the hour is late. It seems to me this is a sound step that we should take from which great benefit can come.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. There are several questions I should like to ask him relative to the mechanics of this joint resolution. On page 3, in paragraph 3, it says:

To employ and fix the compensation of such temporary professional and clerical staff

as it deems necessary: *Provided*, That the number shall not exceed ten: *And provided further*, That compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of the Congress.

I am wondering if the gentleman can tell us whether there is any difference in the maximum paid to members of the staffs of House and Senate committees; and what is that maximum? And how much could these 10 people be paid if the maximum were paid, disregarding the Civil Service rates?

Mr. JUDD. I am not aware that there is any substantial difference in the maximum compensation paid to clerical and professional staffs of the House and of the Senate. It certainly would not exceed the highest allowed by either body.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding there is no difference between the maximum salaries of House and Senate.

Mr. BOW. But can the gentleman tell us what the maximum is?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I understand it is \$17,600.

Mr. BOW. So we can spend \$17,600 on salaries alone. I think there should be some limitation which would relate to the Civil Service laws.

My next question goes to paragraph 5 which says:

To pay its share of such expenses as may be involved as a consequence of holding any meetings or conferences authorized by subparagraph (2) above, but not in excess of \$100,000.

We do have a limitation of \$100,000, but what is our share? Do we mean by that that it will be pro rata according to the number of nations participating, or will our share be an arbitrary figure such as we run into in the case of some of these organizations, up to 90 percent?

Mr. JUDD. My understanding is that the total composition of the commission will be 100 members. The United States, as the largest member, will appoint 20. Other members will appoint roughly in proportion to their size. Maybe one will appoint 14, another 11, another 8. If the expenses are prorated according to the number of members, the separate nations have on the commission, our share would be one-fifth since we will have 20 out of 100 members, although there is no firm commitment of that sort. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] has a more definite answer. He was active at the parliamentary conference from which came the suggestion. I invite his contribution.

Mr. HAYS. It will be based on a prorating of NATO which is, I believe 24.2 percent for us, but not more than 25 percent. Our share would certainly not be more than that, and as much less as it would be possible for our delegation to get them to agree to.

Mr. JUDD. Approximately 24 percent?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. BOW. I have two more questions, if the gentleman will yield further.

What is the basis of the travel and subsistence allowance under section 4? Would that be under the new regulations that have been adopted by the Congress this year on travel regulations?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I would think so. The same regulations should apply to employees and members of this commission as apply to employees of the House Foreign Affairs Committee or the Appropriations Committee who are sent out on specific missions involving travel and expenses.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution, and wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a most important resolution which would 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.

As a delegate from the United States to last year's NATO Parliamentary Conference, I have become increasingly concerned with the importance of cooperation among the peoples of the nations of the North Atlantic area. This resolution (S.J. Res. 170) stems from a proposal of the Third NATO Parliamentary Conference, held in 1957, and has been reaffirmed by that organization since. Meetings of prominent able Americans such as this resolution proposes to assemble can perform a different service than those appointed strictly as Government officials. The future of the Atlantic community can be discussed frankly and realistically by thoughtful people without the sometimes hampering responsibility of government position. Any practical ideas which might emerge from the proposed convention would then be available for the State Department, NATO, and the United Nations. The cause of North Atlantic unity can best be served if it is clear that in the research to be conducted that no government commitment is involved. The entire remarkable development of NATO is a new process in intergovernmental relations. It is in a state of growth and development. Many unprecedented things have already been accomplished by it. I should hope that the Congress would concur with the State Department and the Committees of the House and Senate which have reported this resolution. It is by such progressive and constructive action that the future of the free world is strengthened. Let us not leave bold and imaginative ideas to the Communists. Let us bring the thinking of able private individuals to the aid of free governments.

I urge that the Congress speedily approve this resolution.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. At the top of page 2 appears this language:

Said Commission shall consist of not to exceed 20 U.S. citizens, not more than one-half of whom may be from any one political party, and who shall be appointed from private life.

One of the big handicaps Congress has had in meeting these international problems is the lack of information. Why do you deliberately bar Members of Congress, particularly members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs? Are you just setting up another commission here to ignore the Congress in the future, or shall we have a commission that really means something to the Congress?

Mr. JUDD. In committee I myself proposed an amendment to accomplish such an objective; in fact, I had several amendments which I thought would make the resolution a little tighter and more specific without in the least handicapping the ability of the Commission to have necessary flexibility and freedom to explore every possible avenue to strengthen political and economic cooperation within NATO. I thought that following the pattern of the Hoover Commission it would be advisable to have on this Commission, out of the 10 members appointed by the Speaker, two Members of the House, one from either party, and out of the 10 appointed by the President of the Senate two Members of the Senate. Perhaps our committee would have accepted that amendment if we had had more time, but this came to us from the Senate just before the end of June and it was thought then that Congress would adjourn sine die before the national conventions. The leadership in both bodies advised that if we wanted to get the resolution through we should accept the Senate language without amendments. If we had to send it to conference, we probably would not get it through. So I accepted the Senate language on that basis, and believe the House should do the same.

Personally, I think there are advantages in having on such a commission two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate who have had experience in what is legislatively attainable. Two questions must always be asked. First, what is sound and desirable—what is good? Second, what can we get? The Members of the House and of the Senate with practical experience are more likely to have good judgment at to what is attainable. They can be useful on such a commission by saying, where indicated, "That may be a wonderful idea but you cannot get it through the Congress; so do not try quite so much."

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Would the gentleman tell the Committee what the background of the thinking was that fixed upon 100 members, and 20 members from the United States? It seems to me, you are getting too many members on a commission here. My own experience indicates that more can be accomplished in preliminary discussions and exploring problems with a smaller group.

Mr. JUDD. My first answer is that this proposal did not come just from the United States. It came out of the North Atlantic Parliamentarians' Conference. The countries participating made preliminary studies and suggested the number of 100. We did not think it was our

job to try to change that figure and perhaps give the impression that they had to play according to our ideas or not at all. The whole group agreed on that figure and we thought it a good enough proposal. Would the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] care to add to that?

Mr. HAYS. At the Parliamentarians' Conference, which was an organization or a meeting composed of 650 people, we found just exactly what you are saying prevailed. It was too unwieldy and too large and the meeting was far too short a time to do anything. The suggestion there, which brought this resolution about, was that the committee be composed of not more than 100 members and the idea was that it would be divided into 5 subcommittees to work in 5 different fields that the Atlantic Congress thought needed to be worked upon. That would make each committee about the size of a committee of the Congress or a little smaller.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I greatly respect the gentleman's position in this area of foreign affairs. I wondered when I heard the gentleman speak if I understood him correctly, that this conference would consider more or less world affairs and world organizations; is that correct?

Mr. JUDD. That is correct.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Then this is my concern, and I think I can express it sincerely to the gentleman in this way. Would not there be a danger that these people so meeting would come up with a recommendation that to relieve world tensions, we should admit Red China into the United Nations and use their position as a lobby to cause that position to prevail?

Mr. JUDD. That is conceivable, but I do not think that it is likely to happen. The experience that most of the countries have had with Communist China has not been very happy. But, I think they ought to be given carte blanche to make that or any other proposal that the majority, after study, considers a step forward. The members from other countries will be outstanding citizens, too. I do not think they will have to take second place to any of us here. I cannot believe that such persons are likely to go off the deep end and make unsound or dangerous proposals. They know the problems are tremendous.

The purpose of the Commission is not to increase the burdens upon the United States.

The purpose is to lessen the burdens, if you will, by pooling the strengths of all free peoples in this area. It is not to weaken the security of the United States, but to strengthen it. Therefore, I think we ought to vote for this resolution.

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

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

Mr. DOWDY. The gentleman mentioned that he wanted people on this committee with imagination. I know what imagination means so far as Members of Congress is concerned—it is the quality of being adept in imagining new ways to spend money. I wonder if it is

possible to get someone on this committee with imagination as to the ways of raising the money.

Mr. JUDD. I think that to appoint people with imagination who may find better ways of solving the problem is the best way to save money. Certainly, we are not doing it very cheaply under present arrangements.

Mr. DOWDY. Does the gentleman not agree that the imagination spoken of in all of these things is imagination to spend and to find new ways of spending money?

Mr. JUDD. Sometimes it is, but not necessarily so. I feel we have reached a point where we need to take a brand-new overall look at our total world situation and the position of the United States and the other free peoples in it. If we cannot safely begin such a fresh look with those who have the most at stake, and who have the greatest experience in self-government and self-support, and who are the most highly developed, and with whom we have historically the closest ties, then I do not know where in the world we can begin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 170. The purpose of the resolution is to utilize the services of private citizens in seeking ways and means of strengthening the NATO alliance. They would function in an advisory capacity in the international field in much the same way as did the Hoover Commission in the national area.

These private citizens would serve as a U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO. There would be 20 from the United States, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate. Although appointed officially, they would express their views as individuals and would not in any way speak for or represent the U.S. Government. They would supplement official consideration of NATO problems by the systematic infusion of the views and recommendations of responsible citizens representing a cross section of competent and experienced people. The resolution spells out their functions, which would be to arrange for and participate in meetings and conferences with similar citizens' commissions in the other NATO countries in order to explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed and democratic freedom promoted by economic and political means.

NATO has been successful to a very measurable degree in building up the defensive strength of the western allies. The Soviets recognize its deterrent potential and continue to make it a primary target of their cold war efforts; their most savage propaganda attacks are aimed at dividing the western nations and breaking up the NATO alliance.

There is a very real need for application of the Hoover Commission-type ap-

proach to the problems we face. Although NATO has achieved a significant posture of defense, Western Europe is presently split into two rival economic groups—the European Common Market and the European Free Trade Association. If these two groups continue their divergent ways, the consequent military unity and economic disunity could turn NATO into an unworkable anomaly. It could weaken our joint defense and also harm our foreign trade.

This resolution has developed impressive support. It has already been approved by the Senate and was reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs by unanimous vote. As stated in the committee report:

The strength of a democracy lies in an enlightened citizenry. The resources of a democracy include the ability to call upon its citizens to contribute their thinking to the common good.

The cost is small in comparison with potential savings that could be accomplished as a result of their efforts. Testifying in support of the resolution, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Percival F. Brundage, estimated that "the overall saving, if we were to accomplish a real effective coordination to the extent of unified forces, common bases, common weapons, and a common master plan, could amount to more than \$10 billion a year." Mr. Brundage added that "the strength that lies in Atlantic unity has rightly been called our vast untapped reserve of power."

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the passage of this resolution will make possible a very effective additional effort to promote improved conditions in the North Atlantic community that will add materially and significantly to our collective defense strength. I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when Dr. Streit appeared before our committee in advocacy of the resolution now before us he referred to the fact that the Constitution of the United States was not the product of a convention of specialists. It was indeed far from that. It is doubtful that a convention composed exclusively of the ablest political economists of the age could have produced the imperishable document that the experience of the decades has proved to be the place among the political documents of the ages of the Constitution of the United States of America. The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States came from all the walks of life, and they had had the experiences of men facing many problems in many activities of human existence. These human experiences gave them understanding, and above all an understanding of good intentions but coupled with human frailties and from this understanding came the Constitution of the United States.

Dr. Streit pointed out two members of our committee, one the chairman and the other a top ranking member of the minority, Dr. MORGAN and Dr. JUDD. They are both pre-eminent in the medi-

cal profession and they are both family physicians. It is no disparagement of the specialist and of the great contribution he has made to medical progress, but it is the family physician who keeps the family on its feet and who ministers to its need for medical attention, in minor and in major ailments the clock around and on every day of the calendar.

Dr. Streit's presentment and his analogy made a tremendous impression upon me. What the world most needs today is an assurance of peace. I am 78 and I have very much less to lose than a young man of 18. Yet the young man of 18 is in exactly the same position as am I at 78 if on a flash an atomic war is sprung. I am 78 and I want to live. I do not want my future, however short it might prove along the way of natural causes, made shorter by an atomic bomb. How much greater is the stake of the young man of 18.

Mr. Chairman, you get people together from all of the NATO countries, and this thought I know will be uppermost in their minds. They need not be specialists. The big thing is that they would be human beings with backgrounds of human experiences. They would have no authority to authorize any sort of a program. Their principal function would be to get together and to talk together, and, Mr. Chairman, when you get people with good hearts and with a common interest and from many countries getting together and talking and thinking things out you are going to make real progress in finding the path to peace. That is my faith. If one does not believe in people one cannot believe in God, and if one believes neither in God nor people he is hopeless.

I hope the resolution will be adopted overwhelmingly. It may mean spending a little money. Perhaps as much as the wee fraction of the cost of an atomic bomb or a battleship, a wee wee fraction thereof. But it will be one of the best investments for peace ever authorized by this Congress. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I am 78 and I want to go on a little longer. In voting for this resolution I am voting for something that I think is a real contribution to my chance of not having my life abruptly cut short by an atomic war at the early age of 78.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution to create a U.S. Citizens Commission to develop constructive and practical ideas toward greater political and economic cooperation between the NATO countries.

The unified cohesive force established by the NATO nations must be continually fortified and encouraged at all levels. The exploration of mutual political and economic problems discussed realistically by thoughtful and responsible citizens can be very useful and the combined thinking of all on these problems will inevitably enhance one of our foremost bastions against Soviet aggression.

I support this resolution enthusiastically.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I had not anticipated using any time on this, but I think perhaps if I take 3 or 4 minutes I might answer some questions that seem to be in the minds of some Members as to how far reaching this may be.

When this was originally proposed, it was much more far reaching than the resolution before you today. While I do not wish to take any undue credit, I think I can honestly say I had as much or more to do with toning the matter down to the point where we think it will work on a problem that needs to be worked on; that is, the implementation of section 2 of the Atlantic Charter.

As I said in either the first or second of the NATO Parliamentary Conferences, the nations of the Atlantic Community have shown for the first time that they can have a military alliance which will hold together for a period of 10 years or more. It has been longer than that now, of course. But I think in the case of a depression or recession which reached worldwide proportions, other nations have not shown that they could stand together at all. On the contrary, as I said, they have not only not stood together but they have actually fallen apart, and they have blamed each other for their economic situation. I think all of us have heard often enough of the Communist propaganda that the way they expect to win is through economic pressure and the economic cold war. I think we have seen enough of Khrushchev's tactics to show that he is trying to divide the free nations on an economic basis.

We have a NATO organization set up. It has at least done the job it was supposed to do militarily, but what happens when economic pressure is being put on; and if we get it, coupled with a depression, then the opportunity for the Communists is ripe, and do we have any defense for it?

What I do hope this Committee would try to do is to seek some of the answers to that problem. That is why I tried to direct the resolution of the Atlantic Congress along those lines, and that is why I think we have a bill today which will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CORBETT. I just wanted the gentleman to emphasize that he agrees with the fact that the NATO alliance is the real alliance of the free world against the Communist world.

Mr. HAYS. I agree with the gentleman, and I think it is the one alliance in the world which has stood the test of time and which has shown that when among nations there is the will to make an organization work, it will work.

Mr. CORBETT. Would not the gentleman agree that if NATO could be broken up this would give the Russians as much pleasure as anything?

Mr. HAYS. I think that is most obvious in their propaganda, because you do not issue propaganda against something that does not bother you; you do not oppose something that is not doing you any harm, real or imagined; you do not want to disturb something that is not thwarting your purpose, but it seems the one thing they are most anxious to destroy is NATO.

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

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives acting jointly are hereby authorized, after consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, to appoint a United States Citizens Commission on NATO, hereafter referred to as the Commission. Said Commission shall consist of not to exceed twenty United States citizens, not more than one-half of whom may be from any one political party, and who shall be appointed from private life.

(b) Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to reemphasize that this resolution came out of the Senate committee by a vote of 8 to 7, the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body. It passed the Senate by a close vote, 51 to 44. I was amazed to see that kind of vote in the Senate where with the greatest of ease they usually pass resolutions of this kind.

I am sure that every Member of the House is for peace, and every Member of the House is against the spread of communism; but here we are about to set up a new commission to cost \$300,000. There are plenty of places in the Third District of Iowa where we could use \$300,000, and I am sure that this is true of Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and all the congressional districts of the country.

The passage of this resolution and the appointment of the commission would give it some flavor of official standing for 20 private citizens to go hither and yon over the face of the earth. Most of these advisory bodies, after touring the world, come back to this country and start propagandizing for bigger and better foreign giveaway appropriations, and so on and so forth.

I should like to ask somebody a question, and I do not care who answers it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PASSMAN. About 2 years ago we had a man by the name of Draper who handled a committee. We thought Mr. Draper would go out and find ways to save money but, rather than finding ways to save money, he came back and recommended an increase of \$400 million in the military program. I wonder if Draper had anything to do with this commission, or did he testify for it in either the House committee or the Senate committee?

Mr. GROSS. The record shows that Mr. Draper was one of the principal witnesses in favor of this resolution before the Senate.

Mr. PASSMAN. I recommend that the House take a long look at the recommendation of this committee if Mr. Draper had anything to do with it, because ultimately we will wind up by spending more money.

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

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman can answer the question as to what concrete contributions the NATO Parliamentary Conference or the Interparliamentary Union or any of the rest of these high-flying junketing outfits already in operation, have made to the cause of peace or stopping the spread of communism?

Mr. HAYS. They brought this resolution before the House. That is one concrete contribution.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought the answer would be.

Mr. HAYS. Another one is that the NATO Parliamentary Conference was instrumental in setting up in Brussels the international study graduate group, which is financed by contributions from industry. Not a dime of Government money in it. I can inform the gentleman of some more things.

I would like to speak about what the gentleman from Louisiana said. You cannot hold it against a bill because somebody you do not like testified for it, or against it. I am not going to desert the Democratic Party because the gentleman from Louisiana has deserted it, and I do not think the Democratic Party is going to founder because he is against it. Let us not get engaged in that kind of business.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that the Democratic Party deserted me, I did not desert the Democratic Party, and if they will come back where we started when we formed the Democratic Party they will find me there waiting.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. Gross) Mr. PASSMAN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to have the record show that I have no personal dislike for Mr. Draper. I am not dealing in personalities. I am talking about

American taxpayers' dollars. We expected Mr. Draper to come in with a recommendation that would save money when he testified for such before another committee, but rather than come in with a recommendation to save money he came in with a recommendation to spend more money, and I am afraid he will do likewise if this is passed.

Mr. GROSS. I have no personal antipathy toward Mr. Draper, but I wish he would stay down in Mexico where his power company is, and run that instead of propagandizing the Congress of the United States to spend additional billions on bigger and better foreign giveaway programs and more free trade, in both instances imposing added burdens on the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. HAYS. As far as General Draper is concerned, I have no brief for him or against him, but if this legislation passes the Speaker of the House is going to appoint a certain number, and the President of the Senate will appoint a certain number. If you people who object to any individual have any influence with the Speaker you are free to lay it before him. As far as I am concerned, I have a great deal of confidence in the judgment of the Speaker to appoint the right people, and I have the same confidence in the man who may be elected Vice President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot yield further for a political discussion. You had your Democrat political convention out in Los Angeles.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Iowa is sincere in his presentation. He has mentioned General Draper as being one of the prime sponsors. It is my understanding that General Draper was invited to testify in the other body. He did not seek to testify.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care whether he was invited or hauled in, it does not make any difference.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. He was there to report on the Atlantic Conference, and I hope the vote on this resolution will not depend on one individual. The gentleman mentioned that the committee of the other body voted 8 to 7.

Mr. GROSS. The trouble is, I will say to my friend from Wisconsin, that we find the same individuals, appearing before the committees all the time promoting the establishment of these advisory commissions which invariably become propaganda mouthpieces.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman mentioned the vote that was taken in the other body.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to finish my statement. Can the gentleman get me a little more time?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman mentioned the very close vote by which this resolution passed the other body. I am sure the gentleman is cognizant that the vote was not on the merit of the resolution but the procedure in the Foreign Relations Committee in the other body. I hope that the resolution before us this afternoon will be acted upon on the merits rather than on the likes or dislikes of any individual.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot agree with the gentleman. If the gentleman will go to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, June 15, 1960, he will find plenty of debate in the other body as to the merits of this resolution. And, I can cite the pages to the gentleman, but I do not believe that is necessary.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The subject came up of Mr. Draper being invited to testify, and I would like to read a brief statement from page 4 of the Senate hearings:

Neither our honorary chairman, Lewis W. Douglas, nor our genial chairman, Eric Johnson, can be in Washington today. If they could be present, they would both testify in favor of this resolution.

Now, it seems to me I remember a Mr. Johnson lobbying in support of some of these propositions. Is this an attempt to get another \$100,000 for lobbying?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman mentioned Eric Johnson. He is a front runner in all of this sort of thing and one of the reasons is that he is employed by an industry which has a big financial stake in the exporting of movies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why fail to mention Paul Hoffman? He is a bigger spender.

Mr. GROSS. I have seen his footprints in most of these deals.

Mr. HAYS. All I can say, if you quit berating Congressmen, then we can have a vote upon it.

Mr. GROSS. I have not berated any Member of Congress. Once in a while we ought to deal with things around here without reference to politics. Here we are dealing with the taxpayers' money. It is proposed to dig into the taxpayers' pockets for \$300,000 for a Citizens Commission, and I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that the NATO Parliamentary Conference apparently is not worth its salt or there would be no need to even suggest that a bunch of citizens be organized for the alleged purpose of giving advice.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman if an atomic war comes and it is not prevented and it happens here, there will not be anybody around to worry

about the gentleman and the taxpayers and so on.

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

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that in connection with mutual security and other foreign aid programs we now have 72 separate committees and everyone recommending additional expenditures in their reports?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. And, if you want to know how many international organizations we have, get this year's Appropriations Committee hearings on the Departments of State and Justice. Beginning on page 990, and page after page thereafter you will find listed the international organizations that the taxpayers of this country are supporting. You tell me what the citizens of this country get out of about 99% percent of these international organizations. Then, in Switzerland, U.S. taxpayers maintain an international organization to wet-nurse all international organizations. We are spending more than \$300,000 a year on this international set-up in Switzerland to provide liaison for the other international organizations. Incidentally, these hearings provide a list of assessments that have not been paid by other countries who are members of these international organizations. The NATO parliamentary organization is not yet old enough to have a record of unpaid assessments but give it time.

Mr. HAYS. The only country that has not paid this year up to date is the United States, and that is because of the recess, and the bill not being passed until this conference report was adopted today. So I presume that our contribution will be forthcoming. But everybody else in the organization has paid up to date, including 1960.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; there is not the slightest question that the United States will come up with its part of the funds; and with far more than any other country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much of what the gentleman talks about did we loan or give them? Here is a sheet that just came out from downtown which shows that between \$80 billion and \$90 billion have been given them since 1946. These are their own figures.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield; but before I do, I wish the gentleman would tell me why we maintain an international organization in Geneva to wet-nurse all these other organizations.

Mr. JUDD. I am not familiar with whatever one the gentleman has in mind.

The gentleman asked if anybody knew of any international organization that had not recommended greater spending. May I recall one to him. When the Marshall plan was proposed, the original amounts asked by the European countries were about \$31 billion for 4 years. Then there was set up the Office of European Economic Cooperation, OEEC consisting of recipients of the proposed aid.

They checked each other, reviewed the program and reduced the total requested to \$23 billion. Then they reviewed it again and got it down to \$17 billion. The Congress then authorized approximately that amount. But they used only about \$13 billion, as I recall. So a very substantial saving of almost \$20 billion was accomplished by that international commission.

Mr. GROSS. I had a letter the other day from a person who apparently would like to be on this commission, who said it might save \$10 billion. Does the gentleman think that this commission that he is proposing to establish would, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, save \$10 billion?

Mr. JUDD. If it makes some headway toward getting more security in the world, which would permit us to reduce our defense budget, that would be the best way, probably the only way, to make any substantial saving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has read the report of the Canadian Parliamentarians Conference held last year.

Mr. GROSS. No; but I anticipate that we will probably have to have a Citizens Commission for this new Canadian Parliamentarians Conference and also one for Mexico. Then will come Ghana, the Congo, and a host of others.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has read the report of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference here in Washington last year.

Mr. GROSS. I have read I think all or parts of most of the reports of these junketing organizations. I have yet to find one that was worth reading.

Mr. BARRY. I am familiar with both of those NATO Parliamentarian Conferences and I think they resolved many differences between this country and Canada.

Mr. GROSS. Name them.

Mr. BARRY. The boundary dispute between Canada and the United States.

Mr. GROSS. How much did we spend on that?

Mr. BARRY. It is not a matter of how much was spent. It was a matter of resolving differences.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will go through the record he will probably find that we have had a longstanding Boundary Commission, and other groups dealing with Canada.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no justification for the establishment of this new Commission, especially since there is already a parliamentary group as an adjunct to NATO, and we are surfeited with international organizations of one stripe or another. Is there no regard for

the taxpayers of this country and their ability to pay all these bills? This is one more vehicle to provide junkets for private citizens and soft jobs at top pay for a staff of employees. Let the record show that I am unalterably opposed to this creation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to let our Republican friends over there deal with their own intramural troubles. I am going to talk a little bit about ours. About the only opposition I have heard to this from our side has come from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] who has disassociated himself from the party, wants it wiped out. The most important thing, he said in the press, was that the Democratic Party be defeated in 1960—if the press quoted him correctly. I understand that even up to and after the convention he was pretty active in the Democratic Party until some certain influences began to work on him. He told me the other day—he said, "I had to do this to save my seat." Do you know something? I think we can spare him a lot easier than we can spare the Democratic Party. And I am not so sure that the rest of the Democratic Party will not feel the same way when we have our caucus next year. The gentleman has a perfect right to oppose this, but he has the right to oppose it on legitimate grounds. There is nothing in this resolution, in any way, shape, or form that says that it is going to make any recommendation about spending money. As a matter of fact, the idea of setting it up was that it would not make any recommendations about spending money but it would make recommendations about how the NATO nations could cooperate better with each other.

I do not care if the gentleman opposes it or does not oppose it, but I think the testimony the gentleman offers should be evaluated in the light of its worth. That is the point I make.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Democratic Party could spare me, but I doubt if they could spare the distinguished gentleman from Ohio who would read a life-long Democrat out of the Party because he refuses to support and embrace a philosophy the Democratic Party has not heretofore advocated.

Let me say for the record that I enjoy playing rough; however, I did not get into this discussion to argue Louisiana politics, but I would be willing to do so if it were not that we must get along with the business under consideration. I have no apologies to offer for the fight I have made in behalf of the American taxpayer during my 14 years in the Congress.

Our total expenditures in the so-called foreign-aid program considering all phases now amount to in excess of \$103 billion since the end of World War II. I mentioned earlier a total of 72 or 82 commissions that have been brought into being since the inception of the foreign-

aid program. So far as I know, not a one of them ever recommended reducing foreign aid expenditures. Without exception they recommended increasing expenditures.

I shall never have to apologize to the American taxpayer for the position I take politically. Inasmuch as my friend from Ohio had to bring that up, I stand on the statement I made, and I make no apologies. It will be up to the electorate of Louisiana to decide whether I shall remain in the Congress, and not the gentleman from Ohio. If he had worked as hard to save the American taxpayer's dollar as I have in my 14 years here, then we would not owe a public debt of \$288 billion, nor would we have foreign aid in 76 of the other 86 nations of the world.

At the proper time I shall place in the RECORD what I have said about the party, its platform and its nominees. I will not be quoted out of context, and I shall ask no mercy of the gentleman from Ohio or any others in the Democratic Party.

I have never voted the Republican ticket in my life and do not plan to do so at this time, but that does not necessarily mean that I will support the Democratic ticket and the strange philosophies set forth in the platform, and I shall make no apologies for what I said. The gentleman from Louisiana will be in a position to take care of himself next January and the January following that. Let that be understood. We can discuss legislation here without dealing in personalities by bringing in a statement that the gentleman does not know too much more about than I know about surgery. I will ask him to wait and read the entire statement, if he so desires.

When the Draper committee was set up more than 2 years ago, I thought he would bring in a recommendation that would save some money in the foreign aid program, but he brought in a recommendation that resulted in more than \$400 million being spent in that year. The time has come when we should think about the American taxpayer. The other body upped the House bill by almost \$500 million, and just during the 5 weeks' respite from our legislation here the administration thought of ways by which they could spend an additional \$700 million over and above what they requested earlier. It is time to stop being a rubber stamp around here and stand up and fight some of these commissions and committees that ultimately bring in recommendations for larger and larger expenditures. This is the position I shall take as long as I am a Member of this Congress.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLYNT: Page 2, line 4, after "political party" strike out "and who shall be appointed from private life" and insert "five of whom shall be appointed from the United States Senate, five of whom shall be appointed from the United States House of Representatives, and ten of whom shall be appointed from private life."

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to the discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 170. I listened to the debate on the rule and I have listened to the general debate on the resolution itself. There is not a Member of the House of Representatives who does not concur in the objectives stated in the title of this joint resolution. We all yearn for the political and economic development of the Western allies which comprise NATO. Yet, I share the apprehension that has been expressed by a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the net result and the end result of this Commission will be to spend more money without bringing a justifiable return in any way—in security, or world peace, or in domestic tranquillity, or in the form of any financial returns to this country. I think it could, perhaps, under some circumstances perform a great service. I voted for the rule because I wanted to hear it debated. I am not certain at this time whether I shall oppose the resolution, but I am confident in its present form I shall not support Senate Joint Resolution 170. If I understood the discussion during general debate, I think I heard gentlemen from both sides of the aisle say that at the time this was before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs one or more of them desired to have a provision written into this resolution that one or more members of this Commission should be from the House of Representatives and that one or more should be from the U.S. Senate. If I misunderstood that, I certainly will yield for a correction at this time.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I said my proposal was that two Members be appointed from each of the two congressional bodies, assuming that one Member would be a Democrat and the other a Republican. The main purpose of that was the same as in the Hoover Commission. The Hoover Commission was a tripartite body—one group of members designated by the President, one by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one by the President of the Senate. Each of the two groups appointed by the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives had two Members of the House or Senate respectively. It seemed to us at that time, and I think it is wise now, to have two Members from each House on any such commission. I think the gentleman's proposal of five is too many. Not many of us have time to give the sustained attention to these matters and to make as thorough a study of them as the situation requires. But, two Members from each body, I think, would strengthen the committee and make it more practical in its recommendations.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think he has made the best argument that could be made for my amending which would provide for five Members from the House and five Members from the Senate on this Commission. The gentleman from

Minnesota knows the situation that prevails with the legislative program in Congress and that if we have only two Members from the House, one Democrat and one Republican, then it would be sometimes virtually impossible to have this body represented at a meeting of the Commission.

It is my purpose in having five from the House and five from the Senate that there would be reasonable certainty that the Congress of the United States would be represented whenever this Commission was in session.

I hope the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Wisconsin will support my amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. If Members of Congress who are paid a salary of \$22,500 would not have time to devote to this, I wonder how somebody serving without compensation is going to find time to do it.

Mr. FLYNT. I think the gentleman has made a very interesting observation, and I agree with his remarks.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to know if other countries have parliamentary representatives on this Commission.

Mr. FLYNT. I do not know, but I will say for one that I am interested in the national interest of the United States first and foremost and above any other nation on earth.

Mr. BARRY. Do you think that your amendment would be duplicating the NATO Parliamentary Conference where Members of this Congress and members of other Parliaments congregate? The Commission we are setting up here is a layman's group.

Mr. FLYNT. I will say to the gentleman from New York that if this Commission is going to perform any good, effective purpose on behalf of the people of the nations, it is worthy of having at least one member from each party from each House of the Congress in attendance whenever this Commission is meeting. I think the presence of Members of Congress from this and the other body would have the effect of strengthening this Commission in the event it is enacted into law.

Mr. BARRY. I am inclined to agree, but I think the ratio is a little high. You have got it very heavily weighted in favor of the legislative branch.

Mr. FLYNT. I will say to the gentleman in answer to the remarks made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that I thought he made as good an argument as I am doing now for the fact that we should have at least a proportion in order to guarantee that there would be a representative of Congress present whenever this Commission was in session.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLYNT was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. Should the gentleman have the assurance that the members appointed from Congress were as devoted to this assignment as they are to their committee assignments, would he then be willing to reduce the number from the Congress and increase the number of public members?

Mr. FLYNT. I would not, because I feel this amendment probably would guarantee a proportionate membership.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman justify this on any basis? If you put Members of the House and Senate on this Commission you have only duplicated the junketing which already exists.

Mr. FLYNT. I will have to say that I have not justified it yet. The resolution may pass and I want it to be in the best possible form in the best interests of the American taxpayers, if it does prevail.

Mr. GROSS. Let us lay the whole thing at rest and plant a bouquet on it and call it over.

Mr. FLYNT. I hope the gentleman will support my amendment.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. You hit very close to a vital matter, because the matter we are debating originated in an ex officio group. Then we are told this proposed conference will be held whether we are present or not. We are either obligated to go along with this or we give the appearance that we are not cooperating. I fear that each time we create another agency or function of this kind, we go further to getting our hands tied. We are forced to go along with the decisions made by ex officio groups.

I agree with the gentleman's thought. We have got to consider the national welfare of our own country first, then the welfare of these other nations.

Mr. FLYNT. I certainly thank the gentleman from Iowa for his observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman I am in sympathy with the general idea. One of the prime reasons I supported this resolution in the beginning was because I have found that in these international meetings which are planned to last a week or 10 days, they do not have the time to give the study to the propositions which may be advanced that the propositions need.

The gentleman knows there is a lot of criticism of Congress because it does not get its work completed in 5 or 6 months, but the gentleman also knows that the committees give very careful scrutiny and observation to the matters coming before them.

Can the gentleman tell me how the ideal of setting up this Commission, which was that it should meet for 3 or 4 months, if necessary, to give the proposals the kind of study, scrutiny, debate, and discussion they need, if he can tell me how Members of Congress can get away for such a length of time? That is the problem we are up against; how do you solve it?

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman for asking that question; it is a good question and I am going to try to answer it. First of all, I will say that the objective of having 10 Members of Congress of this Commission, 5 from this body and 5 from the other body, was to meet such a contingency and would be the only way possible through which there would be practically 1 Member of Congress, preferably 1 from each body, in attendance at every session that is held.

I believe the gentleman knows from his own able experience in participating as U.S. representative on the NATO interparliamentary group—and I congratulate him for the work he has done on it—I think that he certainly agrees that the experience which he and other Members of this body have gained and have learned in participation in this NATO group to which I just referred, that such experience would be of incalculable value to the best interests of the United States whenever this Commission meets. I certainly think that many Members of this House could serve a very great purpose if selected to serve on this Commission and I certainly include my friend from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman for the very complimentary things he has had to say about me and my colleagues, and I am inclined to agree with him that people who have had such experience would be valuable members of such a Commission, but I am confronted with the practical situation of how a Member of Congress could get away for the length of time that would be necessary.

Mr. FLYNT. Does not the gentleman feel that the interests of the United States would be increased and enhanced by having men of parliamentary experience representing this Nation on that commission?

Mr. HAYS. I do not think there is any question about it. But there are people available in private life who have had such experience, and it would be desirable that such people be picked. I certainly agree with the gentleman in principle but I am overwhelmed by how to solve the problem that is involved of a Member's getting away for such a long period of time.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution and I hope he, too, will support my amendment.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. I certainly congratulate the gentleman on his amendment. It seems to me the importance of the amendment does not lie in the fact that you need Members of the House or the Senate engaged in the associations or the preliminaries.

The important part of the gentleman's amendment is these Members of the House and Senate would have the power to refuse the recommendations which will be made eventually to this Congress. That is the important part of the gentleman's amendment, and I agree with him.

Mr. FLYNT. I feel it is an important part of the technical amendment which I have offered.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out in general debate, a similar proposal was given full consideration and study in the committee. The amendment was not adopted because at this late stage in the session the measure would die in conference. I am sure that the gentleman from Georgia will agree that any amendment offered at this time to the proposal in effect will kill the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. Just because the gentleman thinks it is so late in the session we cannot work this thing out, we should pass bad legislation?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Why not go ahead and defeat it now?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I disagree with the gentleman that it is bad legislation. Since it has been announced that the session may end within a week, the gentleman will agree with me that it would be impossible to have a conference report before adjournment.

In reference to membership on this commission of Members of the Senate and the House, I call to the attention of the gentleman from Georgia the fact that we have many able former Members of Congress who could serve on this commission. It is my understanding that in the Chamber at the present time is the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. Richards, who would be an excellent member and would serve with distinction on this commission.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to associate myself with the views expressed by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI]. As has been said heretofore, I prepared an amendment in committee to have two Members from the House and two from the Senate on this commission. But we are faced with a practical situation. I

accepted that situation in committee, and I accept it here. The main thing is to pass this legislation. If we accept amendments here today, the whole thing is likely to fall by the board. Therefore, I hope these amendments will not be adopted, and that any other amendments that may be offered will not be adopted. I hope the House will accept the bill as passed by the Senate, and recommended by our committee, and then we can go ahead and make some progress, I hope, in this important field.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to point out that we have an excellent man sitting back here, a distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Richards, who would make an ideal member of this commission. He has had experience in Congress, he has had experience as an ambassador. He is the only man I ever knew that they sent out to give away money, some \$200 million, and who brought some of that back with him. That would answer the economy end of the argument.

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Are we admitting that we have legislation that should be amended and could be amended, but on account of the lateness of the session we have to take it as is on account of getting a resolution through?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am not saying anything of the sort. I am pointing out that this is a meritorious piece of legislation. It received the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Perhaps it could be perfected. The question is whether a minor perfection should be adopted at the expense of the loss of the entire resolution.

Mr. PASSMAN. We cannot perfect the legislation on account of the lateness of the session, is that what the gentleman in effect said?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I said in effect, if we want to see the resolution passed, all amendments should be rejected. In my opinion any amendment would very likely kill the proposal for this session.

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

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

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, is it not true that several members of the committee in committee sessions expressed approval of the objective of my amendment?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes; but over and above the acceptance of the amendment the sponsors and committee considered the meritorious features and passage of the proposal during this session of Congress. Certainly, we do not want to lose the resolution at the expense of an amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. What is the urgency here after we have gotten along for 150 years without commissions of this kind?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to my remarks in general debate. I pointed out that we are living in a critical era. We need the counsel and assistance and wisdom of informed citizens. It is our hope that such citizens would be appointed to this commission. I am confident that the deliberations, discussions, and recommendations of the commission proposed by this legislation would be helpful in coping with world problems. I am sure that the gentleman will agree that the situation in the world is not very harmonious.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Does the gentleman feel that is best served by expediency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLYNT), there were—ayes 33, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I stated at the outset during consideration of the rule, I was willing to listen to the debate on this resolution and to consider it with an open mind. I have done that, and I have listened attentively. But, when we reach the point where we say that no amendment should be considered because it might defeat the bill, then we have reached the point where we should consider letting this important and novel proposal go over until such time as we can consider it with the due deliberation it deserves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an important matter, because it is going to set a pattern, as I will show you. In the first place, if I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly in response to my question when he was discussing the resolution, it was indicated that the Department of State was strongly in favor of it. Is that correct?

Mr. FULTON. I did not use the word "strongly." I said there had been no witness that the Department of State had favored it. I might say there was no witness from the Department of State or the Government that came up to the Hill before either committee—

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FULTON. The Department's position is contained on pages 1 and 2 of the Senate hearings and on the last page.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I have three amendments pending at the desk, and I do not want to find myself again in the position today that I was in in the past, where many Members took additional time and I was not given sufficient opportunity to present my amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object at this time, since the gentleman from Illinois is not present, I will object to any further requests for additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred twenty-two members are present, a quorum.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania clarifying his statement that the Secretary was in favor of this and calling our attention to the Senate hearings, because I have looked at the Senate hearings and I have found this to be the fact. By letter of May 28, 1959, Mr. Macomber, Assistant Secretary in the Department, replied that:

The NATO Parliamentarians Conference is itself a new institution and the forthcoming Atlantic Congress is an even more recent initiative. In fact, the entire very remarkable development of NATO in the last few years, particularly in the field of political consultation, is a new process in a state of growth and development.

And then in italic is this statement:

The Department therefore suggests that action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 be deferred.

Then under date of August 25, 1959, just 4 months later we see another letter from the same gentleman, Mr. Macomber, being written and this letter says:

The Department has no objection,

They continue to kick it back and forth some time. I shall not read the letter at length, but I have here the colloquy in the Senate immediately after its insertion in the record.

Senator GREEN. Are these letters favorable?

The CHAIRMAN (the Senator from Arkansas). They are not unfavorable. In brief, the Department takes the position that they have no opposition.

Senator GREEN. They are noncommittal?

The CHAIRMAN. The nearest I can state is that they say they have no opposition to the resolution.

Senator GREEN. This means it is favorable.

The CHAIRMAN. The letter speaks for itself.

Then we find that it gets down to this. The State Department says that the executive wants no part of this. They say in effect, if you leave us out entirely we will not interpose opposition. In other words, the executive is not about to turn over its affairs to some 20 people from among the citizenry of the United States. I submit, why should the elected Representatives of those people, the Congress of the United States, turn its powers or responsibilities over to any such group? And why should they do it by giving the taxpayers' money to such a group to go out and hold this Congress or convention or whatever you want to call it and give these 20 citizens full discretion as to whether they report at all and to whom they report, and so forth. If the executive branch is not going to turn its powers over to them and is afraid of such a situation as this, does not want anything to do with it, why should we as the elected Representatives of the people be willing to create such an agency, using the taxpayers' money, and give them the authority of Congress to go out, then come back with a report or reports if they in their sole discretion so elect and set up another lobby such as we had set up after our more recent commissions, to carry out their recommendations.

I suggest to you that the lobby is already at work. The lobby went to work between the dates of these two letters from the State Department in May and in August, to get the Department to change its position and at least interpose no objection. I suggest to you that those people are already at work, figuring out, getting recommendations of who might serve. They are very fine people, but they are not elected to represent the United States. They are not agents of the U.S. Government. And here is the great danger, as I see it. It is this: If there is one thing we need, and I agree in this respect with some critics of our foreign policy, it is to have clear-cut lines of authority and lines of responsibility. But how are you going to maintain or obtain that when you have people that are not responsible to the Congress although they are appointed by it, and who have nothing to do with the executive, meeting in a convention and coming up with reports and recommendations?

How many of you remember the Conference on Education and how it was used and manipulated to lobby for Federal aid to education. Yes; the Hoover Commission as the first such a commission did a splendid job, but there we had a committee formed to carry out the recommendation of the Hoover Commission. Others seeing the success have seized upon this as a vehicle for getting through about every pet scheme imaginable. This becomes a taxpayer-paid lobby to lobby the Congress, and

we are appropriating the taxpayers' money to pay for it. If you please we are hiring a lobby to lobby the Congress in many instances.

Look at what this joint resolution sets up. There are no guidelines as to what they shall do or anything else. They are responsible to no one. They are required to report only as they themselves see fit. The joint resolution states that the Commission is "to submit such reports as it deems appropriate."

I admire the gentleman from Minnesota. He made a very persuasive argument about the need to discuss world situations and how they could possibly come up with some solutions. But I find that original Senate Resolution 17 expressly provided that this Commission would be "designed to achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing economic and political affairs, joint defense, and the aims of world peace and individual freedom."

In the joint resolution before us "aims of world peace and individual freedom" have been stricken from the bill. The only thing they can do, as is stated on page 2 of the joint resolution, is to hold conferences to explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means. The rest is stricken.

Then I begin to wonder who is promoting this. I find Mr. Draper, Eric Johnston, and others who have contacted me on one occasion or another. I am happy to have their opinion. I do not happen to agree with them. They are the ones who are promoting this economic and political cooperation. I think that is fine, but their idea of such seems to be more foreign aid at our taxpayers' expense and giving up more of our American products and jobs to foreign imports. I wonder if there are going to be some recommendations for more economic cooperation whereby this country opens further its trade doors and other countries shut theirs to us. I wonder which one of these NATO countries it is that needs this economic help I heard mentioned. It seems to me they are all doing great. Their economies are advancing, with one exception, and I recognize that one exception. In that case they do not now have a legislature to appoint anybody to go to this convention. But look at Italy, Germany, England, and so forth. Their economies are going up, up, up. So I think we have been doing pretty well in helping them.

I am very happy to see us develop greater political cooperation and greater economic cooperation, but I should like to see it done within the framework of the Constitution of the United States of America by an executive department that is elected by the people with the regular appointive officers and with treaties confirmed by the Senate of the United States. Above all, I do not want to see the Congress of the United States give up its power by adding agencies and commissions like this, appointed with no responsibilities or guidelines, to make policy, to write reports, and propagandize at taxpayers' expense as they

see fit. There are no controls on the spending of this \$300,000. So my position is simply this: that I think we would do well to let this go over until next session and give us time to give it the deliberate consideration it deserves. If it is to be considered at all, we should know more about it. I fear it embarks us on a dangerous course that might well threaten our very liberty and our constitutional government.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to recall some history for you. I am sure all of you remember the Hague Conference of 1949. That was a citizens' group from all the countries that are now the NATO nations. It met at a time of strict military emergency. One of the recommendations which came out of that and which was ultimately enacted into a working organization was what is now called NATO. This simply proposes a smaller, more workable group of people to sit down and give some thought to the problems confronting these NATO nations in a different field of activity.

I certainly do not envisage that this organization will call upon us to make any contributions to the NATO countries. I would think it would be more likely it would call upon the NATO countries to join with us and carry some of the burden of fighting this economic cold war. I have been led to believe by what I have read in the press and by what I have heard in other places that some of these countries are willing to do this if there is some kind of meeting of the minds as to how to do it. Now the gentleman expresses great fears because this is a nongovernmental body. I am sure he is sincere. I think that is a legitimate point to be raised. I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee on the State Department and one of the things that these people tell our subcommittee in the Committee on Foreign Affairs many times is that they do not have the time to sit down and give the thought to some of these problems that they would like to because they are so busily involved in the day-to-day operation of the Department of State. I would like to say to the gentleman in all honesty and sincerity, in answer to what I know is an honest fear, that this specifically spells out that we are not going to bind the executive to anything and we are not going to bind the Congress to anything, and that we are going to try to have these people, and I would hope that some of them would be the kind of people we had at the Atlantic Congress, like the president of the University of Pittsburgh and the president of the University of Minnesota and the president of the University of Alabama, who are three that I remember, who would give of their fine brains and of their time to think out some proposed solutions to some of these problems to lay before the Congress and to lay before the executive. Then, if we do not like them, we do not have to take any of them. But I think the gentleman will agree that all of us are pressed for time to think about these problems. This is an effort to get the job done by some of the best people that we can talk into doing this for the good

of the country and for the good of the free world. It is just as simple as that.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Does the gentleman envision this as a continuing setup?

Mr. HAYS. No; the gentleman does not envision this as a continuing setup. The gentleman envisions this as a one shot or, at most, a two-shot operation; perhaps, a meeting and then a recess for the national delegations to get together and then a final meeting and recommendations. I certainly would not ever envision it as being a continuing body. I do not think very many people in the Atlantic Congress who proposed the resolution so envisioned it. I heard nobody express an opinion that it would be a continuing body.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Dr. Litchfield testified on page 6 of your hearings. He was the leadoff witness on this and he said:

What one such convention would do I think is limited. I think it would do a great deal to help citizens in the various parts of these countries to talk together.

He further said:

I think this is another of many, many steps that are essential in gradually building a Western culture into a closer understanding.

Mr. HAYS. Of course, he has the right to speak his own opinion, but I just do not feel that a continuing organization of this kind is what we want to set up. I do not envision that as being set up by this resolution. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] that I would not be in favor of continuing it unless it can show some overwhelming progress and some overwhelming reason to continue it for another year.

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has correctly stated that this commission would have no authority to speak for any governmental body, either legislative or executive, of these United States. And, certainly, we want it that way. But, is it not also true that the Congress would not in the slightest degree be delegating on limiting any of its powers when it appoints this commission?

Mr. HAYS. Of course, it would not. It would be just like the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body when they hire universities and other organizations to make studies of certain facets of foreign policy matters. The Members do not have the time to make such studies themselves. There are a great many things that I would like to have my subcommittee study. We have two or three proposed studies before us, but the problem is when can we get them done?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one point—that there are many good precedents for this sort of ad hoc commission. Next January there will be a conference here in Washington called by the President to consider the problems of the aging. This is also a citizens' group, set up by the executive branch, to study all the facts and facets and factors of the problems of our elderly citizens. It will have no authority. It will make recommendations, which I hope the Congress will find useful. They will be considered by the proper committees of the Congress. If the committees approve them, they will formulate appropriate bills, report them to the Congress, and the Congress then can vote them up or down as the majority deems wise.

We had the Hoover Commission a decade ago to study the various agencies within our own Government and the relations between them. The Congress did not surrender any power when it established that Commission. The findings of the Hoover Commission were studied by the proper committees of the Congress. The recommendations which the committees thought to be desirable were worked into legislation and brought before the Congress and the Congress worked its will.

I cannot see how anybody can find any danger in this proposal to appoint 20 distinguished, public-minded, public-spirited citizens of the United States to sit down with 80 citizens of other NATO countries to study our relations with the other countries of the NATO area in terms of our present world situation. It is not in any sense to increase the burden the United States is carrying. It is an attempt to share the burden by pooling our strengths, that is, to get help in carrying the burden. The dangers are infinitesimal compared to the benefits that may be gained. So I hope we will go ahead and pass this resolution.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this resolution and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the resolution and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my approach to this legislation is one of trust in peace. I think we are living in very serious times. I think if we are going to find a solution we must go not to the legislative halls but to the grass roots. So I welcome this suggestion that 20 Americans, not Americans in public office, Americans perhaps in the ministry, in education, in the professions

in the various fields, to meet with people from other lands in the countries friendly to us, and in their talks together perhaps find a solution for our own problems.

I am not in favor of study groups. They get nowhere, only kill time. I am not in favor of expenditures of money unnecessarily, but it seems to me, just as a matter of commonsense, that while we still have hope of reaching our objective of peace we should encourage this bringing together—not dressing them up with authority—they are only getting together as people talking together. Certainly I think this is only commonsense that we should view with sympathy and pass this resolution.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that time for debate has been limited. I have three amendments I sincerely believe will improve this bill.

Time after time there has been an extension of time here again today in general debate by members of the committee and others, yet when we come down to reading the bill there is an attempt to cut off debate. I think it is unfair and unjustified especially to Members who have amendments they wish to offer. At the proper time when the Clerk reaches that portion of the bill I shall offer my amendments but I will explain them briefly at this point.

Paragraph 3 on page 3 of the bill provide that there shall be 10 employees of this commission and that compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of the Congress. That would mean that under that provision \$176,000 could be used for the employment of personnel.

My amendment would limit it and provide that the total payment shall not exceed \$50,000. Fifty thousand dollars is enough to spend and give them enough money to hire experts and their stenographic staff.

My second amendment is in paragraph 5 which provides that the United States shall pay its share of the expenses and limits the amount to \$100,000. My amendment would add to that "or not over 20 percent of the total." With the number of nations in this we should not pay over 20 percent of the total.

My third and last amendment is to section 4 and would require the members of the commission to make the same report on travel as Members of Congress are required to make under the bill which we passed not long ago.

It seems to me these are proper amendments of limitation of funds.

Look at the resolution. The total authorized to be appropriated is not to exceed \$300,000. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] has said these people may sit for 3 or 4 months. If they sit for 3 or 4 months being paid a per diem,

travel expenses, especially if they are 3 or 4 months traveling abroad, staying at high-priced hotels, that \$300,000 will melt away and they will be back in a supplemental for additional funds.

It seems to me proper at the very start that we have definite limitations on what they can spend. I know from my own experience as a member of a Subcommittee on Appropriations where we have to deal with money authorizations for commissions. We appropriate the full amount, but it is not long before they come back with a supplemental and with additional authorization for an increase in the payments. I think these amendments are needed; I think they are liberal. They would allow them \$50,000 for clerical and professional staff; limit to 20 percent of the total our contribution; and the members of the commission are required to file the same kind of reports to the House as Members are required to file under the legislation we passed before the recent adjournment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio care to offer his amendments?

Mr. BOW. I did not know the Clerk had reached that portion of the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the balance of the resolution will be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

There was no objection.

(The balance of the resolution follows:)

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of such Commission to endeavor to arrange for and to participate in such meetings and conferences with similar citizens commissions in the NATO countries as it may deem necessary in order to explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means.

(b) The United States Citizens Commission on NATO is not in any way to speak for or to represent the United States Government.

SEC. 3. To promote the purposes set forth in section 2, the Commission is hereby authorized—

(1) to communicate informally the sense of this resolution to parliamentary bodies in NATO countries;

(2) to seek to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary;

(3) to employ and fix the compensation of such temporary professional and clerical staff as it deems necessary: *Provided*, That the number shall not exceed ten: *And provided further*, That compensation shall not exceed the maximum rates authorized for committees of the Congress;

(4) to submit such reports as it deems appropriate; and

(5) to pay its share of such expenses as may be involved as a consequence of holding any meetings or conferences authorized by subparagraph (2) above, but not in excess of \$100,000.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission, who shall serve without compensation, shall be reimbursed for, or shall be furnished, travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their

duties under this joint resolution, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of said Commission.

SEC. 5. Not to exceed \$300,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State to carry out the purposes of this resolution, payments to be made upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds. The Commission shall make semiannual reports to Congress accounting for all expenditures.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall cease to exist on January 31, 1962.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendments and ask that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Bow: On page 3, line 8, after "Congress", insert a semicolon and the following: "Provided, further, That the total compensation shall not exceed \$50,000."

Page 3, line 14, after "\$100,000" insert "and not to exceed 20 percent of the total cost."

Page 3, line 20, after "commission", insert "and shall be subject to the provisions of section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961".

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I favor the last amendment, but oppose the first two. I do not believe the chairman put to the Committee the question whether there was any objection. I do object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] offered three amendments, and he asked unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

Mr. FULTON. That was not put to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That question has not been put to the Committee. Is there objection?

Mr. FULTON. I object to their being considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOW. That is, on the three amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. That is on all three amendments, under the unanimous consent agreement already entered into.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLYNT yielded the time allotted him to Mr. Bow.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dowdy yielded the time allotted him to Mr. Bow.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I shall repeat what I said in the well a few minutes ago as to this amount, particularly the first amendment, which I think is very important.

The provision says they may have not to exceed 10 staff members. There is no limitation. It has not been stated that they shall be appointed according to the Civil Service classifications or rules, or the classifications of the State Department. It simply says they may have 10 and that the compensation shall not

exceed the maximum rate authorized for committees of the Congress.

The maximum rate authorized by the committees of Congress is \$17,600. So you see we do have a chance of spending \$176,000 of the total of \$300,000 to be used for payment of the staff. My amendment limits this to \$50,000 a year. They can hire experts with that, and stenographers and clerks, and that is sufficient to carry on the work.

We know there are certain instances of groups where the United States is paying much more than its fair share for the maintenance of these commissions. I know one that appeared before our committee where we are paying 98 or 99 percent of the total cost. It seems to me that just saying "we shall pay our share" is not sufficient. We should say what that share shall be. This is an important amendment, the second one. We say that share shall not exceed 20 percent of the total.

We have that \$100,000, which is a limitation, but still we should get down to the 20 percent and let the other countries know how much we would be able to contribute.

Number 4, on the reports of the commission. We should make them provide the same reports that Members of Congress make on travel expenses.

Mr. Chairman, the argument is going to be made again that if any amendments are adopted to this bill, there will be no bill. I must join with others who have said that we have a bill that should be amended. We should spell out the facts in the bill. Certainly we should not pass it if it is a bad bill merely because we are close to the end of the session. That is no reason for passing bad legislation.

If we pass this today, these are simple amendments and it would be a very simple thing to call the Senate conferees, get them together and agree or disagree to an amendment such as this. I cannot understand why we cannot pass this bill today with amendments, get the conferees together and clear it up. It can be done and it should be done in order to have legislation that is proper so that we can understand the manner in which the taxpayers' funds are going to be used.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with what the gentleman from Ohio is seeking to do. But I think that his amendments are unnecessarily restrictive. The first amendment sets a limit of \$50,000 on the salaries of up to 10 people to do the staff work. That is too small. The commission will be crippled and ineffective unless it has good staff workers. This would allow \$5,000 each per year. Now, just where can you get competent and able persons at \$5,000 apiece?

Or if three top grade staff men were appointed for the salary necessary for such men, they would have no secretarial help. The limitation of \$300,000 on total expenditures is surely adequate to prevent extravagance. If we are to set up a commission and expect it to

do a good job, it seems to me it ought to have flexibility within the overall limitation to decide how much should go for staff and how much for travel expenses and how much for per diem for commission members, and so on. I cannot believe that when we consider the world dangers for which we are appropriating some \$44 million each year to try to maintain our security in peace, we should skimp on how much of the total is to go for technical staff. I do not want to set up a commission at all unless it is able to hire the very best people available. I cannot think of anything more penny wise and pound foolish than to put in this limitation which might save \$10,000 here or \$40,000 there at the possible cost of losing several billion dollars in the end.

So, first, I think the amendments are too restrictive and, second, if we add amendments today, we are practically dooming this legislation to an untimely death as far as this session of the Congress is concerned. For those two reasons, I hope the amendments will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLYNT. Was not objection made to the request that they be voted on en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is now taking a vote on the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 3, line 8, after "Congress", insert "And provided further, That the total compensation shall not exceed \$50,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 38, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 3, line 14, after "\$100,000" insert "and not to exceed 20 percent of the total cost."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 40, noes 58.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. ZABLOCKI.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 45, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 3, line 20, after "Commission", insert "and shall be subject to the provisions of section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the funds under this resolution will be expended on vouchers signed by the chairman of the commission. Further, all funds expended will be subject to the rules and regulations governing the accountability of obligations and expenditures made under the jurisdiction of the State Department. Such accounts are subject to review by the Comptroller General. Wherever it is possible for the commission to meet its expenses through the use of local currency, the commission will use appropriated dollars to purchase such currencies.

So we do have adequate control. I looked this up after the amendment was offered, and there is adequate control.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 4, line 3, strike the period, and insert a colon in the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this resolution or of the funds available for expenditure for any individual included in this resolution, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation proposed or pending before Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment I have offered to a number of appropriation bills in this session of Congress and in previous sessions of Congress. In almost every instance they have either been accepted by the chairmen of the committees or adopted by the House. I would hope that the chairman of this subcommittee and the ranking minority member would accept this amendment. It would make certain that this outfit could not be used for propaganda purposes, at least with respect to Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 43, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, it is not without reservation that I oppose this measure. Its purposes are all to the good. However, it is my general feeling that diversification and decentralization of the conduct of our international affairs leads to confusion.

Matters which have to do with this country's relations with other countries that fall within the general purview of international law I feel should be handled by our Department of State which has been established constitutionally for this purpose. It is in adherence to that principle of organization that I oppose the measure.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the breakdown of personal diplomacy in the conduct of our foreign affairs during these past several weeks has sharpened the ideological, political and economic struggle now going on throughout the entire world. The situation is grave indeed, but not without real hope. Perhaps two things of positive good in the interest of freedom and justice across the face of the earth can yet be accomplished as a result of the diplomatic disappointments of the past several weeks: First, it might well be that we have had pointed out to us in a way more dramatic than otherwise might have been possible the aims and tactics of the international Communist movement. Writing in his book, "The Real Soviet Russia," the late Joseph Stalin said:

Words must have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron.

Certainly the events from Camp David to the ill-fated summit meeting in Paris, to the postsummit events in the Far East, bear out in bold detail this statement. Second, it could bring about at an even earlier date than might have otherwise been thought possible a convention among NATO members to explore further NATO cooperation in the vitally important fields of economic and political action.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that NATO is strong militarily and prepared for the military defense of Western Europe. However, all is not so muscular with other aspects of NATO endeavor and I refer to such matters as the various economic, monetary and political problems of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These economic, monetary and political factors are equally as important to the functioning of NATO as is the military strength of NATO. All of these facets are interrelated and go to make up the whole pattern of North Atlantic defense. The argument may be put forward, Mr. Chairman, that we have held numerous other NATO conferences and this is true. However, the fact is that these previous conferences have tackled the problem piecemeal and none have tackled them as a whole. If NATO is ever to function as an integrated entity with all its component parts making their own peculiar and significantly needed contribution to this defense alliance, we need a "Committee on the Whole" which will wrestle with the problems involved from the beginning to the end as a whole and not on a piecemeal basis.

I urge affirmative action on this proposal. If we seek strength today in the unity of the North Atlantic community

we shall show Moscow that we are in no frame of mind to make huge unilateral concessions. Visible and within our grasp, we have the possibility of building such military, economic and moral strength that the Communists will not dare challenge our position of freedom in the North Atlantic community. We can yet prove this union to be one of the world's most potent influences toward peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bass of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration 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, pursuant to House Resolution 587, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. GROSS. I am unequivocally opposed to it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit Senate Joint Resolution 170 to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with the following amendment: On page 4, line 3, strike the period and insert a colon and add the following: "Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this resolution or of the funds available for expenditure for any individual included in this resolution, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation proposed or pending before Congress."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 289, nays 103, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—289

Adair	Foley	Miller, Clem
Addonizio	Forand	Miller,
Albert	Ford	George P.
Allen	Frazier	Miller, N.Y.
Anderson,	Frelinghuysen	Milliken
Mont.	Friedel	Moeller
Anfuso	Fulton	Monagan
Arends	Gallagher	Moore
Ashley	Garmatz	Moorhead
Aspinall	Gathings	Morgan
Auchincloss	George	Morris, Okla.
Avery	Gialmo	Moss
Ayres	Gilbert	Moulder
Baker	Granahan	Multer
Baldwin	Gray	Mumma
Barr	Green, Oreg.	Murphy
Barry	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Bass, N.H.	Griffin	Nelsen
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	Norblad
Bates	Gubser	O'Brien, Ill.
Becker	Hagen	O'Brien, N.Y.
Beckworth	Halleck	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Halpern	O'Hara, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	O'Neill
Blatnik	Hargis	Oliver
Boggs	Hays	Osmers
Boland	Hechler	Ostertag
Bolton	Hemphill	Patman
Bonner	Henderson	Perkins
Bowles	Hogan	Philbin
Boykin	Holifield	Pilcher
Brademas	Holland	Poage
Breeding	Holtzman	Porter
Brewster	Horan	Powell
Brooks, Tex.	Huddlestone	Price
Broomfield	Inouye	Prokop
Brown, Ga.	Irwin	Pucinski
Brown, Mo.	Jackson	Quigley
Broyhill	Jarman	Rabaut
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Calif.	Rains
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Colo.	Randall
Burleson	Johnson, Md.	Ray
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Wis.	Rees, Kans.
Cahill	Jonas	Reuss
Canfield	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Carnahan	Judd	Riehlman
Chamberlain	Karsten	Riley
Chelf	Karth	Rivers, Alaska
Chenoweth	Kasem	Rivers, S.C.
Chipperfield	Kastenmeier	Roberts
Church	Kearns	Robison
Clark	Keith	Rodino
Coad	Kelly	Rogers, Colo.
Coffin	Keough	Rooney
Cohelan	Kilday	Roosevelt
Collier	Kilgore	Rostenkowski
Conte	King, Calif.	Roush
Cook	King, Utah	Santangelo
Cooley	Kluczynski	Saund
Corbett	Knox	Schenck
Cramer	Kowalski	Schneebell
Cunningham	Lafore	Schwengel
Curtin	Laird	Selden
Curtis, Mass.	Lane	Shelley
Daddario	Langen	Sheppard
Dague	Lankford	Shipley
Daniels	Latta	Sisk
Delaney	Lennon	Slack
Dent	Lesinski	Smith, Iowa
Denton	Levering	Smith, Miss.
Derounian	Libonati	Spence
Diggs	Lindsay	Springer
Dingell	Lipscomb	Staggers
Dixon	McCormack	Stratton
Donohue	McCulloch	Stubblefield
Dooley	McDonough	Sullivan
Dorn, N.Y.	McDowell	Taylor, N.C.
Doyle	McFall	Teague, Calif.
Dulski	McGovern	Teller
Durham	McIntire	Thomas
Dwyer	Macdonald	Thompson, Tex.
Edmondson	Machrowicz	Thornberry
Elliott	Mack	Toll
Everett	Madden	Tollefson
Evins	Maillard	Trimble
Fallon	Marshall	Udall
Farbstein	Martin	Ullman
Fenton	May	Vanik
Fino	Meader	Wainwright
Fisher	Merrrow	Wallhauser
Flood	Metcalf	Walter
Flynn	Meyer	Wampler
Fogarty	Michel	Watts

Weaver
Weis
Widnall
Willis

Wilson
Wolf
Wright
Yates

Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—103

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alexander
Alford
Alger
Andersen,
Minn.
Andrews
Ashmore
Bailey
Baring
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks, La.
Brown, Ohio
Budge
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Colmer
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Ga.
Derwinski
Devine
Dorn, S.C.
Dowdy
Downing
Feighan

Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Gary
Gavin
Goodell
Gross
Haley
Harmon
Harrison
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holt
Hosmer
Hull
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jones, Mo.
Kitchin
Kyl
McGinley
McMillan
Mason
Matthews
Mills
Minshall
Montoya
Morris, N. Mex.
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly

Pfost
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Reece, Tenn.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Scherer
Scott
Short
Sikes
Siler
Simpson
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Taber
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Utt
Van Felt
Van Zandt
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wier
Williams
Winstead

NOT VOTING—39

Barden
Barrett
Baumhart
Bentley
Bolling
Buckley
Celler
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Fascell
Glenn
Grant
Harris

Healey
Hébert
Hess
Ikard
Kee
Kilburn
Kirwan
Landrum
Loser
McSween
Magnuson
Mahon
Mitchell

Morrison
Murray
Nix
Norrell
Preston
Quie
Rogers, Mass.
Smith, Kans.
Taylor, N.Y.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Vinson
Withrow

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Taylor of New York against.

Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Baumhart against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Withrow against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Loser with Mrs. Rogers, Mass.

Mrs. MAY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 170 just prior to its passage.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, an-

nounced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12619. An act making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12619), making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PASSMAN, GARY, CANNON, TABER, and FORD.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us as to the program for tomorrow, either definitely or as a probability.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman made that inquiry. I have no legislative business or program for tomorrow, as I announced earlier. I do not know what the situation will be in connection with conference reports. I know of none now, although the committee handling Health, Education, and Welfare has until midnight tonight to file a report. Of course, those may be brought up at any time.

In the event that the Rules Committee should report a resolution to take from the Speaker's desk and send to conference the minimum wage bill, then the leadership on both sides of the aisle—this colloquy is for that purpose—alerts Members that that rule may be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that, as far as I am concerned, and I am sure his attitude is the same, we would want to discuss that with our members on the Rules Committee to determine whether or not if a rule is reported such action would be in line with what they want done. As far

as I am concerned I would be glad to go along with any such arrangement if a rule is reported.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's position is clearly understood and it is a very fair and proper one. This colloquy between the gentleman from Indiana and myself is simply to let the Members know and be on their guard that there is a reasonable if not strong probability that if a rule is reported out it may be brought up tomorrow.

I understand also that the Committee on Ways and Means has until midnight to file a report on a bill.

Conference reports can be brought up at any time. We just want to advise the Members about the probability of sending the minimum wage bill to conference.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—and I make this request not only for myself, but for my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who filed a companion resolution—for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 799, establishing a George Washington Carver Centennial Commission.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this going to cost?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that George Washington Carver was not only one of the great Americans, but one of the great men of all time. On the occasion of his 100th anniversary, the resolution provides for the establishment of a commission to be known as the George Washington Carver Centennial Commission. The number of members is provided in the joint resolution. The authorization is \$249,000.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman anticipate that that will take care of this Commission, and there will be no further requests for money?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would prefer that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] answer that question.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] that there will be no further requests for this purpose. It is a most worthy cause. George Washington Carver, as the gentleman knows, was a person of great fame not only to every colored person in America but every person in America. We worship his memory. July 13 of this year was the 100th anniversary of the birth

of this great American. I trust there will be no opposition to this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] that we cleared this with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the ranking member, and the minority leader. It has all been cleared. If we are going to do this at all we have to do it now, otherwise next year it will be too late.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I introduced this joint resolution a few days ago and was pleased and proud when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said to me that he would be proud to have the privilege of introducing a similar resolution, which he did. He has carried this thing along now. I know that every American who has known of the great work of George Washington Carver will be proud of the Congress of the United States for doing this thing.

Mr. GROSS. I would say only this, that I think there is more justification for the passage of this joint resolution than the one passed just a few moments ago.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. For many years George Washington Carver was on the faculty of West Virginia State College. He was one of the three or four outstanding Negroes of his generation. He carried on many experiments that led to the development of the peanut and other industries while he was on the faculty of West Virginia State College. Later he moved his activities to Alabama. I am very much in favor of the joint resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the "George Washington Carver Centennial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of sixteen members as follows:

(A) Five members who are outstanding Americans, to be appointed by the President;

(B) Two members who are Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(C) Three members who are Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(D) One member from the Department of the Interior who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his representative, and who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and

(E) Five members to be appointed by the President after consideration of such recommendations as may be made, upon the request of the President, by the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation.

(2) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman, and two of the members appointed by him to serve, upon the recommendation of the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation, full time under the direction of the Chairman in carrying out the functions of the Commission. The two members of the Commission serving full time shall receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Chairman and shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. The other members of the Commission shall receive no salary but shall be reimbursed for their actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties.

(b) The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Washington Carver. In carrying out these functions the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation to plan a centennial celebration of the birth of George Washington Carver, and to invite all of the people of the United States to join therein.

(c) The Commission may employ, without regard to civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

(d) (1) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this section. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this section.

(2) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account also for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress not later than June 30, 1962. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(3) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property: *Provided*, That any property so acquired which may be requested by the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation to assist it in carrying out its functions and purposes shall be donated to the Foundation. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Commission, for necessary expenses in carrying out its functions under this section, \$249,000.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record, and I

further ask that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed and with regard to the late George Washington Carver.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in an age dominated by scientific achievement, there are many great names to consider and many great deeds to praise. Even so, there is no doubt that some stand alone in their magnificence, no matter how worthy the others may be.

In such a category do we find Dr. George Washington Carver, a giant among giants in his field.

Born a slave in the Civil War era, Dr. Carver rose above the traditional barriers and pitfalls of poverty, plus that of race, to wholly revolutionize the field of agricultural chemistry.

His contributions to the field have earned for him such names as the "Wizard of Tuskegee." Nor has he worked for science alone. Indeed, his discoveries have so elevated the economic value of the once-neglected peanut, to the point where it stands today as one of the greatest money crops in the southern United States.

A benefit to science, to agriculture, and to economic prosperity, Dr. Carver merits the praise he receives today, from every corner of the land.

Mr. Speaker, may I say further that I have talked to two of our colleagues, one from North Carolina and the other from South Carolina, about the joint resolution just passed, and the words of praise they had for the late George Washington Carver were certainly inspirational to me. I know each of them has indicated to me that he wants to insert his remarks in the RECORD in relation to this great man.

Mr. Speaker, I have ready to file in this august legislative body this day, a copy of House Joint Resolution 787, dated August 22, 1960, on that day introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] establishing a George Washington Carver Centennial Commission. This copy of Mr. JENSEN's resolution was presented to me yesterday by Mr. Phillips, of the distinguished Tuskegee Institute, with the request that I join in sponsoring House Joint Resolution 787.

In view of the fact that our distinguished majority leader has this day done another of the very fine, exemplary legislative acts which are his custom, and has called this resolution to the floor for action at this time, I, of course, will not file House Joint Resolution 787 as I intended to do before the close of legislative business today.

But, may I say that I heartily approve this resolution and the very appropriate and timely purpose thereof; for, the resolution provides that the Commission therein provided for is to be constituted by five outstanding Americans to be appointed by the President; two members who are Members of the U.S. Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate; three members who are Members

of the House, appointed by the Speaker of the House; one member from the Department of the Interior who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his representative, who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and five members to be appointed by the President of the United States after consideration of such recommendations as may be made, upon the request of the President, by the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation.

Subdivision (b), on page 3 of House Joint Resolution 787 provides, as follows:

The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of George Washington Carver. In carrying out these functions the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation to plan a centennial celebration of the birth of George Washington Carver, and to invite all the people of the United States to join therein.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join in support of this resolution in honor of George Washington Carver. In addition to all those things we know of this eminent statesman and scientist, he was also an author. For more than 20 years I have had a framed enlargement of his famous poem hanging on my office wall. It is entitled "You Have What It Takes," and it is the most inspirational message delivered in modern times.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very special satisfaction to me as a long-time member of the board of trustees of Tuskegee Institute where Dr. Carver did much of his invaluable research to vote for this timely resolution introduced by the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] and the distinguished Member from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

This resolution establishes a George Washington Carver Centennial Commission and authorizes the expenditure of \$249,000.

The research, largely in the agricultural field, has benefited hundreds of thousands of our people. All America is grateful to this humble dedicated scientist as are many nations overseas. It is fitting indeed that we do him honor.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the late George Washington Carver, noted Negro scientist, was outstanding in the field of agriculture. As the present decade marks the 100th anniversary of his birth, it is, indeed, appropriate that we pause to recall his accomplishments and pay tribute to his greatness.

Dr. Carver, eminent in the field of science, and especially chemistry, was for many years an honored educator at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. It was Booker T. Washington, great Negro educator, who induced George Washington Carver to join in the work for the youth of his race which he was undertaking.

The boy George Carver, born of slave parents, was taken into the home of kindly people disposed to give room to his eagerness for learning. He learned from the field and wood and soon developed a sense of deep economy of the trees and flowers. As a young lad he determined to get a good academic education and, further, to take part in the

work of educating his people. When he arrived at Tuskegee he was caught up in the opportunity he faced to meet their fundamental needs.

With a zeal almost evangelical, George Washington Carver began right off to try to turn the interests from cotton planting to peanut planting. He knew there was a large market awaiting peanuts; and, besides, it was a plant good for the soil. It was enriching.

Reluctantly the Negro farmers followed him. They raised so many peanuts that subsequently there was no market for them. But Dr. Carver was determined not to betray the confidence of his people in his efforts.

Then followed weeks alone in his laboratory. He had only the crudest type of equipment, but out of his earnest prayers, his unflinching courage, and his skill came forth uses for the peanut that opened up market after market for the planter.

It is not to be wondered that this man became familiar among the world's men of learning and the recipient of medals and doctorates from many learned societies.

His friend Thomas A. Edison once offered him the facilities of the New Jersey Edison Laboratory for his work, but Dr. Carver chose to stay at his beloved Tuskegee Institute. It was there he died in 1943.

Presidents, statesmen, leaders of industry, and the humble called at Carver's laboratory. Henry Ford visited an exhibit in Carver Memorial Museum to view the peanut-oil massage display. In 1936 Dr. Carver experimented with peanut oils as a massage for after-treatment of infantile paralysis. Prior to 1936 he had developed numerous everyday uses for sweetpotatoes, peanuts, cornstalks, and blossoms. For the products of the South's red clay he developed milk, ink, plastics, cosmetics, paper, and paints.

Besides being chief of research and experiment at Tuskegee Institute, Dr. Carver was closely connected with the research work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

While he was best known for his contributions to agriculture, Dr. Carver was also listed among the artists of his age.

Near the close of his career, Dr. Carver was asked if his labors did not seem arduous, considering how alone he worked to prove his beliefs in his experiments. He denied this emphatically with the following comment:

No, I am just an interpreter. I have only to listen for God's voice, and to do what He tells.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to pay tribute to this great American, George Washington Carver, who rose from the ashes of the unfortunate institution of slavery to become one of the world's great scientists.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, as the unquestioned giant of this and all future generations, science has come to dominate the attention of the world. And America is justly proud to find so many of her sons dedicated to scientific pursuits.

Among our men of science, a few stand out in exceptional splendor, for service to a cause worthy only of the clearest intellect. Included in the group—as one of a select, special nucleus comprising the most ingenious of all—stands George Washington Carver, the “Wizard of Tuskegee,” and the miracle man of agricultural chemistry.

Entering American society as a slave of the Civil War era, George Washington Carver rose quickly to academic recognition, and upon joining the staff at Tuskegee Institute, Ala., soon claimed the attention of the scientific world.

The work of Dr. Carver centered in the preservation of our soil and to this end he proposed the planting of peanuts as a substitute for cotton. Certain of the scientific principles involved, Carver was also a practical man, and therefore set out to improve the economic status of the peanut; a course which carried him not only into the field of economics, but medicine, as well.

When finally he concluded his experimentation, Dr. Carver had developed hundreds of new uses for the peanut, including an oil for the cure of paralysis. In consequence, the farmers of the Southern States found a wide market for peanuts, which soon became a major money crop in the southern economy.

Captivated by so astonishing a performance, the Royal Society of Arts of London admitted Dr. Carver to its councils in 1916, and the scientific community hailed him as one of their most distinguished leaders. Thereafter, Dr. Carver was showered with honors and hired as an expert in his field to advise in the operation of a branch of the U.S. Agriculture Department.

A pioneer in the professional sense and a hero in the personal sense, he has earned the appreciation he receives today from every corner of the globe. All America is proud to join in honoring this man of genius and conscience whose service to mankind shall never be forgotten.

PROPOSAL FOR AN OFFICE OF AGING WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, with 16 million senior citizens in the United States, and with the number increasing in proportion to the whole population, it is clear that we need an office within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to correlate all efforts in their behalf.

Because we did not anticipate the extent and the seriousness of this problem of security in old age, we met each challenge with a piecemeal solution, tacking on new responsibilities to existing agencies.

In the beginning, we thought that old-age and survivors insurance benefits,

and old-age assistance benefits would provide an overall solution. But then we learned that special public housing units must be built for some of the aged. We are presently concerned with the design of a suitable health insurance program for them.

This step-by-step improvisation has resulted in too much overlapping and duplication that has obscured other problem areas where the aging need our advice and help. A single office to serve as a clearinghouse for information, for research and training programs, and to provide clear leadership and direction, will coordinate Federal, State and community action in behalf of a comprehensive yet unified approach to the whole problem. In addition to the meeting of prime needs of sufficient retirement income, suitable housing, and health insurance, we must achieve greater fulfillment for the aged by reaching the following objectives:

Full restorative service for those who require institutional care.

Equal opportunity to employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age. Furthermore, the present limitation of \$1,200 on earnings by those who are receiving old-age insurance, should be raised to \$1,800 or \$2,400 before the recipient starts to forfeit his monthly benefits.

Retirement in health, honor, dignity after years of contribution to the economy.

Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

Immediate benefit from proven knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

The establishment of an Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to promote these objectives, will expedite progress toward solution of the problems of aging. It will give our aged something to look forward to, and it will help our legislators and our public officials to implement plans with constructive action.

The modest appropriations for planning grants; project grants; and grants to institutions and organizations; under the terms of the bill I have introduced, will earn human dividends in greater security and happiness for those whose years of full-time work are behind them.

A U.S. Office of Aging will help to bring comfort and dignity in the harvest-time of life to those who have contributed so much to the progress of our Nation.

RUSSIAN EDUCATION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been much publicity in the American press dealing with the Soviet education system. During the same time, there has been a spirited reappraisal of education in the United States.

In light of these developments, and under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article appearing in the July 4, 1960, issue of the U.S. News & World Report entitled “The Truth About Soviet Education.” The article sets forth the views of two vocational educators, Dr. Mark Nichols and Dr. Hoyt H. London, former presidents of the American Vocational Association, who spent several weeks in Russia during April and May of 1960. The article follows:

Question. What overall conclusion did you draw from your intensive study of Soviet education?

Answer. Here is our conclusion: You see, Russia, by our standards, is a poor country. You walk down the street and there'll be 10,000 people and you can't hear a belly-laugh among them. They just walk in silence. Education is conceived by the people at the top, the parents, the kids, everybody, as the one and only ladder that leads from poverty and commonness right up through the ceiling to a life of achievement and respectability. Every person is trying to climb it.

Question. Is education the only way to the top in Russia?

Answer. An education is indeed the ladder to economic achievement in Russia. For instance, if a boy drops out of school at the seventh or eighth grade in America, he may get into business ultimately—in fact, he may become a millionaire. The opportunities are his to use his abilities.

If a boy drops out of school in Russia, he becomes a manual worker at that grade, and so his opportunities for achievement and a better standard of living are based on his education.

The boy who comes out of the trade school will not do as well with his job salarywise as the boy who comes out of the technical school. And the young man or the young woman who gets up to the technical institute will do far better than any of those. The individuals who get to the university seem to have top priority.

Educational competition in Russia is terrific among young people. That is a basis for the seriousness that we observed in the students.

Question. Do the Soviets try to give everybody a college education?

Answer. Not now. Since the change in their educational system in 1958, they are doing a thing we should consider very seriously in this country. That is to train every individual as much as possible for production proficiency in terms of his native ability and the needs of society. Apparently the 1958 change was a shift away from emphasis on higher education toward more emphasis on vocational training.

Question. Why was that shift made?

Answer. Apparently because of their lack of capital and consumer goods—a great lack—and the need of vocational education for training productive workers to make consumer goods available in larger quantity.

You see, Russia has three main problems—they'll tell you frankly. One problem is housing, and another is farming. Roughly 47 percent of their labor force is buckled down on their farms at a time when they've challenged America and the other capitalistic countries for the industrial markets of the world.

They realize, if they are going to win this economic struggle, they've got to increase the efficiency of agriculture so they can release a great bulk of their farm labor to go into industry. And, secondly, they've got to train people to build not only more houses but better houses.

And, then, their third problem, we are told, is finance. They're manipulating their money system now, trying to correct this somewhat.

Question. How do these problems affect Soviet education policies?

Answer. They look upon vocational and technical education as a means of providing the skilled manpower that will enable them to turn out both capital and consumer goods, and thus surpass America.

Just walk, drive or fly around any place in Russia, and you can see these problems glaring everywhere. Russia is 50 years, at least, behind America or the Scandinavian countries, but they know where they are going and they are coming up fast.

They have recognized that, although science, mathematics, and languages are important to an educated people, you just cannot run a competitive economy with everybody trained for a job at the top. And they are meeting that head on—realistically through vocational and technical education.

Question. By training workers?

Answer. Yes. And so they're dignifying the life of the worker. In the May Day parade, we saw 600,000 workers march 100 to 125 abreast—across Red Square, singing, carrying banners and artificial flowers. Many were singing the workers' song, "Moscow in May"—apparently happy and proud of the fact that their industry had exceeded its assigned quota.

The Russians are glorifying, to a very great extent, what we would call the "blue collar" worker in America, as distinguished from the "white collar" worker.

Question. They glorify him, but apparently they don't let a worker into college unless he has exceptional academic abilities?

Answer. He can't make it, no—in the face of their terrific competitive emphasis in education.

Question. Does the government decide who goes to college?

Answer. There is an examination, we discovered, after the seventh grade in the 10-year school and again after the 10th grade. It was our observation—we at least deduced by innuendo—that students who do not do too well academically in these exams at the seventh year go, or are sent, into trade schools. A trade school is a one-specialty affair where a student spends from 10 months to a year and a half—or 1 to 2 years—in a specialty; and, in the second year, a lot of time is spent out on the job.

The first-year instruction is devoted about 70 percent to skill training and practice, and about 30 percent to theory or related instruction. Students in these trade schools are rather young boys—and a few girls.

Question. What must a Soviet youngster do in order to get to college?

Answer. He must make a good grade—academic grade—from the 10-year school, and pass the entrance examinations, which are pretty comprehensive, we were led to believe, for the institutes and the universities.

Question. Isn't this creating a "class" in Russia? Communists talk about a classless society—

Answer. We thought we saw a distinctly "class" society.

Question. What were the classes?

Answer. The intelligentsia—the scientists, the professors, the engineers, the designers, the planners. By the way, one of us said to a fellow, "What would you do with me in Russia? I happen to have a Ph. D." He said, "Why, we'd put you on the payroll." I said,

"What for?" "Well, just because you have a Ph. D.; we would find some use for you."

Question. Is the top layer the intelligentsia?

Answer. Yes, and then they've got a management group. Next come the factory workers, and at the bottom they have what they call "peasants" running collective and state farms.

Question. What kind of teachers do the Russians have?

Answer. Teachers are of two kinds in most of the schools we saw. A "teacher" teaches the theory; an "instructor" teaches the practice. The instructors are graduates of "technicums" (something like American trade high schools) and the teachers are graduates of technical institutes or universities.

The instructors who teach the skill processes in the schools follow their students into the factories to see that they become adjusted to their jobs and to give some orientation training on the job—a good idea, we thought.

Each one of the "technicums" has what is known as a patron factory, and they plan their manpower supply realistically to meet current and future needs.

To illustrate, if you are putting down a foundation for a house and you have 50 half-inch bolts to fasten the sill to, then you need 50 nuts of that size and with a thread that matches to go on them.

Apparently the Russians study their manpower needs in industry just like that, and they structure or pattern their educational program accordingly—just like making half-inch nuts for half-inch bolts. We've got nothing like that in America.

Question. Is that a good thing?

Answer. To a degree, it's a good thing. It doesn't follow that we've got to do it as they do, but it gets at something that is a big problem in American education of all sorts—not only in vocational education, but in professional education at the higher level as well.

For example, according to the American Association of School Administrators, we need 800 men per year for school superintendents to replace those who die or retire.

But how many are we training? Eight hundred? No, not at all. We have 300 or 400 institutions in America training literally thousands to be superintendents of schools. And so you've got a great discrepancy between what's really needed and what's being prepared, and little if any attention is given to it.

That's not only true in school administration. Take medicine—we seem to have a great shortage of qualified physicians and dentists in this country. What are we doing about it? Practically nothing, except maintaining the status quo.

And so the Russian system is vastly different from ours in this respect, and much more realistic, we are convinced.

Question. Does the Russian system take all initiative away from the students? Are the students told what to study?

Answer. No, not directly. That was a point that interested us greatly and we questioned Russians at length about it. They insist that the parent and the student have some choice—and they do, within a degree or range.

But the fact is, as we got it from our observations and what we were told, the series of examinations given after the seventh grade is a determining factor, along with the academic achievements. If students do well on these examinations, they are encouraged; if they do not do well, they are directed toward occupations that make use of their type of ability and where there is a recognized need.

Question. But if a Russian boy wants to be a biologist, he isn't told that he has to be a medical doctor?

Answer. Oh, no. We didn't see any evidence of that.

WHAT STUDENTS MAY DECIDE

Question. Is he allowed to follow his own bent?

Answer. He has the choice within the scope of his demonstrated achievements.

Question. Then, how do they make sure they get enough biologists and not too many medical doctors?

Answer. That was a stumper to us, and yet they maintained that it was relatively simple to solve. The incentives given, the stipends paid, and other encouragements of various kinds, are used to regulate this. We have never seen a society anywhere that had so many different types of devices used to motivate people.

Question. What are some of those motivating devices? Do they depend on guidance counselors?

Answer. We didn't find in any school that they had guidance counselors, as we have in our schools. But apparently in Russia the school principals are very much concerned, the teachers are concerned, and then they have individuals at the city level, at the republic level and I would say at the national level, too, very much concerned about manpower needs—and the schools work very closely with them.

We did not get the answer conclusively to our satisfaction, but they did point out that they used three devices to get students into desired areas.

In the first place, if there's an occupation where they have a shortage—and they claim they have shortages in nearly every occupation and that the difference is a matter of degree—then they offer a higher stipend to youngsters going into training for that occupation.

Secondly, if the industry needing the workers is out in Siberia, say, and most of the people want to live in the city because the standard of living is higher, then they raise the wages to attract the person who has been trained to go to Siberia to work and live.

And, thirdly, they manipulate the allotments of housing. Housing is one of their big problems, and everywhere people are crowded. A young fellow going out into one of these new industrial areas in Siberia would, as we understand it, be given a housing preference, whereas if he stayed in Moscow, say, he wouldn't have it.

Finally, and this has a bearing on Russian scholarship: The students who do well may receive a stipend of up to 25 percent more because of excellence, so there's a pay incentive.

ENCOURAGING BETTER WORK

Question. Is this stipend what they are paid to live on while going to school?

Answer. Perhaps—at the technical schools. The trade-school pupils don't receive a stipend, nor do they in the 10-year school. But in the technical schools they receive a stipend of an average of 275 rubles per month—that's \$27.50 per month—and it may go up to 297, or it may go down as low as 235. So it's regulated. There is, then, an incentive for a student to do well.

Question. Did the students live at these schools?

Answer. They did not live at the technical school which we visited. But they live at the University of Moscow and some of these other schools. They have a series of universities and what they call technical institutes and technicums.

Students in the university and those in technical institutes are all paid stipends, we were told—or practically all. They said

about 80 percent of the students at the University of Moscow receive stipends. And that is manipulated, as explained earlier, to attract people into fields where the need is greatest, and also to promote scholarship.

If a student does better, he gets an additional sum of something like 45 rubles a month. They think of the money as scholarships, rather than stipends.

Question. In other words, the state reaches into the lives of each of these schoolchildren, just as it affects everything else?

Answer. Oh, there's no question about that. But it's not as harsh as we've been led to believe. People there have more freedom than Americans generally think they do.

Question. What kind of extracurricular activities are there in Soviet schools?

Answer. They have extracurricular organizations that work in cooperation with the schools. For example, they have what they call Palaces of Culture for the Young Pioneers, and they have Clubs for Labor Reserves—youths in their late teens and early twenties. These agencies are run in close cooperation with the schools, and they emphasize music, dramatics, athletics, and so on. In other words, they've somewhat divorced these things from the school. And the school is a pretty formal affair—you walk in the room and the students jump up, and sit down when they're told to—getting factual information and drilling for examinations.

All over the country—in every school we visited in Russia—on the billboards and fences in Moscow and Leningrad and other cities, and on the cowbarns in rural areas, are plaques with Lenin's picture at the top followed by the basic principles of the 7-year plan, all urging the people to be more productive so they can beat the capitalistic world. This is their crusade. And the goals—they live by goals, the goals of the 7-year plan. The students constantly receive the goal indoctrination in the schools. They take production goals very seriously—they're very much concerned about achieving them.

Question. Critics of U.S. schools have said that Soviet schools have higher standards than ours and that Russian youngsters are crammed full of science and mathematics and foreign languages practically from the time that they can walk. How much truth is there to that?

Answer. A good deal of that is fiction. There is no question about their emphasis on math and science and foreign languages. But we had an opportunity on several occasions to visit freely with young Russians, and we did. We were astonished to find how few of them, really, could speak English—or German or any other language except Russian.

Yet our observation in the 10-year schools that we visited was that they were emphasizing math and physics and chemistry to quite an extent. We saw, for instance, organic chemistry being taught in a 10-year school, and you don't observe that organic chemistry is being taught in too many high schools in America.

Question. Are Soviet teaching methods superior to ours?

Answer. We would say generally not, although we saw some instruction devices that were unique and different from what we have in this country, and better. But on the whole our methods of teaching would compare favorably and in our better schools probably would excel theirs. We saw one instructional device of illustrative panels at the front of classrooms which we hadn't seen in our country and which we thought was excellent.

Question. Otherwise, are the teaching methods much the same?

Answer. Yes, in their shops and drawing classes. The teaching is very formal. The teacher-student relationship is far more formal than ours and appeared to us to be somewhat stilted. But the seriousness on the part of the students to learn was strikingly noticeable and observable in all the schools that we visited.

Question. Do all Russian students have to meet certain national standards? Pass nationwide tests?

Answer. Admiral Rickover, for example, and other critics of American education have led us and perhaps other people to believe that Russia has a system of national standards and that they measure everybody by standardized tests on which they do better than American students. Well, we were visiting a 10-year school, and in looking through a boy's chemistry textbook, we found a copy of the national examination for chemistry.

One of us questioned the boy and his teacher in great detail, and here's what they told us about these examinations:

They do have such standards, and they have examinations that are worked out at the national and republic levels. But—note this—they give the boy in the 10th grade and also his teacher a copy of the examination in September (start of the school year) along with the textbook, and he has it to study by all year, and the teacher has it to teach by. Comes the following June, and he takes the examination. Why shouldn't he do well?

Question. Do you mean, then, that a Soviet student studies just to answer questions which have been posed for him in advance and that he doesn't do free study?

Answer. No, you couldn't say that entirely. But the impression has been given to the people of this country that, at the end of a school year, Russian youngsters are descended upon and given a comprehensive examination on which they do better than our youngsters do. We just don't believe this is a true picture.

EXAMS AS A STUDY PLAN

Question. Would you compare the Soviet system with the case of an American student who crams for an examination to which he has stolen the questions from the teacher's desk?

Answer. Well, you wouldn't say it's quite that simple because these examinations are made by subject-matter specialists, and we were told that they're pretty comprehensive. Obviously, they give the student something definite to study for and the teacher something definite and concrete to teach.

Question. Do you think this approach takes anything out of education that might be important?

Answer. Oh, it may take out of education some of the training and ability that comes from independent research, investigation, and reading. We didn't see much evidence of the free type of reading that goes on in an American high school—although in fairness it must be said that we were astounded to find many youngsters who seemed to know more about Mark Twain and Jack London than most Americans, including those who have read a great deal of both.

Question. Did you notice any of the so-called "frills" in their school buildings? Do they have cafeterias, gymnasiums, and other things that some people call "frills"?

Answer. We saw some cafeterias, but we didn't see in any school a gymnasium as we know it in American high schools. We saw some rather small playrooms, or recreation rooms, but not gymnasiums.

Question. Do the Soviets put any emphasis at all on sports in their schools?

Answer. Sports aren't emphasized over there to the extent that they are here. And there is no sea of shiny new automobiles around every school in Russia, as you see

parked around the average American urban high school. There were no student-owned automobiles, and in most instances we saw no bicycles—they walk to school 6 days per week.

And, with their formal-discipline procedure, they're studying specialties pretty narrowly. We didn't see students smile very often, either. That's a significant thing.

Question. Are Russian schools coeducational?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did you see more men teachers than women teachers?

Answer. Yes, we saw more men than women teachers in the vocational schools. In the general schools, we would say there are more women than men, as is true in our country.

HOW SUMMERS ARE SPENT

Question. Do Soviet students get a summer break?

Answer. Yes, but the students in all general and vocational schools, so we were told, are required to work 25 days during the summer either on a collective or state farm or in a factory—that's what they call "polytechnic education" in their reorganized system. They are convinced that work education is essential, and they conceive of their vocational and technical schools as the instruments through which to recruit, upgrade and use their manpower to outproduce the capitalistic world.

Students at the 10-year school we visited in Moscow work for 25 days on collective farms after the eighth year and after the ninth year they work for 25 days in factories during the summer.

Question. What do Soviet students do at home?

Answer. What they do at home is a question. The Russians have built thousands of huge apartment houses. We visited one, and had dinner in the apartment of one school principal. We were told that there were 110 families living in that apartment house. They said each individual is entitled to eight square meters [86 square feet] of floor space, and that isn't very much. So home life for young people apparently isn't too good from the standpoint of ample space.

And so we saw tens of thousands of people out walking on the streets—just walking and with no observable loud talking or laughter.

Question. Out walking to escape from crowded homes?

Answer. Eight families, we were told, use one bath and one kitchen in many instances. That is the workers. Those that have better positions—one school principal, for instance, had a kitchen, a living room, a bedroom and a bathroom as a part of his apartment.

Question. How would you compare a Soviet school with a first-rate American high school?

Answer. You can't compare an American high school with a Russian school of any sort. They're too different. The buildings are different. Teaching is different. Time is scheduled differently. Their schools are managed differently.

Question. Who learns the most—a Russian student or an American student?

Answer. We got the impression that, as far as our vocational and technical schools are concerned, the American student does very well, and, if he isn't superior, then we've been fooled.

Question. What explains that?

Answer. The American student has better equipment to work on. And again and again we got the impression that the course of instruction given in the trade schools of this country is superior to that in Russia. The Russians might disagree with this.

Question. But just how is the American system superior?

Answer. It's more comprehensive. They narrow the Russian students down to a very, very narrow range—and in America we give a broader type of training. Now that has some advantages because it makes for versatility. Apparently, they don't want versatility over there. They want to train each student to fill a specific manpower need.

Question. On the whole how would you compare the Soviet system with the American system of education?

Answer. So far as vocational education is concerned, the idea of a systematic study of manpower needs and an efficient approach to training the number of people needed—not wasting your time and money on those that aren't needed—makes sense.

In all honesty, we must admit, they're more realistic and more efficient than we are in this respect. Now, that doesn't mean that, if we were trying to improve this phase of our education, we'd have to do it as they do. But we learned something from the Russians on that score.

In the second place, this idea of recognizing fully that, if a nation is to compete successfully in the markets of the world, it must take every last individual and make him as productive as possible is sound. They've done that.

The idea of incorporating work experience with theory is also good. As far as buildings are concerned—and teachers, curriculum, content—we wouldn't say they're superior to us in any respect, except in the one school previously mentioned where we saw some unusually fine visual-education materials.

Question. Do you think that education has just become so readily available in this country that Americans don't appreciate it?

Answer. There may be something to that; yes. We just take it for granted, and, for some, going to college is a social achievement. In our colleges we have football teams and fraternities and all that type of thing that may detract from education or at least academic learning. Somebody has said that football has the same relationship to education that bullfighting has to agriculture. In Russian higher education, this is conspicuous by its absence.

MORE CONTRASTS WITH UNITED STATES

Question. What other differences did you find?

Answer. One of the significant differences was a recognition of individual differences in pupils. It seems to us that, in America, we school people generally give lip service to it, but Russia has an education program which does something constructive about individual differences.

Question. You mean differences in aptitude?

Answer. Aptitude, yes. They are recognizing these differences, and giving every student the greatest possible opportunity to achieve in terms of them. In America it's socially so desirable, and parents generally are so very anxious to have their children attend college or universities—that's regarded as a great achievement in and of itself.

Russia recognizes that only those should go to universities who have the academic abilities to profit from such an experience. But they recognize the many other abilities besides academic ability and have adjusted their school programs to make the most of them. This is one of the significant differences between American and Russian educational philosophy and procedure. And, then, as has already been stated, their matching of educational programs with manpower needs is a surprising achievement.

Question. Do you think the United States should adopt the Soviet school system?

Answer. We don't think that, in America, we should follow the Russian system, but we can give far more recognition to the vocational facets of guidance in our public schools than we're doing today. We have

guidance programs, but the vocational facets of guidance are lacking as compared with our emphasis on psychological and clinical guidance. That's the No. 2 difference.

And then, No. 3, there's a great difference, as already mentioned, between the Russian formal procedures and our American procedures of instruction and course content as well as our concepts about what students should be taught and learn.

We apparently have recognized competitive athletics as an important and integral part of the American educational system or we wouldn't have spent the millions of dollars on gymnasiums and football fields. Russia does not do that. And this is another difference.

Question. Do they put less emphasis on the social side of education?

Answer. They do not recognize the social facets of life in the same light that we do. Yet they seem to be doing much in helping youth to make a sound occupational choice and to profit by work experience.

At present, Russia is prescribing some work experience for every last kid from elementary school up through the university, and if that is sound, then they may have something that is very desirable.

Perhaps that is a procedure that we can emulate more in America.

If a youngster is taught to work and knows what it means to sweat in the earning of a dollar, he should be a wiser spender and have a greater appreciation for our economic way of life.

We haven't gotten around to recognizing this as an important facet of secondary education in America. Student work experience in our competitive capitalistic economy must be implemented in a different way than in Russia—but to recognize the importance of student work experience and to implement it into action for its maximum educational contribution is a challenge for those of us engaged in education leadership in this country.

We have done a lot in promoting good recreational programs. We still have much to do in providing desirable work-experience programs as an integral part of education.

Question. What changes in the American system do you think should be made as a result of what you saw in Russia?

Answer. Well, No. 1, a greater attention to the vocational facets of guidance. That's the No. 1 need in American secondary and higher education.

No. 2, recognizing that work—some kind of productive work experience—on the part of secondary-school youth is a desirable thing for good citizenship.

And, thirdly, we should put more emphasis on the study of economics. It appears that every youth in Russia understands the Russian economic system. That is not the case in America. We need much more emphasis on economics. We need a crusade in this country to convince our young people of the values inherent in our economic system and of the elements essential to its success in our democracy.

LET'S GET THE FACTS: CHOLESTEROL—HEART ATTACKS

Mr. REUSS. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, cholesterol is a term which, in the last few years, has come out of the laboratory and entered the vocabulary of untold millions of Americans.

Cholesterol is much in our minds today because many medical doctors and scientific researchers believe that a high level of cholesterol in the blood is a contributing cause of diseases of the heart and the arteries.

We in the Congress must be concerned not only with the health of ourselves and our families but of our whole population. Having the facts on cholesterol, its causes, and its effects is of tremendous interest and importance to the American public and, therefore, to the Congress.

We cannot help but be concerned about heart disease. It is the No. 1 killer in the United States today. It annually snuffs out the lives of more than 800,000 Americans. Hardening of the arteries—known in its severe form as atherosclerosis—is the principal cause of heart disease. Atherosclerosis is the artery condition underlying heart attacks and strokes. Heart attacks killed 6,549 persons in Wisconsin in 1958, nearly 18 percent of all deaths in the State.

No further statistics are needed to point up the problem. The question is where cholesterol enters the picture, and to what extent.

Our newspapers and magazines have been filled with articles on the subject of diet, cholesterol, and heart attacks. Despite the fact that these articles, in most cases, have carefully pointed out that the whole truth is far from being known, much of the public has reached the following conclusions:

Heart attacks are caused by atherosclerosis; atherosclerosis is caused by cholesterol; cholesterol is caused by fats in the diet, particularly the saturated fats in dairy products, fatty meat, eggs and certain other foods; therefore, to avoid having a heart attack, you should give up whole milk, butter, cream, eggs, and animal fats generally.

How many Americans have reached this kind of extreme conclusion? We do not know. Numbers have taken up the no-fat diet, although this in itself can lead to grave nutritional difficulties.

We have not experienced a huge drop in consumption of dairy products and meat—which indicates that the great majority of our people are receiving the news of cholesterol research with reason, not panic. But we have experienced some decline in the consumption of these foods, and it is reasonable to assume that this can in part be attributed to public reaction to the diet-cholesterol-heart attack publicity, and to people cutting down on certain fats either on the basis of competent medical advice or self-prescription.

It is clear, however, that medical findings—one way or the other—concerning diet and cholesterol can have a serious effect on the dairy industry, which is of such vital importance to Wisconsin and other States, and on agriculture generally.

Therefore, both from the health standpoint and from the economic standpoint, we need the answers—the sooner the better—on the exact relationships between dietary fats and cholesterol, and the exact relationship, if any, between cholesterol and heart disease.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to insert in the RECORD several articles which represent current thinking on the subject.

The following article from the Milwaukee Journal of June 14, 1959, summarizes the opinion of heart experts, given at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Heart Association:

"EAT LESS FAT," PATIENTS TOLD—HEART VICTIMS ADVISED

A panel of heart experts Saturday agreed that patients who had had heart attacks should sharply curtail their consumption of butter, cream, and other fatty dairy products.

Several members of the panel, speaking at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Heart Association went further than that. The meeting was at the county general hospital.

Dr. W. Ford Connell, Kingston, Ontario, chairman of the Department of Medicine at Queens University Medical School, said he advised patients with high levels of blood cholesterol to reduce their butter and meat fat consumption. He said he also advised them to supplement their diet with corn oil or some other vegetable oil.

(Cholesterol is a fatty substance made by the body. Some studies indicate that diets high in animal fats cause the body to make more cholesterol, which circulates in the blood. Some researchers believe this leads to formation of fatty plaques in the walls of arteries, causing heart and blood vessel diseases.)

ADVICE FOR PATIENTS

Dr. Connell made it clear that his advice was for patients rather than for well persons. He said it was "suggestive," but not yet proved that too much animal fat in the diet was a contributing cause of the high rate of coronary artery disease in the United States.

Dr. Connell suggested that dairy farmers, instead of bragging about the high butterfat production of their cows, try to breed animals that give milk with more proteins.

"I'm a great advocate of skim milk," he said.

Dr. John S. La Due, New York City, associate professor of medicine at Cornell University, said he kept "seeing one more nail struck in the coffin" on the importance of dietary fats in heart disease. Animal fats, he said, may increase the clotting tendency of the blood, besides clogging the arteries with cholesterol.

Dr. La Due said he advised his patients to reduce the animal fat in their diets to 25 percent of total calories, and for those over 40 to use vegetable oil as freely as they like.

HE USES CORN OIL

Dr. A. Carlton Ernestene, chief of medicine at the Cleveland, Ohio, clinic and president-elect of the American Heart Association, said: "We give about the same advice."

Both Drs. Ernestene and La Due were asked whether they themselves had changed their dietary habits.

"I have practically cut out eating butter," Dr. Ernestene said, "and reduced my amount of cream and animal fats."

Dr. La Due said he had reduced dairy products and animal fats and was using corn oil to supplement his diet. He said that enzymes could be used experimentally to dissolve blood clots that block arteries, causing heart attacks and strokes. But the enzymes now available are too crude, unstandardized and expensive for use in human patients.

Dr. Clark H. Millikan, Rochester, Minn., associate professor of neurology at the Mayo Foundation, said treatment with drugs that slow blood clotting often could prevent progression of a developing stroke. Surgery also may be useful, he said.

Next, I submit two articles, dated August 22 and 29, 1959, about heart attacks, by the Milwaukee Journal's very able medical writer, James C. Spaulding:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 22, 1959] IS HEART ATTACK TIED TO CERTAIN KIND OF FAT?—MAJORITY OF MEDICAL AUTHORITIES BELIEVES QUESTION CANNOT BE ANSWERED YET

(By James C. Spaulding)

A single question raises what is probably the most vital health issue in the United States today: Does too much of a certain kind of fat in the diet cause the excessive rate of heart attacks among middle-aged men?

Reputable medical scientists can be found who will answer flatly either yes or no. But the majority of more respected researchers and heart specialists believe that the question cannot be answered yet. A flat answer may never be possible.

They say that 5 to 10 more years of research will be needed. They admit, however, that in the meantime something has to be done. They are trying to adopt an attitude that will provide the most chance of protection with the least risk of harm.

PUBLIC IS CONCERNED

Public concern is evident. Patients ask their doctors to order blood cholesterol tests. Sales of unsaturated fats, chiefly corn and cotton oils, are increasing.

Atherosclerosis, the artery condition underlying heart attacks and strokes, is the major cause of death in the United States. Heart attacks killed 6,549 persons in Wisconsin last year, nearly 18 percent of all deaths in the State. Many of those who died were in the prime middle years from 40 to 65. Thousands of others were hospitalized with nonfatal heart attacks.

Since 1900 the life expectancy at birth has increased about 20 years. But in the same time expectancy at age 50 has risen only 2.2 years, despite great medical advances. The major reason is the increasing death rate from atherosclerosis, chiefly heart attacks.

COMMON IN 30-40 GROUP

A Milwaukee cardiologist said that heart attacks used to be so rare in the 30 to 40 age group that doctors wrote articles for medical journals about them. Now they are common.

In Wisconsin last year there were at least 10 such fatal attacks among men 25 to 29 (1 among women), and 18 among men 30 to 34. There were 45 heart attack deaths in the 35 to 39 age bracket for men.

Women are thought to have relative immunity to heart attacks before the menopause because of a protective effect of female sex hormones in the body. After the menopause, the heart attack rate in women increases sharply and becomes nearly as high as for men.

In atherosclerosis, fats and cholesterol (a fatlike substance that is a normal constituent of the blood) become deposited in patches within the lining of a blood vessel wall.

LESIONS "NARROW" VESSEL

These atheromatous lesions narrow the diameter of the vessel. The lesions tend to become invaded with tiny blood vessels that bleed and swell the lining of the artery. The lesions also are apt to slough, ulcerate and become the site for formation of blood clots.

The heart muscle obtains the nourishment it needs to pump blood from two large coronary arteries that branch and divide into many smaller arteries.

Unfortunately, the coronary arteries are a favorite site for the lesions of atherosclerosis. When such a lesion suddenly blocks a branch of one of these arteries, part of the heart muscle is deprived of nourishment.

If the infarcted (blocked) area is small, the heart goes on beating and the injured spot eventually heals with scar tissue. If the area is large or the infarct affects the nerve conduction system in a certain way, the heart may stop, causing death.

LESIONS BY AGE 25

Autopsies of soldiers killed in Korea showed that by age 25 many American men had obvious atherosclerosis of the coronary arteries. Chinese and Korean soldiers had no such lesions.

By age 45 or 55, coronary atherosclerosis is severe in the majority of American men. Many do not develop heart attacks, of course, but the essential underlying condition is there.

There have been four chief indications that fat in the diet is related to atherosclerosis:

The artery lesions have a high fat and cholesterol content.

Atherosclerosis can be produced in animals by anything that raises the blood cholesterol level.

The incidence of human atherosclerosis is higher among persons suffering from diseases in which fat metabolism is abnormal.

Studies of populations all over the world seem to show that atherosclerosis is associated with diet, including its fat content.

The best evidence favoring the nutritional theory is the observation that in humans premature atherosclerosis is commoner when the level of cholesterol and fats in the blood is excessive for long periods of time. This is believed to account for the greater incidence of atherosclerosis in diabetes, for instance.

Population studies so far have shown low heart attack rates where the usual diet has been low in animal and dairy fats and animal proteins, low in refined carbohydrates (sugar), and high in roots and grains. This applies to lower economic groups in Spain, Egypt, Japan, and South Africa, among others.

The epidemiologic studies seem to show, also, that population groups eating relatively large amounts of vegetable oils, the so-called unsaturated fats, also have a lower heart attack rate than is found in the United States.

SOLID OR LIQUID

The usual American diet is said to derive 40-50 percent of its calories from fats, mostly of dairy and animal origin. These are the saturated fats.

The terms "saturated" and "unsaturated" when applied to fats indicate the relative number of hydrogen molecules not bound chemically to carbon molecules.

For practical purposes, saturated fats are solid at room temperature and unsaturated fats are liquid. Vegetable oil shortenings that have been solidified by hydrogenation are relatively saturated. There are exceptions to the rule. Coconut oil, for instance, is saturated, although liquid.

Some researchers report that they have been able to lower patients' blood cholesterol levels significantly by reducing the total fat of the diet and substituting vegetable oils for animal and dairy fats to a certain extent.

MULTIPLE CAUSES?

Some go so far as to say that by reducing the percentage of dietary fat calories to 30 or 35 percent and substituting vegetable oils, they can lessen a person's chance of developing a heart attack.

More conservative scientists say there is no proof of this. Many of them doubt that it is true. They say that much of the evidence is only suggestive or inconclusive. Some is simply shaky.

The majority of cardiologists believe that coronary atherosclerosis has multiple causes, both environmental and hereditary.

Stocky, thick chested heavily muscled men, for instance, seem more likely to have heart attacks than those of thinner build.

High blood pressure and obesity are known to predispose to heart attacks. Emotional stress, smoking, and lack of physical activity are other suspected factors, besides dietary fat.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 29, 1960]

HEART ATTACKS, STROKES HAVE HEREDITARY BASIS—EVIDENCE ALSO MOUNTS THAT A HIGH DIET OF ANIMAL FAT MAY BE A BIG FACTOR, TOO

(By James C. Spaulding)

Evidence is accumulating that a diet high in dairy and animal fats may be a major factor in the process leading to heart attacks. But other factors appear important, also.

Probably the most important single influence on the process of atherosclerosis, which underlies heart attacks and strokes, is heredity—the individual's inborn characteristics.

Blood pressure, body weight, metabolic rate, level of physical activity, occupation, emotional makeup, and possibly smoking, besides diet, all apparently affect the process of atherosclerosis.

This makes it difficult for cardiologists to give any general advice to American men, who are particularly susceptible to heart attacks in middle age.

HEART MUSCLE NEEDS BLOOD

On the basis of what is known currently, the heart and nutrition experts do not recommend now that all men reduce their intake of dietary fat. But they believe that certain men should.

In atherosclerosis, fat and fatlike cholesterol become deposited in plaques within the walls of blood vessels. These deposits swell the vessel wall and narrow the inner diameter. Ulceration, sloughing, and clotting tend to occur at the site of the lesion.

Atherosclerosis has a predilection for the two coronary arteries, which supply the heart muscle with the blood it requires for nourishment. When a coronary artery or one of its branches suddenly is blocked, part of the heart muscle is injured. This is a heart attack. Twenty to thirty percent of first heart attacks are fatal. About 18 percent of all deaths in Wisconsin last year were caused by heart attacks.

INCREASES CHOLESTEROL

The dietary fat theory of heart attacks, somewhat oversimplified, is this: Eating excessive amounts of dairy and animal fats increases the amount of cholesterol in the blood and the amount deposited in the arteries. This accelerates the process of atherosclerosis and leads to earlier heart attacks.

Another aspect of the theory is that so-called unsaturated fats, principally liquid vegetable oils, tend to lower the amount of cholesterol in the blood when substituted for solid animal and dairy fats.

Some doctors think that this may protect against premature development of atherosclerosis and heart attacks. The majority, however, believe that there are too many other contributing factors to rely on diet alone.

Population studies in different countries suggest that blood cholesterol levels are higher where the diet contains the most animal and dairy fats.

INTERPRETATION IS DIFFICULT

The rate of heart attacks appears low in underdeveloped countries, where the diet is skimpy or lacking in dairy products, meat fats, and sugar.

But these findings must be viewed skeptically. In most of the studies, diets were

estimated on the basis of food available for consumption, rather than food eaten.

The concept of what constitutes a heart attack differs from one country to another. Accuracy in reporting causes of death varies, also.

Interpretation of dietary studies is difficult. The same population that subsists on a diet low in animal and dairy fats is likely to be one in which most of the labor is still performed by human muscle.

Diet studies fail to show a direct correlation between the amount of dietary fat and the heart attack rate. Austria and the United States have diets containing about the same amount of animal and dairy fats. But the heart attack death rate is 300 per 100,000 population in Austria and 739 in the United States.

SMOKE MORE, WALK LESS

There is no question, however, that Americans today smoke more cigarettes and walk less than 50 years ago.

Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, director of the heart disease control program of the Chicago board of health says that "the fact that many persons eating a typical American diet for decades reach old age without evidence of atherosclerosis—this fact alone refutes any attempt to imply (simple) cause and effect relationship between diet and disease."

However, Dr. Stamler believes that a high-fat diet is a prerequisite to development of atherosclerosis and heart attacks.

Obesity, high blood pressure, diabetes, a family history of early heart attacks, a high blood cholesterol level and heavy smoking are danger signs for middle-aged men, according to Dr. Stamler.

OBESITY IS A FACTOR

When large groups of men, originally free from heart disease, are observed from month to month, it turns out that the risk of heart attack is definitely proportional to body weight, blood pressure, and blood cholesterol, Dr. Stamler said.

"It can be roughly estimated," he said, "that a low risk middle-aged man, normal in weight, blood pressure, and serum cholesterol, has 1 chance in 20 of developing clinical coronary heart disease during the age period from 45 to 64.

"In contrast, a middle-aged man with two or three abnormalities (obesity, high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol) stands almost one chance in two."

A highly respected Milwaukee cardiologist was asked whether he thought that men generally should reduce the amount of animal and dairy fat in their diet and substitute vegetable oils when possible.

WATCH FAMILY HISTORY

He replied that dietary changes did not seem justified for all men, but that such changes would be wise for any young man who has had a heart attack or suffers from angina pectoris, the painful ailment caused by lack of enough blood to the heart muscle.

Others for whom dietary fat reduction is desirable, the cardiologist said, are men with a family history of heart attacks, strokes, diabetes, and high blood pressure.

Men with this family history probably should have a blood cholesterol test made, the heart specialist said, even though results of cholesterol tests are difficult to interpret.

There are additional valid reasons for reducing dietary fat consumption. Fat is the most concentrated source of calories. Avoiding it helps prevent obesity. Obesity adds to the risk of developing atherosclerosis.

INCREASE CLOT RISK

Fatty meals shorten the time it takes blood to clot. This has the effect of increasing the risk that clots will form in an artery affected by atherosclerosis.

By training, doctors are conservative in their treatment and advice. They find fads distasteful in medical science, and the fat-cholesterol-heart attack theory has attracted health faddists.

A consensus seems to be that moderate reduction of dietary fat might be a worthwhile hedge until researchers find more conclusive evidence about the multiple causes of heart attacks.

Regular exercise, organization of living activities to avoid excessive anxiety, and moderation in smoking habits might be equally worthwhile precautions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that I have been interested in the cholesterol problems for many years, being one of many Members of Congress who has been put on a regimen of unsaturated fats. In 1957 I had the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepare a study on the subject of diet, cholesterol, and atherosclerosis, covering research done in all parts of the world:

DIET, CHOLESTEROL, AND ATHEROSCLEROSIS

(By Warren W. Morse)

The leading cause of death in this country is coronary atherosclerosis, the causes and etiology of which are not definitely known. It is known that persons who have had atherosclerosis or a myocardial infarct often have above normal levels of serum cholesterol, but many persons with such high levels never have a serious coronary disease, and the level of serum cholesterol is not of value diagnostically.

In terms of national groups, it has been observed that recorded rates of atherosclerosis are highest in those countries whose typical diets contain the highest proportions of fats. Population groups whose diets have a high fat content are also characterized by high average serum cholesterol levels. From these facts it is inferred by many investigators that it is reasonable to assume a casual relationship between diet and atherosclerosis.

Numerous investigations have established that changes in the fat content of the human dietary can cause changes in average serum cholesterol levels. To eliminate the possible influence of race, it has been established in experiments with natives of Japan and South Africa that their normal low levels of cholesterol can be elevated by adding fats to their dietary, while a study of serum cholesterol levels in infants born to native African and European mothers in South Africa showed that there were no differences at birth although the European mothers had higher levels than did the native Africans. It has also been found that within a given country, as in Yugoslavia, serum cholesterol average levels in different sections reflect broad dietary differences.

The question has been raised as to whether the serum cholesterol level may not be related to some factor in the diet other than its fat content such as its cholesterol or protein content. Keys established through studies in Minnesota and Sardinia that variations in the cholesterol content of the diet had no detectable effect on serum cholesterol levels. Populations customarily living on low fat diets tend also to be low in protein intake. To test whether or not the protein content of the diet might be related to serum cholesterol levels, Keys and associates tested reactions in physically healthy schizophrenic patients to diets varying between high and low protein content. No relation was found between serum cholesterol levels and dietary protein.

Although there is no conclusive evidence of a causal link between serum cholesterol and atherosclerosis, the relationship is such

that various researchers advocate a low-fat diet as a preventive to coronary heart disease. Among those who hold that diet is the chief clue to the causes of atherosclerosis there is a sharp disagreement between those who hold that it is related to the total fat content of the diet, those who see the cause of atherosclerosis in the relative proportions of saturated to unsaturated fats in the diet, and those who believe coronary heart disease is caused primarily by a lack of certain "essential fatty acids" (EFA).

A South African study found that serum cholesterol levels were correlated with dietary intake of animal fats, but not with vegetable fats. Ingestion of animal fats (which are saturated) and saturated vegetable fats (i.e., unsaturated fatty acids converted through hydrogenation to saturated fatty acids, as in margarine) raised these levels, while the unsaturated or natural vegetable oils, such as olive oil, sunflower seed oil, or ground nut oils, and marine oils, had a reverse effect. On the basis of this study, Bronte-Stewart and associates believe that "a possible common difference between animal fats and hydrogenated vegetable fats, on the one hand, and natural vegetable oils and marine oils, on the other, is not the cholesterol, sitosterol, vitamin, or protein content but is in some way connected with the proportion of highly unsaturated fatty acids in the fat concerned."

In commenting on the study by Bronte-Stewart and associates, the *Lancet* said that if the findings were "substantiated, coronary-artery disease becomes in part a preventable disorder—but at the cost of a complete revolution in our present day dietary habits. The hydrogenation plants of our modern food industry may turn out to have contributed to the causation of a major disease."

The article points out, however, that little is known about the relative proportion of saturated and unsaturated fats in the diet, or of the proportion of essential to total fatty acids consumed, or of the nature of total fats consumed.

Keys has made a study of the effects of different types of fats on serum-cholesterol levels. He cites numerous studies to support the statement that the serum cholesterol level in man can be lowered by substituting carbohydrates for the common meat and dairy fats in the diet, and that this effect does not depend on the intake of cholesterol itself. Different food fats, however, differ in their effect, and certain vegetable oils may depress the serum cholesterol levels.

One researcher had found corn (maize) oil particularly effective, deducing from this that the effect of dietary fats on serum cholesterol levels was due to the relative degree of saturation of their constituent fatty acids. But, Keys noted, corn oil has a relatively high content of the essential fatty acid linoleic acid, and he considers the theory that hypercholesterolemia (i.e., an excess level of serum cholesterol) reflects a deficiency of essential fatty acids in the diet, rather than the presence of saturated fats. From a practical, dietary point of view, the question would be whether to eliminate one class of fats from the diet, or add another to the one already consumed. It was decided to compare the results of using sunflower seed oil, richer in linoleic acid than corn oil, and fish oil, which is practically deficient in linoleic acid but is the most unsaturated food oil, and corn oil itself. These oils were to be compared to each other, and also to butter, which is known to increase serum cholesterol levels, for their effects in depressing serum cholesterol levels. Groups of men took 100 grams daily for 2 weeks of each of these fats, in addition to a normal, controlled, matched diet. Corn oil had a greater depressing effect than either sardine oil or

sunflower seed oil. This indicates to Keys the possibility that neither linoleic acid nor a high proportion of unsaturated fatty acids in the diet is chiefly responsible for depressing serum cholesterol levels, but that corn oil "is remarkable in some way not measured by either of these two characteristics." Keys feels that a high serum cholesterol level is not simply an inverse function of the essential fatty acid content or the degree of unsaturation of the fatty acids in the diet. He finds that serum cholesterol levels rise in groups as fat consumption rises, and that when this happens consumption increases for both saturated and unsaturated fats. It seems obvious to Keys that rather than attempt to effect a complete change in our dietary habits it would be wise simply to reduce consumption of all fats. To the argument that our diet may be deficient in essential fatty acids, Keys replies that he doubts the possibility of this, since it is very difficult to supply such diets even to experimental animals.

In the study made in Yugoslavia by Brozek and associates diets of the three groups chosen for analysis were characterized respectively by a high animal fat content, a low fat content of mixed source (animal and vegetable), and a high vegetable fat content (olive oil) with almost no animal fats. Serum cholesterol levels were highest in the high animal fat diet group and lowest in the high vegetable fat diet group, although in total fat content these groups were practically identical. Inasmuch as animal fats are relatively saturated, while olive oil fats are relatively unsaturated, these findings tend to support the theory that the proportion of saturated fats in the diet has more effect on the serum cholesterol level than does total fat content.

The most controversial figure among those who hold diet responsible for coronary artery disease is H. M. Sinclair, who directly disagrees with the position of Keys that total dietary fat of whatever kind is related to atheroma and coronary thrombosis. "Since then I have come to realize that Keys' hypothesis is not correct: What matters in atheroma is, I believe, the amount and structure of the dietary fatty acids."

Sinclair believes that modern methods of food preparations, involving the hydrogenation of vegetable fats and the extraction of essential oils from flour lead to deficiencies in the essential fatty acids, in vitamin B₆, and in vitamin E. The significant factor in atherosclerosis and coronary thrombosis, he feels, is not the total levels of cholesterol, but the deficiency of fatty acids needed for proper metabolism of fats, so that the esterified cholesterol collects, clogs, hardens, and eventually leads to clotting of the arteries.

Citing a variety of studies on experimental animals, Sinclair sees increasing evidence for the theory that a dietary deficient in essential fatty acids, or with an excess of unusually saturated or unnatural (i.e. artificially produced) fatty acids, predisposes not only to coronary artery disease, but also to cancer of the lungs and leukemia. His arguments for including bronchial carcinomas and leukemia are as follows: "Thirdly, EFA-deficient animals are much more sensitive to noxious agents such as ultraviolet light (mild doses of which we found to produce complete necrosis of an irradiated paw), to X-irradiation including probably its carcinogenic action, and perhaps to chemical carcinogens. In your columns (of the *Lancet*) Dr. Nyrop has argued for EFA-deficiency increasing the sensitivity of males particularly, to a chemical carcinogen in tobacco smoke and so contributing to bronchial carcinoma, and in general I endorse his views. Aortic atherosclerosis is unusually common in persons dying of bronchial carcinoma." He also feels that increases in the death rates from leukemia may be influenced by a dietary essential fatty

acid deficiency which increases sensitivity to the carcinogenic action of X-rays.

To test the relation of the essential fatty acids to atherosclerosis, Rinehart and Greenberg subjected 40 monkeys to a synthetic diet deficient in vitamin B₆ (pyridoxine, an essential fatty acid). The monkeys developed alterations in the blood vessels which resembled arteriosclerosis as it develops spontaneously in man, as well as fatty metamorphosis and cirrhosis of the liver, and a high rate of dental caries. Calling attention to the essentiality of vitamin B₆ in metabolism, particularly of proteins, the authors state that it is problematical whether the average daily intake of pyridoxine in man (1.5 mg.) is adequate to meet metabolic needs. They raise the question of whether or not long-term suboptimal intake of pyridoxine may be a contributory factor in the pathogenesis of important human diseases—arteriosclerosis, dental caries, and cirrhosis of the liver.

In an experiment with young men who had arteriosclerotic heart disease, Farquhar and associates found that the administration of beta sitosterol resulted in highly significant reductions in serum cholesterol and beta-lipoprotein lipid. The apparent lack of deleterious effect, coupled with the observed changes, suggested to them that sitosterol might be a therapeutic agent, although its value has not been established clinically.

In another study Pollak found that simultaneous feeding of sitosterol and cholesterol to rabbits results in complete inhibition or mitigation of the hypercholesteremia commonly resulting from feeding cholesterol alone to rabbits. Pollak also found that the administration of sitosterol to man will reduce the serum cholesterol level without harming health, or interfering with metabolism of any foodstuff other than cholesterol. Sitosterol is found in the oils of wheat germ, the common bean, rye germ, and corn germ, in corn gluten, in the dry hull of hempseed, and in the leaves of kale and broccoli.

Pollak doubts the significance of the fact that populations on low fat and cholesterol content diets have relatively low serum cholesterol values, holding that it is not clear what causes the low serum cholesterol. Although it is possible, as usually assumed, that it may be the result of lowered fat intake, it is also possible that a relatively high intake of proteins leads to relative hyperalbuminemia and stabilization of plasma colloids, including lipoproteins and cholesterol. This phenomenon could be due, he states, to an intake of sitosterol sufficient to prevent resorption of dietary cholesterol. "Much attention is being paid to the foodstuffs missing from the diet of those persons, but little attention is paid to the relative or absolute increase of other nutrients. * * * It would be interesting to learn the sitosterol content of diets in people with low blood cholesterol values."

In still another approach to the relation between diet and health, a group of over 400 British physicians and dentists sponsored a public declaration on soil, food, and health. This public declaration, which was a call for further research, points to experimental farm work tending to show that foodstuffs raised on land fertilized either exclusively or in part by chemical fertilizers have the effect of altering the chemical composition of that food, or of stock fed on it, to the detriment of its nutritive value. Seeing a possible connection between the increased use of commercial fertilizers and the incidence of degenerative diseases, the framers of the declaration make the following statement:

"In our view, the recent suggestion of the importance of the essential fatty acids to the circulatory and nervous systems and to the carcinoma barrier points to the kind of knowledge which is becoming essential to us as practitioners."

L. C. Filios and his coworkers produced gross atherosclerosis in rats by feeding them a synthetic diet containing cholesterol, sodium cholate, and thioauracil for periods up to 363 days. They noted that although "the mechanisms involved in the atherogenic process are still subject to speculation, the bulk of experimental evidence favors the theory that the occurrence of atherosclerotic lesions is associated with impaired cholesterol metabolism." In their study, they felt that the dietary cholate may have interfered with cholesterol-to-cholic acid conversion in the liver, with resulting hypercholesterolemia. In addition, they feel, the sodium cholate feeding may have facilitated the absorption of the dietary cholesterol and this in turn contributed to the increased serum cholesterol levels. The cholate feeding may also have added to the depletion of body organic sulfur stores. Sulfur amino-acid deficient diets facilitate or enhance induced hypercholesterolemia.

There have been other studies indicating that atherosclerosis and hypercholesterolemia may be related to a disturbance in cholesterol metabolism that is not, in itself, the result of a high fat content in the diet. A genetic study of patients with atherosclerosis led Adlersberg and associates to the conclusion that "it appears that the common factor for most patients with atherosclerosis may be a hereditary disturbance of cholesterol metabolism manifested by elevated serum cholesterol." Gertler and White also conclude that coronary heart disease is a familial disease, and believe that the implications of studies indicating this are of "utmost importance for the control of the disease."

Gertler and White are doubtful that diet plays so important a role in atherosclerosis. Noting that there is practically no correlation between amount of cholesterol ingested and serum cholesterol levels, they suggest that "a major source of cholesterol could possibly be endogenous." When atherosclerotic patients are put on a low cholesterol diet, they note, serum cholesterol levels drop off at first, then resume former levels, indicating that when exogenous source is cut off, the endogenous source eventually takes up the slack. They also note that the phospholipids may act as colloidal stabilizers by maintaining the serum cholesterol in suspension, preventing its tendency to be attracted to the intimal tissues and thus be deposited there. Hence, a disturbance in the colloidal state of the blood may be one of the most important factors in atherosclerosis.

They discount the value of comparative studies of different national groups. Autopsies of Okinawans, they say, show that about 12 percent have atherosclerosis, which figures are comparable to United States data. The low rates of death from atherosclerosis of national groups on poor diets may not be a sign of health: "actually, ill-nourished individuals and chronic alcoholics are more prone to other diseases at an early age and hence do not always attain the age at which degenerative diseases manifest themselves."

They question also the comparability to humans of data obtained from rabbits and dogs. The cholesterol levels induced in laboratory animals are much higher than man would have; lesions in the arteries produced by excessive cholesterol are mainly in the distal arteries, not in the coronary arteries, meaning that the human disease process has not actually been reproduced in animals.

In March 1957 the American Medical Association's Council on Foods and Nutrition held a symposium to sum up present knowledge of the interrelationships of fats, serum cholesterol, and atherosclerosis. In the words of the journal editorial commenting on this symposium, "the one definite conclusion that resulted from this investigative meeting is

that quite a bit more study concerning dietary fats will have to be done before the average American's eating habits are to be drastically altered."

No reason is seen, the editorial states, for nonoverweight persons with normal serum cholesterol levels and without a familial history of early death from heart disease to make any change in diet. Obese persons with cholesterol levels that are not elevated might do well to reduce, they believe, but "at the present time this is the only diet modification that can be recommended for such persons." Individuals with consistently elevated serum cholesterol levels would "have somewhat more reason" to attempt to lower them, particularly if they have family histories of early death from cardiovascular disease. It is emphasized, however, that the present state of knowledge is inconclusive.

I submit also an article on atherosclerosis by Dr. Donald S. Fredrickson of the National Heart Institute, National Institutes of Health:

CURRENT ATTITUDES ABOUT ATHEROSCLEROSIS

(By Donald S. Fredrickson, M.D.)

(Evidence grows that fat metabolism is causally related to atherosclerosis. Susceptible persons can sometimes be singled out by doing blood lipid or lipoprotein measurements. And for some patients, dietary instruction appears to be in order—instruction that includes (1) proper caloric intake, (2) curtailment of saturated fat. To date, there is no drug therapy that deserves unqualified recommendation.)

At present it is more accurate to consider the problem of atherosclerosis, especially its clinical management, in terms of attitudes rather than in terms of established facts about the causes, prevention and cure of this disease. The chronic nature of atherosclerosis, the awkward uncertainties in premortem diagnosis, and the requirement that man be the ultimate experimental subject make it very difficult to satisfy the demand for categorical answers from the brilliant but limited research advances which have been so recently made. The result is an understandable and, no doubt, temporary chaos, from which the physician is, nevertheless, expected to extract something worth while for his patient's care and comfort.

It may be refreshing to review a few questions concerning atherosclerosis along with some answers apt for the time of this writing. While the answers will be meant to reflect a majority opinion of those closely studying this disease, they must be taken for what they are—current attitudes about atherosclerosis.

Question 1. Are we any closer to understanding the cause of atherosclerosis than we were, say, 5 years ago?

Answer. Yes, we are. At least evidence has grown much stronger which tends to incriminate fat—either fat in the diet or some wayward aspect of fat metabolism—as casually related to atherosclerosis.

Up to 5 years ago, almost all the evidence supporting this relationship had been obtained by direct experiments with animals. The work is now about 45 years old which first showed that the feeding of cholesterol to rabbits could lead to development of typical lesions in their arteries. In recent years this has been extended to other animals, up to and including the monkey. But such experiments still fall short of the critical animal, man. Because of the obvious difficulties of performing this last and most important experiment, more recently the evidence has been sought indirectly, through epidemiologic studies. These have taken several forms. One has led to incontrovertible evidence that groups of patients with good clinical evidence of coronary artery

disease have higher blood lipids than comparable groups of normals. This is certainly true for Americans, and it appears to be valid for some other population groups as well. In the study of populations on a worldwide basis, it is also strongly suggested that the nature of the diet is correlated with the plasma lipid levels and the incidence of atherosclerosis. It may be tentatively concluded, at least, that diet is more important than race, for example.

Most of these studies have concentrated upon the amount, and more recently, the kinds of fat eaten by one group as opposed to another. They have succeeded in demonstrating that populations eating larger amounts of animal fat seem to have more atherosclerosis. They have not proved a cause and effect relationship and have not attempted to rule out all other variables even in the diet.

Finally, although most advances have been made in correlating lipid metabolism with atherosclerosis, there are other areas, some unrelated, of progress. There is now convincing statistical evidence that hypertension accelerates development of atherosclerosis. Intimal injury and other local effects have been demonstrated to be of importance, and various aspects of blood-clotting mechanism are being given increasing attention.

Question 2. If most Americans have higher values for blood cholesterol than, say, the South African Bantus, does measurement of blood lipids constitute a worthwhile clinical test for screening patients for atherosclerosis in this country?

Answer. Yes. Blood lipid measurements do help single out patients prone toward accelerated development of atherosclerosis. However, every physician is aware that many patients may still have severe atherosclerotic coronary artery disease with blood lipid values well below the considered upper limit of normal for our population.

Question 3. Aren't cholesterol measurements old fashioned, and isn't it better to measure the plasma lipoproteins or the atherogenic index?

Answer. First, let us review several helpful points about lipid transport. All the fats in the blood circulate bound to protein. The cholesterol, phospholipids, and the triglycerides, sometimes called neutral fat, are present in plasma and lymph in association with globulins, or as "lipoproteins." The small amount of lipid remaining, the unesterified fatty acids, are largely bound to albumin. The lipoproteins contained in the plasma of a normal fasting human may be considered for convenience in two great groups, arbitrarily called the "low density" and the "high density" lipoproteins. Each group contains several subspecies of lipoproteins. The low density lipoproteins have been divided into classes by means of ultracentrifugal techniques first described by Gofman and his colleagues. They are denoted by S_i numbers which indicate the rate of flotation of the lipoproteins, a property inversely related to their densities. The "atherogenic index," introduced by these workers, is a mathematical term derived from the sum of the weighted concentrations of certain S_i classes. They have shown that the average "atherogenic index" of a group of patients with coronary artery disease is significantly higher than a group of similar age and sex who are free of clinical evidence of atherosclerosis. Strictly speaking, measurements of plasma cholesterol and plasma low-density lipoproteins are not the same. With the lipoproteins one also indirectly obtains a measurement of other lipids, particularly the triglycerides, which make up more of the lipoprotein molecules of lower density (and higher S_i values). About two-thirds of the cholesterol normally present

ent in plasma is carried in the low-density lipoproteins. For reasons only poorly understood, it happens that an elevation in plasma cholesterol usually expresses itself in a raised concentration of some or all of the low-density lipoproteins. Hence measurement of cholesterol gives a rough index of low-density lipoprotein levels. It alone does not distinguish between which S₁ classes of lipoproteins may be elevated. Gofman and his group have stressed that these latter measurements, which constitute the "atherogenic index" are necessary for accurate diagnosis of patients with an atherosclerotic tendency, and, more recently, for proper dietary management of such patients.

Recently a careful study of the relative diagnostic values of cholesterol and lipoprotein determinations was published. It unfortunately involved only a 2-year period of observation, a short interval for study of atherosclerosis. The results failed to convince the majority of the workers involved that the more sophisticated lipoprotein measurements were any more successful than cholesterol measurements alone in helping select those patients likely to soon develop coronary artery disease. This by no means disproved the possibility that certain lipoproteins have more to do with the cause of atherosclerosis than cholesterol alone. The present evidence makes it extremely difficult, however, to recommend to a physician that he use the more expensive ultracentrifugal analyses as a routine diagnostic procedure.

Question 4. What is the exact relationship between dietary fat, the blood cholesterol, and the atheroma?

Answer. The exact relationship between these three parameters is still a major unsolved problem. A relationship of the dietary fat to atherosclerosis is strongly suggested by epidemiologic studies. On the basis of good experimental studies, a relationship of dietary fat to plasma cholesterol likewise seems to be established. There is not enough evidence to be absolutely certain that these three factors are sequentially involved, i.e., that dietary fat is related, through elevating the plasma cholesterol, to the development of atherosclerosis. Despite the studies that indicate that some fats have differing effects on the plasma cholesterol, there is yet no experimental evidence in man, or in animals for that matter, that different kinds of dietary fat will have a different effect on the development of atherosclerosis. The evidence to forge this important link in the chain must still be obtained.

Question 5. What exactly is currently meant by dietary fat in relation to atherosclerosis? Is this the amount of cholesterol in the diet or is it something else?

Answer. It has been shown that the amounts of cholesterol per se likely to be found in the American diet do not influence the plasma cholesterol level. Emphasis has passed from cholesterol to the triglycerides or esters of fatty acids and glycerol, which make up most of the body and dietary fat. These dietary constituents have been shown to affect plasma cholesterol.

The triglycerides consist mainly of fatty acids which may differ chemically in several ways. One important difference is the degree of saturation with hydrogen of the bonds linking carbon atoms in the fatty acid chain. Acids containing double bonds are called unsaturated acids, because they still can be saturated with more hydrogen at these linkages. The saturated acids have no carbon-to-carbon double bonds.

It is convenient to define the degree of unsaturation in terms of the iodine number, in other words, by the amount of iodine which can be added to existing double bonds. The more iodine, the higher the iodine num-

ber, and the greater the degree of unsaturation.

Question 6. What are the sources of the saturated and unsaturated fats?

Answer. With the exception of one vegetable fat, coconut oil, most saturated fats are of animal origin, such as milk and egg fat, lard and other meat fats. Most unsaturated fats such as olive, peanut, cottonseed, corn, soybean and safflower oils come from plants. Some of the most unsaturated fats such as the fish oils again may be animal in origin. Commercially, hydrogen is added to many naturally unsaturated fats to protect against rancidity and alter their texture for various purposes.

Good evidence, based strictly on experimental diets, indicates that there is a very real difference between the effect of certain dietary fats on the plasma cholesterol. When given in large amounts (50 to 100 grams per day) those fats which are saturated will raise the plasma cholesterol. When these fats are replaced by large amounts of unsaturated fats, such as corn oil, the cholesterol level is lowered. There is no question about these experimental facts at the present time, although it is not certain that degree of saturation is the only factor involved in results obtained with these diets.

Question 7. Is, then, vegetable fat (oleomargarine) healthier than animal fat (butter)?

Answer. This question has been raised to make a point. The actual answer is unknown. Oleomargarine usually consists largely of a mixture of naturally unsaturated cottonseed and soybean oils. However, partly because the housewife may not like her spreads to run at room temperature, and for other reasons, oleomargarine is partially hydrogenated. While few if any studies have been made using oleomargarine as the only source of fat, extensively hydrogenated vegetable oils appear to have the same effect on plasma cholesterol as do the saturated animal fats. Hence the origin of fat is less important than the subsequent handling, if this includes hydrogenation.

Question 8. The so-called essential fatty acids like linoleic acid are unsaturated and come largely from vegetable sources. Is not atherosclerosis then a deficiency disease, a deficiency of essential fatty acids or of vitamins?

Answer. However attractive this hypothesis may be, it has not been buttressed as yet by much experimental data. Most nutritionists believe there is no evidence of an absolute deficiency of essential fatty acids in the American diet. It has also not been shown that essential fatty acid deficiency in animals will produce atherosclerosis.

Question 9. Does the present state of knowledge warrant the use of diet therapy to prevent or cure atherosclerosis?

Answer. No one knows with certainty whether altering the fat in the diet in any way will reduce the amount of atherosclerosis in our population. The reluctance of most nutritionists to recommend sweeping changes in the diet of everyone on the basis of what we now know is understandable. We also do not know if radical changes in the diet in humans will cause atherosclerotic lesions to regress. But, for some patients, dietary instruction appears to be in order.

Our best working hypothesis today is based on the observations that elevated blood lipids are related in some way to atherosclerosis and that blood lipids can be affected by diet. The modifications in diet necessary to produce presumably desirable changes in blood lipids have also not been demonstrated to be potentially harmful. It therefore seems unreasonable to ignore the information now available in the care of those patients who bear a greater threat of an untimely death from atherosclerosis.

Question 10. Who are these patients to whom attention to diet should be recommended?

Answer. This group properly includes patients with so-called essential elevations in blood cholesterol or low-density lipoprotein levels. There is a prevailing attitude that it should also include any patient with coronary artery disease or a family history which is suggestive of hypercholesterolemia, xanthomas or a tendency to accelerated development of atherosclerosis, even though these patients may have normal cholesterol levels.

Ideally every patient over 40, with a suggestive history or not, should have a determination made of plasma lipids. The minimum examination of blood lipids must be made on blood taken after an overnight fast. It includes: (1) Observation, preferably by the physician himself, of the clarity of the serum or plasma. If even faint turbidity is present, one may be fairly certain that the triglycerides, and concomitantly the levels of the lower density, triglyceride-rich lipoproteins are elevated. (2) Determination of plasma cholesterol by a reputable laboratory capable of furnishing its own limits of normal in terms of age and sex. Every physician caring for this type of problem should arrange for the proper execution of these two simple, inexpensive tests. If more elaborate information is desired, serum may be sent to a specialized laboratory for lipoprotein analyses. With the finding of an elevated cholesterol level or turbidity in fasting serum with or without marked elevation in cholesterol (or the finding of abnormal low-density lipoprotein values), the patient deserves some nutritional instruction from his physician.

Question 11. What dietary changes should be recommended to these patients?

Answer. Diet instruction in atherosclerosis lies in an area at present so controversial that the most conservative attitude is justifiable. In the experimental studies so far reported, however, three conclusions stand out which can be incorporated into a reasonable dietary approach. These are: that a diet high in saturated fat will result in higher cholesterol levels than diets high in unsaturated fats; that a diet very low in all kinds of fat, and therefore usually high in carbohydrate, may tend to raise, rather than lower, some of the low-density lipoprotein levels; that any diet containing excess calories, even if these include large amounts of unsaturated fat, will adversely affect plasma lipid levels. It has been adequately shown that obesity is associated with greater incidence of coronary artery disease.

Therefore, for the patients chosen for attention to diet: (1) The proper number of calories to maintain ideal weight should be prescribed. A balanced reduction diet may have to be used initially. (2) Major sources of saturated fat should be curtailed. This means that visible fat on meats is to be left uneaten and the use of lean meats such as chicken and baked fish is to be encouraged. The use of whole milk products should be sharply reduced and skim milk, a valuable source of protein and calcium, should be substituted. Butter and oleomargarine should be used sparingly, one pat a day, for example. If an egg is eaten, the daily ration of lean meat should be reduced. Fruits and vegetables are freely permitted. Unsaturated oils, like corn, cottonseed, soybean, safflower, peanut, and others, which are inexpensive and widely available, should be used liberally and with all ingenuity. Such oils may be used not only as salad dressing but for cooking and some baking as well. For some patients, the use of palatable commercial preparations of vegetable oils may be advisable as a dietary supplement, but never to caloric excess. There is

no evidence whatever to suggest the capsules containing a gram or less of linoleic acid will offer anything of benefit when added to the above balanced diet. The same is true of small quantities of vitamins available in certain special vitamin preparations, although adequate multivitamin supplement is a wise addition to any reduction diet.

Such general dietary instruction represents a practical formula designed to give appropriate patients the benefit of current developments in research. It may not cure atherosclerosis, and in some cases it may even fail to lower elevated blood lipids. However, dietary management of this type represents a positive approach of potential benefit—about all that we have to offer at the present time.

Question 12. What about drugs in addition to diet? Specifically, heparin, sitosterols, or estrogens?

Answer. Sitosterols are cholesterol-like sterols found in plants. Careful experiments have shown that daily ingestion of large amounts of sitosterols can lower serum cholesterol. A few experimentalists believe that some of the vegetable oil effect on serum cholesterol may be due to presence of sitosterols. There is evidence to indicate they may interfere with absorption of cholesterol in the diet, and endogenous cholesterol secreted into the gut. However, it is general experience that sitosterols will usually effect not more than a 10- to 15-percent fall in serum cholesterol, and this is not consistently obtained. A major problem, as with all drugs, is the apparent necessity of continued administration for continued effect. This alone limits enthusiasm for wider use of sitosterol preparations.

There are two possible rationales for using heparin. One is its anticoagulant effect. The other is the interesting fact that heparin causes the release into the blood stream of "clearing factor," or "lipoprotein lipase," an enzyme catalyzing hydrolysis of triglycerides. Such enzyme activity may change hyperlipemic blood from a creamy to a clear state. Heparin is being used in several large experimental studies. It has been reported to increase the longevity of patients following myocardial infarction. It is still unknown whether this is due to the anticoagulant effect or to the effect on "clearing factor." We are going to hear much more about heparin and other anticlotting agents in the future, but at the present time it is still expensive, requiring parenteral administration, and it is not entirely without hazard. Long-term clinical trials with heparin for patients surviving myocardial infarction are justified. Its use in patients with abnormal blood lipids but without coronary artery disease is still experimental.

Finally, estrogens. There is no question but that giving estrogens will revert the lipoprotein pattern of a male to that of a premenopausal female. There is also no doubt that the young female enjoys more immunity from atherosclerosis. However, all estrogenic preparations must be pushed to the point where the patient has the usual unsatisfactory side effects before appreciable changes in blood lipids are observed. There are several long-term studies in progress on the effect of the estrogens on the longevity of patients surviving myocardial infarction. They have not yet produced significant conclusions. The use of estrogens in uncomplicated hyperlipidemias is also still restricted to experimental studies. For obvious reasons, present estrogenic preparations will never be applicable to a large population of patients.

In effect, there are today no drugs to be unqualifiedly recommended to the practitioner for treatment of atherosclerosis per se. For elevated blood lipids accompanying diabetes or hypothyroidism, insulin or thy-

roid preparations, of course, have a distinct place in therapy.

These are some current attitudes about atherosclerosis. Some of them may soon be discarded; all are subject to change. This changeability itself expresses our expectation of gradually finding more definitive means of affecting the development of this important disease.

Finally, I submit an article from the Milwaukee Journal of June 26, 1960, demonstrating the concern of the Nation's dairy industry over this problem:

DAIRY FOODS SURVEY MADE—DOCTORS QUESTIONED

CHICAGO, ILL.—News stories linking dairy products to heart disease have not undermined doctors' confidence in those foods, an official of the National Dairy Council said Saturday.

Gaylord P. Whitlock, director of the council's health education program, said that in a survey of 1,000 physicians, only 10 percent said they had been affected by such reports. Less than half of these said the reports had affected their dietary recommendations.

Whitlock spoke at the closing session of a summer conference of the nutrition research organization.

"The big story centered around the fat-heart disease controversy," said Whitlock. "Only about 10 doctors out of the 1,000 expressed concern about strontium 90 (nuclear fallout)."

FOURTEEN PERCENT URGE LESS FAT

The survey, taken by the council, showed that only 6 out of each 10 doctors surveyed make any diet recommendations to their patients. More than one-third of these doctors do not restrict the use of dairy products, while 10 percent do restrict certain dairy products and 14 percent recommend reduction of fat in the diet.

"Two-thirds to three-fourths of all doctors recommend whole milk for all age groups, varying from infants to senior citizens, and recommend milk in amounts that are generally acceptable to the nutrition authorities—more than three glasses per day for youngsters and about two and one-half glasses per day for oldsters," said Whitlock.

Where doctors did not recommend dairy products, other than whole milk, their reasons were primarily that the diet could be balanced without them, and to reduce fat.

"I'D LIKE SOME ANSWERS"

A sense of urgency in settling the questions raised about milk products was shown by the board chairman of the council, a Kentucky dairy farmer.

John A. Moser of Louisville, who also is treasurer of the American Dairy Association, said in an interview that "scientists are troubled and I'd like some answers myself." This is the feeling of other farmers, too, he said.

"We can't cram down the throats of the consumers anything that they don't want, especially if the doctors say it is not good for them," Moser said.

As a Holstein breeder, Moser said he had been asking himself if he should be breeding for 4-percent fat content in milk, when some experts are saying that a 2.5-percent milk is what the public wants.

Moser said he didn't want to call the professional men wrong in the weight problem, but he felt there was "a difference in human beings—just like a beef calf puts on more meat than a dairy calf."

Moser noted that researchers had reported at a recent meeting of the American Medical Association that: "There are plenty of factors, other than diet, implicated in heart disease, including heredity, sex, obesity, exercise, hypertension, and stress."

Moser rapped food faddists for making a "favorite target" out of milk or dairy foods.

What do we or can we conclude from these samplings on the subject of diet, cholesterol, and heart disease?

It adds up to the fact that we do not know nearly all that we need to know to protect the health of our people or to guide the future of the dairy industry and agriculture.

There is evidence to show that a diet high in saturated fats will result in a high level of blood cholesterol. There is evidence indicating that excessive blood cholesterol may produce atherosclerosis, which may in turn produce coronary artery disease, heart attacks, and death.

There is other evidence, of equal importance, showing that heredity, blood pressure, body chemistry, obesity, lack of exercise, nervous tension, and even smoking, are of as much or more significance in producing atherosclerosis.

Diet may be a factor in producing heart diseases—but it is at most only one factor. How much weight should be placed upon diet in this context is a matter of debate between the most eminent medical scientists. Some give it no weight, others think it the most important factor.

When the experts disagree so widely, when different doctors give different advice to patients as to whether they should or should not eat dairy products or meat, and how much or how little, can the public be expected to do the right thing?

Is the dairy cow a much-maligned animal? Are her butter and cream good for us, or not? Is milk the perfect food it has been thought to be?

Personally, I am inclined to think that the cow and her products have been overly insulted—that the saturated fat-cholesterol-atherosclerosis link up has been overpublicized and overrated.

However, we want to be, and we must be, realistic; we are dealing with something which might affect the life span of millions of people.

If animal fats and the dairy cow are shown to be the villain in producing heart attacks, I shall admit it. But I do not want to wait 5, 10, 15, or more years to get the facts.

The current haziness on saturated fats, unsaturated fats, and cholesterol needs to be dispelled promptly. We want the truth, and the whole truth.

To that end, I suggest the following program of action:

First. Continuing, and greatly accelerating, basic research by the National Institutes of Health in cooperation with other research institutions into the composition and effect of cholesterol, its relation to saturated fats in the diet, and its relation to atherosclerosis and other diseases.

Second. Continuing, and greatly accelerating, research to discover drugs and medicines which will safely reduce the blood cholesterol level in human beings.

Such work is now being done by the National Institutes of Health and by many pharmaceutical companies. I have been advised, for example, that the William S. Merrill Co. of Cincinnati now has available for doctors' prescription,

a drug called MER/29, which reduces high blood cholesterol levels. Other companies have developed or are working on other drugs of this nature. The National Institutes of Health should promptly test these drugs for safety and side effects, so that the best possible products will be available to the public.

Third. An all-out effort by the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with such groups as the National Dairy Council and the American Dairy Association, to discover means of reducing the saturated fat content of the foods we eat and drink.

A number of researchers have experimented with means to reduce the fat content of meat and milk, without affecting the taste or flavor of the product. This work should be stepped up, and should have the support of the Department of Agriculture and of the industries involved.

The dairy industry particularly needs to be realistic. Unlike the tobacco industry, which has tended to scoff at the evidence of a connection between smoking and cancer, the dairy industry can, I believe, gain popular good will if it seriously engages all along the line in scientific effort to bring out the facts concerning diet, cholesterol, and heart disease.

I am writing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Agriculture, urging them to implement the program referred to above.

I hope that HEW, Agriculture, and the industries involved will work closely together to attack this problem promptly and with coordination.

The public deserves the facts, and we in the Congress have a duty to see that they get the facts quickly.

TRANSFER OF NIKE SITES TO NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of the House, I had occasion to visit the Nike-Ajax Orchard Park—East Aurora Site No. 34. This is one of the sites adjacent to the city of Buffalo, N.Y., which was turned over to the New York State National Guard by the Army recently.

Upon my arrival I was met by the commanding officer and escorted to a briefing room. After the briefing, a tour was arranged for me to go through the facilities by the following officers:

Capt. Earl Close, commanding officer, Battery D, 2d Missile Battalion—Nike-Ajax—106th Artillery, New York Army National Guard.

First Lt. Owen B. Schnitzer, commanding officer, Battery A, 2d Missile Battalion—Nike-Ajax—106th Artillery, New York Army National Guard.

Maj. James F. Swist, information officer, 209th Artillery Group—Air De-

fense—New York Army National Guard.

Capt. Thomas Pierino, intelligence officer.

Capt. Edmund J. Dietzel, chaplain.

First I was shown the electrical devices which are the integral part of the operation. These were manned by soldiers, and the details were explained by the officer-in-charge.

Following this inspection of the base, our entire party was driven to the missile location.

In viewing the operation of this facility and observing a practice alert, I found that the men who operate this well equipped defense installation are familiar with the equipment. They handle it with expertness and ease—which creates confidence in the people whose safety, homes, and lives may depend upon this capability in the event of enemy attack. The assumption of the operation of these bases by the National Guard places this organization in an active, day-to-day role in the defense area. This transfer plays an important part in the overall military policies of the United States. Furthermore, this transfer of operational responsibilities releases Regular Army personnel, who manned these facilities previously, for reassignment elsewhere.

This maximum utilization of manpower is an excellent method of stretching our defense dollars to meet the ever-present threats and dangers of the existing cold war.

This visit to one of the segments of the defense of my immediate congressional district was an enlightening experience. While we, in Congress, concern ourselves mainly with the overall defense of our country, it is well to maintain contact with matters close at home so that we can get a more clear picture.

OPERATION UNDER DONABLE SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that public health, education, and civil defense organizations received, at acquisition cost, \$97,860,585 worth of personal and real property pursuant to the donable surplus property program during the period April through June 30, 1960. The Secretary's press release states:

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

A breakdown of the property distribution by States follows:

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Personal property received by State surplus Property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Apr. 1 through June 30, 1960

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total.....	\$89, 578, 615	\$8, 281, 970	\$97, 860, 585
Alabama.....	3, 682, 872	3, 682, 872
Alaska.....	838, 825	114, 452	953, 277
Arizona.....	1, 284, 278	1, 284, 278
Arkansas.....	1, 114, 282	1, 114, 282
California.....	10, 388, 641	225, 543	10, 614, 184
Colorado.....	849, 557	5, 953, 441	6, 802, 998
Connecticut.....	819, 762	819, 762
Delaware.....	306, 484	306, 484
Florida.....	4, 020, 580	4, 020, 580
Georgia.....	2, 001, 579	500	2, 002, 079
Hawaii.....	282, 165	282, 165
Idaho.....	535, 072	535, 072
Illinois.....	3, 640, 471	3, 640, 471
Indiana.....	3, 610, 633	3, 610, 633
Iowa.....	547, 718	4, 000	551, 718
Kansas.....	999, 883	179, 250	1, 179, 133
Kentucky.....	1, 651, 957	17, 245	1, 669, 202
Louisiana.....	1, 853, 873	1, 853, 873
Maine.....	488, 921	488, 921
Maryland.....	1, 756, 412	77, 817	1, 834, 229
Massachusetts.....	2, 760, 243	2, 760, 243
Michigan.....	2, 334, 400	6, 469	2, 340, 869
Minnesota.....	1, 997, 408	1, 997, 408
Mississippi.....	1, 720, 900	1, 720, 900
Missouri.....	819, 319	819, 319
Montana.....	218, 775	8, 000	226, 775
Nebraska.....	495, 437	24, 000	519, 437
Nevada.....	287, 992	287, 992
New Hampshire.....	199, 724	199, 724
New Jersey.....	1, 740, 599	1, 750	1, 742, 349
New Mexico.....	905, 679	86, 975	992, 654
New York.....	5, 738, 176	5, 738, 176
North Carolina.....	1, 713, 387	51, 000	1, 764, 387
North Dakota.....	178, 756	260, 757	439, 513
Ohio.....	3, 158, 522	777, 796	3, 936, 318
Oklahoma.....	1, 979, 700	15, 130	1, 994, 830
Oregon.....	853, 017	2, 650	855, 667
Pennsylvania.....	2, 049, 961	72, 750	2, 122, 711
Rhode Island.....	314, 572	314, 572
South Carolina.....	961, 702	53, 203	1, 014, 905
South Dakota.....	275, 462	275, 462
Tennessee.....	2, 413, 996	36, 018	2, 450, 014
Texas.....	5, 707, 252	97, 249	5, 804, 501
Utah.....	1, 372, 358	1, 372, 358
Vermont.....	314, 704	314, 704
Virginia.....	2, 761, 275	105, 782	2, 867, 057
Washington.....	1, 880, 902	94, 380	1, 975, 282
West Virginia.....	767, 088	767, 088
Wisconsin.....	1, 857, 569	1, 857, 569
Wyoming.....	288, 455	288, 455
District of Columbia.....	368, 582	368, 582
Puerto Rico.....	503, 738	25, 813	529, 551
Virgin Islands.....

AREA DEVELOPMENT: A TRAGEDY IN THREE ACTS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, as we near the close of this session, all of us who have been so vitally interested in the adoption of a program to begin rehabilitation of areas now depressed by long-term unemployment must face the sad realization that we will return to our districts emptyhanded. When this second session convened in January most of us were convinced that the need for area redevelopment legislation was so great, and was so widely recognized, that we could confidently anticipate the enactment of an appropriate measure to place in the law of the land a mark of

Federal interest in the problem, and authorization of the first tangible efforts to correct it.

What we have witnessed instead has been the drawing of the final curtain on a tragedy in three acts. The first act ended on a note of disappointment for the people residing in depressed areas with the Presidential veto of a measure passed by the 85th Congress. The second act was climaxed by a second Presidential veto of an area redevelopment bill passed at this session of the 86th Congress which added to the disillusionment of the unemployed.

The final act was played to a foregone conclusion last week when the Secretary of Commerce appeared before a Senate subcommittee and testified for 3 hours. This meeting was called to seek a compromise among differing viewpoints. No compromise was reached, and none was possible under the circumstances.

The congressional majority which passed S. 722 in this 86th Congress was bipartisan, and it supported a reasonable approach to a serious national problem. It was never said by any responsible person that the contents of S. 722 offered a full and complete answer to the conditions created by long-term technological unemployment. Any bill passed by the Congress which is designed to deal with a situation without precedent is bound to be experimental by the very nature of the matter. And this is a situation without precedent—the existence of pockets of heavy unemployment in a time of generally high wages, new highs in personal income, and rising costs and prices.

The administration has consistently, during the past 5 years, viewed area redevelopment as if it were a new form of pork-barrel activity designed to distribute Federal funds at random and without justification. The Secretary of Commerce has repeatedly projected himself in the image of Old Mother Hubbard, pointing at an empty cupboard and wailing piteously that we can't afford to make the effort to reverse the economic cycle in areas which today do not contribute their proper share of productive activity to our economy.

They take the position, apparently, that some 3 million citizens and their families who have not had gainful employment for a year or more, and who reside in communities where employment prospects have evaporated, will suddenly, by a wave of a magic wand, become substantial employed persons again, without any investment of time, thought, planning, or money by anybody.

The administration was specifically requested by the Congress, through the medium of the passage of S. 722, to indicate a willingness to approach this problem of area redevelopment with an open mind. The bill contained sections which would have caused activity to be generated at several levels—in urban areas, in rural areas, in worker retraining, in public works tied to the creation of industrial attractiveness and utility. Admittedly, some of these approaches might have been found ineffective, and might have been dropped or superseded by others. In any case, we would have learned something about a problem

whose solution has defied us for over 10 years.

The answer to the passage of S. 722 was a veto. The answer to the effort to compromise was insistence upon a narrow program offering minimum hope of success, unworthy of support by the Congress. The areas of long-term unemployment were offered a gesture, a collection of crumbs off the table of national plenty.

Until recent weeks, there was a general disposition to consider area redevelopment on a bipartisan basis. Recently, however, we have been treated to a wave of oratory, especially from persons who do not serve in the Congress, which is designed to spread the belief that a so-called practical area redevelopment bill could have received White House approval. The word "practical" is not defined in this oratory, but those of us who have studied the problem know that the only practical approach is one offering the greatest hope of success at its point of application.

As matters stand, we will adjourn soon and file out of these halls after the conclusion of an area redevelopment tragedy with overtones of farce. We will have reached a zenith in impracticality in dealing with the problem. No remedial legislation will have been enacted, and everybody will lose—the unemployed, the merchants and businessmen of the affected communities, the employed persons who must pay for public services to the unemployed, and even the Federal Treasury, whose income depends heavily on the withholding tax from employed persons.

Clearly the issue must be joined again in the new climate of a new Congress, and joined it will be. As to the authorship of the tragedy, that will be determined by the people in November, and I have every confidence that they will lay the burden of guilt precisely where it belongs.

THE LATE HONORABLE OSWALD WEST

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. 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 gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 22, a very grave loss was suffered by the people of Oregon. The Honorable Oswald West, one of Oregon's greatest Governors, died at the age of 87. Os West, as three generations of admiring Oregonians have called him, was Governor for only one term, from 1911 to 1915. But in that one term, his devotion to government in the public interest changed the face of our State.

Governor West was responsible for initiating Oregon's State highway system, for enacting Oregon's pioneering workman's compensation law, and for the creation of the State board of control. Perhaps his most enduring contribution to Oregon, his greatest gift to Oregon's people, and his own most lasting memorial is the principle of public ownership of Oregon's 400 miles of ocean beach—on

which there are no private preserves, no stretches to which the public can be denied access to this day.

Os West, Mr. Speaker, was a Democrat, and as a Democrat I am proud of that fact. But he never hesitated to criticize his fellow Democrats when, in his eyes, they went wrong. His devotion to the welfare of Oregon, and his concern for the reforms which he established in his tenure as Governor, went far beyond party lines.

Os West, Mr. Speaker, was one of Oregon's authentic great men. His courage was boundless. His passion for justice was unlimited. His wit, his integrity, his understanding of the purposes of democracy will be sorely missed.

OLD CURRENCY LEGISLATION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I introduced the old currency bill which would save the taxpayers of this country somewhere between \$3 and \$5 million each year. Early in the 86th Congress, I again introduced my bill, H.R. 5691. This legislation, although noncontroversial, has not even been the subject of hearings in the Banking and Currency Committee. I believe this indicates that the majority members of the committee are not interested in a sound financial approach to problems of the Treasury and are not interested in saving money for the taxpayers.

Early in July I had hopes of favorable action by the House. It was at that time the Senate passed S. 3712, a bill that would accomplish the same purpose as H.R. 5691. Unfortunately, my anticipation that this Congress would finally approve this money-saving measure disappeared yesterday when the Banking and Currency Committee voted to table S. 3712.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for preventing the Federal Treasury from receiving the benefits of an immediate cash improvement totaling \$98.3 million and for robbing our taxpayers of better than \$3 million annually rests with the majority members of the committee. The vote in committee that has effectively killed the old currency bill was 13 to 9. Thirteen Democrats voted to table S. 3712. Two responsible Democrats and seven Republicans voted to report it out to the House.

Before I present figures that show the amount of money lost because of dilatory action during the past 3 years, I want to refresh the memories of Members of the House as to how this proposed legislation came about and again give credit to the man who brought the situation concerning old currency to light.

On January 12, 1957, Mr. Charles E. Putnam, of Seattle, Wash., asked the Secretary of the Treasury for an analysis of outstanding paper currency carried on the books of the Treasury. Mr. Putnam learned, for example, there was

\$1,143,198 in Treasury notes of 1890 outstanding, yet only about one-tenth of 1 percent was being returned for cancellation each year. He reached the conclusion it would take more than 1,000 years to cancel this obligation, during which time the Government would have to pay interest on the outstanding balance each year.

The results of such an unbusinesslike approach were obvious, so he wrote to me May 16, 1957, and suggested that I cooperate with others in the Congress and the Treasury Department to find the proper action to take.

Treasury officials informed me legislation was needed to get to the heart of the problem, so we worked out a bill which I introduced August 26, 1957, with hope of early enactment. Now, 3 years have passed since Mr. Putnam suggested this way of saving the American people a minimum of \$10,000 a day. Action by the Congress 3 years ago could have saved more than \$6 million, by the most conservative estimates, and possibly as much as \$13.5 million.

Earlier, I mentioned this proposal would have the effect of improving the Treasury's cash position by \$98.3 million. This would include \$31.2 million in gold now held as security for outstanding gold certificates, \$30 million in silver held as security for old silver certificates and \$37.1 million to be received from Federal Reserve banks to discharge their liability on account of the old large-scale Federal Reserve notes. The increase from these sources would enable the Treasury to decrease by corresponding amounts our outstanding interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations with an annual saving in interest costs of \$3 to \$3.5 million at current interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that each day the old currency bill is delayed, money that could be used for defense or other operations of the Government is being lost. The action of the committee in refusing to report S. 3712 to the House is an example of futility in extending this session of the Congress unnecessarily beyond July. It is a clear-cut example that when political maneuvering takes precedence over constructive, responsible legislation it is the American people who suffer. The example of fiscal irresponsibility exhibited yesterday by the Democratic majority on the Banking and Currency Committee is one which will be remembered by the voters on November 8.

THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Speaker, we in these legislative halls have a keenness and awareness of the problems which face our country. The American people have given us the daily assignment to grapple with these problems, both large and small, and somehow find ways to resolve them.

We labor under the U.S. Capitol dome, a glowing symbol of a free people in a free Nation.

Above our Capitol, and our Nation, hangs the scourge of communism, a wicked symbol of domination and greed. Its leaders are greedy men; they hunger for the control of our minds and bodies.

Some will tell you that this angry cloud is but a ghost. But we must not believe that, although the scourge may be shrouded in lofty slogans or pious oratory.

The aggression of communism is our most serious, most deadly and most immediate concern. It is a grave danger. And a danger, too, is the attitude of some on ways to resolve this greatest of all conflicts.

As the Communists wage war, they would have us wage peace. As the Communists seek victories, they would have us seek appeasement. As the Communists strike out to dominate the world, they would have us pamper other lands and peoples.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one clear-cut goal for the United States in this cold war. And that goal is not a plateau of stalemate; that goal is victory. If we do not win this war, we shall lose it. Our policies must reflect our goal of victory.

I have introduced a resolution which puts us on the inside lane of the first bend in that road to victory. I believe it should be the sense of Congress to break off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and other Communist dominated countries.

Almost by the hour, the Communist regime hurls an insult, breaks an agreement, assaults our citizens and property, or throws added sparks into the cold war. The recent shooting down of an Air Force RB-47 is but one example of Communist arrogance.

Let us show this gangster regime that we are not going to merely sit back and smile. Severance of relations would reflect a tough U.S. attitude. And is there anything wrong with that? Of course not, it is exactly what I believe the American people want.

The move would serve as a firm and forthright example to other countries of our disapproval of Communist tactics and perfidy.

The Communists harass our diplomats, shoot down our aircraft, kidnap our citizens, enforce their threats with espionage and blackmail. And, with diplomatic relations, they are provided an opportunity to carry out these programs within our very borders.

Severance of diplomatic relations would shut off the huge Communist network of espionage, headquartered here in the embassies of our Nation's Capital. It would halt a large influx of Communist agents into the United States. Many of these are now protected by diplomatic immunity.

And, aside from these reasons, if the American people felt that—with such action—the U.S. Government felt that strongly about it, there must be something important about this communism business, after all.

We do not recognize Red China and our reasons for not doing so apply to Soviet Russia and her satellites. Against

this entire evil bloc we must direct our thoughts of victory. Why favor our opposition with moral support?

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Glenn] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Lindsay. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a civil rights bill which I ask the House to enact. Most of this bill is not new. It picks up where we left off last May in our work on the Civil Rights Act of 1960. That was a good piece of legislation. But the House will recall that certain additional proposals, contained in bills that I and others introduced, did not survive House deliberation. Three of these proposals are now renewed in the bill that I have introduced. The fourth is a new proposal.

The Congress chose to stretch out its session in order to complete unfinished business. Among the items of unfinished business is civil rights. As I have stated, most of what I now propose was rejected by the Congress before the political conventions. However, at the conventions both parties in their platforms pledged performance on each of these points. Therefore, how can we now avoid our responsibility to finish the job?

The bill first, recognizes and grants congressional sanction to the Supreme Court's school desegregation case by providing technical assistance to those communities that are making efforts to comply with the law; second, calls for the creation of a statutory Commission on Equal Job Opportunities on Government Contracts with statutory powers; third, authorizes the Attorney General to bring actions for school desegregation when economic coercion or threat of physical harm is used to deter persons from going to court to establish their rights.

Each of the above proposals were contained in legislation which I introduced a year and a half ago.

And, fourth, the bill calls for strengthening of existing efforts to guarantee the right to vote to all qualified citizens by providing that completion of six primary grades in a State accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes. This is a new proposal. It is in the Republican platform. There have been mass denials of the right to vote under the 15th amendment by discriminatory applications of State literacy tests or by lack of objective standards. This is born out by the reports of the Civil Rights Commission and of the Attorney General of the United States.

We have heard many promises in the recent party conventions on the subject of Federal civil rights legislation. We have the promises; now let us have performance.

PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. GLENN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during the hearings on House Resolutions 606, citing Austin J. Tobin; 607, citing S. Sloan Colt; and 608, citing Joseph G. Carty, for contumacious conduct before a subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary, it was necessary that I leave the floor for a short period on urgent committee business. I therefore did not hear the remarks of my colleague from New Jersey, FRANK OSMERS, but I have now had the opportunity of reading his remarks in the RECORD.

I subscribe to and support his statement that when the New Jersey delegation decided in February to ask the Committee on the Judiciary for a staff study of the Port of New York Authority's compact to determine the authority's legal right to construct an airport in Morris County, N.J., it was not our thought, nor did we give any support to a resolution that would request the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to make a full investigation of the Port of New York Authority. In fact, this point was raised in the discussion and assurance was given that such was not the purpose of the meeting of the New Jersey delegation inasmuch as there were some of the members of the delegation who were not in accord with or in favor of a fishing expedition type of investigation of this bistate authority.

I was one of those present who so felt.

I join with my learned colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS], in his very sound and logical reasons for his stated opposition to these citations, and I am sure that when the proper tribunal passes on the constitutional grounds under which these citations were issued, they will be quashed and the matter will be adjudicated properly, as could have been done previous to this time by a declaratory judgment settling the jurisdictional controversy and without any harm to the reputation and standing of three very outstanding citizens who now stand cited for criminal contempt proceedings, which are altogether uncalled for.

JAPANESE AND ENGLISH COMPETITION IN PURCHASES BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Flood]. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter, including tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss a serious matter before this Congress today. Recently I sent the follow-

ing letter to the Department of the Interior.

AUGUST 17, 1960.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR,
CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON OFFICE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following is a direct quote of an article recently appearing in one of our local papers:

"A Japanese company for the first time was chosen to supply electricity-generating equipment for a Federal power project. The Interior Department named Hitachi New York, Ltd., to supply two turbines for a power plant near Redding, Calif., for \$664,860. The agency also picked English Electric Export & Trading Co., Ltd., of New York, a British concern, to build two turbines in a plant near Lewiston, Calif., for \$832,830. In both cases, the difference in bids by the foreign companies and those by U.S. firms was greater than the 6-percent differential which the 'Buy American Act' requires."

I would appreciate, at your earliest convenience, any information concerning the above—as to details on the bids for these two purchases, who the bidders were, and any other pertinent information you may be able to send me.

Thanking you in advance for your prompt attention in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

[Department of the Interior, Information Service Release, Aug. 12, 1960]

RECLAMATION AWARDS CONTRACTS FOR TURBINES FOR FOUR PROJECT POWERPLANTS

Award of contracts to manufacture nine hydraulic turbines required for four major hydroelectric powerplants on Bureau of Reclamation projects in California and Utah was announced today by the Department of the Interior.

The four contracts, involving work totaling \$3,421,240, were awarded as follows:

The contract for three 50,000-horsepower turbines for the Flaming Gorge powerplant, on the Green River in Utah near the Utah-Wyoming border, was awarded to James Leffel & Co., of Springfield, Ohio, on its bid of \$798,550.

Two 105,000-horsepower turbines for the Spring Creek powerplant, to be located about 2 miles north of Keswick Dam in Shasta County, Calif., will be built by Newport News (Va.) Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. for \$1,125,000.

Two 93,500-horsepower, 225-revolutions-per-minute vertical shaft hydraulic turbines for Clear Creek powerplant, near Redding, Calif., will be built by Hitachi New York, Ltd., a Japanese firm, at a bid price of \$664,860.

Two 85,000-horsepower turbines for Trinity powerplant, near Lewiston, Calif., will be built by English Electric Export & Trading Co., Ltd., of New York City, an English firm, for \$832,830.

Bidding was heavy on each contract, with participation in each bid invitation by both foreign and domestic manufacturers.

The Hitachi firm which has its main fabricating plant at Ibaragi-Ken, Japan, became the first Japanese firm to win a Bureau of Reclamation turbine contract. It was low among seven bidders for the contract to build the turbines for the Clear Creek unit of the Central Valley project's Trinity River division. The installation, to be constructed on Clear Creek approximately midway between Redding and Lewiston, Calif., will consist of two 67,000-kilowatt generators, each driven by a 93,500-horsepower turbine.

English Electric also won its first Bureau of Reclamation turbine contract with its low bid for the Trinity powerplant turbines, in competition with four other bidders. The installation, on Trinity River about 8 miles northeast of Lewiston, Calif., will include

two 50,000-kilowatt generators, each driven by a vertical shaft Francis-type hydraulic turbine. Each turbine will have two interchangeable runners—one to deliver 85,000-horsepower at a 426-foot head and the other to deliver 70,000-horsepower at a 334-foot head.

Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation N. B. Bennett, Jr., explained that the award of these contracts at this time would require the concurrent production of nine turbines for four major and important powerplants of the Bureau of Reclamation. He explained that it would not be in the interests of the Bureau under these circumstances to award more than one major turbine contract to each of the two firms that have not heretofore manufactured turbines for the Bureau, pending demonstration that technical standards of Bureau specifications did not present obstacles to satisfactory contract performance.

Based on this decision, Hitachi's bid for the Flaming Gorge turbines was rejected in favor of Leffel's second low bid of \$798,550. The powerplant installation at Flaming Gorge Dam, approximately 60 miles south of the city of Green River, Wyo., will consist of three 36,000-kilowatt generators, each driven by a 50,000-horsepower, vertical shaft Francis-type hydraulic turbine. The 490-foot-high Flaming Gorge Dam is the second largest feature of the Colorado River storage project. Work on the dam was started in mid-1958.

The Bureau's decision was applied in the bidding for the two Spring Creek turbines. Bids of the Hitachi and English Electric firms were rejected and the third low bid of Newport News firm was accepted. The Newport News bid was 13 percent below the engineer's estimate.

The Spring Creek powerplant, located on the west bank of Keswick Reservoir, will be connected with the Whiskeytown Reservoir by the 2.9-mile Spring Creek power conduit. The powerplant installation will consist of two 75,000-kilowatt, 225-r.p.m. generators, each driven by a 105,000-horsepower turbine.

Bids for the generators for the Trinity powerplants and the Flaming Gorge plant will be invited this fall. The three major Trinity Division powerplants (Trinity, Clear Creek, and Spring Creek) will have a total installed generating capacity of 384,000-kilowatts. These plants are expected to generate an average of 1.27 billion kilowatt-hours of hydropower annually for the Central Valley project power system. Completion of the project construction is scheduled for late 1963.

Pursuant to this information I issued the following public release:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT today condemned the administration's 6-percent-differential ruling in Government procurement. He blamed the loss of two turbine generators to Japanese manufacturers and two more to English manufacturers on the unrealistic unsound differential established by this administration which reduced the differential between foreign and American turbine manufacturers from 25 percent to 6 percent.

"This isn't enough to make up the difference in cost of production mandated by our Federal laws on social security, unemployment compensation, and other costs not encountered by foreign manufacturers. I warned 2 years ago after the loss of millions of man-hours of work for American workers that the 6-percent differential would be an open invitation for all low wage, low economy, low standard producers in foreign countries to take over the entire need of the United States for electrical generating facilities.

"It is apparent that this is fact becoming the rule rather than the exception when Japan, a country that has been a buyer of turbines from us, now sells their products to our Government.

"With the unemployment situation as it is in my area amongst this type of manufacturing it becomes a serious and dangerous matter. We can no longer ignore warnings that stand out both in our economic as well as our defense programs.

"This country can ill afford the luxury of government mandated unemployment and economic depression," concluded DENT.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit an analysis of the real differential that exists in actual transactions in Government procurement:

PURCHASES BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—DOMESTIC VERSUS FOREIGN

Question: "In instances where the Federal Government has the opportunity to purchase required goods of equal quality either from a foreign producer or from a domestic producer at a higher price, which purchase is the most economical for the Federal Government?"

The accurate answer to this question can not be determined by just applying the usual business approach of "when goods are of equal quality, buy on price." In fact, from a business standpoint, this axiom certainly does not apply in Federal Government transactions.

With the objective of proving that buying foreign goods at a lower price is not economical when compared with purchasing the same quality goods from a domestic producer, an analysis has been made of the flow of money resulting from both a foreign transaction and a domestic transaction.

The main point of this analysis is the inescapable fact that when any money is put to work within the United States it produces tax revenues for the Federal and State Governments. When money is paid directly to a foreign entity, no tax revenue is generated for the benefit of the United States.

For example, a domestic corporation receives an order from the Federal Government for \$100,000 of goods. To fill the order the corporation purchases its raw materials from suppliers; it purchases certain services necessary for its operations; it pays the wages of its employees and it pays for transporting the goods to their destination. The profit on the transaction is distributed as income taxes, as dividends to its stockholders and, in some instances, a portion is used to purchase new property and equipment.

Each of the above steps made by the domestic corporation results in the generation of revenue for some taxing entity; i.e., the supplier of materials must go through a similar process in his business; the companies and individuals furnishing services have business cycles which generate tax revenues; the employees receiving wages pay taxes directly and also contribute to the tax generating business of the merchants and others who serve them and their families.

This tax generating phenomenon is not activated when funds are paid directly to a foreign entity.

The following analysis shows that on the original transaction of selling \$100,000 of goods to the Federal Government, an average domestic manufacturing corporation will pay Federal and State taxes of \$6,250 or 6.25 percent of the gross sales value.

The taxes paid by the suppliers and employees on revenue paid to them by the average domestic manufacturing corporation, amount to an additional \$9,199.

At this point, of the original payment by the Federal Government for the \$100,000 purchase, Federal and State taxes aggregating \$15,449 have been generated.

The analysis carries the example transaction further so as to complete two cycles of money turnover. At the end of the second cycle, Federal and State tax generation amounts to \$36,014 or 36.014 percent of the original \$100,000 outlay.

ANALYSIS OF FEDERAL AND STATE TAX GENERATION RESULTING FROM A \$100,000 PURCHASE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM A DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING CORPORATION

Only the following taxes have been considered:

1. Federal and State income taxes.
2. Federal excise taxes.
3. State sales taxes.
4. Federal old-age benefit taxes (social security).
5. Federal and State unemployment taxes.

No consideration was given to:

1. Various State and local taxes such as franchise, ad valorem, personal property, gross receipts, etc.
2. Tax generation resulting from taxes paid, i.e., salaries of Federal and State Government employees paid from tax receipts.
3. Tax generation which would result from the purchase of new or replacement manufacturing equipment by the domestic corporation.

Exhibit A sets forth, in summary, the tax generation for an average domestic corporation within various manufacturing groups. (The average corporation for each group was determined by reference to "Statistical Abstract of the United States.")

Exhibit B sets forth, in detail, the tax generation for an average domestic manufacturing corporation. (The average corporation was determined by reference to "Statistical Abstract of the United States.")

References to specific source data are set forth in "Notes" and cross-referenced to exhibits A and B.

NOTES

Only two reference works have been used for basic data; namely:

Internal Revenue: "Statistics of Income" by Internal Revenue Service as published in "Statistical Abstract of the United States" by U.S. Department of Commerce; references are to the "Abstract", number in front of reference represents edition year.

United States: "U.S. Income and Output" by U.S. Department of Commerce, edition 1958.

1. One hundred thousand dollar contract award:

The assumed payment made by the U.S. Government to a domestic manufacturing corporation. When foreign competition is involved it may be assumed that the size of the contract is such that only businesses with a corporate financial setup will be able to compete.

2. Federal corporation income tax on an average manufacturer:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine Internal Revenue, page 380, table No. 482, "Active corporation income tax returns, 1956," total compiled receipts from returns with and without net income for manufacturing, line 18, \$319,313,746,000; income tax, \$12,289,618,000; computed tax rate, 3.84 percent on receipt.

3. State corporation income tax: Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine Internal Revenue, page 379, table No. 481, "Corporation income tax return, 1956," total compiled receipts, \$679,868 million for returns with and without income.

United States, page 165, table III-2, "State and local government receipts, 1956," line 9, corporate profits tax accruals, \$1,041 million.

Computed tax rate: 1,041 plus 679,868 equals 0.15 percent on receipt.

4. Excise and sales taxes, corporate and noncorporate taxpayers:

Although the Federal Government cannot be taxed, most State laws consider the Government contractor the consumer and subsequently charge him for the tax.

Million

United States, p. 164, table III-1, "Federal Government receipts and expenditures, 1956," line 10, indirect business tax and nontax accruals before refunds..... \$11,726
 United States, p. 165, table III-2, "States and local government receipts, 1956," line 11, sales tax... 7,989

Total excise and sales taxes... 19,715

	Amount	Computed ratios	Type of taxpayer
1958 Internal Revenue, p. 488, table No. 606, "Sole Proprietorships, Partnerships, and Nonmanufacturing Corporations, Gross Receipts, 1956":			
Sole proprietorships.....	\$117,100	} 22.02	Noncorporate.
Partnerships.....	75,000		
Note 3, 1st paragraph total compiled receipts for corporations.....	679,868	77.98	Corporate.
Total gross receipts.....	871,968	100.00	

Computed tax rate: 19,715 plus 871,968 equals 2.26 percent on receipt.

5. Distribution of dividends and salaries and wages by average manufacturer:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine Internal Revenue, page 380, table No. 482, "Active corporation income tax returns 1956," line 18, manufacturing:

	Amount	Computed ratios
Total compiled receipts.....	\$319,313,746,000	100.00
Dividends paid.....	7,177,397,000	2.26
United States, p. 201, table VI-2, "Wages and salaries by industry, 1956," line 12, manufacturing.....	77,697,000	24.33

6. Individual Federal income tax: Twenty percent is the lowest tax bracket for individuals. It is assumed that wages resulting from the contract transaction would be subject, at least, to this lowest tax rate.

Computed tax rate: 1,580 + 268,584 = 0.59 percent on dividends, wages, and salaries received by stockholders and employees.

7. Individual State income tax: Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine Internal Revenue, page 377, table No. 478, "Individual Income Tax Returns With Income, 1956," adjusted gross income, \$268,584 million.

8. Unemployment insurance tax: United States, page 170, table III-6, "Contributions for Social Insurance":

1956; line 4, State unemployment insurance.....	\$1,475
1956; line 5, Federal unemployment tax.....	326
Total.....	1,801

United States, page 165, table III-2, "State and Local Government Receipts and Expenditures, 1956," line 3, personal income taxes, \$1,580 million.

United States, page 201, table VI-2, "Wages and Salaries, By Industry, 1956," line 1, all industries, \$227,304 million.

Computed tax rate: 1,801 plus 227,304 equals 0.79 percent on wages and salaries.

9. Social security taxes:

Six percent is the actual rate effective January 1, 1960, being paid equally by employer and employee. "Business Statistics" 1957 bi-annual edition, U.S. Department of Commerce, page 69, shows as weekly earnings in 1956 \$86.31 for durable goods industry and \$71.10 for the nondurable goods industry, or approximately \$4,800 and \$4,000 respectively, per year. Subject earnings are well below the \$4,800 annual social security base.

10. Federal income tax for average U.S. corporation:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine Internal Revenue, page 379, table No. 481, "Corporation income tax return, 1956," returns with and without income:

	Million
Total compiled receipts.....	\$679,868
Total tax liability.....	21,364

Computed tax rate: 21,364 plus 679,868 equals 3.14 percent on funds distributed to corporate suppliers, etc.

11. Federal income tax for business entities other than corporations:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight Internal Revenue, page 488, table No. 606, "Sole proprietorships, partnerships, and nonmanufacturing corporations, 1956":

[In billions]		
	Gross receipts	Net profit before taxes
Sole proprietorships.....	\$117.1	\$14.8
Partnerships.....	75.0	7.9
Total.....	192.1	22.7

Computed: Profit to gross receipts 22.7 plus 192.1 equals 11.82 percent. At the lowest individual tax rate of 20 percent, the tax rate on gross receipts is 11.82 percent times 20 percent equals 2.36 percent on funds distributed to noncorporate suppliers, etc.

12. Distribution of dividends and salaries and wages by average U.S. business entity:

	Amount	Computed ratios
Note 4, total gross receipts computed.....	Million \$871,968	Percent 100.00
Note 8, wages and salaries, all industries.....	227,304	26.06
U.S., p. 206, table VI-8, net corporate dividend payments, 1956, line 1, all industries.....	12,038	1.38

EXHIBIT A.—Direct taxes generated for use by the Federal and State Governments and the economic cost to the United States from a \$100,000 contract award to individual U.S. manufacturing groups as compared with contracts awarded to foreign entities

	Contract to U.S. manufacturer			Actual cost to the United States for foreign purchase under a 7-percent margin	Percentage increase of cost to the United States when buying "foreign" as compared to "domestic," after only 2 cycles have been completed. The percent of excess cost will increase as more cycles are being added
	Accumulated tax generation		Economic cost to the United States after completion of only 2 cycles		
	Through 1st cycle	Through 2d cycle			
Stone, clay, and glass products (highest tax generation within the manufacturing group).....	\$24,324	\$39,143	\$60,857	\$92,999	53
Machinery, other than electrical.....	22,960	38,046	61,954	92,999	50
Paper and allied products.....	22,379	37,578	62,422	92,999	49
Chemical and allied products.....	21,953	37,237	62,763	92,999	48
Transportation equipment.....	21,851	37,154	62,846	92,999	48
Primary metal industries.....	21,801	37,113	62,887	92,999	48
Electrical machinery and equipment.....	21,502	36,868	63,132	92,999	47
Rubber products.....	20,134	35,775	64,225	92,999	45
Textile mill products.....	19,230	35,092	64,908	92,999	43
Petroleum and coal products.....	18,988	34,851	65,149	92,999	43
Tobacco (lowest tax generation within the manufacturing group).....	18,882	34,763	65,237	92,999	43

NOTE.—The same bases and ratios have been used as in exhibit B to accumulate above data, except that the 1st cycle reflects bases and ratios characteristic for the individual group. The sources are the same as those used for compiling the data for exhibit B.

EXHIBIT B.—Direct taxes generated for use by the Federal and State governments and the flow of funds resulting from a \$100,000 contract award to an average U.S. manufacturing corporation

	See note	Distribution base	Total funds available	Distribution of funds by taxable categories				Tax generated per turnover	Accumulated tax generation
				Dividends	Wages and salaries	For supplies, services, etc., paid to—			
						Corporate entities	Noncorporate entities		
1ST CYCLE									
Original distribution of funds by the Federal Government to a domestic manufacturer.....	1		\$100,000						
Which receipt is taxed at the following rates:									
Federal corporation income tax.....	2		1 3.84						
State corporation income tax.....	3		1 1.15						
Excise and sales taxes.....	4		1 2.26						
Giving a total tax rate of.....			1 6.25						
And tax generation in the amount of.....							\$6,250	\$6,250	
The balance of the funds, namely, \$100,000 less \$6,250 for taxes, is distributed by the manufacturer to its employees, stockholders, suppliers, etc.									
The ratio of distribution to employees and stockholders is based on the original receipt of \$100,000 to the employer.....	5	\$100,000		1 2.26	1 24.33				
While distribution to suppliers, etc., is the remainder of the funds, namely:									
Original contract receipts.....		\$100,000							
Less: Taxes.....		\$6,250							
Dividends (2.25 percent of \$100,000).....		2,260							
Wages and salaries (24.33 percent of \$100,000).....		24,330			32,840				
Funds available to suppliers.....		67,160							
Since suppliers, etc., may be both corporate and noncorporate entities, the amount, \$67,160, is broken down in the ratio of.....	4	67,160				1 77.98	1 22.02		
Resulting in the following tax bases.....			\$68,750	\$2,260	\$24,330	\$52,371	\$14,789		

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT B.—Direct taxes generated for use by the Federal and State governments and the flow of funds resulting from a \$100,000 contract award to an average U.S. manufacturing corporation—Continued

	See note	Distribution base	Total funds available	Distribution of funds by taxable categories				Tax generated per turnover	Accumulated tax generation
				Dividends	Wages and salaries	For supplies, services, etc., paid to—			
						Corporate entities	Noncorporate entities		
The balance of funds, etc.—Continued									
Since suppliers, etc.—Continued									
Which are taxed at the following rates:									
Individual Federal income tax	6			1 20.00	1 20.00				
Individual State income tax	7			1 .59	1 .59				
Unemployment insurance tax	8				1 .79				
Social security taxes	9				1 6.00				
Federal corporation income tax	10					1 3.14			
State corporation income tax	3					1 .15			
Federal noncorporation income tax	11						1 2.36		
The sum of the tax rates is applied against the tax bases									
And results in tax generation of				1 20.59	1 27.38	1 3.29	1 2.36	\$9,199	\$15,449
Before the funds revert back to usage by business, the suppliers, etc., pay their employees and stockholders in the ratio based on:									
Corporate tax base		\$52,371							
Noncorporate tax base		14,789							
Total distribution base	12	\$67,160		1 1.38	1 26.06				
Which give a tax base of				\$927	\$17,502				
Applying the tax rates used in the preceding distribution				1 20.59	1 27.38				
A total tax generation results in the amount of								4,982	20,431
2D CYCLE									
The stockholders and the wage earners buy consumer goods, etc., while the suppliers acquire new inventory items, capital goods, and services, bringing the funds distributed in the 1st cycle back into business. Since it is difficult to ascertain the distribution of taxes collected by tax authorities, the only funds considered available are the original receipt in the 1st cycle, \$100,000, less tax generation up to this point, \$20,431, leaving \$79,569 for further distribution.									
The 1st tax generation under the 2d cycle arises from the receipts, \$79,569, by business; however, as previously a distribution by corporation and noncorporate taxpayers must be made in the ratio of									
Resulting in the tax bases of	4	79,569				1 77.98	1 22.02		
						\$62,048	\$17,521		
To which the following tax rates are applied:									
Federal corporation income tax	10					1 3.14			
State corporation income tax	3					1 .15			
Federal noncorporation income tax	11						1 2.36		
Excise and sales taxes	4					1 2.26	1 2.26		
Resulting in total tax rates of						1 5.55	1 4.62		
And tax generation in the amount of								4,253	24,684
When business has paid direct taxes, \$4,253, on its receipts of \$79,569, a balance in the amount of \$75,316 is left for further distribution to employees, stockholders and suppliers, etc.									
The basis and ratios for percentage distribution is the receipt, \$79,569 less tax \$4,253, of the employers									
While distribution to suppliers, etc., is the balance, namely:	12	75,316		1 1.38	1 26.06				
Original receipts		\$79,569							
Less: Taxes		4,253							
Dividends (1.38 percent of \$79,569)		1,039							
Salaries and wages (26.06 percent of \$79,569)		19,627							
		24,919							
Funds available to suppliers		54,650							
But, as suppliers, etc., may be both corporate entities, the amount of \$54,650 is broken down in the same ratios as used in the 1st cycle, namely	4	54,650	\$75,316	\$1,039	\$19,627	1 77.98	1 22.02		
The following tax bases are the result				1 20.59	1 27.38	\$42,616	\$12,034		
Which are taxed at the same total rates as used in 1st cycle						1 3.29	1 2.36		
Resulting in tax generation of								7,275	31,959
As in 1st cycle, the suppliers, etc., pay their employees and stockholders in the same ratios used in 1st cycle but based on above distribution of:									
Corporate entities		\$42,616							
Noncorporate entities		12,034							
Total distribution base	12	54,650		1 1.38	1 26.06				
Which give a tax base of				\$754	\$14,242				
And applying the tax rates used in the preceding distribution				1 20.59	1 27.38				
Total taxes are generated in the amount of								4,055	36,014

¹ Percent.

² This amount of \$36,014 represents direct taxes generated from the \$100,000 contract through the 2d cycle and since taxing continues indefinitely, this amount will continue to increase. Compare this to a contract awarded to a foreign entity where under the

current regulations of a so-called 7-percent margin would cost the United States as much as \$92,999, and stay fixed. A full margin of 25 percent, as has been discussed by some Members of Congress, would still leave as uneconomical a contract awarded to a foreign entity.

Mr. Speaker, at this point let me acquaint the House with Russia's policy on imports. No product imported in Russia can be sold to the consumers at a price less than that charged for a similar or like product produced in Russia—authority—U.S. News & World Report.

Compare this to the disastrous policy followed in our American market.

FANTASTIC FAILINGS

To those of us whose lives are closely knit to our homes, our communities, our neighbors and our country, the realities

of our conditions here and abroad seem like something out of a fairy tale.

To sit by and watch community after community become almost entirely dependent upon Government surplus, unemployment compensation, relief, social security and local charities is as

unbelievable as anything that has happened to this Nation in all of its history.

This is not a report based upon fiction but one that is based entirely upon facts and figures that are substantiated by the record. It is a sad record but a true one.

Recently, Dewey Anderson and associates covered the subject of depressed areas and used as a base for their article a special report by Julius Duschka from the Washington Post. Let me quote some of the findings and observations from this report as well as some of my own facts gathered by going through many pages of Government reports and news items in our leading journals.

Quote: "A scandal that will not die—From the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia to the trail of the Cumberland Gap in Kentucky, tens of thousands of Americans live in appalling poverty. Live? No, they hardly exist."

This is not the exaggeration of a "do-gooder" or a "bleeding heart" or a labor "boss" out to get a bigger cut of dues money, as the chamber of commerce would say. No, it is the calm statement of a special reporter for the Washington Post sent by his newspaper into the Appalachian region of the United States to tell the story of what is happening to thousands of our fellow Americans in the chronically depressed areas.

How long will it be before the conscience of our people is moved to the point where we do something for the whole counties that "are precariously held together by a flour-and-dried milk paste of surplus foods," counties of proud mountain folk for whom "relief has become a way of life"?

The answer may well lie in the present session of Congress which has so much crucial legislation to cram into the relatively few days that lie between us and the election campaign. Will anything be done? Why has it not been done before? Has our failure as a people to act been an example of cruel indifference? Does it lie in violently conflicting theories of political philosophy? Are there actually powerful, selfish interests in our country who simply do not want to pay higher taxes for the benefit of those in need?

The tragic truth lies in a combination of all these reasons—a combination that for 5 years and through two presidential vetoes has thwarted every effort to bring aid to the depressed areas.

What are the facts?

There are hundreds of communities in southern New York State, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Virginia, and New England that have become ghost towns or are inhabited by people living in abject poverty, people who exist only by virtue of relief and Federal handouts of surplus agricultural products that are given away not because they constitute a decent diet but because this is one way to get rid of them. For one reason or another the basis of their industry has dried up. They need help to get a new start.

For 5 years Congress, under the dogged leadership of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat—supported by the majority in Congress, including your Con-

gressman—has tried to do something for these people. In 1958 Congress adopted legislation that would have extended massive aid to the distressed areas. The President vetoed it. Again this year Congress passed a second bill calling for roughly \$250 million in aid. The President vetoed it for the second time.

Why? An excellent case can be made for the fact that the American people have not been adequately aroused to the real tragedy of the depressed areas. The Washington Post story is one of the relatively few firsthand reports that we have had. "Yet," says Reporter Julius Duschka, "one cannot forget the faces that have been hungry for so long, the houses that have been unpainted for even a longer time and the sense of despair which lingers over so many of the valleys and ridges. It is hard for a visitor to forget people whom the Nation has so easily put as far out of mind as they are out of sight."

There are others, however, for whom it is easy to forget—like the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, which have been battling the Douglas bills with vindictive persistence.

"Why should the successful be taxed to reward the unsuccessful?" they ask. "Why help the depressed areas to compete with your areas?" "Why don't these people move out and get jobs elsewhere?" "Why don't they help themselves?" "Why try to save areas that are done for, anyway?" In brief, "Root, hog, or die."

Why? One can honestly ask that question when he reads in every newspaper of the President's great concern for underdeveloped countries, for the economic aid to every nation on earth, directly or indirectly. No one denies the need for aid to help the world and the many friends we hope to make and keep in a world torn by conflicting ideologies.

Somehow, though, it does not rest well to know our own needs in so many areas and yet be called upon in the name of humanity and patriotism to spend billions in tax money to help foreign countries as well as opening up our market-places to floods of cheap, low-wage manufactured consumer goods which in a great measure are responsible for some of the distress right here at home, even in our own backyard in Westmoreland County.

The answer is not simple, but one thing is sure—we cannot continue the present policy without courting serious economic disaster.

Recently one of our best-known district industries sent me a report on foreign competition with its disastrous effects upon their ability to stay in business.

These local citizens, both labor and management, have always supported our foreign-aid program, believing, as all of us have believed, that this was the open road to peace on earth, good will to men.

However, let me quote from this letter:

DEAR JOHN: There are several enclosures accompanying this letter which I think you will find very interesting. At the present time here at ——— Steel, we have laid off

about 25 percent of our work force, and the enclosures will explain, to a large degree, why.

The two price sheets speak for themselves, as does the letter from one of our salesmen to Mr. Dahl, vice president in charge of our sales. The importation of foreign steel, particularly by Bohler, is quite serious. They are taking over many, many small accounts throughout the United States; and the paragraph which I have marked on the copy of our salesman's letter shows what they are trying to do with our big accounts. The M-2 type mentioned in the letter is responsible for the largest sales in our high-speed steel, and you can see there's a difference of 24 cents per pound in base prices and, in addition, they do not charge any extras.

All of our laid off employees are constituents of yours, and so, I am sure you will do everything possible in their favor to see if some relief can be granted in the future.

Coupled with our reciprocal trade program as administered with the Tariff Commission being guided in its decisions by the international trade and tariff organization—GATT—the results are becoming disastrous.

This Nation has foolishly measured its foreign export and import balances upon dollar volumes with little or no regard to the serious deficiencies in manhours and payroll dollars as well as dividend incomes to stockholders.

It is easy to figure who gets hurt when we sell Japan \$100 million worth of raw goods—cotton, and so forth—and buy back \$100 million worth of finished goods to be sold to our consumers. The difference in manhours and payroll dollars is tremendous.

I recently compiled a partial list of items that are flooding our American market and the increase in just 4 years is beyond reason when you figure the difference in our costs for wages, taxes, and payroll deductions forced upon our cost of production by Government edict.

Let us look at just a few items for comparison. Even the U.S. News & World Report has taken serious notice of this grave situation:

Automobiles—here is a striking illustration of what has happened to U.S. trade. Sales of American cars abroad have dwindled year after year, now amount to less than half of what they were in 1955. Demand for foreign cars in the United States, at the same time, has skyrocketed. In just the last 3 years, the foreign share of total auto sales in the United States has jumped from less than 2 percent to more than 10 percent—1956 imports, 108,000 cars; 1959 imports, 668,000.

Tires—cars, trucks, other vehicles are rolling on foreign-made tires as never before. Many of these tires are products of U.S. firms operating abroad. In 3 years, tire imports have multiplied by 8, not counting those on the wheels of imported cars—1956 imports, 149,000 tires; 1959 imports, 1.2 million.

Typewriters. Most of the big manufacturers of typewriters have set up plants abroad. Some figure they can sell foreign-built machines in the United States for about half the price of similar models made here. Italian, Swiss, German, and Japanese firms are selling more and more typewriters in the United

States. Exports of U.S. typewriters have dropped sharply—1956 imports, 276,000 typewriters; 1959 imports, 470,000.

Machine tools. With a price advantage on their side, foreign producers have been stepping up sales of these important industrial machines. Trade sources estimate that a machine tool costing \$6,250 to make in Germany would cost \$10,000 here. Why? Mainly because a machine-tool worker averages 60 cents an hour in Germany, \$2.40 in the United States—1956 imports, \$25 million; 1959 imports, \$35 million.

Steel. Last year's steel strike pushed demand for foreign steel to record highs, and much of this lost market is not expected to be recaptured by U.S. steel-makers. Industry officials estimate imports this year at 3½ million tons, nearly triple the imports of 1956—1956 imports, 1.3 million tons; 1959 imports, 4.4 million.

Shoes. Americans are buying a record number of leather shoes; boots and slippers made in factories abroad—1956 imports, 5.3 million pairs; 1959 imports, 13.8 million.

Farm machinery. In 1959, nearly 15,000 tractors were shipped into the United States—about double the number only 3 years ago. Some 13,000 combines were imported—also double the 1956 total. Other farm machines show a similar trend.

Barbed wire. This item was invented in the United States. Yet, in 1959, more than 60 percent of all the barbed wire used in this country was made abroad—1956 imports, 62,000 tons; 1959 imports, 78,000 tons.

Trucks. Imports of trucks have not increased at anything like the rate of foreign auto imports. Still, trucks have been coming into this country at an accelerating pace. Imports were less than one-half of 1 percent of U.S. truck production in 1956. By 1959, truck imports equaled nearly 2 percent of domestic production—1956 imports, 2,800; 1959 imports, 22,000.

Clothing and textiles. Overall imports of cotton, wool, and silk goods went up nearly one-third in just 3 years. Examples: Imports of cotton shirts reached 2.2 million dozen in 1959—nearly double the 1956 total. Japan exported no suits to this country in 1956; last year it shipped 30,000, and this year the total may reach 80,000. About 2.5 million dollars' worth of corsets and brassiers came into this country from Hong Kong in 1959; in 1956, there were no U.S. imports of these items from the British Colony—1956 imports, \$340 million; 1959 imports, \$446 million.

Optical instruments. Imports of binoculars, microscopes, telescopes, and the like have nearly doubled in 3 years. U.S. exports of these products have dropped—1956 imports, \$14 million; 1959 imports, \$24 million.

Electrical machinery. U.S. industry has stepped up its buying of imported generators, transformers, switches, and motors. Foreign makers increased their sales to the United States by 50 percent in just 3 years—1956 imports, \$22 million; 1959 imports, \$33 million.

Hand tools. Local hardware stores are displaying a growing variety of hammers,

saws, screwdrivers, wrenches, and so forth, made in foreign countries. They usually sell at prices considerably below those made in the United States—1956 imports, \$15 million; 1959 imports, \$25 million.

Nuts and bolts. While U.S. exports of nuts, bolts, screws, and rivets have been dropping off, imports have doubled. Congress was told earlier this year that indicated imports of these items in 1960 would require 130,000 tons of steel to produce. That amount of steel, if made in the United States, would provide jobs for 1,000 workers, according to the testimony—1956 imports, \$9 million; 1959 imports, \$18 million.

Office equipment. Here, again, imports have about doubled in 3 years. Many American firms are setting up plants in Europe to take advantage of cheaper labor—in some cases only a third as high as in the United States. The figures do not include typewriters—1956 imports, \$14 million; 1959 imports, \$27 million.

Steel cutlery. U.S. exports of knives, forks, and spoons made of steel were only \$800,000 in 1959, a third as much as 3 years earlier. Imports in the same period about doubled—1956 imports, \$8 million; 1959 imports, \$14 million.

Remember, this has happened since 1956. When you compare these figures with 1952, the first Eisenhower year, you receive a real shock.

We have proven one thing—our money can help distressed and underdeveloped nations; then why cannot we try the same medicine here at home in the thousands of American communities where the coal is worked out, where industries have moved out, where the community needs help to rehabilitate its utilities, widen streets, build facilities, and, in general, do here what we have done abroad? The issue is still there. The tragedy of hungry Americans in a land that boasts day and night of its opulence cannot be brushed aside. It must haunt men of good will day and night until it is resolved. This next session of Congress gives us a new chance to show whether we mean business or not.

Recently I had a group of visitors in my Washington office—most of them from my hometown and district. They were in Washington to appear before the Tariff Commission pleading for fair treatment by GATT in regards to the importation of window and plate glass.

Those of us living in and around Jeannette, Arnold, and Belle Vernon know what has happened to our jobs, as well as to our local businessmen, because of the failure of this administration to afford relief under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trades Agreement.

Here, in part, is the testimony presented to the Commission by Enoch R. Rust, vice president of the United Glass & Ceramic Workers of America:

My appearance here is to plead for the cessation of any further tariff cuts and to argue for a protective quota system to be established for glass and ceramic products.

The Glass & Ceramic Workers Union normally consists of approximately 57,000 members and nearly 228,000 people directly dependent upon our industries. Due, how-

ever, to automation and imports, that figure has been drastically cut. Thousands of our glass and ceramic workers are walking the streets today and many thousands of their dependents face poverty. These Americans are confused and bewildered. They cannot understand why their breadwinner's job has been exported overseas. They are even more confused by the fact that often these jobs have gone to the nation which they understand to be the outstanding enemy of our way of life, the Soviet Union.

Certain business interests with the aid of political friends of both parties are playing a devious role in using imports to undermine the high standard of living enjoyed by Americans in every State of our great Nation. All too often the same capitalists who seek union cooperation and assistance in meeting foreign competition are actually financing that foreign competition. The relatively higher wage levels which prevail in the American continent should and do serve as a stimulant to workers in other lands. Certain big business interests, however, give the appearance of making a concentrated effort to use imports as a means of lowering the standard of living for working people at home.

The United Glass & Ceramic Workers have always favored reciprocal trade with friendly nations. Our organization has always supported policies calling for a fair and equitable trade program. We believe that the continuous flow of goods in and out of the United States could be a great contributing factor to the assurance of world peace. Reciprocal trade means that all parties entering into a mutual agreement will trade equally with one another. Today we find ourselves faced with a trade program that has all but lost any resemblance to reciprocity. Instead it tends to take on the appearance of a vast program initiated and designed to club the American workers into submission by flooding our markets with goods produced by cheap, and in some cases perhaps, slave labor.

In the United States the imports of window and plate glass alone equal the full-time output of at least 4,100 production and clerical workers. This means in effect an export of a payroll of approximately \$34,012,000 annually to nations all over the world. Among these nations are Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. The impact is equally as bad in the ceramic field. Approximately 3,000 such jobs with a possible payroll of \$18,720,000 annually have been exported.

If, however, Mr. Mitchell's statement at the Rotary convention were to come to pass, "such industries as watches, bicycles, glass, pottery, and certain textiles are threatened with extinction because of comparative wage levels abroad," we would find that the window and plate glass industries alone would displace 13,162 workers between the ages of 40 and 65.

It is clear then, gentlemen, that we are not merely dealing with jobs or business, but that our primary duty is to protect the well-being of our own people. It is with these people in mind that we ask for a cessation of tariff cuts and for protective quotas. The facts and figures are plain but the policies behind these facts and figures are often hard to understand. Over 425 million square feet of window glass was imported into America in 1959. That means that over 2,600 choice American jobs were exported. In March 1960, 500 tons of window glass arrived from Russia. Approximately 500 choice American jobs thus went to the Soviet Union. How can we explain that to American glassworkers? Thirty-eight million feet of plate glass was imported along with the millions of square feet that arrived in the 668,000 imported automobiles. For that we exchanged nearly 2,000 of our best jobs. Forty-six million square feet of floor and wall tile were

imported in 1959. Between 3,000 and 4,000 jobs in the floor and wall tile industry left our country in those transactions. In 1960 it will certainly be worse, unless we act, and we must act now.

Gentlemen, our international union has supported a reciprocal program. Now, however, we find ourselves faced with a fight for survival. In many instances we find that we are fighting with our friends who have not yet awakened to the stark reality of the trade situation.

The very purpose behind foreign trade and the foreign aid program is being defeated in Europe today.

These programs, since their inception, were to work as economic aids to the nations of the world, especially those of the free world bloc. But today, we find the reciprocal trade program working in reverse; in fact it is retarding the economic growth of European nations.

We must take a firm and positive position to create a quota system that will protect our old established industries from extinction and that will insure the worker the security he once envisioned as a young man. We must inaugurate a fair trade program. If we do not begin such a program soon, the pendulum will swing once again far to the right. We will again be faced with the high and unfair tariff barriers which may well have been the foundation for both World Wars. This we do not want.

Mr. Khrushchev has said that Russia would bury us economically. By importing 500 tons of window glass and exporting 500 American jobs to the Soviet Union we have begun to assist him in making his prediction a reality. Why must we help him do it?

Next the Commission heard from Marshall Lewis representing the National Association of Mirror Manufacturers in behalf of the industry side of the picture. A few excerpts from his statement shows the same worry, the same problem and futility faced by the workers:

The purpose of this appearance is to express opposition of the association to further tariff reductions on mirrors which are dutiable under tariff paragraphs 223, 224, and 230(b), all of which have been included in the list of items which it has been announced will be considered for tariff reduction.

The hearing and investigation to establish the peril point on tariff paragraph 223 was held in October 1959. And now, before the results of the other proceeding have been announced, we find this commodity again listed for possible tariff concessions.

There should be some end to litigation. The mirror industry believes it is being treated rather harshly by being placed in the position of continually having to defend itself against additional tariff reductions.

Japan is the principal country supplying U.S. imports of mirrors not over 144 square inches in size. Exhibit III indicates the large percentage of imports in this category which come from Japan. Imports from Japan have been increasing rapidly under tariff paragraph 230(b), particularly since the rate of duty has been reduced.

Labor cost, it is estimated, constitutes approximately 60 percent of the cost of finished plate glass mirrors.

We have been unable to obtain exact comparisons of the wage rates in the glass industry manufacturing in Belgium and in Japan in comparison to those in the United States.

However, generally U.S. wages in manufacturing are approximately four times those prevailing in Belgium and many times the rates in Japan.

Most U.S. mirror manufacturers are located in small towns with the plants being important to the economic life of these

communities by providing the means of livelihood for many families as well as tax revenue for the towns themselves.

We are convinced that the present rates of duty assessable under paragraphs 223 and 224 are not adequate to cover the differences in costs of production here and abroad.

The protection remaining to the American mirror industry is in effect only a figure of speech in view of the wide difference in wage rates and other elements in costs of mirror manufacture which operate to the disadvantage of the highly competitive American industry—which at best is operating mainly on a marginal profit basis with a very substantial number of concerns actually operating at a loss.

The U.S. productive capacity of mirrors is far in excess of demand which results in competition being very severe. Imports have been increasing even though the average unit value of imports has been declining materially. A further lowering of the rates of duty would only accentuate the amount of imports which already are at an increasing rate and threaten serious injury to the domestic mirror manufacturing industry. Total value of imports of mirrors of all sizes for 1952, \$423,343; for 1959, \$2,031,461.

The same story is told by the manufacturers of tennis balls, sporting goods and all other lines. Typical of how we are becoming enmeshed in a system of American enterprise abroad with unemployment growing here at home is the following late news on developments that have a serious bearing on our future:

Pressure is building up in Europe at two strategic points—productive capacity and the labor supply. Most countries, but particularly Germany, simply cannot build new plants fast enough to cope with current and anticipated demand. At the same time, the labor supply is being stretched to the breaking point.

Typically, we've heard of a U.S.-owned firm in Germany which is putting new plants in remote villages chiefly because untapped local labor was available. There are now about 10 vacancies for every 4 unemployed workers in Germany as a whole.

In Britain, job openings about equal the number of unemployed. Allowing for "frictional" unemployment and turnover, this means some areas are in for a worsening pinch. Even Italy has been hit by a shortage of trained technicians and engineers.

Switzerland reports more than twice as many vacancies as unemployed.

An agreement between Ford Motor and Toyota of Japan is said to be imminent. The joint venture calls for capital investment of \$1.1 million by each of the companies. Toyota will provide equipment, buildings, and labor and Ford will supply engineers, machine tools and prototypes. The plan (if it is approved by the Japanese Government) is to build Falcons or a new midget car that has been perfected but not yet produced by Ford. Most of the Japanese-made Fords would be earmarked for sale in Japan and throughout Asia. Toyota already sells small cars in the United States and South America.

Toyota's chief rival in Japan, Nissan Motors (Datsun), has closed a deal with Mexican interests for establishment of the first full-process car production plant in Mexico. Mexico puts a tariff of almost 100 percent on American cars.

Mr. Speaker, what does it all add up to? Simply this, we are putting more of our tax dollars into nonproductive incomes. These incomes are limited and naturally tend to buy goods at the cheapest prices which in turn brings into the

United States more cheaper made goods and puts more Americans out of work.

The millions of Americans who are not producing today and living on limited incomes runs up into the millions.

As a partial list, let us add a few figures: 17 million on social security; 3 million on private or personal retirements; 7 million on relief recipients; 5 million unemployed—formerly employed; 3 million unemployed—not recorded as such, youths, handicapped, and so forth; total, 35 million Americans living at below payroll incomes.

Add to this about 9 million more persons who are employed in governments at all levels, plus the hundreds of thousands of farmers who receive a partial Government income from subsidies, soil bank payments, and so forth, and finally the number of workers in private industry whose income stems from Government spending in both military and non-military procurements, and you have a picture of the American economy that ought to cause every real American to sit up and take notice of our serious economic condition.

Yesterday I introduced House Resolution 622, and I quote from its contents:

Whereas there has been a continuing and growing unrest in certain industries of the United States because of the operations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade over the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; and

Whereas the administration of the Buy American Act has been detrimental to the American economy; and

Whereas there is a continuing and chronic unemployment of approximately five million workers in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor appoint a select committee of a proper number of members of the committee, said membership to be at the discretion of the chairman, to immediately start a full investigation of the operations of reciprocal trade agreements and all of the allied operations, the economic developments under the foreign and mutual aid programs, the rulings and operations of the Buy American Act and the Small Business Administration Act to determine the effects on the economics of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That a study be made by this same committee on the direct or indirect relationship of foreign trade on domestic employment; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution become effective immediately upon passage.

Mr. Speaker, too many of the Members of Congress refuse to even look at the picture of unemployment from the base of foreign import labor displacement and yet some of the most ardent supporters of foreign aid and reciprocal trades agreements are finally seeing the dismal results of our overzealous and unrealistic policies in these fields of administrative and congressional action.

I quote now from the National Independent Labor Journal on the "Effect of Foreign Competition on the American Economy:"

EFFECT OF FOREIGN COMPETITION ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Did you know that metalworking is the largest of all industries? Sales last year were in excess of \$150 billion. This industry accounts for 43 percent of all manufacturing employment in the country.

Did you know that we are not only importing larger quantities of metalworking products into this country, but we are losing export sales which formerly was a large part of the metalworking industry's market.

Did you know that traditionally, we have exported more finished steel products than we have imported, but the tide has turned. During the past 3 years, the increase in imports has resulted in 7 million tons of finished steel not being produced in American mills by American labor. This is equal to 10 million tons of ingots or 11 percent of last year's domestic production.

Did you know that had this 7 million tons of steel been produced in this country, it would have provided employment for 56,000 more people in the steel industry. (This calculation is based on the industry's experience of 16 man hours required to produce a ton of finished steel.)

Did you know that last year, we imported 625,000 foreign built passenger cars, while our export of American built passenger cars dropped to 115,000. This means we lost the production of over 700,000 passenger cars, annually, which would have required an additional 1½ million tons of finished steel and would have provided job opportunities to 65,000 additional American workers. This is only the direct job losses in steel mills and automobile plants. If we were to roll back labor requirements for making an automobile all the way to the farms and mines 700,000 cars would represent the labor of 350,000 people.

Did you know that in 1953 we imported 16 million pounds of metal fasteners and last year imports reached 70 million pounds with a sharp and steady decrease in exports. The indicated imports of metal fasteners in 1960 would require more than 130,000 tons of steel to produce. This loss to American industry would provide employment for another 4,000 American employees since the production of metal fasteners requires 40 to 50 man-hours per ton.

Did you know that during 1950, we imported 153,000 sewing machines and last year we imported 1,229,400 units. There are many who will shrug off the loss of this industry, just as we shrugged off the loss of the watch industry, bicycle industry, the typewriter and business machine industries, but we cannot shrug off the loss of the machine tool industry because of its economic and security implications.

In the forties the machine tool plants sold abroad 40 percent of their total output. Today, less than 10 percent of American tool production is being sold abroad. Foreign machine tools are invading the domestic market and has now reached 18 percent of our total consumption.

Did you know that in an attempt at self-preservation, many machine tool builders and other manufacturers have acquired manufacturing facilities in foreign countries to take advantage of the cheaper labor available there and the more favorable tax policies existing there.

Did you know that surveys indicate that half of all the companies building machine tools now have or are in the process of acquiring manufacturing facilities in foreign countries. This presents a threat in the event of a national emergency, such as we faced in the last war.

Did you know that we are so vulnerable to foreign competition because:

1. We have aided financially the establishment of modern industrial plants for them through our foreign aid program.

2. We have shared our technological know-how with countries who are our industrial competitors.

3. In our preoccupation with foreign aid, we have neglected domestic aid which other governments have granted their industries. For example, the overhauling of depreciation rules and regulations to encourage modern-

ization and efficiency of industry, the extension or guarantee of credit, the protection of home markets to import quotas, and restrictions.

4. Our industries pay wage rates which are fantastically higher than those paid by our foreign competitors. For instance, in the machine-tool industry the average rate for production rate workers in America, exclusive of fringe benefits, is \$2.40 an hour. In England, 85 cents per hour, Germany, 60 cents per hour; Italy 35 cents per hour. This explains why Western European machine-tool builders can manufacture products in their modern plants, ship them to this country, pay freight, insurance, tariff, and still undersell domestic builders by 30 percent.

Did you know that in the steel industry, exclusive of fringe benefits, the average hourly earnings in the United States in 1959 were \$3.11 per hour; in Germany, 67 cents; England, 80 cents; Belgium, 77½ cents; Japan, 41 cents?

This disparity in wage rates has been increased by the wage contract signed this year in the basic steel industry. That contract raised the cost of labor 40 cents an hour over the term of the contract. Meanwhile, foreign steelworkers have settled for increases approximating 5 cents per hour.

It takes about 16 man-hours to finish a ton of steel. Under the present wage rates, that means that the cost of labor input per ton of steel in this country is now \$60 a ton. In Western Europe the labor input cost is around \$12 to \$14 a ton, and in Japan it is in the neighborhood of \$7 to \$8 per ton.

The steelmaking facilities of those countries are as modern, if not more modern, than ours. With a labor savings of \$50 per ton, it is no wonder that foreign steelmakers can flood world and American markets with steel at prices \$30 to \$40 a ton under the cost of manufacture in our mills. The narrowing margin of American technological superiority cannot overcome such an enormous cost advantage.

It is an obvious conclusion that our competition from foreign countries has made inroads on the steel industry that poses a national problem and should be recognized as such.

The Government must modernize their depreciation system to encourage increasing production efficiency and take all proper steps to aid American industry to maintain a competitive position in world trade.

Source: Report by Walter J. Campbell, editor, Steel magazine, before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Mr. Speaker, does this point up the need for the investigation I am asking for or are we going to put our heads in the sand like the ostrich that refuses to see the dangers that threaten our very existence?

Too often the only motive behind the expansion of American investments abroad is to make exorbitant profits, get away from American governmental regulations and safety laws, run away from union contracts, and to get out from under the close scrutiny of their accounts by the Revenue Department.

Does this sound like the high-toned aims of the public proclamations by the President, the State Department, and the free traders and foreign aiders we hear on the floor of Congress?

Time magazine in June published the following article on profits that ought to interest every Member of Congress:

PROFITS FROM IMPORTS—BUSINESS GOES ABROAD TO SELL IN THE UNITED STATES

The rising challenge of bargain-priced foreign imports has sparked a profound—and

controversial—change in the strategy of many U.S. businesses. To meet the competition, hundreds of U.S. firms are going abroad to manufacture or buy products to sell in U.S. markets. Already U.S. firms import or manufacture overseas an estimated \$1 billion worth of products each year for U.S. customers—and the trend is growing fast.

The shift overseas has raised a storm of protest at home. Some businessmen use it as an argument for higher tariffs; chambers of commerce often consider it downright disloyal; unions complain that it exports U.S. jobs, cuts employment. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers, says: "Expansion is legitimate, but expansion at the expense of American workers is illegitimate."

Few firms go abroad with the prime intention of making products for the U.S. market. They usually begin by buying cheaper components abroad to put into U.S.-made products, or by setting up plants overseas to compete better in growing world markets. Once overseas, an increasing number of firms, undercut at home by foreign imports, find their cheaper, foreign-made goods just the thing to fight competition in U.S. markets. Royal McBee set up a typewriter plant in Holland in 1953 as part of its world marketing program, but heavy competition in the United States from foreign-made, lightweight typewriters forced it to begin shipping a similar, Dutch-made model into the United States.

Chief reason for manufacturing abroad is low foreign wages, which some manufacturers find are 25 cents an hour in Japan, 60 cents in Germany against \$2.25 in the United States. International Harvester, which imports its small diesel tractors from a British subsidiary, sells them for \$2,800, compared with an estimated \$3,400 they would cost if made in the United States. Hamilton Watch bought a factory in Switzerland last year, now makes its lowest-priced watch there.

There are other reasons besides wages for going abroad. The International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., which announced last week that it may soon resume sales of foreign-made consumer equipment (radios, appliances, etc.) in the United States, is already bringing in automatic post office equipment made by its Belgian and German subsidiaries. Reason: I.T. & T. says that the equipment is technically superior to any available in the United States. Manhattan's Lafayette Brass Manufacturing Co., producing overseas since 1953 for the U.S. market, has found cheaper tool costs abroad enable it to change designs more frequently than in the United States, keep its products up to the minute. Other firms set up abroad to be near raw materials.

Moving overseas is not always easy. Many countries, such as Brazil and Peru, have tough labor laws that make it almost impossible to fire an incompetent worker, and others exercise strict control over investment. In some countries the problem is payola for government licenses, etc. Blueprint standards have to be changed, laws and languages learned.

For many U.S. firms the move is almost a matter of survival. Singer Manufacturing Co. is the only major U.S. manufacturer left in the household sewing machine industry, where cheaper Japanese and European imports have captured 65 percent of the U.S. market. Part of Singer's secret of survival: it makes its two lower priced models at its factory in Scotland.

Nevertheless, firms that go overseas often fear U.S. public reaction, often market foreign-made products under their own U.S. labels and play down their overseas operations. Some businessmen make no secret about their foreign imports, vigorously defend the practice.

U.S. News & World Report had this to say on the subject:

International Telephone & Telegraph plans to invade the U.S. consumer goods field with products made abroad.

Beginning next year, International Telephone & Telegraph will import, under its own label, consumer products made by foreign subsidiaries and affiliated companies.

That is a reversal of policy. International Telephone & Telegraph has been manufacturing abroad—but only for sale in foreign markets.

First items to be imported: radios and tape recorders from Japan and Germany. Some products will be assembled from components made in several countries.

In every field we find the same complaint, we can't do business under American standards and compete in the marketplace.

It has been pointed out that when we talk of our inability to compete with imports we always want to blame the American wage standard for our trouble.

It is true that we have a higher wage level and that our workers enjoy a higher standard of living. It is also true that this has always been the case. Even if you go back 50, 40, 30, 20, or 10 years you'll find that the American worker received compensation far in excess of the wages paid in foreign countries.

What really makes the problem so pronounced and serious today is a combination of wages, taxes, foreign investments by Americans, Government handouts to competitor nations, foreign operations unrestricted by antitrust laws, antimonopoly practices, Walsh-Healey, Davis-Bacon, social security, hospitalization, unemployment compensation.

Some of these humane and social acts are necessary to our way of life and competitively are not the difference between success or failure in trade.

The real culprit lies in our mistaken policy of putting profit above people both here and abroad.

Are we really helping our friends by building up American industries abroad, syphoning off a great deal of our foreign aid into a few pockets, both American and foreign, rather than spreading it out over the entire populace of an aided nation.

I've said before and I repeat again that our present foreign policy can be summed up in two short sentences, "Blame everything on Khrushchev and the Communists and send every nation more money."

Recently, Hon. Spruille Braden had this to say about "friendships for sale":

Of course, as usual, when confronted with the Cuban situation, Washington had no courage or imagination and so reverted to the wornout, frayed solution of trying to buy friendship.

Some of my Latin American friends are insulted at our assumption that their friendship is for sale. An Argentine friend writes me: "I hope I'm wrong, but I fear that with the aid of North American dollars we will follow the same path as Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bolivia, and so many others who have fallen under Communist tyranny with the aid of dollars taken under compulsion from the North American people."

Too often the second step in our diplomacy has been to grant trade concessions with the same hope of buying friendship. Money and trade concessions have brought us nothing but failure.

Another example of the growing awareness to the seriousness of the problem is highlighted by this news story:

GARMENT UNION MAY BOYCOTT CLOTH IMPORTS

MIAMI BEACH, May 30.—The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America threatened today a union-enforced boycott of Japanese fabrics and finished garments.

The threat of direct union refusal to work on Japanese goods represented a major tactical shift in the Amalgamated's campaign to check invasion of the domestic market by sweatshop imports from the Far East. Up to now the union has relied primarily on Government aid in negotiating trade quotas.

WARNS AT CONVENTION

The warning was given by Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated, at the opening of its 22d biennial convention here.

Representatives of the union's 385,000 members in the men's clothing industry cheered his assertion that the workers could not be compelled to commit economic suicide by working on goods made in low-wage countries abroad.

He disclosed that the union would confer with leading manufacturers in New York on June 8 on specific measures to enforce the import cutoff.

At this time I want to present certain statistical and logical arguments presented to the tariff commission on this serious subject.

Foreign imports started out as an encroachment upon the American market but has now become a full fledged invasion.

I now quote from the presentation of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and the Admiral Corp.:

STATEMENT OF ROBINSON F. BARKER, VICE PRESIDENT, GLASS DIVISION, PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO., BEFORE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, AUGUST 17, 1960

My name is Robinson F. Barker. I am vice president and general manager of the glass division of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., and have been in the glass business for 25 years.

First, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to appear here.

My company—PPG—has previously filed with you three confidential memoranda in opposition to further reductions in existing tariff rates—one relates to sheet glass, one to plate glass, and the third to optical glass.

Because of limitations of time and, more important, because sheet glass constitutes our most acute problem, I shall rely upon the memoranda we have filed in the cases of plate glass and optical glass and confine my remarks here to the crucial sheet glass problem.

I appear to present facts which will demonstrate the complete lack of justification for any further reduction in existing tariff duties and the absolute need for the granting of relief at the earliest practicable date by invoking the escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act.

The problem can be stated simply—the U.S. sheet glass industry is losing the domestic market. We respectfully submit that this should concern not only the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information, but also the American public at large.

Of course, we are mindful of the desirability of reciprocal trade relations among the nations of the world, and it is not our purpose to quarrel with the wisdom of the concept underlying our country's overall international trade policy.

But, we are also mindful of the fact that loss of the U.S. sheet glass market to foreign producers necessarily jeopardizes thousands of jobs as well as sizable investments which people in this country have made over a long period of years.

I feel that I am qualified to speak about loss of jobs for the reason that one of my major company responsibilities is that of supervising all our glass manufacturing operations. In that capacity, I know from day to day which of our facilities are operating and what the status is of our factory labor force.

It is not pleasant to report to you that commencing with August 1959 each succeeding month, with but one exception—December 1959—has witnessed a decline in the number of our factory workers employed. It has now reached the point where nearly 25 percent of our normal complement of 2,900 sheet glass factory workers are unemployed. My company is not unique in this respect, and we believe that our experience is typical of all domestic sheet glass producers.

The principal markets for sheet glass include the building construction, automotive (including laminating and tempering), sash and door, mirror and specialty manufacturing, and glass jobbing industries. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, the total volume of sheet glass shipped in 1959 by the domestic producers was \$134,502,000 (U.S. Department of Commerce facts for industry series BDSAF-375-09, Feb. 18, 1960).

The following companies manufacture sheet glass in the United States:

1. American St. Gobain Corp.: Sheet glass plants at Arnold, Pa., Jeannette, Pa., and Okmulgee, Okla.
2. Blackford Window Glass Co.: Sheet glass plant at Vincennes, Ind.
3. Ford Motor Co.: Sheet glass plants at Dearborn, Mich., and Nashville, Tenn.
4. Harding Glass Co.: Sheet glass plant at Fort Smith, Ark.
5. Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.: Sheet glass plants at Charleston, W. Va., and Shreveport, La.
6. Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.: Sheet glass plants at Clarksburg, W. Va., Henryetta, Okla., Mt. Vernon, Ohio, and Decatur, Ill.
7. Rolland Glass Co.: Two sheet glass plants at Clarksburg, W. Va.

I have listed these companies alphabetically and not according to size. Parenthetically, we believe that PPG produces about one-third of the sheet glass manufactured in this country.

Having asserted that the U.S. sheet glass industry is losing the domestic market, I should state the bases for this assertion. If my assertion is correct, as I firmly believe it to be, then this forum presumably will wish to know how this came about, what role the tariff has played, what domestic damage has resulted, and—finally—what can or should be done about it.

Let's begin with some basic facts.

IMPORT IMPACT

In 1950 foreign imports of sheet glass into the United States totalled a modest 31.7 million pounds. In 1959 these imports had risen to the staggering figure of 502.6 million pounds. This represents an increase over 1950 of 1,485 percent.

This phenomenal growth in the absolute amounts of imports over the past 10 years is shown graphically in a chart we have

prepared. With the permission of the chairman I shall hand up copies of the chart with the request that it be designated as an exhibit, and made a part of the record.

You will observe that this chart, which we have entitled "Foreign Invasion of U.S. Sheet Glass Market," records imports in terms of millions of 50-foot single strength equivalent (SSE) boxes rather than in pounds. Fifty-foot SSE boxes constitute the standard unit for measuring sheet glass quantities and that unit is used by the Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, in the statistics it compiles respecting this industry.

The impact of this absolute volume of imports upon the domestic sheet glass producers is readily discernible from our next chart.

Our second chart, which we also request be made an exhibit, shows—as the title indicates—"Foreign Penetration of the U.S. Market as a percent of U.S. Sheet Glass Production".

The rate of penetration of this market by imports has been fantastic. In 1950 foreign sheet glass imports were equivalent to 2½ percent of the total estimated domestic production. In 1959, imports increased to over 31 percent.

I cannot refrain from observing that in the 10-year period in which this foreign penetration occurred there were a series of reductions in the U.S. rates of duty applicable to imported sheet glass—the 1951 Torquay reduction and the subsequent Geneva reductions in 1956, 1957 and 1958—all on top of prior severe cuts together aggregating 62 to 67 percent.

The two exhibits I have handed up demonstrate that the amount of imports as well as the ratio of total U.S. production supplied by imports increased each year over the previous year shown, with but one exception—1957. Although we do not pretend to have the complete explanation for the 1957 decline in imports, we do know that the domestic demand was off sharply in that year. This is in contrast with a preceding 2-year period of unprecedented demand which undoubtedly led to some scare buying in 1956. With U.S. demand down in 1957 it is logical to assume that the foreigners concentrated more on other markets in that year in preference to the United States.

DECLINE IN EXPORTS

During the 1950-59 period U.S. sheet glass exports have declined substantially. As shown in our revised table 6, U.S. exports in 1950 were 13.4 million pounds, or 231,837 SSE 50-foot boxes (U.S. Department of Commerce (FT-410) reported 8,586,534 square feet). By 1955 U.S. exports had declined to 7.2 million pounds, or 124,026 SSE 50-foot boxes (U.S. Department of Commerce, 4,593,535 square feet), and in 1959 to only 4.8 million pounds, or 74,046 SSE 50-foot boxes (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2,742,437 square feet). Thus, the 1959 exports amounted to only three-tenths of 1 percent of total U.S. production. Contrasted with imports amounting to over 31 percent of domestic production, the picture is certainly a dismal one for this American industry.

One further word about exports from the United States—in recent years we have seen our export markets slowly dwindle away for the reason that more and more countries are establishing their own sheet glass plants. These plants not only serve their own respective domestic needs but also create additional sources of imports to the United States. As a result, during the 1956-59 period, over 30 countries shipped sheet glass into this country.

The foregoing might well be captioned "The Problem Confronting the U.S. Sheet Glass Industry."

At this point you might properly ask: "Well, how did this come about?"

In answering this question, I will first summarize the reasons which have occasioned the loss of a substantial part of our market to the foreigners and then take up each in some detail. The reasons are as follows:

1. There is equality of technology, labor skills, and productivity among foreign and domestic producers;
2. Ocean freight rates constitute no barrier to importation into the United States;
3. Most important is the fact that the foreigners have an overwhelming cost advantage over the domestic producers. This permits the foreigners to cut well below domestic prices.
4. Finally, successive reductions have increased the ineffectiveness of our tariffs in equalizing or offsetting in any way the foreigners' cost advantage.

EQUALITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Considering, first, equality of technology, labor skills and productivity, I am mindful that there is a line of thought in this country that American industry can always meet—and beat—foreign competition simply by the adoption of production-line techniques and mass mechanization. Possibly that line of thought might have application to some domestic industries—I don't know. But, I do know that it does not apply to sheet glass.

It must be remembered that the flat-glass industry had its origin in Europe and over the years a large number of European companies entered the flat-glass manufacturing business. Today, many of those old, established companies are of great size (even by American standards) and they operate internationally.

Those European companies have large research and engineering organizations and their plants are highly mechanized. Many of the European sheet glass facilities have undergone extensive enlargement and modernization since the end of World War II. Unquestionably the Europeans possess sheet-glass technologies equal to those used in this country. Moreover, the quality of their product is comparable to that produced in the United States.

These same observations, only to a slightly lesser degree, are applicable to the Japanese sheet-glass industry. And, in this connection I respectfully urge that you mark well the fact that in 1959 Japan, which has been steadily increasing its position as a world sheet-glass supplier, moved up to second place in the foreign invasion of the U.S. sheet-glass market.

In summing up this point, it is indeed fair to state that by reducing our sheet-glass tariffs this country has not been giving needed sustenance to small, weak foreign glass manufacturers; rather it has given vast, powerful, international companies more fat.

OCEAN FREIGHT RATES

The second reason why we are losing the U.S. market to foreign competitors is that ocean freight rates constitute absolutely no barrier to importation. A few illustrations will make my point.

Using Boston as our first example, you will be interested in learning that the freight rate from Antwerp to Boston is 84 cents (\$0.8391) per hundredweight. This is to be compared with the rate of \$0.86 per hundredweight which is applicable to shipments from our nearest plant at Clarksburg, W. Va., to Boston.

Another illustration—the rate from Liverpool to Miami is 73 cents (\$0.7344) per hundredweight. This compares with the rate of \$1 from Clarksburg to Miami, Clarksburg again being our nearest plant.

Turning to the west coast for our final illustration, we find that the rate from Yokohama to San Francisco is \$1.24 (\$1.2375)

per hundredweight. This is 38 cents (\$0.3825) lower than the \$1.62 per hundredweight rate from our nearest plant, Henryetta, Okla., to San Francisco.

FOREIGN COST ADVANTAGE

By far the most important reason underlying the success of the foreigners in invading the U.S. market is the overwhelming cost advantage they possess over the domestic producers.

This cost advantage applies not only to the cost of labor, by far the most important component of total cost, but also to the cost of raw materials.

Let's examine now what this cost advantage amounts to.

LABOR COSTS

Turning first to comparative labor costs, the advantage possessed by the foreign producers over us is aptly demonstrated by this chart which is entitled "Glass Workers Average Hourly Wages, 1959." We ask that it also be designated as an exhibit.

You will observe that in 1959 the average hourly wages in Japan, excluding fringe benefits, were 33 cents and that such wages (including fringe benefits) were 69 cents and 75 cents, respectively, in West Germany and Belgium.

On the other hand, our average hourly wages in that year were \$3.72. Thus, our wage rates were four times those of Belgium, five times those of West Germany, and eight times those of Japan.

While no data were available respecting Japanese fringe benefits, it is unlikely that such benefits would increase the Japanese 33-cent figure above a maximum of 40 cents.

With respect to our PPG figure of \$3.72, I should mention that labor contracts we have negotiated in recent months have provided for increases which will raise the \$3.72 figure as follows: February 1960, \$3.82; September 1960, \$3.87; February 1961, \$3.92.

The significance of this almost insuperable labor cost advantage held by the foreigners is best appreciated when it is realized that our labor content represents more than 50 percent of our total costs in making sheet glass. (See p. 7, PPG memorandum, for a more precise labor content percentage figure—a figure I do not wish to disclose to my competitors.)

RAW MATERIALS COST

Is the foreigners' labor cost advantage offset by higher cost of raw materials? The answer is no. In fact they have an advantage here too.

This advantage is reflected in a chart entitled "Raw Materials Costs—Belgium and United States." (Costs of five principal ingredients in 1 ton of sheet glass batch). We request that a copy be marked as an exhibit.

In our memorandum—page 11—we had listed a cost comparison between Belgium and the United States of four principal materials needed in the manufacture of sheet glass. Since the memorandum was filed we have obtained comparable costs of a fifth principal material—dolomite—and, accordingly, this additional information is also reflected in this chart which now accounts for 96 percent of the batch composition.

This raw materials cost comparison shows that PPG's costs are approximately 14 percent higher than those of the Belgians. So, here again we are at a marked disadvantage in competing against them.

We are frequently reminded by those who are interested in lowering still further the tariffs on sheet glass that the European producers suffer a great cost disadvantage because of the relatively high price of gas-producing coal in Europe. The fact of the matter is that producer gas is not the principal fuel used in the manufacture of sheet glass abroad. The principal fuel used is oil,

and it is a fact that the delivered cost of oil in Belgium is less than in the United States so that during those winter months when natural gas service is interrupted in domestic plants, the Belgian fuel cost is actually less than that of the U.S. manufacturers. During the months of the year when natural gas is available in the United States the domestic producer does have a fuel cost advantage over his Belgian competitor, but too small to offset the raw materials cost advantage enjoyed by the foreigners.

OTHER ADVANTAGES OF FOREIGNERS

But, these are by no means all of the foreigners' cost advantages.

Replacement and repair costs, and research and development expenses are appreciably lower abroad primarily because of the lower labor costs they enjoy.

Then, too, the foreigners have greatly reduced marketing expenses in selling their sheet glass in the United States. Each of the domestic manufacturers advertises extensively. Although this advertising produces certain benefits, it obviously costs money. Unfortunately the foreigners get a "free ride" from the extensive domestic advertising and they derive substantial benefits from it.

For example, a few years ago we promoted at our expense the use of heavy sheet glass in jalousies, a new product. Within a short period of time the foreigners, by means of deep price cuts which their substantially lower costs permitted, took over this new market entirely and without any promotion expense of the kind incurred by us.

Looking ahead, it is evident that the European producers within the Common Market can look forward to further advantages which will flow from the economic integration of the member countries. Moreover, utilization of the St. Lawrence Seaway will enable the foreign producers to invade our inland domestic markets on an even more economical basis than formerly was the case.

From the foregoing it is crystal clear that the foreigners have an overwhelming cost advantage over the U.S. producers. In this cold, hard fact lies the principal explanation why they have been able to invade the U.S. market successfully.

It is equally clear that our tariff has been completely ineffectual in equalizing or offsetting this tremendous cost advantage.

Since the Tariff Act of 1930 there have been absolute reductions from the basic rates of duty ranging from 62 percent to 67 percent. Moreover, the ad valorem equivalents have declined from 62 percent in the 1936-39 period to only 14.8 percent in 1959. And, in the case of very thin sheet glass, the ad valorem equivalent is down to about 5 percent.

Under these circumstances no reasonable basis exists for consideration of any further reductions in our tariff duties.

The latest in the series of tariff reductions to which we have been subjected became effective as recently as July 1958. In the full year 1958, imports of sheet glass into the United States were approximately 300 million pounds. In 1959, the first full year after the latest reduction, imports zoomed to 502 million pounds—an increase of 67 percent.

DOMESTIC PRICE DISADVANTAGE

With their tremendous cost advantage obviously the foreigners can and do undersell us consistently in this market. Furthermore, as I will demonstrate, regardless of the level of domestic prices at any given time, the foreigners are able to sell at prices ranging from 8 percent to nearly 25 percent below us.

At this point permit me to hand up copies of our revised tables 8 and 9. The information set forth in these tables is identical to that contained in tables 8 and 9 at pages

18-19 of our memorandum except that we have added price data for a typical inland city—Pittsburgh. You will observe that revised table 8 compares the laid-down prices—prior to April 25, 1960—of Western European producers with our prices. You will note that for this comparison we selected such major ports as New York, Chicago, Miami, New Orleans, and Seattle and, as I noted above, Pittsburgh.

As revised table 8 shows, during the period prior to April 25, 1960, the Western European producers laid-down prices ranged from 7.8 percent (Chicago and Miami) to 12.3 percent (New Orleans) below PPG. And, during that period, the prices of Japanese sheet glass laid down on the west coast were approximately 16.5 percent below our prices.

Effective April 25, 1960, we cut our delivered prices to meet this competition and for a brief period we were quoting at approximate parity with the European producers. This, however, was short lived and in a matter of days the foreign producers announced reductions which effectively restored and in some cases even exceeded their previous differentials under our prices.

The results of our abortive attempt to narrow the foreign producers' price differentials are reflected in revised table 9. This table shows at a glance what happened after April 25 in the same port cities—and Pittsburgh—which are shown in our revised table 8. Thus, you will observe that the post-April 25 differentials of the Western European producers below PPG on "B" quality glass ranged from a low of 9.9 percent (Chicago) to a high of 11.1 percent in Seattle (port city) and 11.9 percent in Pittsburgh.

Japanese prices for single and double strength glass on the west coast after April 25, 1960, have ranged from 16 to 19 percent below our delivered prices and in Miami their prices are now approximately 23 percent below ours. This evidences their ability to quote even lower prices whenever they wish to invade a particular market.

It is apparent, therefore, that our April 25, 1960, price reductions did not effect any significant shrinkage in the differentials in favor of the foreign producers. In fact, in important instances, those differentials were further widened.

Since the date of the filing with you of our memorandum, there has been a price development which I should bring to your attention.

On or about July 14 at least one U.S. importer sent telegrams to its U.S. glass jobber customers indicating that its Western European factory sources were about to increase their sheet glass prices approximately 6 percent. Shortly after that date a number of the European sheet glass producers published such increased prices. I do not know at this time whether those new prices have actually been put into effect. Nor do I know what has motivated this action. I cannot help but observe, however, that this foreign price activity occurred on the eve of the issuance of the witness schedule which lists those who are appearing before you in connection with this extremely vital tariff matter. Whether this is a mere coincidence, I do not know.

In addition we realize, of course, that there is nothing whatever to stop the foreign producers from reestablishing the same deep price cuts as soon as these hearings are concluded.

In any event, we learned just last week that one of the domestic producers has also recently announced slightly higher sheet glass prices. A comparison of the new prices announced by the European producers with those of that domestic producer indicates that were such prices to stick there would be a moderate narrowing in the differentials which previously obtained. The amount of

this narrowing seems to approximate 3.7 percent.

My company has not changed its prices and is studying most carefully these recent developments.

Obviously, these price gyrations have not materially altered the basic disadvantages which confront us. Foreign sheet glass continues to be sold at considerable price differentials below domestic prices. And, foreign producers continue to possess substantial advantages in every significant element of cost.

INVASION OF AUTOMOTIVE MARKET

Proponents of tariff reductions in sheet glass from time to time contend that the domestic producers have a significant advantage in making sales to the large volume domestic automobile manufacturers. This is not the fact.

Chrysler Corp., which fabricates half of its glass parts, is presently purchasing 70 to 80 percent of its raw sheet glass requirements from foreign producers. Similarly, the Ford Motor Co., both a producer and fabricator of glass, has contracted to buy sheet glass heavily from abroad. Such glass is used by Chrysler and Ford for fabricating side lights and rear windows. Also independent fabricators of auto glass parts are purchasing a large volume of their sheet glass requirements from foreign producers.

The all-important product for automotive glazing when tempered is 7/32-inch "A" quality heavy sheet glass. Prior to April 25, 1960, the published prices of the Western European producers for this product laid down in Detroit were 12 percent lower than ours. This was 4½ to 5 percent greater than the differential those producers were quoting in Detroit on "B" quality SS and DS window glass, which products are not generally used in automotive glazing.

After April 25, 1960, the differential in most bracket sizes of 7/32-inch "A" quality heavy sheet glass was increased from 12 percent to 14 percent, and in the case of the bracket size needed for automotive side vents to 17.5 percent. These differentials are to be compared with a differential of 8 percent which the European producers applied after April 25 in sales of SS and DS "B" quality window glass in Detroit.

Manifestly these prices, on their face, show that the Western European producers are engaging in an all-out effort to capture the large volume domestic automotive market.

I am informed that PPG's sales and profits in recent years were the subject of comment in a brief filed by one of the importers that is urging for another tariff reduction. For that reason, I feel that I should speak to this subject.

In 1959 PPG had net sales of nearly \$607 million and net earnings of \$44.1 million. Comparable figures in 1958 were \$513.7 million and \$32 million. We have recently reported sales of nearly \$324 million and net earnings of about \$25.7 million for the first 6 months of 1960. Viewed abstractly these are large amounts of money but let us examine for the moment their sources.

For competitive reasons PPG, like most diversified companies, does not disclose its sales and profits for separate products. For the most part PPG derives its sales and earnings from the operations of its five major divisions, namely glass, paint and brush, fiber glass, merchandising, and chemicals and cement (through a wholly controlled subsidiary).

Each of these divisions in turn deals in multiple products. For example, sheet glass is only one of the many products handled by our glass division. Other such products would include plate glass, laminated glass, tempered glass, multiple-glazed units, structural glass, storefront metal, and special glass products for national defense purposes.

Presumably reference to PPG's consolidated sales and earnings are made to suggest that each of its many product lines is relatively profitable. This, of course, is not the case. And, with respect to sheet glass, it should be obvious that no industry with a heavy investment can make a satisfactory profit contribution when operating at 55 percent of capacity in a market fraught with intense price competition of the type I have described.

By way of summary, the tariff on sheet glass declined from 60 percent in 1939 to 14.8 percent in 1959. The absence of effective tariff rates, coupled with excessively low wage rates, has enabled European producers to sell in the United States at prices 8 percent to 17½ percent below domestic producers and has permitted Japanese producers to sell as much as 25 percent below. As a result, imports of foreign sheet glass increased from 2 percent to 31 percent of domestic production in the short span of 10 years—from 1950 through 1959. In the absence of vitally needed tariff relief there is every reason to believe that this steady loss of markets will continue unabated. It should be kept in mind that many cost disadvantages of the domestic producer are the direct result of rules and regulations which have been established by our Government to attain the high standard of living which prevails in this country. I have in mind here our laws relating to minimum wages, collective bargaining, social security and taxes—to name a few. After helping American workers to secure a fair wage, it cannot be the policy of the Government to promote buying abroad to avoid the resulting higher wage costs of domestic producers. These cost disadvantages materially affect our ability to compete.

At present, we are producing at only 55 percent of our capacity with nearly 25 percent of our normal number of sheet glass factory workers out of work. Operating at such a low rate sharply increases our per unit cost of production, which in turn places us at an even greater competitive disadvantage. In addition, our inventories of sheet glass have been steadily increasing even at our current low rate of operations. Today our inventories are at an all time high and nearly double what they were a year ago. We believe that our experience in this regard is typical of all domestic producers.

In conclusion, I invite your careful attention to one of the most alarming situations which faces us—namely, the steady loss of our position in the American market and the substantial denial of participation by us in the increased demands of the U.S. market for sheet glass. It is my understanding that there is agreement in many quarters that the decade in the sixties will open a golden period of dynamic growth in American industry. Based upon our research and development, and market studies we have every reason to believe the market for sheet glass will be an expanding one. However, under the conditions which presently exist, and which I have endeavored to outline to you, we have no present hope or expectation of sharing in that growth.

We do not believe that it is the purpose or policy of our Government under the Trade Agreements Act or any other provision of law to deny to any American industry—and in this instance particularly to the sheet glass industry—the opportunity to participate in the indicated steady economic growth of our country. That participation, we fear, may be difficult if not impossible unless prompt action is taken to place us on some basis of equality with the foreign sheet glass producers in the U.S. market. We do not ask for, nor expect, an embargo—we ask only for a fair opportunity to compete.

For all these reasons we respectfully submit that this Commission should report to

the President of the United States that the peril point for sheet glass has been reached and exceeded, and that pursuant to the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act this Commission institute on its own motion an escape clause investigation in order that action may be taken at the earliest practicable date to extend essential relief to this industry.

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON JAPANESE ELECTRONIC EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES FROM ADMIRAL CORP., AUGUST 1960

The tidal wave of Japanese electronic products continues to flood U.S. markets. First quarter statistics from the U.S. Department of Commerce indicate that electronic exports from Japan to this country were nearly double the level of last year. In some categories, first quarter shipments were nearly as great as those during the entire year 1959.

More than 4 million Japanese transistor radios (with three or more transistors) were sold in the United States in 1959, while nearly 500,000 tube radios were shipped here. These radios were produced by Japanese earning from 12 to 16 cents an hour, a wage level which existed in this country some 60 years ago.

It is of interest to note that there is no limit on the number of Japanese radios that can be landed in the United States because of this country's wide-open-door policy. The U.S. duty is only 12½ percent, compared with an 18-percent duty imposed on any American radios shipped to Japan.

On the other hand, although American labor rates in the electronics industry average \$2 and more per hour, the Japanese government restricts the importing of American radios by subjecting them to licensing which is rarely granted. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, only 835 American-made radios were exported to Japan during the entire year of 1959.

In addition to their extremely low wage levels, it should be noted that Japanese electronic plants also are automated to a high degree. The wide discrepancy in wage rates of American and Japanese workers is made even greater by the many fringe benefits including social security and unemployment compensation offered in this country.

In calling for an immediate reevaluation of American trade policies with Japan, Ross D. Siragusa, president of Admiral Corp. of Chicago, said,

"We recognize the need for foreign trade, but we do not believe American workers and industry should be forced to suffer because of our Government's wide-open-door policy and lack of restrictions."

What are American manufacturers doing to combat the heavy Japanese electronic imports? Most of them have taken the line of least resistance and are buying components or complete Japanese radios for marketing under their own brand names (Motorola, Emerson, Bulova, OE, etc.).

Admiral has followed a buy American program and has steadfastly refused to use Japanese components or otherwise cheapen its radios or television receivers. Suppliers, who have been concerned about shrinking employment as well as diminishing business, have cooperated wholeheartedly in the Admiral effort to be competitive in today's market.

Admiral radio cartons proudly carry this identification: "Made by American craftsmen with guaranteed quality American components." RCA and Zenith also are using similar slogans.

Admiral's advertising mentions "100-percent American quality—100-percent American made." The company has carried its fight against Japanese inroads to its big Times Square spectacular sign in New York City

which now calls attention every 60 seconds to buy American.

The Electronic Industries Association, Washington, D.C., asked the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization last year to take action without apparent results.

While in favor of protecting the American electronics industry, EIA is split within its organization by the many companies that are buying finished Japanese radios or are using Japanese components in radios assembled in the United States.

Proof that the foreign imports are hurting American employment is evidenced by a statement from M. Frank Darling, president and business manager of Local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, pointing out that the number of employed members in his Chicago area local has dropped 14,000 over the past 3 years.

Local 1031, largest in the United States with some 42,000 members, carries this message on a huge sign in front of its headquarters building on West Madison Street:

BUY AMERICAN-MADE PRODUCTS—THE JOB YOU SAVE MAY BE YOUR OWN

The union sponsored a 26-week series of spot announcements recently on WGN radio, urging listeners to buy American-made goods and support U.S. industry.

The United States is not the sole target of Japanese radios. Canada, too, has been feeling the effects of heavy imports. The Electronic Industries Association of Canada blames the Federal Government's inaction as "rapidly forcing the Canadian electronics industry out of business."

In Canada Japanese radio imports have increased 769 percent since 1957; Japan has taken 32.5 percent of that country's electronic market; employment at receiving tube plants has dropped 24 percent in 1 year as a result of Japanese imports.

Stuart D. Brownlee, retiring president of EIAC and president of Canadian Admiral Corp., Ltd., of Port Credit, Ontario, said that the 395,000 Japanese radio receivers imported by Canada in 1959 represented 2,370,000 man-hours of labor lost. Quotas seem to offer the only real solution, he added.

In Australia, where Japanese radio imports began to flood dealers about a year ago, the Government took prompt and effective action to stem the tide. A \$22.50 duty was imposed on every imported product with transistors no matter where it came from. The result: no more imported radios and no more problems.

Radio industry manufacturers in the United Kingdom are especially concerned about Japanese sets flooding their market. One industry official (Norman Dodd) while speaking recently in the House of Commons said it was regrettable that the government increased the quota last month.

"Japanese components are being imported in Austrian and Italian transistor sets. As a result of the Irish Government's favorable terms to a Japanese subsidiary we are likely to get more shipments from the free port of Shannon. The main components of these transistors are not the raw materials but labor—they have a high labor content."

It was pointed out that in addition to direct imports from Japan there were other imports of receivers with a large Japanese content coming from the Continent and Hong Kong.

A spokesman estimated the Japanese transistor radios would corner 20 percent of the expected United Kingdom market in 1960 "at a time when our industry is just beginning to get the market going here. The United Kingdom Government must be aware of what has happened to the transistor radio industry in the United States, Canada, and elsewhere. Similar circumstances may face the United Kingdom radio industry."

A few months ago the Research Clinic of Woodbury College conducted a survey for Admiral among 2,500 families in the Metropolitan Los Angeles area. More than 72 percent indicated a preference for American-made transistor radios despite higher retail prices. According to the survey, these results point up the greater confidence of consumers in American quality and workmanship.

Within the next few months the Japanese will embark on another electronics invasion of the United States—with television receivers. Ross D. Siragusa, the president of Admiral, does not believe the Japanese will enjoy anywhere near the same success with their TV sets as they did with radios.

"The American public realizes that television is a complex electronic instrument," Siragusa pointed out. "I am confident that when the consumer buys a TV set he wants to be certain he can get it repaired and obtain replacement parts anywhere, should they be required. I also want to mention that at the present time no Japanese TV sets carry the Underwriters Laboratories' seal which assures the safety of electrical products in regard to fire and shock dangers."

Incidentally, Japanese TV sets will be taxed at the rate of only 10½ percent when they begin to arrive in this country. Any American TV sets which are licensed for shipping to Japan are hit with a 25-percent duty.

Mr. Siragusa said there is growing evidence of attempts to delude the American public with highly questionable marketing practices for Japanese radios. He called attention to a new brand name for transistor radios—Americana—announced by Sanshin Jitsugyo Co., Ltd., Tokyo, and also referred to a full-page advertisement of Transistor World Corp. in the August 2, 1960, issue of Home Furnishings Daily.

The ad by the distributor of Toshiba radios in the United States carries this headline: "Acceptance Built on Integrity," and features a large photographic illustration of the Mount Rushmore National Monument (South Dakota) showing Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Roosevelt, and Lincoln.

The shipment of electronic components from Japan to the United States in the first 3 months of 1960 shows alarming increases in every category: Receiving tubes, up 383 percent; loudspeakers, up 233 percent; transistors, up 1,059 percent.

It is obvious that these increases cannot continue for long without inflicting serious and permanent damage on American suppliers.

Therefore, Admiral Corp. hopes the administration in Washington will make an immediate reappraisal of American trade policies with Japan, especially in the area of electronics.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a press release from my office dated August 23, 1960:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT today prevailed upon Congress to pass a resolution calling for an investigation of the administration of the Buy American Act, the reciprocal trades program, and the influence of GATT on the American economy.

DENT cited the long list of American industries and American labor groups that have been spending high sums of money and many days of futile efforts in protesting tariff cuts and quota liberalizations before the Tariff Commission in vain.

The added weight of the import lobby, the Presidential veto power, the State Department's blending of foreign affairs with tariff concessions, the new reciprocal trade agreements fraud, perpetrated by the inter-

national trade groups that control GATT are just too much for many American industries.

The vigorous protest of the American glass manufacturers and American glass and ceramic workers seems to fall on deaf ears year after year and in the meantime, we've made Japan the world's largest glass producer, particularly for the U.S. market. Glass isn't alone in its protest. I've received vigorous statistical protests from steel, paint, window glass, coal, steel producers, flint glass, ceramic, sporting goods, toy, tire and tube manufacturers from my own district showing absolute proof that they cannot compete with foreign producers with our tax structures and American standards of living. Steel, rubber goods, toys, tennis balls, watches, and in fact, all of the consumer goods are in serious trouble with foreign imports.

Our Government can't expect anything but chaos and more unemployment, factory closings, and main street bankruptcies unless it starts right at the top and enforces the Buy American Act in Government procurement. The unrealistic 6-percent differential established by the Eisenhower administration in Government procurement practically closes the door upon American industry and the American workman. Actually, if carried out to its ultimate, not one American car would be sold to our Government, not one American rifle or uniform, not one American piece of equipment because by actual competition the American producer doing business with our Government starts off with 36.014 percent against him since this much out of every gross dollars worth of business with our Government is paid back to the Government in only five categories of Government payroll and profit taxes.

If all local and raw material supplier taxes are computed, the amount the Government assesses against every American bid is fantastic, especially so when you figure the unrealistic differential allowed Americans.

THE MEXICAN MIGRANT LABOR PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTANGELO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 of this year the House passed H.R. 12759, which extends Public Law 78 which permits the use of migrant labor on American farms. We have seen that approximately 440,000 Mexican nationals, known as braceros, are working on American farms producing food and fiber. Approximately 60 percent, or 260,000, are working on cotton farms. Most of the braceros are working in five States: Arizona which has 24,630; Arkansas, 27,387; California, 136,012; Texas, 205,959; New Mexico, 18,290.

During the consideration of the bill, I became greatly concerned about the charges made against this program. I heard talk about the slave wages being paid these braceros, the horrible housing conditions which were provided by the

growers who hire these men and the lack of sanitary conditions. I also heard about the immorality of hiring braceros and migrant workers and how domestic workers were being ousted from employment by these migrant workers. Representatives from the Southwest and Far West on the other hand claimed that these accusations were untrue, that braceros earned more than \$1 an hour and that also it was imperative for growers to hire these braceros in order to harvest their crops.

As a matter of fact, I was impressed by the argument as to the dire need of the bracero program and was also impressed by the dangers of exploitation inherent in hiring cheap foreign labor. I introduced an amendment, which because of a limitation of time, received little consideration. My amendment provided that the Secretary of Labor should not authorize the entry of Mexican nationals for farm labor except for the cultivation and harvest of food supplies. This would exclude the use of braceros on cotton farms, which is in surplus which our Government subsidizes and which is costing our Government storage charges because of the surplus. That amendment was defeated, but not my interest in this growing subject of migrant labor. I decided to see for myself.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Agriculture, I visited several areas in California and in Arkansas during the week of July 18, 1960, shortly after the debate. I was accompanied by a staff officer, Ross Pope and Congressman ROLAND LIBONATI, of Illinois, a member of the Judiciary Committee, who was deeply interested in the immigration aspects of the importation of these braceros. We sought to observe the type of agricultural conditions in these areas and to study farm labor problems with respect to both domestic farmworkers and Mexican nationals—braceros. Throughout my trip I was accompanied by representatives of the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture. They were very helpful and cooperative.

I take this opportunity to report to you what we found in California and in Arkansas, what we learned and what conclusions I have drawn. I shall discuss the wage rates, the housing conditions, the employment opportunities, the pending litigation, the employer-company store, and my conclusions and recommendations. The conclusions that I have drawn are my own. I do not bespeak the sentiments of the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. Their views may or may not accord with mine. I shall pull no punches and shall praise or criticize this program without fear or without bias.

REPORT: SANTANGELO CALIFORNIA AND ARKANSAS TRIP

It seems to be the thinking of the majority of those who hire braceros that a Mexican national—bracero—is fortunate to find employment in the broiling sun at 100 degrees or better at 50 cents

an hour, and that housing discomforts and insanitary facilities are necessary evils. Because these housing discomforts are endured for a short period of time and are temporary in character and that these braceros are accustomed to poverty, insecurity, and inequality, it is felt that a standard of living which is at a level slightly higher than the standard of poverty to which they are accustomed is a benevolence. Such a viewpoint cannot be accepted by a humane society and a nation which rejects the notion that poverty is inevitable. No group of people which believes in the dignity and worth of a human being can tolerate the degrading housing conditions and lack of sanitary facilities which exist in certain areas. The Department of Labor must see to it that a decent standard of living considering the circumstances must be maintained. This program no matter how necessary it is to growers should be permitted to continue only if clean housing and sanitary facilities are provided.

CALIFORNIA

The schedule in California included visits to a number of farms and ranches in the San Joaquin, Santa Clara, and Napa Valleys as follows:

First. We visited the DiGiorgio Farms at Arvin, near Bakersfield. This property covers 10,000 acres, 6,000 of which are in vineyards. This operation supports some 900 people on an annual basis and about 2,000 at peak periods, including around 300 Mexican nationals. We were told that the labor turnover rate was very high.

The farm workers average 50 hours per week in busy periods and 40 hours per week during slack periods. The rates of pay for picking grapes were \$1 per hour. Where grapes are both picked and packed in the field, the rate was \$1 per hour, plus 10 cents per box. Thompson seedless grapes are produced in the main. For picking plums and peanuts, the rates were \$1.25 per hour. Packers in the packinghouse receive \$1 per hour for grapes and a piecework rate for plums which averages at least \$1 per hour. One packing house was completely air conditioned.

We were told that these rates applied to both domestic workers and Mexican nationals. The charge for room and board was \$2 per day for domestics and \$1.75 for nationals.

Second. We visited the Coit Ranch at Mendota, near Fresno. This is an 11,000-acre property with 4,000 acres devoted to the production of cantaloupes. They are delicious and succulent. Considerable acreage is planted to cotton also. This operation employs 100 to 150 domestics on a year-round basis, with 150 to 200 Mexican nationals on a seasonal basis. Here we observed the cantaloupe fields and inspected the domestic labor camp and single workers' camp—primarily for Mexican nationals.

Third. We visited the G. Oberti and Sans olive processing and canning plant at Madera, near Fresno. This organization has about 800 acres planted to olives on 9 ranches. One orchard totals 320

acres, the largest olive orchard in the United States. It uses about 600 seasonal workers, both domestic and Mexican nationals, for 6 to 8 weeks each year during the harvesting period.

The group visited the canning plant and inspected the farm labor camp which was unused and looked structurally sound and airy.

Fourth. We visited the Progressive Growers Farm Labor Association at Santa Clara. This is an association of Santa Clara Valley growers which is responsible for obtaining both domestic and foreign labor for the individual member growers. Last year it used some 4,000 braceros at peak periods, with an average of 500 for 8 to 10 months of the year. It also provided employment through its members for an average of 2,000 to 2,500 domestic workers for 8 to 10 months of the year. Here we reviewed the payroll and picking records of Mexican nationals and domestic workers. It was interesting to note that generally the Mexican nationals were more productive than the domestic workers. We also inspected the Walter Brown Labor Camp which houses 425 single workers used by various growers in the area, and the L. G. Farms, a small user of farm labor.

Last year on September 16, 1959, the Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, made a surprise visit to Santa Clara farm labor camps, and ordered one to be closed down and ordered some others to clean up or shut down. One of the barracks belonged to the Progressive Growers Association camp. I am happy to report that the barracks which I observed belonging to the Progressive Growers Association were acceptable in my opinion. It provided tolerable housing accommodations, running water, sanitary facilities, and also a community playroom where I observed braceros playing pool, listening to Spanish music on a juke box and playing cards.

Fifth. We visited the Louis Martini winery at Rutherford, north of San Francisco. This winery was founded in the early 1900's and has over 600 acres of vineyards. The group toured the winery and observed various operations from crushing of grapes to final bottling and labeling. Also, the group inspected the farm labor housing—60-man capacity—and some of the vineyards.

Sixth. We visited the C. E. Herrick Farms at Napa, north of San Francisco, a large prune ranch employing some 10 workers. Here we observed the prune orchards, visited the farm labor housing—12-man capacity—and inspected an automated prune dehydrating plant just installed. Housing was adequate, but sanitary facilities could be improved upon.

Seventh. The group also visited the main office in San Francisco of the DiGiorgio Fruit Corp., which owns and operates in California six large fruit ranches, one of which has been discussed earlier in this report, three processing plants, several wineries, a bottling plant, and a lumber and box plant. It

also has two properties in Florida. Here we conferred with Mr. J. S. DiGiorgio, president of the company. We were told that this company declared dividends of 3 percent last year, that farm labor turnover had averaged 500 percent last year and that wages throughout the organization for farm workers had averaged \$2.50 to \$2.75 per hour for Japanese workers; \$2 to \$2.50 per hour for Mexican nationals; and \$1.35 to \$1.75 per hour for domestic workers. Mr. DiGiorgio pointed out that his organization employed every domestic worker referred to them, despite their poorer production record and their general unemployability. He stated, however, that during peak periods they had to depend on foreign workers to get the crops harvested.

ARKANSAS

The visit to the Mississippi Delta area near West Memphis, Ark., included the following stops:

First. The Kuhn plantation, near Lepanto, Ark., a 4,000-acre cotton farm. Here we inspected a farm labor camp with a capacity of 50 men. Living conditions were very poor here, with outdoor sanitary facilities and no running water. Such camps as these should not be permitted to continue and should be closed down unless sanitary conditions are immeasurably improved. We so indicated our feelings to the farm manager and to the authorities, and the Mexican nationals were moved out—see report of Roy L. Haynes to his supervisor dated August 2, 1960, attached herewith. We have been informed that these housing facilities will no longer be used unless and until the unsanitary conditions are corrected.

Second. A group of farmer cooperative associations which use 1,500 to 2,000 Mexican nationals each year, at Lepanto, Ark. These associations included the Lepanto Growers Association, the Citizens Independent Growers Association, and the Parkin Growers Association. These organizations are paying 50 cents per hour for "cotton chopping" for both domestics and braceros and \$2.50 to \$3 per hundred pounds for cottonpicking. It was pointed out that most of the domestic workers are women, children, and older people who are not as productive as the braceros. It was also pointed out that, on occasion, the local wage rates for domestics are less than the rates paid the Mexican nationals.

Here we visited the farm labor housing facilities of several member growers, including the J. P. Gooch plantation and the Joe Roy Nash plantation, both near Lepanto. The Gooch property has 250 acres of cotton and employs about 10 Mexican nationals in the spring and around 40 in the fall of the year. The Nash property covers 160 acres, of which 55 are in cotton, and employs three braceros in the spring and eight in the fall. The housing facilities inspected here were in poor condition, very much like those found on the Kuhn plantation. Sanitary conditions would have to be improved and maintained; otherwise, it is our recommendation that the housing

should be closed down—see report of Roy L. Haynes to his supervisor, dated August 2, 1960, attached herewith. These conditions, in any charitable sense, could not be labeled livable. We have been informed that had sanitary conditions have been corrected.

Generally the buildings are those which were previously used by tenant farmers and have been converted for this purpose. Housing is usually furnished free of charge and each person is expected to furnish his own meals with stoves in the houses. We were told, however, that many Mexican nationals prefer this type of housing where they can live in small groups to the large labor camps in Texas and California which are more like military camps.

The group also observed the recontracting of Mexican nationals who had finished their work in Arkansas for further farm work in Michigan and Wisconsin.

Third. We visited the Robert Wilson Co., of Wilson, Ark. This is a large company with sizable holdings, including most of the town of Wilson. It operates some 25,000 acres, largely planted to cotton. It employs some 450 permanent domestic workers and as many transient domestics as it can get during the peak cotton picking period; it also uses as many as 2,000 Mexican nationals. The group consulted with the owner, R. E. L. Wilson 3d, and the manager, Jim Germany. The wage rates are generally the same as paid in the rest of the area—50 cents per hour for cotton chopping and \$2.50 to \$3.50 per hundred pounds for cotton picking. Mr. Wilson stated that the average worker can make from \$25 to \$45 per week picking cotton. We inspected the hourly work sheets, which confirmed the company's representations that the workers were being credited the hourly minimum wages. The records also indicated that most of them were working in excess of 8 hours per day at 50 cents per hour, 5 days per week, on the cotton farms doing hoeing or chopping. Mr. Wilson also stated that "Mexicans are wonderful workers and can usually exceed \$25 to \$45 per week." When braceros chop or hoe cotton, it is unlikely that they can earn more than \$40 per week.

He further pointed out that the organization expects to increase its production of vegetables in the future to provide more continuous employment for 8 to 10 months of the year. He indicated that this type of operation should provide permanent employment throughout most of the year for some 350 to 500 farmworkers. The company has several farm labor camps which can accommodate from 25 to 200 workers. The group inspected one of these facilities and found it to be very satisfactory, much like those found in California.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

First. Wage rates: Farm labor wage rates in California are generally \$1 per hour or more for most operations, except in the Imperial Valley. The more experienced workers can earn considerably

more than this on a piecework basis. I am attaching a Department of Labor release showing average hourly earnings of Mexican nationals in various counties in California during May 1960.

Reports which we have received regarding wages and employment conditions in the Imperial Valley of southern California indicate that growers request a greater supply of braceros than their farm needs require. Of the 14,000 in this area, over 9,000 work on cotton farms. Consequently, many braceros find their modest maximum income reduced by part-time employment, by the cost of food consumption during their enforced leisure hours, and by reductions for medical care. Weekly wages after deductions in the Imperial Valley of southern California have amounted on occasions to a paltry \$2 or \$3 per week. Complaints have also been received that the medical treatments guaranteed by the medical insurance programs in time of need have not been forthcoming or are inadequate. We did not go into this matter, but the Agriculture Committee, if it has not done so, should do so.

Wage rates in Arkansas are much less than those in California—50 cents per hour for cotton chopping in the spring to perhaps 75 cents to \$1.25 per hour picking cotton. It must be realized, however, that all income levels are lower in Arkansas and that living costs are much lower, particularly for housing and utilities.

In most areas, Mexican nationals and domestic workers are paid the same wages for similar work. In some instances it appears that domestic workers in Arkansas earn slightly less than braceros on some occasions.

Second. Housing conditions: Farm labor housing in Arkansas is very inferior to that observed in California from the standpoint of cleanliness, comfort, eating facilities, and recreational opportunities. Most labor camps in California are relatively new and are easier to maintain. Since the number of persons housed is much larger in camps on the typical California ranch, central eating facilities are provided with excellent menus. In Arkansas, most of the farms are small, employing only a few workers. The housing provided there is usually reconverted tenant housing with outside sanitary facilities and no running water. The occupants are provided with cooking facilities and are required to provide their own meals which are less costly to the worker but far less satisfactory. The Mexican national is charged \$1.75 per day for meals and lodging in California—\$12.25 per week. We were told that the average Mexican could feed himself for around \$5 to \$6 per week in Arkansas with no charge for housing.

The DiGiorgio Fruit Corp. representatives in California showed us plans for improved housing to accommodate 4 braceros in a cottage instead of 7 barracks accommodating 50 or more Mexican nationals.

In Arkansas, in the main, the lack of running water is a degradation to the

farmworker who returns home after an 8- or 10-hour workday in the broiling sun. In my opinion, the regulations by the Department of Labor should require running water for toilet and bathing facilities as a condition precedent to certification by the Department of Labor that the housing conditions are acceptable for the importation of braceros.

Third. Employment opportunities: Despite a 5- or 6-percent unemployment rate in California, it appears that the growers there are employing all domestic workers referred to them. In addition, they are using many Mexican nationals during the peak seasons to enable them to meet their planting, growing, and harvesting schedules. Because of the large variety of crops produced in California, with the periods of harvesting staggered throughout the year, there is a need for farmworkers for nearly 10 months of the year from March through December. The growers contacted generally felt that there is a need for additional sources of farm labor, in view of the deficiencies of domestic workers.

Agriculture in Arkansas is limited to fewer crops, generally cotton and soybeans, which means that the need for itinerant domestics and Mexican nationals is limited to a few months in the spring and again in the fall. As indicated earlier, there is some effort being made to introduce additional crops to lengthen the season, stagger peak periods of work and stabilize income. If such trend becomes widespread, more continuous employment opportunities will be possible for both domestic and foreign workers.

Fourth. Pending litigation: Presently there is litigation pending in the courts involving the right to enforce the regulations by the Department of Labor as to the minimum wages payable and the acceptable working conditions.

The program of importing Mexican nationals in my opinion cannot be justified unless decent housing conditions and sanitary facilities are provided and maintained by the growers. An enforcement of the regulations must be effective. Two attempts have been made to stop the enforcement of the Department of Labor regulations. The first involved a group of agricultural employers in the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, who instituted legal action to restrain certain officials of the Department of Labor from requiring them to pay Mexican workers in their employ more than \$2.30 per hundredweight for picking cotton. The second involved an association of agricultural employers which sought a temporary injunction enjoining certain officials of the Department of Labor from placing the name of the association upon a list of employers not eligible to contract Mexican workers because the employers failed to keep accurate payroll records. The background and status of these cases is set forth in a memorandum attached herewith.

Fifth. The employer company store: Complaints have been heard that the infamous company store operated by

mine owners and gouging employers has found its appearance in the Southwest of the United States and that braceros were being overcharged in the purchase of food commodities far in excess of their true value or comparable prices in non-company stores. We requested and obtained a comparison of prices which braceros are required to pay in the so-called company store and the prices which obtain in the nearby markets out of the area of the employers' premises and in the neighboring sections.

Attached herewith is a summary of commodities most used by Mexican nationals working in the area of Wilson, Ark., and which are purchased in the company and noncompany stores. A reading of the report indicates that in the Wilson Grocery and Market in Wilson, Ark., that in 10 out of 13 commodities, the company charged a difference from 1 to 5 cents over the average selling price in the adjoining areas. In two of the commodities, the noncompany stores on the average charged about a penny more than the price which was being charged in the company store. It appears, therefore, that the complaints have very little substance in this regard in this area.

I am attaching a letter from Robert C. Goodwin, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security, dated August 12, 1960, in which he sets forth a summary of the litigation pending in the U.S. District Court in the Southern District of Texas, the tabulation of findings of the prices of food commodities current in the area of Wilson, Ark., and the action taken by the Department of Labor in regard to the housing conditions which we observed and which we complained about. The Department of Labor has taken effective action, but it is recommended that more frequent inspections be made, and in the event that personnel be insufficient, that additional personnel be engaged to make periodic and frequent inspections.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1960.
HON. ALFRED SANTANGELO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SANTANGELO: During your recent visit to Arkansas you requested Mr. Ray Haynes, of our Dallas regional office, to secure and furnish you with information concerning the injunction suit in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas and a summary of our findings on a study of food costs (selected items) in the towns of Lepanto, Osceola, and Wilson as compared to charges made on the same items at stores (commissaries) on the Lee Wilson Plantation, particularly at Marlon and Wilson, Ark.

In compliance with this request I am enclosing copies of the "Summary of Litigation Pending in the U.S. District Court in the Southern District of Texas," and a tabulation of our findings of the "Prices of Food Commodities Most Used by Mexican Nationals Working in Area of Wilson, Ark."

I am also enclosing excerpts from Mr. Haynes' report to his supervisor, W. B. McFarland, dated August 2, 1960. These excerpts summarize the action taken concerning housing deficiencies observed during your visit.

I am pleased to provide you with this information and if I can be of any further service please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. GOODWIN,
Director.

SUMMARY OF LITIGATION PENDING IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

A group of agricultural employers in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas instituted legal action to restrain certain officials of the Department of Labor from requiring them to pay Mexican workers in their employ more than \$2.30 per hundredweight for picking cotton. The background to this litigation is as follows:

Section 503(2) of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, prohibits the Secretary of Labor from making Mexican nationals available for agricultural employment in the United States unless he can certify that their employment will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic agricultural workers.

Until 1958, no studies had been made of the earnings produced by the various piece rates paid to Mexican workers in the many agricultural activities in which they were employed. In 1958, the Department of Labor conducted a survey of the earnings produced by the piece rates paid to Mexican workers employed in the vegetable harvest in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. This survey revealed that on the basis of the then prevailing piece rate paid to Mexican workers their earnings averaged 33 cents per hour. The Secretary of Labor thereupon determined that he could not, consistent with the statutory responsibility imposed upon him under title V of the Agricultural Act, certify the employment of Mexican workers, working at piece rates producing earnings of less than 50 cents an hour, where under the statute he would be placing domestic agricultural workers in competition with such Mexican workers. Accordingly, in order to carry out his statutory responsibilities, the Secretary adopted the "90-10" wage policy. This policy requires, as a condition precedent to the determination and certification called for by section 503, that the piece rate offered by an employer to Mexican agricultural workers must afford to at least 90 percent of the employer's Mexican workers of normal competence and diligence, within a given pay period, average earnings of not less than 50 cents per hour.

For a number of years, in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas \$2.05 per hundredweight was the rate paid by growers for employment in cotton picking. Studies in 1953 disclosed that at least \$2.30 was necessary to meet the provisions of the "90-10" wage policy and growers in the area advised that the Secretary of Labor would not be able to certify that a rate less than \$2.30 per hundredweight would not result in adverse effect. Because the information obtained was inconclusive as to whether \$2.30 per hundredweight was adequate to meet the "90-10" wage policy, the growers were at the same time advised that a further study would be made at the end of the 1959 cotton harvest season to determine the adequacy of the piece rate.

Prior to the beginning of the 1959 cotton harvest season, the Department of Labor held a series of conferences with the growers who assured the Department that they would, on a do-it-yourself basis, comply with the "90-10" wage policy.

At the end of the 1959 cotton harvest, a study was undertaken of the earnings that

the \$2.30 per hundredweight had produced. The Department examined the payroll records of 35 employers who had employed 36,574 Mexican workers in cotton picking during the 1959 cotton harvest in the lower Rio Grande Valley. This examination revealed that 29 of these employers, employing 34,395 workers, had not maintained adequate and accurate records of the hours worked by Mexican workers employed by them in the cotton-picking harvest. It was thus impossible for the Secretary to determine the actual hourly earnings of the Mexican workers. Accordingly, it became necessary for the Secretary to develop pertinent information from the best sources available to the Department of Labor. Therefore, the Secretary caused an examination to be made of the payrolls of employers of Mexican workers similarly used in cotton picking during the 1958 and 1959 cotton harvests in the El Paso and trans-Pecos areas of west Texas and in 13 counties in Arkansas.

This investigation revealed that in the El Paso and trans-Pecos areas of west Texas where the per acre production of cotton is more than double the per acre production of cotton in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas the earnings of Mexican workers barely met the requirements of the "90-10" wage policy at piece rates of \$2.05 and \$2.25 per hundredweight for short staple cotton and \$3 to \$4 per hundredweight for long staple cotton; that in the 13 counties of Arkansas, where the average per acre production of cotton in 1959 was approximately 20 percent higher per acre than the production of cotton in the four counties of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, the prevailing rate paid to Mexican workers employed in cotton picking ranged from \$2.50 to \$3 per hundredweight. Consequently, on the basis of this investigation, the Secretary of Labor determined that he was unable to certify under section 503 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, that the employment of Mexican workers in the cotton harvest in the four counties of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas at wage rates less than \$2.50 per hundredweight for picking cotton did not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

It was this decision of the Secretary of Labor that he could not certify that there would be no adverse effect unless a piece rate of \$2.50 per hundredweight was paid that precipitated the aforementioned litigation. In this case, the U.S. district court has issued a preliminary injunction and an appeal by the Department is pending at the present time.

In another case, pursuant to the provisions of the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951, as amended, an association of agricultural employers had been declared ineligible to contract Mexican workers because of the failure of the association to keep accurate payroll records. The association has obtained a preliminary injunction temporarily enjoining certain officials of the Department of Labor from placing the name of the association upon a list of employers not eligible to contract Mexican workers and from requiring the association to terminate its contract with Mexican workers now employed and under contract to the association.

AUGUST 2, 1960.

W. B. MCFARLAND,
ROY L. HAYNES.

(Visit to northeastern Arkansas by U.S. Congressmen ALFRED SANTANGELO and ROLAND LIBONATI on July 22, 1960.)

Reference is made to my report dated July 25, 1960, to Tracy Murrell on "Visit to Northeastern Arkansas by U.S. Congressmen

ALFRED SANTANGELO and ROLAND LIBONATI, July 22, 1960."

The West Memphis district office has made a follow-up reinspection of housing units at Marion and Lepanto, Ark., which is summarized, as follows:

I. MRS. R. T. KUHN HOUSING

Located 3½ miles west of Marion, Ark., on U.S. Highway 61, across the highway from Kuhn store, consists of 4-room frame house, good roof, sidewalls, and floor; outdoor privy, pit type; separate building 12 feet by 12 feet for bathing; hand pump on well 60 feet from cooking area. Basic standards had been met but entire quarters were dirty and unsanitary when inspected by Congressmen SANTANGELO and LIBONATI on July 22.

At request of District Supervisor Dave Foster, workers were removed on July 23. All nationals (15) were returned to Mexico. (Contracts had been completed on July 21.) A recheck made on July 25 by FLSR masters of the West Memphis district office, confirmed removal of workers. Employer will not be permitted to use the facilities again for Mexican nationals until the sanitary conditions are corrected, after reinspection has been made and housing approved.

II. CITIZENS INDEPENDENT GROWERS ASSOCIATION, LEPANTO, ARK.

J. I. Gooch, user-member. Housing located 1 mile south of Lepanto, Ark., tenant-type frame, four rooms, maintained in poor condition, particularly bad drainage of grounds and unsanitary interior of house at time of inspection on July 22.

A total of 14 deficiencies were noted. Ten workers were living in the quarters at the time of inspection. Employer made immediate correction on July 23 and 24. A followup inspection was made on July 25 and the following had been done:

1. Tabletops had been covered with new surface.
2. Stoves had been scrubbed with steel wool and thoroughly cleaned.
3. One back room had been set aside as the cooking and eating area and all stoves were moved into this room.
4. Two sleeping rooms had been papered with new wallpaper.
5. Bathroom (separate unit) was moved to a distance of 50 feet from living quarters and a deep drainage ditch was dug. This will be covered as required by the regulations.
6. Fill dirt was placed around the outside of the living quarters to eliminate any pools of standing water after rains.
7. Floors of house (living quarters) were scrubbed with soap.
8. Loose sections of screen doors were repaired.
9. New steps erected at front entrance of house.
10. New mattresses replaced some that were worn out; clean covers provided for all mattresses with assurance they will be laundered by employer at least once a week.
11. Gravel walk provided to toilet.
12. Self-closing device (spring) installed on privy door.

III. CITIZENS INDEPENDENT GROWERS ASSOCIATION, LEPANTO, ARK.

Joe Roy Nash, user-member. Housing located three-fourth mile south of Lepanto. Two-room frame house with front porch. Three workers were housed in this unit at time of inspection on July 22, 1960.

Reinspection was made on July 25 and all workers were removed on that date. The following action had been taken by employer even though workers had been recontracted and sent to Michigan employers:

1. Screen doors had been repaired.
 2. Kitchen had been cleaned.
 3. Weeds had been cut around house.
- By July 27 he had scheduled correction of following deficiencies:
1. Provide smooth, hard-surface tabletops.
 2. Provide storage space for utensil storage.
 3. Clean or paint kitchen ceiling.
 4. Provide one window to bathroom, two lights and bench.
 5. Provide drainage for bathroom.
 6. Provide walk to toilet and bathroom.
 7. Remove all dirty, wornout mattresses and provide clean mattress covers.
 8. Cut weeds around toilet; provide vent in roof; install self-closing device on door; provide lime for privy.

The regional office and the West Memphis office will conduct a series of meetings before cotton harvest season to discuss with employers, housing and transportation regulations, particularly their responsibilities of keeping accurate records on employment of contracted nationals.

Average hourly earnings of Mexican nationals in all activities paid at piece rates by county, by activity for employment during the month of May 1960

County ¹	Activity	Hourly rate for activity	Total wages paid	Total hours worked	Average hourly earning	County ¹	Activity	Hourly rate for activity	Total wages paid	Total hours worked	Average hourly earning
Alameda	Strawberries, harvest	\$1.00	\$5,713	4,770	\$1.20	Orange	Oranges, pick		\$205,880	217,574	\$0.95
Butte	Peaches, thin	1.00	3,713	3,742	.99		Parle, bunch	\$0.90	12,480	8,862	1.40
	Sugar beets, thin	.90	395	319	1.24		Parsnips, top	.90	3,264	2,744	1.18
Colusa	do	1.00	26,532	21,241	1.25		Rhubarb, harvest	.90	365	214	1.70
Contra Costa	Asparagus, cut	1.00	123,071	123,719	.99		Rutabagas, top	.90	1,744	1,263	1.38
	Sugar beets, thin	1.00	576	576	1.00		Turnips, top	.90	6,032	4,666	1.29
El Dorado	No activities paid by piece rates					Placer	No activities paid by piece rate				
	do					Riverside (East)	Carrots, harvest	.75	4,202	4,076	1.03
Fresno	Sugar beets, thin	.90	2,182	2,249	.97		Citrus, harvest		18,580	14,530	1.47
Glenn	Carrots, harvest	.75	59,576	61,906	.96		Dates, tie bunches		384	252	1.45
Imperial	Grapefruit, pick		3,101	2,532	1.22		Onions, harvest and dry	.75	35,962	37,776	.95
	Onions, harvest and dry	.75	32,624	40,761	.80		Green onions, harvest	.75	1,145	1,271	.90
	Miscellaneous vegetables, harvest	.75	665	476	1.18		Tomato plants, pull and bunch	.75	18,810	17,603	1.06
Kern	Cucumbers, harvest	.90	6,792	7,325	.93	Riverside (West)	Apricots	1.00	1,558	1,344	1.16
Kings	No activities paid by piece rate						Grapefruit, pick		6,933	5,492	1.08
	do						Lemons, pick		11,272	10,325	1.09
Lake	do						Oranges:				
Los Angeles	Beets, table, pull and tie	.90	285	239	1.19		Navel, pick		868	808	1.07
	Grapefruit, pick		2,376	2,425	.98		Valencia, pick		37,644	35,299	1.06
	Green onions, bunch	.90	6,893	6,566	1.05	Sacramento	Asparagus, cut	1.00	27,776	32,625	.85
	Lemons, pick		24,162	24,469	.99		Sugar beets, thin	1.00	8,243	6,524	1.26
	Moving sprinkler irrigation pipe	1.00	8,410	6,471	1.29		Hops, string	1.00	2,621	2,199	1.15
	Mushrooms, harvest and cultivate	1.00	5,341	4,223	1.26		Peas, harvest	1.00	7,967	6,690	1.20
	Oranges, pick		28,829	30,101	.96	San Benito	Strawberries, harvest	1.00	9,920	8,913	1.11
	Radishes, pull and tie	.90	2,478	1,717	1.43	San Bernardino	Grapefruit, pick		10,184	9,150	1.11
	Rhubarb, harvest	.90	888	538	1.09		Lemons, pick		25,868	24,947	1.03
	Spinach, pull and tie	.90	152	142	1.07		Oranges (Valencia), pick		58,136	55,592	1.05
	Turnips, bunch	.90	192	194	.90		Rhubarb	1.00	433	297	1.46
Madera	No activities paid by piece rate					San Diego	Grapefruit, harvest		615	531	.97
	do						Lemons, pick		2,762	3,012	.92
Mendocino	Peaches, thin	1.00	114,721	106,524	1.08		Oranges, pick		32,386	31,906	1.02
Merced	Sugar beets, thin	.90	260	320	.81	San Joaquin	Asparagus, cut	1.00	841,228	840,335	1.00
Modoc	No activities paid by piece rate						Sugar beets, thin	1.00	18,948	16,808	1.13
Monterey	Broccoli, harvest	.90	4,071	3,780	1.08		Boysenberries, pick	1.00	99	120	.83
	Peas, harvest		5,127	5,049	1.02		Cherries, pick	1.00	3,174	2,719	1.17
	Strawberries, harvest	.90	51,876	50,959	1.02		Onions, top	1.00	357	342	1.04
Napa	No activities paid by piece rate					San Luis Obispo	Strawberries, pick	1.00	88,530	80,455	.99
Nevada	do					San Mateo	Celery, harvest	.90	3,823	2,548	1.50
Orange	Carrots, top	.90	11,429	9,552	1.19		No activities paid by piece rate				
	Lemons, pick		13,146	13,916	.95	Santa Barbara	Broccoli, harvest	.90	414	371	1.12
							Lemons, pick		116,154	104,530	1.11
							Lettuce, loading	.90	761	488	1.55
							Miscellaneous vegetables ²	.90	4,036	3,606	1.11

¹ The 43 counties listed are those in which Mexican nationals were authorized in 1959 or 1960 to date. The 15 counties in which Mexican nationals were not authorized in 1959 or 1960 to date are: Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Del Norte, Humboldt, Inyo, Lassen, Marin, Mariposa, Mono, Plumas, San Francisco, Sierra, Trinity, and Tuolumne.

² Miscellaneous vegetables include: Cutting endive, lettuce harvest, cut-load cabbage, and carrot harvest. Of the 3,606 hours shown, 1,234 was spent cutting endive and harvesting lettuce; 1,691 for cutting and loading cabbage, and harvesting lettuce; 139 for cutting endive; 542 for carrot and lettuce harvest. The Oso Flaco district of San Luis Obispo County also included in this report.

Average hourly earnings of Mexican nationals in all activities paid by piece rates by county, by activity for employment during the month of May 1960—Continued

County	Activity	Hourly rate for activity	Total wages paid	Total hours worked	Average hourly earning	County	Activity	Hourly rate for activity	Total wages paid	Total hours worked	Average hourly earning
Santa Clara	Cherry, pick	\$1.00	\$91	81	\$1.12	Ventura	Cabbage: Pack	\$0.85	\$589	350	\$1.68
	Raspberry, pick	1.00	1,259	1,363	1.92		Thin	.85	19	14	1.30
	Strawberries, harvest	1.00	103,903	92,791	1.11		Carrots: Harvest	.85	116	118	.98
Santa Cruz	Peas, pick	1.00	451	352	1.28		Load	.85	114	57	2.00
	Strawberries, pick	1.00	1,062	940	1.13		Flowers, cut and harvest	.85	4,355	2,581	1.68
Shasta	No activities paid by piece rate						Lemons, harvest	.85	410,011	396,394	1.03
Siskiyou	do						Lettuce, thin	.85	252	158	1.60
Solano	Asparagus, cut, sled	1.00	65,701	62,929	1.04		Oranges, pick	.85	22,880	23,993	.95
	Sugar beets, thin	1.00	11,848	9,639	1.23		Spinach, cut and crate	.90	185	92	2.00
	Strawberries, harvest	1.00	2,496	2,479	1.00	Yolo	Tomato plant, pull	.85	17,603	14,984	1.17
Sonoma	Sugar beets, thin	1.00	431	423	1.02		Asparagus, cut, sled	1.00	17,461	20,347	.86
Stanislaus	Peaches, thin	1.25	9,752	6,661	1.46		Sugar beet, thin	1.00	38,388	31,937	1.20
	Strawberries, pick	1.00	27,071	27,938	.97		Peas, harvest	1.00	1,907	1,729	1.12
	Sugar beets, thin	.90	409	399	1.03		Hops, string	1.00	12,947	11,207	1.16
Sutter	Peaches, thin	1.00	61,883	44,793	1.38	Yuba	Peaches, thin	1.00	4,864	4,277	1.14
	No activities paid by piece rate										
Tehama	Potatoes, harvest	1.00	8,445	6,808	1.24						
Tulare											

Source: "Employer" payroll records, California.

Prices of food commodities most used by Mexican nationals working in area of Wilson, Ark.

	Pinto beans per pound	Sugar per pound	Canned milk (Pet) large	Rice per pound	Coffee per pound (Folgers)	Potatoes per pound	Fresh hot peppers 1/2-pound jar	Flour 25-pound bag	Eggs (large) per dozen	Oatmeal (large box)	Pure lard per pound	Bread (small loaf)	Vermicelli
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Portis Super Market, Lepanto, Ark. (17 miles from Wilson, Ark.)	Cents 16.0	Cents 13.0	Cents 16.0	Cents 16.0	Cents 80.0	Cents 10	Cents 25.0	\$2.42	Cents 55.0	Cents 55.0	Cents 15.5	Cents 2-33	Cents 21.0
Ferrells Grocery, Marie, Ark. (13 miles to Lepanto), (15 miles to Osceola)	15.0	11.0	15.0	15.0	87.0	8	27.0	2.30	50.0	55.0	16.0	20	20.0
Wilson Grocery Market, Wilson, Ark. (12 miles to Osceola), (17 miles to Lepanto)	17.0	11.0	17.0	18.0	85.0	8	29.0	2.49	55.0	57.0	17.0	21	20.0
National Food Store, Osceola, Ark. (12 miles from Wilson)	15.0	10.5	15.0	17.0	77.0	7	29.0	2.39	49.0	53.0	17.0	17	17.0
Big Star Grocery, Osceola, Ark. (12 miles from Wilson)	15.0	11.5	15.5	15.0	75.0	7	39.0	2.30	55.0	47.0	16.0	2-33	19.0
Average cost	15.7	11.4	15.7	16.2	80.8	8	29.8	2.416	52.8	53.4	16.3	18	19.4

Source: Compiled by FLSR Oscar E. Masters, West Memphis district office, July 25, 1960.

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

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman from New York yielding at this time, and I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to my colleague from New York for the statement he has made. I think it has been an outstanding one, and I feel a very factual statement.

I am deeply impressed by his apparent zealously in analyzing the problems he had an opportunity to see. I may say to the gentleman from New York, I hope that more people will go out and actually observe what is taking place in this program. I realize the discussions that went on here some weeks ago at the time we voted on an extension of Public Law 78 were not conclusive. I realize a committee acts and talks sometimes without understanding all of the situations that exist. That is why I say I appreciate what I believe to be a very factual statement on his part. I frankly admit now that there have been abuses of this program from time to time. There are among our farmers those who would take advantage, as we have business in other areas who will take advantage of a situation and do things that are outside the law. There is no question in my

mind but what we have had abuses in California, and we have had them from time to time in other areas. It has been my position that if the law was strictly enforced as Public Law 78 is written, we would have less difficulty.

I may say that I agree with the gentleman there should be more regular inspections and these inspections very closely and rigidly followed out in order to require that the law be met and complied with.

I am concerned primarily with the well-being and welfare of our domestic workers, as I think my colleague is. This is of far more concern than that of the imported workers. We are all concerned to see that our American workers, the people in this country, have the very best living conditions and working conditions that can possibly be made available to them. I am concerned with them, as I know my colleagues from California, Arkansas, Texas, and other areas are concerned.

So, in closing, I would hope that we might have more people who have the willingness to go out and spend time and effort as our distinguished friend from New York has done, and actually see what is taking place, because I believe that if we work together with the program, we can make better progress. We may adjust the program, we may amend

the law if the facts justify, to make a more workable program, something that is fair to our domestic people as well as fair to our farmers who, as I say, and as I think my colleague has agreed, in certain instances will need certain foreign workers.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to say to the gentleman I wish more of the committees would come back to the House and make a report such as the gentleman has made. It is most informative. It is a reasonable report. The report he brings here from my State does show that some of our housing is not of the very best—that is, our farm housing. But our folks are not rich. We do not have running water in some instances. It would be well if we did. But the housing that we have over in Arkansas is far superior to the housing that the Mexican nationals have been accustomed to in their own country, and corrections are being made all the time, and we are bettering the housing conditions in Arkansas right along.

For example, the Phillips County Farmers Association, which is to the

south of where the gentleman visited, have rigid rules and requirements for their members; and, if a member of that association does not comply, they will drop that member and will not allow him to obtain Mexican nationals for his use. So, the housing conditions are being improved right along in that area. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has brought us this factual report. As to the amount of money paid for the picking of cotton, the cottonpickers, both domestic and Mexican, in our area make from \$7 to \$10 a day. This bracero program is a great program. These Mexicans come over and they are able to send money back home to Mexico so that they can move into the village and give their children an opportunity to go to school. It is a great program. It helps build good will between the two countries as well. It is the second biggest medium for bringing in more dollars to Mexico. I appreciate the gentleman's approach to this problem and the report that he has made.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for his comment. But, I would like to observe that in Arkansas there is an outstanding company, the Lee-Wilson Co., which is cooperating with the Department of Labor to improve its housing facilities. But, I cannot say the same thing for the other growers who neglect the housing facilities where the braceros are housed. To me the conditions there were deplorable and degrading. And, even though the conditions might be a little better than the conditions in which the bracero finds himself in Mexico, the standard is not the standard that we in America think that a human being should be compelled to live in.

Mr. GATHINGS. You can find right here in the shadow of the Capitol some most undesirable housing. We find that situation everywhere. And, there is need for improvement, that is true, but at the same time the gentleman ought to bear in mind that the farmer down there does not make much money from his operations, and it is very difficult for him to comply every time with these standards set up by the Department of Labor. In so many instances those standards are better than the farmer himself has for his own family.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I would like to state that if the farmer is not making so much money under conditions which exploit braceros, he should not be permitted to let these people harvest his crops. I believe the braceros should have decent housing, and the farmer, whether he is a large or small farmer, should not exploit them for profit. I have not seen the rest of the country, but the fact that we have had housing in the District of Columbia is no excuse for maintaining bad conditions.

Mr. GATHINGS. According to the report, there is no exploitation of the Mexican bracero.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I said as far as the chopping or hoeing of cotton is concerned, they make a maximum of 50 cents an hour, and I pointed out that the average earnings on piecework is a little higher than 50 cents an hour.

Mr. GATHINGS. The report of the Committee on Agriculture showed that in some instances, in those areas in Arkansas, where they did not use Mexican braceros, the wage rate was less than in those areas where the braceros are employed.

Mr. SANTANGELO. That is right. There is where the 50-cent maximum hourly wage raises the wage of the domestics. Where the bracero is not there to earn that minimum wage, the domestic sometimes is paid 30 or 40 cents an hour. However, a 30- or 40-cent an hour wage these days is no wage for any person to earn. I think wages like that will send them on the relief roll.

Mr. GATHINGS. You did not find any 30- or 40-cent-an-hour wage in Arkansas, did you?

Mr. SANTANGELO. There were instances we found where the domestics were getting 40 cents an hour.

Mr. GATHINGS. Farm wage rates, I will say to the gentleman from New York, have increased more than any other classification in this period.

Mr. SANTANGELO. It is interesting to observe that in the picking of cotton, 10 years ago they were getting \$3½ a hundredweight or 3½ cents a pound. Today in Arkansas they are getting maybe \$2.50 a hundredweight or 2½ cents a pound to pick cotton.

Mr. GATHINGS. I should like to say that in 1946 I was in the implement business for a short time. At that time it took the gross proceeds of seven bales of cotton to buy a tractor. Today it takes the gross proceeds of 17 bales of cotton to buy the same tractor. So there are quite a number of considerations involved.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The worker is getting less today and the dollar does not purchase as much.

Mr. GATHINGS. The price of the commodity has gone down.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I read the report of the gentleman from Arkansas and it is quite detailed and complete. But I do think an effort should not be made to frustrate the Department of Labor in the enforcement of its regulations, but that there should be some cooperation with the Department to see that the regulations are enforced so that the standard of living of these people may be raised; so that they may have a decent place to live, with sanitary facilities and with running water. Perhaps the gentleman's own people, the domestic workers, as well as the growers themselves, may be able to sink pumps and get running water.

Mr. GATHINGS. It would be wonderful if that situation could be improved all across the land. I think good living conditions are desirable everywhere, even right here in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I went through the desert heat in California, which got up to 110 degrees, and where they have had to dig deep for water. The gentleman may be able to do the same thing in Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman brought out the point that it is difficult to get domestic labor to do this work in this intense

heat. That is true. They do not like that stoop labor. So there is a shortage of domestic workers. We only bring this labor in here as a supplemental supply. We do not bring that labor in unless it is absolutely essential. It costs the farmer, out of his own pocket, \$42.10 to bring the labor up from the Mexican border to Arkansas, a distance of 1,000 miles, and to get him back. That is \$42.10 that he, the farmer, has to pay and which is not reimbursable. He would not bring that labor up unless it were absolutely necessary and needed badly.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman for the fine spirit he has shown, along with his colleagues, who went with him to visit these camps. I think he has made a very fine report. Let me say that the gentleman is not the only one who is concerned about abuses in the operation of Public Law 78. I have been a Member of this Congress for 4 years and I have been waging a continuous and unrelenting fight to get rid of the abuses, at least in my district. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read to the gentleman the last few paragraphs of a Washington report which I sent out to my people in July of this year.

Public Law 78 will expire on June 30, 1961, unless it is extended by Congress prior to that date. During the busy days preceding the recent recess of Congress, a bill to extend the program to June 30, 1963, was passed by the House of Representatives. It is now pending before the Senate. Rough going for final passage of this bill is foreseen by both the proponents and opponents of the Mexican national program.

Then my concluding paragraph:

I have been informed that areas where Mexican nationals are now being used, including Riverside and Imperial Counties, will be under very close scrutiny by committees of Congress and the Department of Labor during coming months. There should be no mistake about that. I earnestly hope that the business and farm leaders in these two counties will get together to lay out a plan and program of community effort, whereby local merchants will be protected from the abuses of the past and American citizens will be assured of their right to obtain employment on American farms at decent wages.

I think the gentleman from New York realizes that my feelings in this matter are the same as his.

I make this statement, that even the gentleman has made a good study of the program, he has made some rather erroneous statements. He made the statement that in some instances the payment was \$2 a week. How many payrolls did the gentleman or his committee examine to come to that conclusion?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I observed not only some of the payrolls but I had some affidavits in which the checks themselves were presented to me in which not less than two dozen checks indicated take-home wages of about \$2. One was

for 36 cents. These were wage checks for workers in the Imperial Valley.

Mr. SAUND. What were the wage rates per hour?

Mr. SANTANGELO. Fifty cents per hour for chopping or hoeing, but because of the lack of employment, because of the surplus of workers in that area, the workers were not able to get a full week's work. They were making \$15 a week, but out of that they ended up with \$2 or \$3.

Mr. SAUND. That is what I have been saying to the Department of Labor. I went there 2 years ago and told the Secretary, when he was going to write out regulations, that he did not have to sit in Washington writing regulations, that he should use the money given to him by Congress to enforce the statutes already on the statute books.

The gentleman says there were 14,000 Mexican nationals at one time employed in Imperial County?

Mr. SANTANGELO. That is correct.

Mr. SAUND. The number 14,000 multiplied by 10 weeks would be 140,000. Out of that you found two checks. They are showing two checks 3 years old. There are three or four people in my county who go out and collect these checks. If the committee will look at them, those checks go back 5 years. These people keep them as samples to show.

Let me assure the gentleman we are trying everything we can. It is not true that in that county they get \$2.50 a week. They get a guaranteed wage. I agree with the gentleman that we should do more to enforce the regulations than we are doing. I am willing to cooperate with the gentleman in every way possible, but I must make the statement that that is not an accurate representation of the condition existing in Imperial Valley.

Mr. SANTANGELO. For workers in the Imperial Valley of California I have photostatic copies of these checks which came into my possession, checks which came from people who claim they were doing part-time work and consequently taking home \$2 or \$3 per week. The reason they give is that they could not get a full week's employment because of the lack of employment. This indicates that too many braceros have been permitted to come into that particular area, consequently only some of them get work.

I am aware of the gentleman's fight to try to improve conditions long before I interested myself in this problem. I commend him on the work he has done in his area. I have no quarrel with him on that score. But surely the gentleman does not condone these employers who give low wages because there is a surplus of labor.

Mr. SAUND. I do not condone that at all; in fact, I hope the gentleman will cooperate with me in seeing that the regulations are enforced and that no more braceros are certified than the need exists and calls for. But I again maintain that it is not a fair statement to say that \$2.50 is the net pay of Mexican nationals in Imperial County. I know; I live there. They send their

money home. We try to help them all we can, but conditions can be improved, and the Department of Labor should enforce the regulations.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The gentleman will have my cooperation.

Mr. SAUND. Did the gentleman find a need for Public Law 78?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I found not only that there was a need by the food producers and growers but that they would like to get many more braceros. It is just like a snowball, it is going to grow bigger. If the wages of the domestics were increased, perhaps many of those who have gone into industry would return to the farm, but at the wage structure of 50 cents an hour in a heat of 100° to 110°, working 8 or 10 hours a day, conditions are not conducive to having people leave the factories where they are making \$1.50 an hour or higher. We cannot expect men to leave industrial jobs at \$1.50 per hour to do work on a farm at 50 or 75 cents or \$1 an hour.

Mr. SAUND. Is there a need for Public Law 78? I do not condone the abuses. If the abuses are removed and the law is properly enforced, does the gentleman find a need for such a measure?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I found need for it so far as the harvesting of food is concerned, but I was not so definitely certain as to the need with reference to the cotton harvest. I recognize the fact that some of the larger cotton growers could not produce as much. But, I will agree with my colleague that in connection with the cultivation and harvesting of food, there is a definite need. I am not able to subscribe wholeheartedly to the proposition that there is a need so far as the production of cotton is concerned.

Mr. SAUND. I am not talking about cotton. I mean the need for Public Law 78 because a word from you means a great deal since I know you have made a thorough study.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I am dividing the thing into two categories—one, the need for producers of food supplies, and, two, the need for producers of cotton. I state definitely now that I find a need for this program in connection with the cultivation and harvesting of food.

Mr. SAUND. I thank my colleague very much.

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

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Would there be as much of a need for Public Law 78, if our immigration laws were relaxed somewhat?

Mr. SANTANGELO. If some of the gentlemen from the South and Southwest would vote for a liberalization of the immigration laws, which would permit many people from Europe and all over the world to come into the United States, there would be a lesser need for braceros. In that way, many people who are real farmworkers could come into the United States and be able to help the farmers of America.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank my colleague.

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

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

Mr. LIBONATI. I am sure our colleague, the gentleman from New York, in speaking of these conditions in generalities does not mean that these conditions are such which in a sense a provision of law would cure. The observations made by the gentleman from New York are in reference to specific areas where, through personal observation and questioning, certain facts from conditions observed were evident. Is that correct?

Mr. SANTANGELO. That is true. The gentleman from Illinois, our colleague, who was with me, recognizes that we have made our observations with respect to those areas which we visited and where we observed the conditions that exist. We make no assertion or any charges against areas which we did not study or observe.

Mr. LIBONATI. In other words, these isolated instances may not be the general rule but may be the exception. So that when you spoke of Arkansas and the gentleman representing that district, you did not intend those remarks to be a generalization of conditions in that section of the country or in his congressional district.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I specifically referred to those places which we observed and my comments and conclusions were with respect to such places. I do not intend to make any reference or generalization regarding areas that were not visited or where conditions were not observed or studies made.

Mr. LIBONATI. As I understand, you did point out that sometimes the practices of individuals themselves contributed to unsanitary conditions; is that correct?

Mr. SANTANGELO. That is correct.

Mr. LIBONATI. I congratulate the gentleman from New York on his fairness.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I would like to make this observation. The gentleman from Illinois pointed out to one of the growers that the conditions under which he was permitting the Braceros to live were intolerable and that if the growers continued such practices, the Congress would not permit this program to continue and that even the friends of this program would be opposed to it.

Mr. LIBONATI. That is very true.

Mr. SAUND. Did the gentleman from New York meet Mr. Goodwin?

Mr. SANTANGELO. No, I did not. I met Mr. Roy Haynes. In fact, we met many men. There were eight or nine representatives of the agriculture and labor departments.

Mr. SAUND. I know that Mr. Goodwin is charged with the enforcement of that public law and I have had Mr. Goodwin in my office at least a dozen times in the last 4 years. On each occasion I have actually begged Mr. Goodwin to please enforce Public Law 78. He comes back every year with excuses. In fact, one time I had Mr. Goodwin in the office of our colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] because I thought Mr. FOGARTY would have more influence over him than I since Mr. FOGARTY is the man who holds the

pursestrings inasmuch as he is chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations, having jurisdiction of this program.

But nothing was done, however. Mr. Goodwin may have come and made a report, but let me assure you Mr. Goodwin and his department has collaborated with the people who have abused Public Law 78 and come over here just to excuse their own mistakes and lay the blame on somebody else.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON NATO INSPECTION TOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, eight Members of this body departed Washington as members of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, for the purpose of visiting the major NATO headquarters and selected NATO troop units in Europe. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] as the permanent U.S. member of the standing committee of the conference was chairman of the U.S. delegation. Unfortunately, the press of business in the United States would not permit the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] to make the entire tour. He returned to the United States after the initial meetings at SHAPE and NATO headquarters in Paris, leaving me in charge as acting chairman of the U.S. delegation. It is in this capacity that I rise to address the House today.

In addition to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], and myself, the U.S. delegation included the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON]. On completion of my remarks, I shall yield such time as these Members may require in order to make known their own views on the matters brought to light during the trip.

I should like to render a brief report of our itinerary, activities, and some general impressions concerning the NATO alliance and the state of readiness of the forces which support it. I point out at the outset that this parliamentarians tour is conducted annually under NATO auspices, and this year included three parliamentarians from France, two from the United Kingdom, and one each from the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands, in addition to the U.S. delegation.

Our tour took us to SHAPE and NATO headquarters in Paris, to Northern Army Group 2d Allied Tactical Air Force Headquarters in northwestern Germany; to 4th Allied Tactical Air Force and Central Army Group Headquarters in central Germany; to Allied Forces South Headquarters in Naples, Italy; and to Headquarters, Allied Forces Mediterranean on the Island of Malta. In addition to those

headquarters mentioned, we visited British, Canadian, French, German, and American ground and Air Force units, in garrison and in the field.

One cannot complete a tour such as this, even in the brief time available in this instance, without being profoundly impressed with the formidable, versatile, and responsive combat force which has been forged under the able and inspiring leadership of General Norstad, as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

The spirit of full and freely given cooperation evident in the high NATO military headquarters cannot fail to impress even the casual visitor. The most optimistic internationalist of 1945 would not have had the temerity to suggest that by 1960, officers from France, Germany, the United States, the United Kingdom, Italy, Greece, Belgium, Turkey, and the Netherlands would be living and working together under one command. The organization and operation of these NATO staffs give us a practical demonstration of effective international cooperation at the working level. The NATO forces strive collectively, rather than individually, to confront the Soviet leaders with a deterrent force so powerful as to make clear to the most expansionist-minded commissar that the cost of waging an aggressive war would be prohibitive. Their success is made abundantly clear by the intemperate and vitriolic attacks on the NATO alliance made periodically by Khrushchev and his spokesmen.

Continued U.S. participation in, and support of, the NATO alliance is, of course, essential to its survival. Happily, the burgeoning economy of Western Europe now permits much greater financial participation by most members of the alliance than was possible at its inception, with a corresponding reduction in the percentage of U.S. expenditures. Some members, such as Turkey and Greece, must continue to receive substantial support in money and materials from the stronger members of the alliance, since their internal economic situations preclude the self-sufficiency of their armed forces.

I, for one, was very pleased at the receptions accorded the parliamentarians at all troop units, whether air or ground, of whatever nation, which we visited. They appeared genuinely glad to receive us, and answered our questions candidly and promptly, without equivocation. There are well recognized problems confronting the NATO military leaders—the same ones which have confronted all the great captains of history. They boiled down to men, material, and money.

Our 7th U.S. Army in Germany makes up the best trained and most combat-ready peacetime army in our history. Units of the 5th U.S. Army Corps in Grafenwoer, the great U.S. training area near the Czech border, gave the parliamentarians a demonstration of combat troops in action which filled the U.S. delegation with justifiable pride. The fact remains, however, that we in the United States have developed better tanks, better small arms, and machineguns, better personnel carriers than were in the

hands of our 7th Army troops. This is our NATO army—deployed along the borders of Soviet satellite nations in Eastern Europe—our first line of defense. I urge the prompt modernization of this 7th Army with the best weapons this great Nation can make available. The modernization of our Air Force units in Germany has already begun. The parliamentarians were shown one of our AF missile bases—one which is operational and ready. Again the U.S. delegation was justly proud.

In the Mediterranean, the NATO sea, air, and ground forces, under the able leadership of U.S. Adm. "Cat" Brown, as commander in chief, south, form the southern anchor of freedom of the Western World. It is regrettable that the time available did not permit the parliamentarians to visit the magnificent U.S. 6th Fleet—another U.S. contribution to NATO in which we, and all our fellow Americans, can take quiet pride and satisfaction.

Before terminating these remarks, I should like to express the appreciation of the entire U.S. delegation for having had the opportunity to meet, travel, and exchange views with these parliamentarians from other nations of the NATO alliance: Senator Dechevigny and Representatives Palewski and Noiret of France; Members of Parliament Dudley Williams and John Peel of the United Kingdom; Vice Admiral Heye, retired, of the Bundestag; and Col. W. Wierda, retired, Member of Parliament of the Netherlands.

We are also appreciative of the efforts of Mr. Otto Van H. Labberton, executive secretary of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, who coordinated the itinerary and made travel arrangements for the full group within Europe.

In conclusion, the NATO tour we have recently completed was informative, instructive, and well worth the time, effort, and funds expended. It is regretted that the Senate's schedule did not permit any Members of that body to participate. I hope they will be able to do so in the future. My own faith in the NATO alliance has been fortified, and I shall continue to support it with confidence and vigor.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of traveling with this group of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] was chairman. I wish to compliment him on the fine way in which he managed the trip and the accommodations and other facilities provided to us through his hard work. He made an excellent chairman and was a very great credit to the Congress of the United States. He had a clear understanding of the work to be done and was tireless in his efforts. I hope the next time I have to make a trip it may be under the same kind of genial, hardworking, cooperative chairman as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. I thank the gentleman from California.

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

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of accompanying this group. It was a very extensive and very intensive inspection trip. There are a great number of impressions that the members of the committee received. I think, by and large, the greatest impression was that of the magnitude of the strength and the degree of training of the NATO forces. I had an opportunity to make personal observation of just a fraction of the American might, and it would dispel any misconception that ours is a weak, decadent, or second-class military force. Our forces combined with those of other nations form a massive military array, a forceful deterrent to the Iron Curtain combine, a remarkable preserver of political equilibrium, a source of hope and fountain of inspiration for nations which are on the very no man's land of a war which but for NATO might have already occurred.

There is more to NATO than arms and men; there is a NATO spirit, an alliance of like-minded peoples. It is an experiment that is working. Old national rivalries and hatreds are being laid aside while former enemies are working in cooperation for a common cause.

It is not all brightness, not all sweetness and light; there are difficulties, shortcomings, and obstacles. You cannot hope to wipe away overnight national similarities and peculiarities. Differences of supply, differences in weapons, strategy, have all played a part in keeping the path of NATO from being a perfectly smooth one. There are political considerations in each of the member nations that must be recognized. There are internal and external problems which may temporarily focus national attention away from the NATO objectives.

No, I am not so naive as to believe that there are not many dark recesses which we could not or were not permitted to examine in which there are added difficulties. But what I do wish to say and to bring to the attention of my colleagues is that NATO machinery is in operation. As a deterrent it has been outstandingly successful. It appears to be able to perform further missions if called upon. It deserves sympathy, cooperation, and assistance of this Congress. Not without criticism, not without scrutiny, not without question. Blank checks are fashionable these days, but I do not advocate them. We as a member country need to do our part; but by the same token we must insist that other nations do theirs, do far more than they have in the past.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to spread upon this record a few observations that I have as a member of this inspection force to the NATO countries. It was a great education, and I am sure every Member of the U.S. Congress who visited NATO came back with a deeper appreciation of the danger of the Soviet threat and an appreciation of

the preparedness of the allied forces to meet that threat.

Personally, I was very much impressed not only by the numerical number of the forces but by the quality of the troops and by the quality of the equipment. We saw at first hand the firing of atomic cannons, Honest John missiles; we saw at first hand the operation of tanks and the Air Corps and all manner and form of military machines. We were all deeply appreciative of what America is doing to preserve peace throughout the world through our cooperation in NATO.

More than that, it was my impression that NATO is indeed the best insurance that the United States has against communism. The best proof of the value of NATO is that since 1951 there has been no further aggression by Soviet Russia throughout Europe. It is interesting to note that our troops were all happy and most of the ones I talked to, at least, of all foreign assignments the one in Germany was indeed the best.

I would like to close my remarks by paying personal tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who is not only an able chairman but was a most considerate one. I would like to say, too, that as far as the members of the committee were concerned, I found their company not only interesting, but I feel I have profited by the many discussions that we had at dinner and at organizational meetings when we were able to exchange ideas.

To me as a freshman Member of this Congress it was indeed an honor to have been appointed in the first place as a member of the committee, but I feel I have come back, Mr. Speaker, a much better Representative for it, and I feel I will be by reason of this experience better able to serve the people of my district.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, had the privilege of being a member of this NATO group that has been referred to. First of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for giving us this opportunity to make a record of our reactions as members on this trip, because, certainly, one of the reasons for the trip has been to give us a chance to view the whole NATO program and to bring back to our various parliaments our own personal reactions.

I would like to say, too, that the gentleman in acting as chairman of the group certainly performed a service in the highest standards of the Congress, and not only in organizing the trip and in his relations with members of the other parliaments who were represented, he did an outstanding job. I congratulate him at this time for the work that he did.

There are a few reactions I personally experienced that I would like to record.

First of all, the importance of having an opportunity to talk and exchange views with members of other parliaments is one of the importance of which cannot be overestimated.

I think that all of us profited from that experience. I wish all those who

discussed NATO on the floor of this House could have had the same opportunity that we had, for I am sure that in many cases their views would have changed. With reference to NATO, the most significant thing, it seems to me, is that for the first time in history a peacetime combination of this size and magnitude has existed, and that is a token of success, it seems to me, for the future. If the gentleman will recall, when we were at Paris I asked General Norstad if NATO was out of date, if it was an anachronism. He said definitely not; that it has performed the job at the present time in holding back the Communist threat and that, even though there may be a new development of long-range missiles and new weapons, nevertheless this alliance has a very vital and important function to maintain. As the gentleman from Michigan said, there are problems that have to be solved in this alliance. The coordination must be increased. Weapons must be made more uniform. The scope must be broadened. But, the experience that we had, with all of these 15 nations working together, their officers working and living together, the members of the families living together, certainly is an aura for a successful future. And, I hope, as Mr. Spaak suggested, that the alliance will be able to move from the purely military into the political and into the cultural field, because in these fields tremendous advances can be made that in my opinion could be of equal importance to that of the military development. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, not too many years ago, if the average American had been asked what NATO stood for, he probably would have hazarded a guess that it was the name of a Japanese movie star or possibly a new brand of household detergent.

Today, an increasing number of Americans are aware of the valuable part that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is playing in protecting the free nations of Europe from the insidious encroachments of communism.

Last week, I returned from a tour of inspection of our NATO bases in Europe, along with a number of my colleagues in the House: Representatives WAYNE L. HAYS of Ohio, FRANK M. CLARK of Pennsylvania, D. S. SAUND of California, JOHN S. MONAGAN of Connecticut, PHIL WEAVER of Nebraska, JOHN E. HENDERSON of Ohio, and WILLIAM T. CAHILL of New Jersey. May I thank the Speaker for giving me an opportunity to participate in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference inspection and briefing tour and the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, acting chairman of the U.S. delegation, for his inspired leadership.

Like many, my impression of NATO before this trip was of a strictly military alliance, a loose confederation of divisions, naval units and aircraft, a sort of marriage of convenience of military units, shoved together out of necessity and lacking cohesion and general purpose.

Instead, I found splendid cooperation and coordination among the forces of 14 nations, a sense of purpose and a common goal. That goal is the protection of the vital nations of free Europe from the creeping paralysis of communism.

It is an eerie feeling to see former officers in the German Luftwaffe, our enemies just a few short years ago, and find them working in close cooperation with Americans, French, Belgians, Canadians, Dutch and Norwegians. It must have been very strange to one of our fellow parliamentarians from Denmark, who lost all his teeth in a beating in a Nazi concentration camp.

There was a great sense of pride and security in visiting the elaborate control centers far underground in which a constant check is kept on air activity over Europe.

There was awe as I watched an Honest John rocket start a noisy trip toward the Iron Curtain from a point only twenty miles from the Czech border. Naturally, the rocket's target was on our side of the Iron Curtain.

Everywhere I visited, on Malta, in Germany, France and Italy, I found a fusion of NATO fighting forces into a solid mass of strength, cool efficiency in the performance of their complicated tasks, and calm coordination and dedication in purpose, the purpose of individual freedom and world peace.

Although the rockets, the arms, the fighting forces are important to NATO, this organization is more than a simple sword and shield for the free nations of Europe.

The battle against the spread of communism is being carried on by NATO on the political, economic, scientific and educational fronts as well.

The Soviet Union has made repeated attempts to split the 15 member nations away from each other so that each can be gobbled up more easily by the Communist offensive. On the political front, there have been promises and threats, sweet words of peace and bullying boasts of atomic annihilation of all those who cooperate in mutual protection against communism.

There have been attempts to outflank NATO defense installations through political offensives in the Mideast and in North Africa.

The Soviet Union has made repeated attempts to obtain "conditioned responses" from individual NATO nations by alternate threat and promise much in the manner of Pavlov's famous dog. But the Reds have found the Western World refuses to perform as a trained dog act to Soviet sirup and strychnine. We and our allies in Europe have stood together strongly in the face of Communist propaganda warfare and we will continue to do so in the future.

On the economic front, NATO nations have never been stronger. It is difficult to believe that only a few years ago our

friends in Europe were attempting to pull themselves up out of the rubble and devastation left in the wake of World War II. But in this short time, most signs of this utter devastation are gone. New homes have been built. Entire new cities have been created. New industries are booming. The economy of Europe is growing at a tremendous rate.

Its people are working as they have never worked before. There are more jobs and at better pay than at any time in history. They are enjoying a constantly rising standard of living which is one of the most telling weapons against Communist plans for expansion and infiltration from within. Communist parties in Italy and France, for instance, have shriveled to shadows of their former selves because free men have demonstrated that living standards can rise most quickly outside a totalitarian system.

Despite these improvements, the military has not been neglected. From its humble beginnings in December 1950, when General Eisenhower was appointed the first NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, the NATO force has grown from 12 divisions to 50, from 400 aircraft to 6,000. Arms and armaments are standardized and interchangeable. Communications for NATO have been built into a complex net of 26,500 miles. NATO forces are equipped with the most modern and up-to-date weapons and equipment, including atomic artillery and guided missiles.

Some 160 jet airfields now ring the Soviet Union and its satellites behind the Iron Curtain, a constant warning to the Reds that we are ready should world tensions threaten to erupt into war.

These modern weapons of war—capable of almost unimagined destruction—are our best hope of peace in the former battleground of Europe.

We have deterrent strength to check Soviet aggressive moves, and we have let the Reds know that we know how to use this strength if necessary.

Perhaps the best test of NATO is in performance. Since its creation not a single inch of ground has been lost to the Communists in Europe, despite an unceasing propaganda and pressure campaign against the West. In Europe, I believe there is more calm self-assurance in the powers of NATO and the forces of freedom than there is here in the United States, despite the fact that the Iron Curtain, at the most, is only a few minutes away by jet or missile.

The soldiers, statesmen, economists, technicians and scientists of free Europe are learning to work together in more than cooperation—perhaps coordination is a better word—toward the common goals of peace and freedom, and they find they like it.

Each nation in NATO is still its own master. Each decision by NATO must have unanimous approval of all participating nations, including ourselves. Decisions have been made forcefully and fearlessly. Europe is stronger. The United States is stronger because of this alliance of free men and women working toward a universal and common objective.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues at this time in discussing the situation and the problems which we found on a recent tour of North Atlantic Treaty Organization bases in Europe. I took part in this inspection trip at the urging of the minority leader of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I was pleased to take part in this important inquiry into the conduct of NATO affairs also because of my position on the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations. I learned a great deal of valuable information about our potential and about the manner in which our NATO defense dollars are being spent. This information will be of great value to me in my capacity as a member of that Subcommittee in the consideration of defense matters.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of these remarks I would like to congratulate the chairman of our group, the Honorable FRANK CLARK, of Pennsylvania, for the very fine manner in which he represented the Congress of the United States while in Europe. He did a splendid job.

Mr. Speaker, I found that our position in Europe is a good one, a strong one and a remarkably flexible one. The position is especially good considering the frequent turnover of governments in some parts of Europe, such as France and Italy.

I found the morale of the troops I visited to be excellent, both American and foreign troops included. We can be proud of the leadership within NATO and I congratulate General Norstad and our other military commanders most highly.

I found the morale of the people whom I visited and with whom I talked to, to be good. They are particularly impressed by the stability of the United States and the steadfastness of our purpose in defending the free world against the encroachment of communism.

From this trip I find that the affairs of the free world, particularly as they are reflected in Europe, are better today than ever before in recent history. Although there are tensions of the cold war and these tensions are apparent, there is a growing recognition among the people of Europe that the Communist cause is weakening. There is a general recognition that the antics of the Communist leaders prove that they are disturbed and that they realize the road they have been following leads them nowhere. They realize that the flamboyant actions and statements of the Communist leaders are nothing more nor less than a propaganda cover for the fact that communism has failed to make the kind of advances in Europe that had once been expected.

The Eisenhower administration through its efforts with NATO and similar organizations has shown that we can work and spend money for peace to a better advantage than through the destruction of world war or even limited warfare. One great saving that has been overlooked is the saving of life under this type of program. The costs of human life and maimed human bodies cannot be estimated and cannot be gaged in terms of dollars and cents.

There is one point concerning the present NATO forces which I would like to emphasize and that is that they must be armed with the most modern weapons available. If NATO troops are to serve as frontline fighters in the continuing struggle against world communism, they must be armed to meet the aggressor.

In some instances, Mr. Speaker, I found that our allied troops were still armed with original Marshall plan grant weapons. This must be repaired. These weapons must be replaced with modern, effective, and efficient weapons as rapidly as possible. This is being done, but not on the needed scale.

I would like to comment on another aspect of diplomacy at this time.

We in the United States have been blessed with bumper crops year after year. Our farmers through their ingenuity and their determination and their use of new techniques have been able to supply far and away more food than our own country can at this time consume. This food has been stored and has become surplus. It has become costly to the American taxpayer and a burden to the American farmer. It has tended to depress farm prices and to destroy the morale of our farm citizens.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, even in some parts of Europe there are people who are hungry. We must not permit malnutrition to be the accepted standard of living.

These conditions do exist to a degree in some parts of Europe. I know from personal experience that they exist to a much greater degree in other parts of the world. In some areas the situation is not only critical, it is disastrous.

It is my suggestion here that the United States undertake through diplomatic means to break down the international barriers that prevent the use of this surplus American food as a great weapon of peace. It is my thinking that our surplus wheat and corn, butter and eggs, milk and soybeans can and should be used to feed the starving peoples of the world. It is my thinking that this would mean a great stride in the direction of stabilizing the forces which are loose in the world and which tend to cause dissension and distrust. We can and should use our abundance and our ability to produce even more abundantly for world peace.

I plan to make this suggestion officially and formally to the adviser on agriculture to Vice President Nixon, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. I shall also discuss this with other leaders in the Republican Party and I hope that it can be incorporated in the Republican agricultural program as it is developed.

WABASH VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the establishment of a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission to coordinate Federal, State and local plans for development of one of America's

most fertile—and most neglected—river valleys.

The Wabash Valley is rich in soil and mineral resources but much of it is a distressed area because of heavy and chronic unemployment in its cities.

Floods that destroy life and property are an annual problem. All this surplus water in flood season could become an asset instead of a liability if stored in reservoirs. As it is, many towns have to haul water during dry seasons and the river runs uncontrolled.

Coordinated planning for the future is imperative if the Wabash Valley is to share the prosperity that most other parts of the country have enjoyed during the postwar years.

My bill would make possible the preparation of a comprehensive, integrated plan for developing the land and water resources of the basin. This approach is a proved and effective one. It has been used with success in the New York-New England region, in the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins and in other large areas with similar problems.

The Commission to be created by this legislation would be composed of both State and Federal representatives.

The President would appoint the Federal members, representing the Army Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service and such other Federal agencies as have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken.

The Governors of Illinois and Indiana would be authorized to nominate members representing their respective States. In addition, there would be a representative of the Illinois-Indiana compact which I cosponsored and Congress approved in 1959.

The Wabash River drains a total area of more than 33,100 square miles of which 320 are in Ohio, 24,220 in Indiana and 8,560 in Illinois. This area has a population of more than 2½ million. One of the principal tributaries of the Wabash is the Embarrass River, which is in Illinois and flows through a section of my congressional district.

Floods have taken a tremendous toll of life and property over the last century. Damage to crops alone in the States of Illinois and Indiana exceeded \$48½ million in 1957 and 1958. Again this year black headlines in newspapers throughout the valley told a sad story of ruined farm crops and washed-out bridges.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this comprehensive study may be authorized without undue delay because the need is great.

PLIGHT OF THE DAIRY FARMERS IN SOUTHWEST MISSOURI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to call the attention of this Government to the serious plight of our dairy farmers in southwest Missouri, and ask that the House join the Senate in a last-ditch effort to get remedial action.

A good dairyman told me last week that he and his wife and five children milk 50 cows, but they cannot even begin to break even. He has better dairy equipment than ever; he has better cows; he works harder and more efficiently; but he is losing money, and he can show you his books to prove it.

This man, and thousands more who are in the same boat in our area, are second-class citizens in 1960 America; and they are at a loss to understand why.

There is no serious overproduction of milk. In fact, milk production has increased only 1 percent a year in recent times, while population has increased considerably faster than that.

Government-held surpluses are not overhanging the market, keeping prices down. The Government does not have enough dairy products to carry on a good school lunch program, much less a market-depressing surplus. As of today, Government supplies of butter and dried milk total only \$85,000 worth; and Government supplies of cheese are about \$3,000 worth—an infinitesimal amount.

Consumers are paying recordbreaking prices for milk, about 5 cents a quart more than 8 years ago. Yet, farmers are receiving 18 percent less for milk and 22 percent less for butterfat than they received in 1952.

It seems that every time the consumer price goes up, the farm price goes down; and slowly but surely, the dairy farmer has been driven to the wall by a cost-price squeeze that is insufferable.

In the past 12 years, dairy farmers' cash expenditures have increased more than 33 percent; the prices of all the items that go into the operation of a farm have skyrocketed—motor vehicles are up 47 percent; farm machinery, up 58 percent; and farm real estate taxes, up 94 percent. Similar increases have occurred in the prices paid for other production items, as well as interest on farm mortgages.

The average dairy farmer is getting 40 cents an hour for his labor.

The law of supply and demand is not functioning justly; and only the Government can correct this serious inequity.

To correct a similar situation that prevailed in the 1920's and to prevent it ever happening again, Congress passed Federal laws in the 1930's empowering the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent unjust farm prices.

Under those laws, the Secretary of Agriculture could correct the present dairy depression, in quick order, if he wanted to do it. He has the authority to step in and raise minimum price support levels on manufacturing milk from the present \$3.06 level to as much as \$3.67 per hundred, at the farm; and he could raise butterfat prices to farmers from the present 56.6 cents a pound to 59.6, if he so desired. And any increase in manufacturing milk prices would result in corresponding increases in grade A blend prices.

But for 7 years now, the Secretary of Agriculture has devoted his time to lowering the farmer's milk prices, not in raising them to reasonable levels. The dairy farmer's legal protector has deserted him; and we have witnessed the

incongruous situation where Congress has to pass laws to protect the farmer from the farmer's Secretary.

In 1957, we passed a bill in Congress to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from lowering milk price supports below \$3.25 per hundred on manufactured milk.

We warned the Secretary at that time that any further reductions in raw milk prices would not be passed on to consumers, that per capita consumption of dairy products would not increase, that the only result would be to gyp the farmer and leave a void for distributors and processors to absorb.

Secretary Benson ignored those warnings and got the President to veto that 1957 bill. Then he proceeded methodically to lower farm milk price support levels from \$3.25 to \$3.06 per hundred. From that day forward, we have been reaping the harvest of what the Secretary of Agriculture sowed: Depression and disposal sales in the best dairylands in America.

After the sad veto experience of 1957, it is understandable that Congress despaired of any dairy programs until we could get a Secretary of Agriculture who cared about the welfare of the farmer.

We have hoped against hope that, once Government supplies of dairy products were disposed of and Government acquisitions became negligible, the present Secretary would see that the law of supply and demand would not assure justice for the dairy farmer, because of today's semi-monopolistic marketing conditions.

Processors and distributors have so much more economic power than any individual farmer or group of farmers that dairy farmers cannot hope to get a just share of the milk dollar unless Government protects them with minimum level price floors.

This year, supplies are in balance with demand. No appreciable amount of dairy products is flowing into Government warehouses. Yet, the farmer still cannot get a reasonable price for his milk.

On August 19, 1960, the Senate passed an emergency bill that would raise present minimum support prices on grade C manufacturing milk—grade C—from the present level of \$3.06 to \$3.22 per hundred and raise minimum floor levels on butterfat from 56.6 cents per pound to 59.6 cents.

I urge the House to pass the Senate bill and send it to the White House for the President's consideration.

By this formal action, we could at least get the dairy farm depression before the President personally, so the President himself could review the policy or lack of policy of his Secretary of Agriculture and take proper action.

As a dairy bill, the Senate measure is certainly no long-range solution to the dairy problem and no one even pretends that it is. The low minimum levels in the bill are nowhere near what the farmer deserves; but if it will get the dairy situation in front of the President himself, it could serve a worthwhile purpose.

Also, it would hold the line against any further decreases in the dairy

farmer's income and protect him from further injustices.

Even in areas such as ours, where some farmers are being paid a premium for milk in tanks, there is no ironclad assurance that the grade C price will not go to \$3.06 next year, as long as \$3.06 is the support price level.

So, lest a bad situation get worse, let us at least hold the line at \$3.22 cents a hundred on manufacturing milk and 59.6 cents on butterfat.

The side effects of passing this bill could be good. In areas like southwest Missouri and Tennessee, where even grade A milk is bringing only a little more than \$4, an increase in base support prices should increase grade A blend prices to farmers immediately. All milk prices are constructed on grade C levels, with premiums added for production under grade A conditions. So, better grade C price means better grade A price, also better blend price.

In our own area I have tried for many, many long months to get the Secretary of Agriculture to reopen the marketing order applicable to our section to see what could be done to improve our grade A prices.

But the Secretary sees no justification for reopening the marketing order; and here again his inaction is inexcusable. In summary, our dairy farmers have been in serious trouble for a long time. Our pleas for justice have fallen on deaf ears. Our acts in Congress have been vetoed. And we are desperate.

The consumer pays a fair price, but the farmer does not get a fair share; and the Government, the only agency big enough to correct the situation, refuses to correct the inequity.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass the Senate dairy bill and, by this formal action, call the dairy situation to the attention of the President himself and hope that he personally will do what his Secretary of Agriculture refuses to do—let farmers share in this country's general prosperity.

THE SCHOOL TEACHER

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers based their hopes for the continuance and the success of a government of free peoples on nationwide literacy. They knew that knowledge is power, and that command over the written and spoken word was the only thing that enabled a people to choose between right and wrong, between wisdom and foolishness, between unenlightened selfishness and respect for the public interest. Hence they promoted free schools and a liberal education.

It is improbable that they could foresee a time in this Republic when the free schools would not only give the youth of the land the power to choose, but actually to set the standards of right and wrong, wisdom and foolishness, benevolence and selfishness. It is a far more important thing to be able to set standards than merely to judge actions by standards imposed by other agencies of society. And it is true that

the schools exercised their original functions so well that society has entrusted them with ever increasing responsibilities. Today the whole world of the child almost from infancy to adulthood revolves around the school. He remains under its influence from the early formative years of the nursery school and the kindergarten until he is called to man the defensive forces of the Nation or to fill the workshops, offices, and professions. His waking hours are filled with tasks and activities and thoughts connected with his school life. The nature and the direction of his training in the school will determine his life attitudes and practices, whether in the field of politics or economy or social understanding.

The power and the prestige of the school as an institution tends somewhat to eclipse the individuals who direct the learning process. The teacher who sits behind the desk in the classroom actually holds the throttle which controls the mighty engine of progress in the arts and sciences, in national and international relationships, in ethics itself. Whether we shall go forward safely and surely toward a better world, or be wrecked on the obstructions of evil and uncertainty and doubt depends on the skill and judgment of the teacher. An institution, after all, is only the lengthened shadow of a man. The teacher is the school, and the school holds the key to the future of America. And that future, as has often been said, is a race between education and catastrophe.

Two things stand in the way of full realization of the potentialities of the school. They are, simply: prestige for the teacher; and money.

In this country, we assume that prestige must be earned for anyone. We do not accord prestige because of the accident of birth or because someone has managed to insinuate himself into office, public or private. Prestige is earned through skill in performance of duty, through complete devotion to the demands of one's calling, and through unwavering integrity and dependability. I insist that teachers have already earned that prestige, and it should be accorded them. One of the few criticisms of American education made by visiting teachers from foreign countries is that teachers in this country fail to receive the prestige due them.

My reasons for making these statements here in the Congress of the United States is that I feel every elected representative of the people has a definite responsibility in the field of education. I, in common with many of my colleagues in this body, know something of the teaching profession, of its frustrations as well as its accomplishments, having been a teacher myself on both the high school and the college level. I have two sisters, a brother, an uncle, and an aunt now serving the public schools of my native State. Further, my wife and I have six children enjoying the unparalleled advantages of a public school system. We want them to grow daily in knowledge and virtue, and we crave an equal opportunity for every child in the land.

I do not know of any specific legislative enactment which could confer prestige on the teaching profession. But I do feel that we need to combat by word and thought whatever anti-intellectualism may exist in this country. We must treat the whole educational process with the gravity it needs to preserve a free government of free people. Given an outspoken understanding and a wholehearted sympathy with the difficulties of the schools and of teachers on the highest national level, we may hope to raise immeasurably the prestige that rightly belongs to the schools of our Nation.

As for the financial needs of the schools, the Congress is in a position to do something definite. Incessant wranglings over amounts that should be appropriated, over methods of distribution, over control of final expenditure, serve only to confuse the real issue, which is that we must spend much more money on education. Whether the money originates in the tax offices of the Nation, the State, or the locality, it all comes from the same American taxpayers. It is folly to assume that a centralized control of the expenditure of every last dime on the local level could be as judicious as community management without a vast bureaucracy of unimaginative and unadaptive pseudo-educators. I favor immediate dedication of a much more realistic share of our national income to the vital cause of public education, lest by saving a little in the name of economy, we may lose all in the breakdown of our entire system of communicating the achievements and the aspirations of the past to the rising generations.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FOGARTY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11390) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for today, August 24, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. BENTLEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for August 24, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MACK, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REUSS, for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. COFFIN, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MADDEN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next.

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Friday next.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next.

(At the request of Mr. MOORE, the following Members were granted special orders:)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 1 hour, on Monday next.

Mr. CURTIN, for 15 minutes, on August 25.

Mr. AVERY, for 1 hour, on August 29, Monday.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI), for 1 hour, on tomorrow, and 1 hour, on Saturday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARMATZ.

(At the request of Mr. MOORE, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TOLLEFSON.

Mr. BERRY in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. McDOWELL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland.

Mr. TOLL.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5789. An act to incorporate the Agricultural Hall of Fame.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 25, 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:

2418. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2419. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting reports on four violations of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, by officers of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, pursuant to subsection (1)(2) of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2420. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during July 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2421. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2422. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to the case of Elias Alvanos, also known as Louis Alven, involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2423. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report containing a review of the status of this Department's current survey relating to the Defense petroleum procurement and of the outstanding voluntary agreements and programs established, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 12491. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the county of Fremont, Wyo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3146. An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3416. An act to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 2144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3727. An act to authorize the bonding of persons engaging in the home improvement business, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 13053. A bill to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12993. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLYNT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1740. An act to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, in order to expand the Federal Communications Commission's regulatory authority under such section; with amendment (Rept. No. 2148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1964. An act to amend the act requiring certain common carriers by railroad to make reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to certain accidents in order to clarify the requirements of such act; with amendment (Rept. No. 2149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 11535. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide that class C and D licenses shall not be prohibited from serving alcoholic beverages in their establishments on New Year's Day when New Year's falls on Sunday; without amendment (Rept. No. 2150). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12775. A bill to increase the relief or retirement compensation of certain former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and of their widows, widowers, and children; without amendment (Rept. No. 2151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee of conference. H.R. 11390. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2152). Ordered to be printed.

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. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 882. An act for the relief of the heirs of J. B. White; without amendment (Rept. No. 2140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3759. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands to Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2306. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Woman's Party, Inc., in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3415. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2143). 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. BAKER:

H.R. 13132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the bracket method of depreciation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 13133. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 by transferring wood charcoal from the free list to the dutiable list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13134. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 by adding nutshell charcoal and lignite briquets, to be sold for cooking purposes, to the dutiable list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 13135. A bill to amend a provision of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act relating to days of unemployment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 13136. A bill relating to the dutiable status of certain articles containing foreign material which come into the United States from its insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 13137. A bill relating to the dutiable status of certain articles containing foreign material which come into the United States from its insular possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional \$2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H.R. 13139. A bill to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 13140. A bill to establish within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new program of mortgage insurance to assist in financing the construction, improvement, expansion, and rehabilitation of harbor facilities for boating and commercial craft; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 13141. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 726. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 727. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 623. Resolution relative to the operation of the Panama Line; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 13142. A bill for the relief of Kwan Chung Yin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 13143. A bill for the relief of Lee Dock On; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H.R. 13144. A bill for the relief of Georg Puffal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Discriminating Against the Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate, Senators KENNEDY and JOHNSON, respectively Democratic candidates for President and Vice President, with a two-thirds Democrat majority back of them and Senator JOHNSON in the powerful position of ma-

ajority leader, are pushing S. 2643, introduced by Senator KENNEDY—H.R. 9070 in the House—in an effort to please a few labor leaders and so capture the so-called labor vote.

At the same time, they are insisting upon legislation which they say will give equal rights to all. On equality they blow hot and cold.

It needs but a glance at S. 2643 and H.R. 9070 to show rank inconsistency. The purpose of both bills is to amend the present labor law so as to enable a minority group on a construction job to tie up the whole job.

Example: A partnership at Port Chester, N.Y., contracted to build a home

for a man in Greenwich, Conn. The partnership used its own employees on all but the electrical installation. That they subcontracted to an employer who had two nonunion men on the job. Other workers by a strike tied up the whole job. The U.S. Supreme Court held (*Electrical Workers v. Labor Board* (341 U.S. 694)) that it was not lawful to throw all the other workers out of their jobs just because the two electrical workers did not belong to the union.

Now Senator KENNEDY and Senator JOHNSON insist the law be changed to enable union officials to do just that.

Where hundreds of union workers are employed on the construction of an