United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1960

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

Our Father God, before ever our yearning needs have broken into speech we know that Thou hearest even the secret sigh of our fainting, yet aspiring heart.

Facing with undaunted faith the duties and tasks which press on all sides, send us forth, we pray, with a gentler tone, a sweeter charity of words, and a more healing touch for all the smart of this wounded world.

Give truth to our words, sincerity to our hearts, and courage to our deeds in these times which are testing as by fire the treasure of freedom entrusted to us.

So may we in our short span of service make patriotism beautiful by our fidelity to the highest. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 26, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

On request of Mr. DOUGLAS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Arnold W. Langner, Sr., to be postmaster at Sheboygan Falls, Wis., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all those nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Cutler to be an Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dennis A. FitzGerald to be Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration in the Department of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for routine diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AUDIT REPORT ON UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Upper Colorado River Basin water resources development program, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, fiscal years 1957–59 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Board, including a report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION 127

"Resolution relative to conveying the sincere appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, Senator from Colorado, Member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee, for introducing legislation advantageous to the territory of Guam and for undertaking other matters beneficial to the people of Guam

"Whereas the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, Senator from Colorado, member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee, has on June 2, 1959, in conjunction with the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, Senator from Nevada, introduced a bill (S. 2093) in the U.S. Senate to provide detention and other benefits to certain Guamanians killed or captured by the Japanese at Wake Island, pursuant to the War Claims Act of 1948; and

"Whereas in spite of the many duties and responsibilities of Senator CARROLL, he has always been ready to lend a helping hand to the people of Guam, as exampled by his reception of the Honorable A. B. Wan Pat, speaker of the Fifth Guam Legislature, and by his taking time to discuss the problems of Guam with the said speaker; and

"Whereas the Senator has consistently manifested his interest and understanding of the needs of the people of the territory of Guam, and the people of the territory of Guam recognize and appreciate his most helpful assistance: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Fifth Guam Legislature does hereby, on behalf of the people of Guam, extend and express its sincere thanks to the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, Senator from Colorado, member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee, for sponsoring bill S. 2093 in the U.S. Senate and for his understanding and sympathetic approach to the other matters relating to the territory of Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secrecy attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, Senator from Colorado, member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee; to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, and to the Governor of Guam.

"A. B. WON PAT,
"Speaker.

"V. B. BAMBA,
"Legislative Secretary."

"RESOLUTION 155

"Resolution relative to commending the Honorable Marcellus Graeme Boss, Secretary of Guam, for the statesmanlike manner in which he has fulfilled his responsibilities and duties as such secretary and as Acting Governor of Guam

"Whereas since assuming the office of Secretary of Guam, on or about the 21st day of November 1957, the Honorable Marcellus Graeme Boss has shown, exemplified, and demonstrated an excellent grasp of the ills and problems of the people of the territory of Guam; and

"Whereas the said secretary of Guam during the absence of the Governor of Guam, demonstrated, illustrated, and manifested his excellent ability, leadership, and statesmanship in steering the helm of the government of Guam, and has proven his excellent qualities as an administrator and leader of men; and

"Whereas the said secretary of Guam, further, as evidenced by the attitude and feelings of the community, including the civic leaders, the business community, the everyday workingman, the legislature, the courts, and the various Federal agencies and instrumentalities within the territory of Guam, toward him, has conspicuously portrayed his ability to gain and acquire the undying respect and admiration of the whole community, for his sincerity, and competence in fulfilling and discharging the various complicated matters referred to him; and

"Whereas such talent and competence should and must be recognized and commended by the entire community of the territory of Guam: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Fifth Guam Legislature duly convened, on behalf of the people of Guam, does hereby commend, applaud, and approbate the Honorable Marcellus Graeme Boss, secretary of Guam, government of Guam, for his sincere efforts in resolving and understanding the desires and wishes of the people of the territory of Guam, and for his true statesmanship in fulfilling and discharging the duties and responsibilities of his office; and be it further

"Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Marcellus Graeme Boss, secretary of Guam, government of Guam, to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Governor of Guam."

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, protesting against the plan of Russia to establish and use an impact area in the central Pacific Ocean for the testing of rockets and missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by Local 338, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, at Spokane, Wash., relating to the abundance of administrative work programs being introduced into post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2917. A bill to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2918. A bill for the relief of Boris Priestley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. FONG):

S. 2919. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall study and investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2920. A bill to provide for the establishment of experimental food stamp allotment programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2921. A bill for the relief of Bessie Rowley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2922. A bill to provide for the disposition of the Fort Mifflin Naval Ammunition Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2923. A bill for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2924. A bill to amend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2925. A bill for the relief of Frank Kramaro and Katica Marinovich Kramaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2926. A bill for the relief of Halina J. Adamska; and

S. 2927. A bill for the relief of Cristina Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2928. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide financial assistance for the provision of housing and related facilities for migratory farm labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a very moderate increase in the price-support level for dairy products. I am joined in sponsoring this bill by Senators KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, MCCARTHY, SYMINGTON, YOUNG of North Dakota, MUNDT, MORSE, AIKEN, CARLSON, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, PROUTY, and WILEY.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until Friday, so that additional cosponsors may add their names if they wish.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table until Friday.

The bill (S. 2917) to establish a price-support level for milk and butterfat, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the enactment of this bill will cost the Government very little. It will greatly increase the seriously depressed income of dairy farmers throughout the Nation. It will do so in a sound and responsible way.

The bill would provide an increase in the price-support level from $3.06 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk to $3.22, and from 56.6 cents per pound for butterfat to 59.6 cents. These price supports would still not exceed the market price.

This bill merits the thoughtful consideration of the Senate for these reasons:

First. After 7 years of a grinding squeeze between falling prices for his milk and rising costs, the dairy farmer has at last worked off the surplus. Not 1 pound of butter and only tiny quantities of cheese, dried milk, or any other dairy product remain in storage today in the warehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second. The prices received by farmers for their milk have dropped almost 25 percent in the past 8 years. At the same time the dairy farmer has suffered a very sharp rise both in cost of living and all the costs of operating his farm.

Third. The sheer economic injustice of the dairy farmer's position is shown in the statistics published by the Department of Agriculture, which show that in America's dairyland, Wisconsin, the average farmer—allowing a 4-percent return on his invested capital—earns less than 60 cents per hour, including the value of food produced and consumed on the farm. At the same time the true cost to the average consumer in terms of the amount of time he must work at his job to earn enough to buy a quart of milk has continued to fall. In 1914 it took the average worker 22.9 minutes to earn the price of a quart of milk. By 1929 it took him 15.3 minutes. In 1947 it took him 9½ minutes. By 1959 the typical worker, earning a countrywide average wage, could buy a quart of milk with the proceeds from 6.8 minutes of work.

Fourth. This bill is a modest proposal. The economic condition of the dairy industry would justify a much higher support level. In 1953, when conditions facing dairy farmers were similar, the Department of Agriculture, under the identical law in effect today, established a support price which was 68 cents per hundredweight higher than the present level.

Fifth. Under the proposed legislation if purchases stay at about the same level, the cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation would be an additional $15 million. But dairy farmers would benefit by an additional $179 million in receipts.

DEMONSTRATION FOOD STAMP ALLOTMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, last year, in connection with the passage of the extension of Public Law 480, the Senate adopted a food stamp demonstration program.

This measure, which would have directed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish up to six demonstration programs in different parts of the United States, was dropped by the conference committee in favor of a broader authorization permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a food stamp program at his discretion. This provision became law, and the Secretary on September 11, 1959, at his press conference, said, "The food stamp plan is a depression program. There is no need for it now. There is no depression. The economy is running near full capacity."

The bill I introduce today is the same program the Senate Agriculture Committee reported last year, and which passed the Senate. It would direct the Secretary to undertake not less than three nor more than six food stamp demonstration programs. These would be in rural and urban areas where there is substantial labor surplus. The bill would authorize the expenditure of $20 million for this project and require the Secretary to complete the demonstration programs and report back to Congress by January 1, 1963.

The desirability of finding better methods of distributing our surplus commodities and abundant food supplies to those in need was demonstrated in the hearings of the Agriculture Committee last year. Food industry representatives and city officials of Detroit recommended and offered to participate in such a demonstration program. I am confident that there are other areas of substantial labor surplus, such as in eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, where demonstration programs could be undertaken.

We need to know how best to administer and operate a food stamp program. The usefulness of such programs has been debated for many years. Let us see if it will work. Just as we have need for agricultural research programs designed to make our land more productive, and find new industrial uses for agricultural products, and new marketing methods, we also have pressing need for finding new ways of making our abundant food supplies available in selected areas of economic depression, disaster areas, to the needy of our cities, and in the event of nationwide emergencies. It would be my belief that the usefulness of food stamp programs in accomplishing these objectives could well be established by the enactment of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until the end of business on Tuesday, February 2, for those who may wish to join with me, and I also ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 2920) to provide for the establishment of experimental food stamp allotment programs, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Food Stamp Act of 1959".

TITLE I—DEMONSTRATION FOOD STAMP ALLOTMENT PROGRAMS

Definitions

SEC. 101. As used in this act—

(a) The term "food commodity" means any food product raised or produced in the United States on farms, including agricultural, horticultural, and dairy products, livestock, poultry, and honey.

(b) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(d) The term "food stamp" means a certificate, coupon, or other similar medium of exchange issued to eligible recipients.

Demonstration programs authorized

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, to formulate and administer in geographically dispersed areas of the United States demonstration food stamp allotment programs under which food commodities will be made available to persons with low incomes, unemployed persons, and such other persons as the Secretary determines to be in need of the type of assistance made available under such programs.

(b) Demonstration food stamp allotment programs authorized by subsection (a) shall be administered by the Secretary in not less than three nor more than six different areas of the United States, and shall, to the extent practicable, be administered in areas determined by the Secretary of Labor to be areas of surplus labor. In carrying out the provisions of this section the Secretary shall provide for at least one such program in a rural area of the United States.

Types of demonstration programs

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary shall, with respect to the demonstration food stamp allotment program to be administered in any area, determine the type of program it is to be, the requirements of eligibility for participation therein, and the manner in which it is to be administered.

(b) In formulating and administering any demonstration food stamp allotment program pursuant to the provisions of this title the Secretary is authorized to consult and cooperate with appropriate State and local authorities as well as representatives of any private industry concerned with the operation of such program.

(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed in carrying out the provisions of this title to utilize such stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation (determined by the Secretary to be in surplus supply) as he shall deem fit.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 104. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of this title.

Termination of programs—Report to Congress

SEC. 105. (a) The demonstration food stamp allotment programs authorized by this title shall terminate prior to January 1, 1963.

(b) The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the termination of such programs, submit to the Congress a final report on the operation of such programs, including such recommendation as he deems appropriate. The Secretary may also from time to time make such earlier reports to the Congress as he deems appropriate.

Appropriations

SEC. 106. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $20 million for carrying out the demonstration food stamp allotment programs.

Maintenance of other assistance

SEC. 107. Receipt by any person of benefits under this title shall not be deemed to be income or resources under the provisions of the Social Security Act or any other Federal legislation pertaining to the security of the aged, blind, disabled, dependent children, unemployed, or other similar groups. Any State or local subdivision thereof which decreases the cash or other assistance extended

to any person or group as a consequence of the assistance made available under this title shall be ineligible for further participation under this title.

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

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Statement prepared by him relating to the Geneva test ban negotiations.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PROPOSAL TO USE "REFEREES" IN SO-CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS VOTING CASES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the proposal of the Attorney General to authorize use of "referees" in so-called civil rights voting cases requires careful study and attention.

In his accompanying statement, the Attorney General says his plan will avoid many of the serious and practical problems connected with Federal registrars.

The Federal registrar proposal was a transparent attempt by the Civil Rights Commission to perpetuate itself and to change the nature of its work from that of an advisory group to an investigative and enforcement unit. It sought to supplant the FBI in civil rights cases, to remove voting cases from the courts, and vest judicial power in reluctant postmasters or other Federal officials not prepared either by training or conviction to assume new, political duties. There was no provision for judicial review.

The President expressed doubt of the constitutionality of this proposal, and the Attorney General refers to the "extended and severe legal challenge" such a law would encounter.

Although the Attorney General's proposal adheres to the formal requirements of judicial proceedings, I believe any legislation on this subject is unwise, unnecessary, and probably unconstitutional.

Americans everywhere should be alerted to the danger of this ruse to establish a Federal beachhead in every State and local election under the guise of a so-called "civil rights" bill. When State and local governments, organized political party organizations are shoved aside by Federal force, military, executive, or judicial, the people lose all chance of real control of their government. The corruption and anarchy of the Reconstruction era should serve as grim reminders of the effect of this Federal control. I do not think that Congress would willingly be a party to such a scheme.

THE MISUSE OF INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes in addition to the time permitted by the usual order.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the American people are being enticed down the trail of insecurity by the issuance of misinformation about our deterrent power; and specifically about the missile gap.

The intelligence books have been juggled so the budget books may be balanced.

This is a serious accusation, which I make with all gravity.

I realize fully that my statements on this vital matter may be labeled as politically motivated by those who prefer to conceal the facts; and by others who do not know the facts.

I choose to face that risk. It is an insignificant risk indeed compared with the unwarranted risk which this policy of misinformation has brought down upon our country.

It is well known that this has been a matter of great concern to me for years, and that I have made every effort to get the facts and to analyze them objectively.

Occasionally, after the administration's inaccuracies have been clearly and publicly labeled as such, top officials have modified their previous statements, such as occurred in the case of Secretary McElroy's admission last year about the 3-to-1 missile gap.

Mostly, however, the administration has served up reassurances and complacency; and most recently, when the existence of a serious missile gap was being generally accepted, the administration proceeded to change the ground rules for evaluating the facts.

A few events over the past 18 months are pertinent.

In late July 1958, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency briefed me on the intelligence community's estimate of the Soviet missile capability. This analysis showed a substantial, and growing, missile gap. Based upon all the facts available to me, however, I considered that the Director had underrated the Soviet missile development.

Accordingly, on August 6, 1958, I visited with him again, and pointed out in some detail my reasons for believing that the Soviet long-range missile development was greater than he had estimated.

A few days later, on August 8, 1958, Mr. Dulles briefed the Senate. At that time he reported figures on Soviet missile development which were the same as those I had questioned on the two previous occasions.

On August 29, 1958, therefore, I requested an appointment with the President, in order to present to him my apprehension about the planned missile gap. At that time I undertook to explain why I believed the Soviet figures as presented by Mr. Dulles were underestimated, and left with the President a long letter giving the details.

Later the White House wrote suggesting that I present this analysis to Secretary McElroy; and also to Mr. Dulles.

These followup conferences were held, but the estimates as presented by Mr. Dulles were not changed; in fact, a few weeks later, December 1958, just prior to the administration's presentation of the fiscal year 1960 budget, the estimates of Soviet ICBM capability heretofore affirmed and reaffirmed by Mr. Dulles were further adjusted downward.

This downgrading of Soviet capability at that time concerned me for several reasons: first, because it appeared probable that our deterrent posture was being weakened by the misuse of intelligence data, and, second, because the people were not being told the facts.

On January 12, 1959, the Vice President was reported as having told a press group that the United States was rapidly closing the missile gap. Immediately after this fantastic report, I told the Senate that any assertion the missile gap was being closed was inaccurate, and announced that if the administration did not publish the truth, I would reveal the projected Soviet-U.S. missile situation in percentages.

In all fairness, it should be noted that thereafter Secretary McElroy did admit to the press that the ICBM gap could well become a 3-to-1 ratio in favor of the Soviets.

On the basis of the facts available to me, I believed that Secretary McElroy's 3-to-1 ratio greatly understated the case. However, I also hoped that admission of such a planned weakness would immediately prompt a revision of our program and would cause a substitution of urgency for the existing complacency.

But no such anticipated change in our ICBM efforts resulted. Rather, the administration took another approach, namely, that of further downgrading the Soviet missile posture.

On January 13, 1960, before the House Appropriations Committee, and again on January 19 before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the new Secretary of Defense informed the Congress and the people that they were using new ground rules for interpreting intelligence data regarding Soviet ICBM's.

The new policy is to compare Soviet intent in the ICBM field as against our ICBM schedules. Prior to this, the comparison had been based upon Soviet capability in the ICBM field as against our ICBM schedules.

This amazing change to intent from capability in the method of using intelligence data enabled the administration further to cut down substantially the estimate of Soviet ICBM production.

At this point it is meaningful to compare the statement of Secretary Gates this year with the statement of Secretary McElroy 12 months ago.

On January 21, 1959, and again on January 29, 1959, Secretary McElroy testified to the Senate committee as follows:

> I think it would be very dangerous if we did not proceed on this basis * * *. I think that it should be understood that from the standpoint of the Department of Defense, we are assuming, as I think we should assume, that they—meaning the opponent—will have these numbers in being at the times when the national intelligence estimates say that they could have it.

On January 13, 1960, and again on January 19, 1960, Secretary Gates revealed a radical change in policy from

that announced by his predecessor. The following quotation is from Secretary Gates' testimony before the House committee on January 13:

Heretofore, we have been giving you intelligence figures that dealt with the theoretical Soviet capability. This is the first time that we have had an intelligence estimate that says, "This is what the Soviet Union probably will do." Therefore, the great divergence, based on figures that have been testified to in years past, narrows because we talked before about a different set of comparisons—ones that were based on Soviet capabilities. This present one is an intelligence estimate on what we believe he probably will do, not what he is capable of doing.

The basic concept has been changed. The fundamental basis of prior evaluation was capability. Now suddenly it has become intent.

Through this process, the administration has given the people the impression that the missile deterrent gap has been sharply reduced and possibly eliminated. In fact, able and responsible reporters have been given such impression, as is evidenced by the many news columns that have been written in an optimistic vein about what has suddenly been discovered about our relative ICBM program.

In other words, without accelerating our ICBM program, the impression has been given that the submitted 3-to-1 gap no longer exists.

On the January 24, 1960, "Face the Nation" telecast, Secretary of the Air Force Sharp was asked, "Is there going to be any period during 1960, or 1961, or 1962, or 1963 when Russia will have more missiles than we have, which are ready to go, and that a missile gap will, in fact, exist?" Secretary Sharp replied, "I think it is doubtful, but they might."

A year ago Secretary of Defense McElroy announced a 3-to-1 missile gap. Under the new theory, the Secretary of the Air Force thinks there may be no gap at all.

From a budgetary point of view, of course, this shift in policy is less expensive than would be a decision to accelerate our own ICBM program.

Without going into the classified specifics, I believe it is important for the American people to know that this manipulation of data as to quantity was also accompanied by an effort to downgrade the Soviet missiles as to quality—the recent impressive Soviet missile test in the Pacific notwithstanding.

In his state of the Union message of January 7, 1960, the President said:

Our military missile programs * * * do not suffer from any present lack of very large rocket engines. * * * The thrust of our present missiles is fully adequate for defense requirements.

Secretary of Defense Gates used almost the same words as the President in minimizing the significance of the large rockets used in the Soviet ICBM's.

Again, without revealing the specifics of classified testimony, it is important to bring out that the destructive payload attributed to Soviet ICBM's, as well as the range of such weapons, is far greater than in our missiles.

Surely the greater payload and the greater range of these Soviet weapons stems directly from the use of greater thrust rocket engines.

The facts are that a very substantial missile gap does exist, and the administration apparently is going to permit this gap to increase.

I made this statement in the past based upon the intelligence information then being used, and I make this statement again today, as it is still true—even when one uses the smaller Soviet figures derived from an analysis of their intent instead of their capability.

The truth is that if we compare the ready-to-launch missiles attributed to the Soviets on the new intelligence basis with the official readiness program for U.S. ICBM's, the ratio for a considerable length of time will be more than 3 to 1.

If one assumes, as I am sure we do assume, that the United States would not be the first to attack, then it is particularly appropriate to compare, on our side, only those ICBM's which there is a chance of our launching after we have received warning of an attack.

There will be those who will contend that this is just a comparison of our ICBM strength against their ICBM strength—and that is exactly what it is intended to be.

This does not include our IRBM's vis-a-vis their missiles of that category—although if it did, the Soviet advantage would be even greater.

Likewise, this comparison does not include the cruiser and submarine launched missiles which both Russia and the United States are expected to have. If it did include such types of missiles, however, it is not revealing classified data to state that more missiles would be added to the Soviet side of the comparison than to the U.S. side.

Therefore, I charge this administration with using intelligence information in such a manner that the American people have been given an inaccurate picture of what is necessary for our national defense.

I regret that it is necessary for me to make this serious charge.

But, because of the critical importance of this whole question to the security of the United States and the free world, I am certain that the American people have the right to know the truth.

THE TREASURY'S SHORT-TERM BORROWING COSTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues, especially those who argue very emphatically that the Congress should give up its one remaining control over interest rates, namely, the 4¼-percent limit on long-term Government bonds, to four news reports.

The first was published in the Wall Street Journal of yesterday. On page 1 we find the following:

The Treasury's short-term borrowing costs skidded to the lowest point in 3 months. Average yield on its latest issue of 13-week bills declined for the third straight week, dropping to 4.116 percent from 4.436 percent last week. Short-term investment funds normally grow more plentiful in January, reflecting the return flow of cash pulled out of banks during the Christmas season.

On page 4 of the Wall Street Journal there is a quotation from the Federal Housing Chief, Norman Mason, predicting that the coming months will bring—

A great increase in the availability of loanable funds. * * * This will result primarily because the Treasury, which was a heavy net borrower of funds in the money market in 1959, is expected to borrow less money in 1960 than it repays. Furthermore the rising incomes of families should generate greater savings. Not only will consumers be saving more but there will be larger repayments on the outstanding consumer debt, so that the net expansion of consumer debt should be smaller in 1960.

This morning's Wall Street Journal states, on page 1:

Interest rates were pared by several major sales finance companies on the commercial paper they issue and sell directly to investors. Reductions ranging from one-fourth to one-half percentage point were ascribed to recent declining tendencies in short-term borrowing costs, reflected in a drop in yields on Treasury bills to the lowest levels in nearly 3 months.

The New York Times of this morning carries the following headline on the financial page: "Bonds: Demand Rises Sharply for Short-Term Issues of Government." It is pointed out that there is only one issue of the Federal Government selling above 5 percent. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 27, 1960]

BONDS: DEMAND RISES SHARPLY FOR SHORT-TERM ISSUES OF GOVERNMENT—YIELDS PLUMMET FOR BILLS OF UNITED STATES—ONE-YEAR ISSUE ONLY ONE IN LIST RETURNING ABOVE 5 PERCENT—CORPORATES ADVANCE

(By Paul Heffernan)

Any pure uncertainty the market for U.S. Government securities may have had in the face of the Treasury's imminent refunding of $11,363 million of maturing debts came to an end yesterday.

Bids for short-dated Treasury securities of all kinds came into the market in emphatic fashion, both from the professional dealers and from investing institutions. As a consequence, there was a further material reduction in the yields on Treasury discount bills and other short-term investments.

The new note issues bearing 5, 4⅞, and 4¾ percent interest, which have been under pressure lately, rebounded in price sharply, the 5s of 1964 gaining six thirty-seconds to close the day at 100$^{21}/_{32}$ bid. The yield at this point is 4.78 percent. The 47⅞s of November 1963, got back to 100 bid, a gain of four thirty-seconds. The 4¾s of May 1964 gained six thirty-seconds to close at 99$^{28}/_{32}$ bid, a yield of 4.75 percent.

There was a big demand for the maturing 3¾s because of their right to be converted into whatever refunding issues the Treasury might designate on Thursday.

Yesterday the bid price rose to 100$^{3}/_{32}$, a gain of $^{3}/_{64}$ on the day.

RIGHTS VALUE NOTED

The bids for this issue reflect a growing demand for subscription rights to take part in the refunding. The money market yield of the 3¾s at last night's close was 1.17 percent, compared with a return of 3.4 percent obtainable from discount bills maturing about the same time.

Should the 5 percent note issue due in August 1964 be reopened for subscription

by holders of the maturing 3¾s, buyers of the certificates due Feburary 15 would, by the exchange, realize a yield of about 4.97 percent. The only other way to obtain the new issue would be to bid in the market when the dealers commence when-issued trading next month.

Continued demand for discount bills by nonfinancial corporations drove the yields on such investments down sharply all along the line. The 91-day issue due April 21 closed at discount rates of 4.04 percent bid and 3.94 percent asked, equal to a yield of 4.04 percent to buyers. This represented an improvement of thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percentage point from Monday's close.

The yield to buyers of the new 1-year bills due January 15, 1961, shrank from 5.18 to 5.1 percent. This is the only Treasury debt issue that returns more than 5 percent at present. The discount bid for the 182-day issue due July 21 improved ten one-hundredths of 1 percentage point from 4.62 to 4.52 percent. The yield at this level is 4.59 percent.

All indications yesterday pointed to oversubscription of the offering of $100 million of 12-year noncallable 5⅛-percent debentures by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) at 99⅝ to yield 5.17 percent. Trading in the issue will begin today.

CORPORATES ADVANCE

The over-the-counter market for investment grade corporate bonds was stimulated by the pricing of the new issue of $30 million of Southern California Edison Co. mortgage bonds at a yield of 4.92 percent. A large part of the issue was reported spoken for.

Prime corporate bonds in market supply, such as the American Telephone & Telegraph 5⅜s, were up from one-eighth to one-fourth point on the day. The telephone bonds closed at 103¾ bid, 104⅛ asked. A price of 104¼ was bid at the close for the new Consolidated Edison 5¼s. This is a gain of about one-fourth.

First trading took place yesterday in the new 6-percent convertible debentures of the Home Oil Co. The issue sold at a high of 107¼ with 106 bid at the close.

Prices of local government bonds were generally steady in quiet trading. The balance of the Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport syndicate account was estimated at $5,120,000.

The 4½-percent bonds of the Republic of Cuba sold at 73, a new low, in trading on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. PROXMIRE. To me this means that interest rates will only rise now if the Federal Reserve Board deliberately and artificially tightens money to create a scarcity that will drive up interest rates. As Housing Administrator Mason indicates so clearly, all the market forces are tending to make funds more plentiful in relation to demand for money and to bring about a situation in which interest rates should fall and not rise. For this reason, it seems to me it would be unnecessary as well as very unwise for the Senate to remove the one control we have over interest rates; namely, the 4¼-percent limit, unless the Federal Reserve Board itself forces the interest rate up against the present natural tendency for interest to fall.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

FIRST THINGS FIRST—WASHINGTON, D.C.'S, SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT CARL HANSEN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the current Time magazine pays a richly earned tribute to a man who handles one of the toughest education jobs in this country, and handles it brilliantly.

I doubt if there is a city in America which has a more difficult school program than Washington, D.C. But Supt. Carl Hansen has not only been able to stay on top of it; he has somehow managed to build in this city a national model.

Mr. President, as a former member of the District of Columbia Committee, I had a chance to question Superintendent Hansen on several occasions. I was deeply impressed with his remarkably fine qualities of mind and character.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from Time magazine be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Few U.S. school superintendents have a tougher job—or a better record—than Carl Francis Hansen, 54, who heads the public schools of Washington, D.C. Like most big cities, Washington suffers all of urban public education's growing ills: crowded classrooms, underpaid teachers, juvenile delinquency. But Superintendent Hansen has extra trouble. In Dixie-oriented Washington, massive integration sparked a continuing exodus of white pupils to private schools and the suburbs; 76.7 percent of the city's 118,244 students are now Negro, up 20 percent since 1953.

While grappling with this legacy, Hansen has found time to launch an astonishing campaign to raise academic standards. In the 2 years since he took over as superintendent, Hansen's hard-hitting emphasis on basic education (order and logic) along with classroom discipline (firmness with love) has begun turning the wreck of Washington schools into a model that less beleaguered cities may envy. If in theory the Nation's Capital ought to be an educational showcase, Carl Hansen seems determined to make it so in reality.

FOUR TRACKS TO EXCELLENCE

Last week Hansen was discussing a budget for next year that, if approved by Congress, will raise the District of Columbia's school bill by 16 percent. His main aim: a hefty pay boost for teachers (from $7,300 maximum to $9,100), frankly aimed at attracting better teachers. Those who join him will find plenty to work with.

The key is a four-track system that Hansen, then assistant superintendent, sold to Washington's Board of Education in 1956. On the basis of ability and motivation, all students are divided into four groups. At the top are 3,000 gifted students (IQ's above 120), navigating a tough honors track from third grade on (about 20 percent are Negroes). At the bottom are slow learners who need special remedial attention. In the middle are two tracks, embracing those of college ability and those who expect only to finish high school. Each student gets the kind of challenge and help he needs, and tracking upward is encouraged.

The four-track scheme has paid off. Despite the steady loss of better prepared white students, College Entrance Examination Board scores have risen each year since 1956 by more than the national average. On three national high school achievement tests, Washington students have raised their position relative to the rest of the United States by 14 percentile points. Hansen is still not satisfied. Beginning this year, honor students must take 16½ required annual units of work to graduate, including 4 years of foreign language, 3 of math, 3 of science. Next year, the high school day will be lengthened by a full period for all students.

THE BASIC ONES

A stiff-collared man of headmasterly mien, Carl Hansen was born in Wolbach, Nebr. (population 442), graduated from the University of Nebraska, got his doctorate at the University of Southern California. As an English teacher (and later principal) at Omaha's Technical High School, he developed a three-level English curriculum, forerunner of his four-track system. Long before going to Washington in 1947, he had hammered out a tough-minded notion of priorities: "Out of the unbelievable range and variety of human activities and experiences, only a limited number of basic ones can be selected for teaching in the classroom."

Among those basic ones now available to Washington students are Russian courses in 3 of the District's 10 high schools and a sweeping program of French and Spanish for 1,900 third-graders in 49 elementary schools. But English remains Hansen's favorite basic, and better writing is one of his priorities: "It seems to me more important for us to know the structure of language than to know how a spark plug works in an automobile."

Compared with most U.S. public school systems, Hansen's English composition program is downright revolutionary. Theme writing starts as early as the second grade, and students in the two top high school tracks are required to write 24 themes a year. To help in the time-consuming grading job (chief obstacle in other cities), Hansen has arranged with Washington's militant PTA for 20 college women "lay readers." To Hansen, it is only a small beginning. By whatever pulling and prodding is necessary, stubborn Superintendent Hansen aims to give Washington's children a real education. Says he: "Too often I am sure, we expect less of students than they are capable of doing."

THE UNDERLYING ISSUE IN MIXING RACES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Judge Jule W. Felton, chief judge of the Court of Appeals of Georgia, is among the large and distinguished body of jurists and scholars who have had the courage to assert publicly that the Supreme Court of the United States grievously violated the Constitution in the school integration decision of 1954.

The Augusta, Ga. Chronicle of January 19, 1960, carries an outstanding editorial dealing with Judge Felton's most recent analysis of this decision.

Mr. President, there is much food for thought in Judge Felton's remarks and in the Chronicle's timely comment thereon, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE UNDERLYING ISSUE

Chief Judge Jule W. Felton, sustaining the position long held by the Chronicle, spelled out to members of the Augusta Kiwanis Club Monday the real issue involved in the current controversy over the mixing of races in public schools.

It is not a matter of race versus race but a matter of whether the Constitution of the United States is a durable contract between the people of this Nation and the Federal Government, as it was intended to be.

"If the Supreme Court can change its mind every day or every week, then all you have left as law is what five men (a majority of the Court) have to say on any given day," the appellate court judge said. "You've de-

stroyed the principle of the written Constitution."

The Constitution, as Judge Felton said, either "intends" or it doesn't. As the only body which can construe that meaning, the Supreme Court must interpret the intention. The first time the meaning of any given provision of the document is questioned, the Court's initial decision becomes a part and parcel of the Constitution. Said Judge Felton: "No Supreme Court has any authority at a later time to reverse that interpretation."

He cited that by way of showing how in 1868, and again in 1927, the court ruled, then upheld, the principle of separate but equal educational facilities for children of different races. Whether the 1927 decision was right or wrong, he said, is not the point. It became law and must be upheld by the court. Only a Constitutional amendment, approved by the people, may alter the Constitution; it may not be done by a court, Felton added.

What many persons—especially those whose American heritage seems less firm than that of the majority of southerners—apparently ignore is that the Constitution is, as Judge Felton said, a written contract wherein the original sovereign States surrendered some of their sovereignty to the Central Government, maintaining to themselves all powers they did not choose to delegate. The Central Government had no power until conceded it by the States themselves. Thus, the States remained sovereign in all matters except those delegated, and control of education was one the States retained.

Therein lies the issue. Is the Constitution of the United States, as it pointedly declares, the "supreme law of the land," or is the Supreme Court, a creature of the government of the people, assuming a bigger right than the people themselves have? Judge Felton said it was his opinion that the framers of the Constitution did not intend that to be, and with that the Chronicle most certainly concurs.

Integration most assuredly is not inevitable, as Chairman James Peters of the State board of education seems to believe. Yet, it may come someday. The point, however, is that the South is not ready for it and must oppose it, not in an atmosphere of mistrust and ill will, but strictly on the constitutional grounds that the decision belongs to the people, not the Warren court.

As Judge Felton told Kiwanians, integration must come, if it does, in peace, love, harmony, and the natural growth of the human spirit—not by force, violence and fighting.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL LOAN FUND

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the American Legion on the so-called national defense educational loan fund.

In 1958, Congress passed an act which provided a $31 million loan fund to aid needy students seeking to further their educations in technical fields.

The act was aimed at bolstering our defense effort by attempting to reduce any possible scientific gap then existing between this country and the Soviet Union. In fact, Mr. President, the relationship of this loan program to our defense structure was considered to be so close that the act was named the National Defense Education Act.

Much has been said and written about the act during the past year and I am certain that the measure will continue to receive national attention this year.

Ironically enough, the controversy centers around a single provision contained within the act itself.

I refer, of course, to the provision whereby students are required to submit two sworn statements: an oath of allegiance and a disclaimer affidavit.

My position on this matter can be summed up in very few words.

I see no reason why any patriotic American should object to swearing his allegiance to his country under any circumstances. Nor do I see any reason why a good American should be offended by an affidavit which states that he does not support, and is not a member of, any organization advocating the violent overthrow of our Government.

Unfortunately, there is an element—with considerable representation in this body, I might add—which takes offense at these requirements.

A handful of college presidents have even gone so far as to withdraw their institutions from participation in the student loan program. Paradoxically, they have clothed this action in the cloak of academic freedom.

Mr. President, I submit that these few college presidents, in their zeal to protect academic freedom, have actually infringed upon this cherished liberty.

They are abridging the freedom of choice of students entering college under the National Defense Education Act. They are closing the doors of their colleges to those students who might otherwise be able to enroll with the aid of this loan program.

I am certainly shocked that men with such high positions in the educational field can have such misguided notions of the meaning of the word freedom.

I hasten to point out, however, that there is a salutary side to this controversy also. For example, it has produced a wave of student opinion in favor of retention of the loyalty oath-disclaimer affidavit provision. It has also focused attention on a number of farsighted college presidents and members of college trustee boards who have been courageous enough to take issue with the view of the few misguided champions of academic freedom who have withdrawn from participation in the program.

I offer as an example, Mr. President, the University of Vermont, one of the outstanding educational institutions in New England. The president of this college, John T. Fey, recently stated:

> If Congress wants to impose restrictions on the use of Federal funds and it does not impinge on the operation of the institution nor upon academic freedom, then we cannot object.

The UVM board of trustees immediately endorsed President Fey's stand.

I am pleased to say that a New Hampshire man, Attorney Neil Tolman, of Nelson, N.H., played a major role in the prompt endorsement by the trustees.

In this connection, I should like to quote from a University of Vermont press release covering the action of the board of trustees:

> The board of trustees of the University of Vermont today endorsed unanimously the stand taken by UVM President John T. Fey in stating that he sees no objection to the disclaimer affidavit of the National Defense Education Act Loan Fund.
>
> Resolution for endorsement of Dr. Fey's statement on the loan provision was moved by board member Neil Tolman, who noted that the provision has come under recent fire from several colleges.
>
> The statement passed by the Vermont board today "resolved that the board * * * unanimously and strongly endorses and highly commends Dr. John T. Fey * * * for the stand he has taken regarding the disclaimer affidavit attached to the Federal student loan program."

Mr. President, President Fey's background would indicate that when he speaks of freedom, he is a man with a thorough knowledge of the subject. He spent 4 years as a marine during World War II. He is a former clerk of the U.S. Supreme Court and a member of the Maryland, District of Columbia, and American Bar Associations. I might also explain that he is a graduate of Washington and Lee University and holds degrees from the University of Maryland and Harvard and Yale Universities—the latter two having withdrawn from participation in the NDEA program.

I believe that President Fey is typical of a great number of leading educators across the length and breadth of this country who are willing to accept the will of Congress on this subject. And the University of Vermont is only one of scores of institutions in America which have adopted a realistic approach to this situation. I commend these schools and individuals for their forthright and courageous stand.

Mr. President, an article entitled "NDEA Evaluated," which appeared in a recent edition of the UVM paper, the Vermont Cynic, analyzes this problem from the students' viewpoint. It is a very interesting and informative article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BRIDGES. There are many who contend that the disclaimer affidavit is meaningless because there is nothing to stop a person from swearing falsely. To these persons I would point out that such a false oath could easily form the basis for prosecution on the ground of perjury, and we know the perjury law is one of our most effective weapons against the Communist conspiracy in this country.

Fortunately, those who oppose the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit appear to be in the minority. More than 1,300 colleges have acepted this provision and only a dozen have defected.

I certainly hope that this ratio of more than 100 to 1 will receive the careful consideration of my colleagues should another attempt be made this year to remove this important aspect of the National Defense Education Act.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Vermont Cynic]

NDEA EVALUATED

(By Judy Sylvia)

Congress passed the National Defense Education Act on August 23, 1958. Under title II

on this act, Federal funds are granted to accredited institutions of higher learning for low-interest student loans. The money is distributed in the following ratio: For each $9 of Federal loan money an institution receives, it must add $1 of its own in matching funds.

In order to receive an NDEA loan, a student must submit two separate sworn statements with his application form: (1) a disclaimer affidavit, and (2) an oath of allegiance.

In discussing this section, the distinction between these two requirements are often forgotten or ignored, and people use the vague term "loyalty oath" to cover both. But it is not the oath of allegiance which many object to, but the disclaimer affidavit.

The National Science Foundation requires an identical oath and affidavit from its applicants, but nobody has questioned that. What is different in the National Defense Education Act, however, from the point of view of the institutions of higher learning, is the way the provision is administered.

First. Each institution is given a certain lump sum, to distribute among students of its own choosing. Thus the institutions directly administer the loyalty provision.

Second. Not only does the institution administer the loyalty provision for the Government; it must, in effect, require an oath and affidavit in return for its own money.

The ethical implications are considerably more demanding than those of other Government programs. The direct administration and financial participation force institutions who value their educational principles to take a definite stand.

Because of the recent publicity of the NDEA, and since UVM does participate in its loan program, President John T. Fey was interviewed as to his position in this controversy.

President Fey, in a newspaper article earlier in the week, made his stand clear. "I think if Congress wants to impose restrictions on the use of Federal funds and it does not impinge on the operation of the institution nor upon academic freedom, then we cannot object."

The President also said that:

1. He did not feel it discriminated against students;

2. He did not feel it was an invasion of academic freedom because it does not affect the faculty, nor the students;

3. If a student, because of religious and/or conscientious scruples, is prevented from taking the oath, this university has other funds available in which the student does not need to sign any oath or affidavit. So no one is denied a loan on this basis.

"It is important to distinguish between the disclaimer affidavit and the loyalty oath, under which the student affirms his allegiance to the United States," said the President. He also noted that none of the colleges objecting to the disclaimer affidavit has opposed the loyalty oath.

Dr. Fey said he could not see why it should be worse to say you do not believe in an organization advocating the illegal overthrow of the U.S. Government than to pledge allegiance to the Government.

Asked why he thought Harvard dropped out of the NDEA loan program, the President said that Harvard had enough money of its own to give out in funds, and they did not want to participate anyway. Harvard did not say this, but expressed the fact that they did not like the disclaimer affidavit because: (1) It was unfair to single out American students; (2) if the Federal Government can do this, they can invade the academic area of the institution.

Yale, too, is against this affidavit. In regard to this, the president of Yale stated something to this effect—the invasion of academic freedom was in conflict with the classical concept of education.

In conclusion, President Fey feels that Congress, as a body, sets national policy, and where they do lend money, they can certainly set their own restrictions.

CUBAN PEOPLE NEED TO BE ALERTED TO STEALTHY DANGERS OF COMMUNIST INFLUENCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the patriotic Cuban people have just fought a bloody battle to rid themselves of the bondages of tyranny.

In their efforts to seek national goals and self-determined form of government we wish them godspeed.

Today, international communism is operating on all fronts, and in practically all countries, to influence, subvert, and ultimately control the people. Consequently, there is a real danger in nonalertness to the stealthy ways and means in which it creeps into, and ultimately subjugates a nation to totalitarianism.

Yesterday, President Eisenhower, I believe, not only usefully, but wisely and constructively, reviewed the fundamentals of American policy. He also laid down a precedent which the Prime Minister of Cuba, Mr. Castro, might well follow in determining Cuban policy; that is, presentation of national policy in a calm, thoughtful manner, rather than in television telethons.

Furthermore, the President wisely issued a warning on the need for an alertness to dangers of the intrigues of communism.

Recently, the tirades against the United States have been of such scope and dimensions, although entirely unwarranted and illogical in the light of previous United States-Cuban relations, as to arouse suspicions as to their motivation. The question thus arises as to the degree to which communism may be utilizing these voices as pawns.

The Cuban people, I believe, do not want to replace one form of tyranny for another. Rather, they, and the whole free world, must be alert to the tactics by which communism seeks to extend its control, first by supporting nationalistic movements and then, after getting a foothold, attempting to take over a country.

Despite the wave of criticism, I have every confidence that there exists between the Cuban people and the citizens of the United States a strong bond of friendship, of mutual respect, and a desire for a better climate of relationships.

The President, I believe, performed a service beneficial to both Cuba and the United States in reaffirming U.S. policies relating to our southern neighbors.

Today's Washington Post published a constructive editorial entitled "Steady Course on Cuba," which contains thoughtful constructive commentary on the merits of the President's policy statement. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STEADY COURSE ON CUBA

President Eisenhower made it clear yesterday that it will take more than a few gusts of wind from Havana to propel this country into intervention in Cuban affairs. The careful statement made by Mr. Eisenhower at his news conference will no doubt disappoint partisans of a big stick approach to Fidel Castro. But advocates of reprisals ought to ask themselves who would be strengthened most by a punitive policy—the United States, or the fiery anti-American wing of the Castro government?

One mark of a great power is its maturity in the face of provocations from a smaller country. Thin-skinned Members of Congress ought to be wary of being entrapped into saber rattling—particularly in a region where past gunboat diplomacy has left bitter wounds. Furthermore, if Congress should decide to punish Castro by a downward revision of Cuba's sugar quota this year, the reprisal could play right into Mr. Castro's hands.

The President struck the right note in expressing his concern for the unwarranted and intemperate attacks on the United States made by Mr. Castro and his spokesmen. Quite properly, the Chief Executive protested the disregard shown for the rights of American property holders in Cuba. But Mr. Eisenhower also made it clear that Cuba has a sovereign right to expropriate lands. The only slip the President made was to declare in an off-the-cuff response that no reprisals were contemplated "at this moment"—a phrase which could be misinterpreted as a veiled threat.

What the President said is not new. But in view of the widespread rumors of an alleged tougher approach, his own words were needed to reaffirm this country's policy toward Cuba. Mr. Eisenhower's calm response ought to be welcomed by Americans who don't want the United States to react like an adolescent in a name-calling feud.

ALBERT J. ENGEL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, during the interim between sessions of this Congress, one of the most rugged characters who served in the House of Representatives during the 1930's and 1940's passed away. I refer to the late Albert J. Engel, who represented the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan from 1935 to 1950.

It was my privilege to serve with him for 14 of those 16 years, and to be closely associated with him. We served together on the appropriations subcommittee for the War Department, where he was my immediate ranking superior. Thus I had occasion to know him as one only knows another with whom he rubs elbows in the close study that marked the work on war appropriations during the buildup to and through World War II.

In those days that particular subcommittee not only handled the bill which provided the funds for the Army and the old Air Corps, but likewise handled the civil functions bill which provided funds for the rivers and harbors and flood-control work of the Army Engineers.

During the war this subcommittee received highly classified information about the Manhattan project—reportedly more than any other committee received. That was largely due to Al Engel's characteristic inquisitiveness. Congress had provided a lump sum of $1 billion in 1944 for General Reybold to use on a secret project, but a committee numbering Engel in its membership was not content to renew that appro-

priation in 1945 until the committee had an opportunity to visit Oak Ridge and see what it was all about.

Albert Engel justly deserved the title of a "one-man investigating committee" which the press accorded him. When we went to Panama on an inspection trip he was in khaki before the boat docked, ready to grab a car and go on his hunt for waste and inefficiency. No man more than he deserves credit for getting the several armed services to use a common hospital. When he saw idle beds in competing service hospitals he literally trembled with indignation.

When we went overseas as the war neared its end he was up before daybreak tracking missing paraphernalia, and like as not coming back with reports of Army jeeps being sold in the black market or the looting of a tire stockyard.

In his approach to appropriations for flood control and development of the Nation's water resources he was similarly direct and forthright. He believed in harnessing our great rivers, in converting damaging floods into resources of hydroelectric power, recreation, irrigation, and navigation.

I and my State should be forever grateful to Albert Engel for his stanch support of my moves to get the construction funds which started Randall and Oahe Dams. It was he who stood shoulder to shoulder with me in a notable battle in 1947 to furnish the funds for completing the planning of Oahe Dam and to start its construction in 1948, notwithstanding the fact that they were not provided in the Truman budget.

Those were accomplishments of the 80th Republican Congress, which Mr. Truman so roundly blasted as a "do-nothing Congress," and in which respect at least the starting of construction on the Missouri River Dam, in South Dakota, he would have had it do nothing, had our committee not acted.

So I have memories of Albert Engel's outstanding work for his country and his cooperation in South Dakota's concerns. But over and above this, Mr. President, I have the recollections of a very fine personal friend.

The Engel family lived only about a block from us in Northwest Washington during many of those years, and Mrs. Engel and Mrs. Case were close friends. They were companions in Red Cross activities during the war.

To Mrs. Engel and to her son and daughters and others bereaved, we extend our deepest sympathy and express the faith that He who rules and overrules in all things will soften their grief and give them the comfort of pride in a devoted husband and father who was the soul of honor in his dedicated and able service to his beloved country.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY ACT OF 1959

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. Before I do so, I should like to say it has been called to my attention that there are two technical omissions in the bill passed yesterday, the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1959. The first technical omission is on page 6, line 18, referring to the act as "Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1959," instead of 1960.

The second technical omission is on page 10, line 17, referring to a section of the code as section 381. It should be 281.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make these technical corrections in S. 694, in the engrossment of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BLACKMAIL BY UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. HART. Mr. President, expressing eloquently a concern which I hope is shared by the overwhelming majority of the people of this country is the editorial entitled "Blackmail Give-In," published in the Detroit News of January 25, 1960. "Blackmail" is a bitterly strong word, but it describes precisely the arrangements resulting from this most recent demand by the United Arab Republic. Experience teaches that the payment of blackmail buys only more trouble. Widespread knowledge and understanding of the nature of U.A.R. demands are necessary so that strong official resistance by this country to such demands in the future will be supported by all Americans. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Detroit News be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

BLACKMAIL GIVE-IN

Only this week was it revealed that for 2 years the U.S. Navy has virtually foreclosed bidding on oil cargo shipping contracts to U.S. flag ships that previously did business with Israel. Cancellation clauses have been included in contracts which in effect bar U.S. shipowners from bidding if they are, or had been, carrying cargoes owned by Israelis.

This represents another concession to the insatiable President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, who maintains that a state of war still existing between his nation and Israel gives him the right to bar Israeli shipping or cargoes from the Suez Canal he seized 4 years ago.

It was bad enough that only last fall U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold, facing the the unpalatable facts of life, had to agree to a formula under which Nasser limited his canal blockade to Israeli-owned or chartered ships or those carrying cargoes owned by Israelis. There was nothing in that agreement that permitted an extension of the blockade to any ship that had at any time done business with Israel.

The Navy claims that the concession is necessary as a matter of "business protection." They are right to take precautions aimed at insuring that their oil shipments arrive on time. They are in line of duty in trying to protect U.S.-owned ships from seizure or delay.

But, for the record, it should be made clear that this represents further appeasement of a blackmailer who knows not the meaning of honest dealing. It comes ill fittingly from those whose purpose in history and duty today has been to insure freedom of the seas.

TO ASSURE DEMOCRACY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in all the furor over the present status of the defense posture of the United States, I wish to speak briefly, drawing upon a long experience in government.

Within my life I have seen the steel-clad battleship go from a position of eminence to oblivion—the aircraft carriers' birth and passage, the manned aircraft develop from a feeble flying machine at Kitty Hawk to a mighty instrument of war passing, too, before a new and awesome vehicle for destruction—the missile.

The cannonball and the Minié bullet have been perfected and discarded—gunpowder and TNT have faded to insignificance before the capability of the tiny atom.

The warmaking potential of all the nations of the world has changed. This is a pushbutton era with events that once took days compressed into minutes.

Fifteen years ago and even less, a nation mounting an attack against the United States could not gain by surprise our total destruction. Protected by two oceans, and with the large area of our Nation, this was impossible. As crippling as was the vicious sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, it only served to galvanize America's might and unity of purpose.

In the years that lie ahead, we must apply a new concept to defense. The sum total of our defense and retaliatory capabilities must be large enough in size, effective enough in power, and adequate enough in dispersal and location to effectively deter an attack upon the United States or its close allies.

Why is this necessary? Stated in its basic terms, because this Nation of free people never has and never will launch an attack upon another nation. The writers of the Constitution made a war of aggression by the United States impossible in theory. The space age has assured that this is impossible in fact.

A missile attack could be launched on this Nation in less time than it takes the President to drive from the White House to the Capitol.

This means we absolutely require an adequate warning and defense structure so that no nation will dare an attack on us. The President has, under the Constitution, the responsibility for instantaneous defense in the event of any attack.

We must prepare to support a defense capability which will absolutely deter attack. To do otherwise will invite an aggression and the total destruction of democracy, our Nation, and very likely all life on this planet.

I shall let others more knowledgeable on military intricacies discuss and debate the details. As for me, I make my position clear. We must retain assured and

real superiority at all times over every possible combination of potential aggressors. This is the price we must pay to maintain our democracy, a form of government that surely offers mankind the inspiration it needs and the opportunity to best fulfill all its desires.

PASSPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to invite my colleagues' attention to an excellent article entitled "No Passports for Our Enemies," written by Charles Stevenson, and published in the February issue of the Reader's Digest.

I am particularly interested in the subject of remedial passport legislation since the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, has recently determined to resume hearings on this matter. The committee has had several bills before it since July 1958, but has not reported one to date. The House of Representatives passed a measure on this subject in the closing days of the 85th Congress, and also passed a bill in the 1st session of this Congress which is now on our committee calendar. While I personally feel the House measure will require some strengthening amendments to meet the deplorable situation so forcefully documented by the Digest article, it should be taken up immediately and not be allowed to die in committee.

If further hearings are necessary I think they should be scheduled so that the committee can complete action on this matter prior to the Easter recess. The American Bar Association has recently recommended legislation to control the travel of Communists, and I assume they will be invited to testify when hearings are reopened on this matter. Only last Thursday Secretary of State Herter, in his briefing of the Foreign Relations Committee, emphasized the continuing need for adequate passport legislation.

Mr. Stevenson's article concludes with the following rather pointed question:

Isn't it about time that we demand that our legislators read the record and awaken to the realization that action is imperative?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the February issue of the Reader's Digest be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

NO PASSPORTS FOR OUR ENEMIES

(By Charles Stevenson)

Within the week that you read this, John Hanes, the U.S. State Department's Administrator of Security in Washington, will open an envelope marked "Confidential security information," and scan a shocking message from the FBI. One of its undercover agents, operating deep within an American Communist ring, will have learned that still another member of the Communist Party will soon be applying for a U.S. passport so he can travel abroad. His assignment: to undermine the cause of America around the world.

Hundreds of such warning messages come to John Hanes' attention. If this one is like the others it will state, typically, that the traveler's secret objective will be to go first to Hungary and turn over to the secret police the names of Hungarian freedom fighters now living in the Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Cleveland and Detroit areas. Next stop will be Red China, where as a representative of American labor he will broadcast to the new African nations that an alliance with the United States will bring them slavery; if they ally with China and Russia they will receive aid and friendship. Returning via Moscow, he will make secret reports on Communist activity in the United States, and he will bring back instructions and perhaps money for future operations in this country.

Hanes will curse under his breath, but he will be powerless. Sure enough, the Communist applies for a passport for a European pleasure trip. In the Washington passport office a clerk will make the usual check. From a central file of FBI, CIA, and congressional intelligence will come a fat envelope reciting the applicant's long personal history of disloyalty, subversion, even treason. Even so, he will get his passport, which vouches for his U.S. citizenship and assures him of Government protection in his journeyings.

This procedure is now so routine that our authorities know it by heart. Every month passports are handed over to a hundred such security risks, a half dozen of them known to be hard-core Communist operators. This has been going on ever since June 16, 1958, when the Supreme Court ruled that the Secretary of State has no authority to deny passports to people because they are Communists.

Indeed, the Security Administrator is helpless even when he knows the passport applicants are operating as Communist secret agents. He cannot even delay an escaping spy unless the FBI is willing to reveal immediately the evidence of a crime already committed; this the FBI usually can't do—because it would require unmasking its own undercover agents before they had worked up their cases against the entire gang.

"Plainly speaking," states a recent report by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "this country has, at the behest of the Supreme Court, authorized a small army of disloyal citizens to go abroad and travel about under the protection of the United States. Naked logic tells us that at least some of this number will be in a position to damage this Nation in a substantial manner."

In an attempt to get congressional action to close this gaping hole in our defense, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover last year told Congress: "This [Supreme Court] ruling will facilitate the travel of spies, couriers, and subversives. The next time a representative of the party is summoned to the Soviet Union he will not even have to go to the trouble of using an alias."

But Congress so far has not dealt with this problem effectively.

Passports are an essential part of any foreign agent's protective coloring. Top Communist spies and saboteurs have had obscure American Party members obtain passports, then assumed their identities. Gerhart Eisler, currently a top propaganda official of Communist East Germany, served for years as the Kremlin's undercover boss of the Communist Party in the United States while using a passport made out to an American Communist but bearing Eisler's photograph. For a long time Eisler directed the Communist infiltration of U.S. labor unions. Then, in 1947, he was convicted of passport fraud. He jumped $20,000 bail and escaped New York on a Polish liner.

Col. Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, the highest Soviet intelligence officer ever apprehended in the United States, was convicted a little over 2 years ago. Members of the cells he organized, some probably still on the job, effectively smuggled defense and atomic secrets to Russia by messengers who returned with instructions and U.S. currency to finance further operations. Abel and the couriers were able to stay in business because they used U.S. passports.

Until 1958 the United States had at least the right to try to protect itself from passport abuse. Ever since 1856, laws had clothed the Secretary of State with authority to issue or deny passports. Traditionally, passports were denied on the ground that an individual's activities abroad would be prejudicial to the foreign relations of the United States. During the 1920's, passports were denied to Communists as a matter of right. The regulations were relaxed during the next 20 years. However, in 1950, after U.S. Communist Party leaders had been convicted of conspiracy to overthrow the Government by force, and after American Reds had openly engaged in trying to throw the Korean war to the enemy, Congress cracked down.

It enacted legislation setting up procedures to identify and label subversive organizations, and made it a crime for any member of such groups to apply for or be issued a passport. By 1952 the State Department had set up elaborate regulations to prevent bureaucratic injustices. Every suspect applicant for a passport was entitled to know the specific reasons for denial. He could explain away the information informally, or appear before an appeals board with counsel and argue his case for the record with his own witnesses.

Fear of the searchlight that such hearings might throw on their activities discouraged most known Communists from even applying for passports. Instead, the party threw a reported $300,000 into legal battles and propaganda to get the courts to knock down the barrier to the Red travel operations.

Three test cases were carried to the Supreme Court, Rockwell Kent, the artist, and Dr. Walter Briehl, a Los Angeles psychiatrist, had demanded passports, but refused to certify they weren't Communists. Dr. Weldon Bruce Dayton, a physicist, said he wanted to go to India. The Government's brief against him showed that he had associated with Communists since 1943. At the University of California he had admittedly headed the Science for Victory Committee, a group described by the State Department as a Communist-organized front for propaganda and espionage activities.[1] Witnesses testified to seeing him several times at the Greenwich Village address used by the Rosenberg spy ring to microfilm U.S. Government atomic documents for transfer to the Soviet Union in 1949 and 1950.[1]

The Secretary of State asserted: "I have reason to believe on the balance of all the evidence that the applicant is going abroad to engage in activities which will advance the Communist movement."

But none of this was enough. In two separate decisions by margins of one vote—5 to 4—the Supreme Court on June 16, 1958, ruled that all three men were entitled to passports. The majority argument: there was no authority under existing law to control travel by Communists, even hard-core revolutionaries.

In the preceding 6 years, out of 3,130,000 applications only 15 passports had been finally denied by the Secretary of State on Communist grounds—proof that most Communists were in no mood to risk exposure of their activities by demanding the right to travel. As soon as the decisions were rendered, however, they rushed to get theirs while the getting was good. Within just 10 months, 1,150 people whose passports would have been held up for inquiry into Com-

[1] "Decision and Findings in the Case of Weldon Bruce Dayton," by Secretary of State Dulles, Oct. 4, 1956.

munist affiliations before the June 16 decision got them without question.

Who are some of these people? What are they really up to?

With controls out the window, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, a Negro writer from Brooklyn with a long Communist-front record, and his wife obtained new passports. Mrs. DuBois hurried to the All-African People's Conference in Ghana to read a speech that her husband wrote attacking the Western Powers and praising Red China and the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, DuBois was received in Moscow by Premier Khrushchev. The Soviet boss indicated his appreciation of DuBois' efforts by awarding him the $35,000 Lenin Peace Prize.

Although our Government forbade American travel to Communist China, DuBois went from Moscow to Peiping—bearing an American passport. There he made hate-America speeches which were beamed to Asian and African peoples. "Because he carried an American passport," says John Sipes of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, "he was regarded as a representative American citizen."

Henry Willcox, a wealthy New York building contractor, and his wife, Anita, were allowed to have passports during the Korean war. They said they wanted to go to France and Turkey "for travel and business." But less than 6 weeks later, in direct violation of the conditions under which these passports were granted, they were consorting with our enemies in Peiping as "American delegates" to an Asian-Pacific peace conference.[2] Over the radio, in China and Poland, the Willcoxes participated in attempts to picture the United States as guilty of germ warfare on a wide scale.

The U.S. Constitution defines treason as "adhering to the enemy, giving them aid and comfort." Thus, when Willcox was called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and suffered a convenient lapse of memory about his germ-warfare proof, Representative Bernard W. Kearney, of New York, declared: "I am firmly convinced that if there was ever a flagrant case of treason this one is."

Because of all this, the Secretary of State refused to renew the Willcoxes' passports when they applied again in 1954. However, owing to the Supreme Court's decision, they now have brand-new passports, ready to use to carry out their activities.

William Lorenzo Patterson, general manager of The Worker, official mouthpiece of the American Communists, had a passport which he used to go to Hungary and Czechoslovakia during the Korean war. In press interviews and in speeches he accused the United States of being a Government of "criminals and cannibals." He, too, repeated the germ-warfare lies to create enmity toward the United States.

The State Department seized that passport because of his illegal use of it in entering a then restricted Iron Curtain country. Now, however, he has a new one which, he has said, he may use to go to the U.S.S.R.

Nowhere, however, is there a more flagrant insult to the United States than the case of James E. Jackson, a member of the U.S. Communist Party's executive committee. He obtained one of the easy-to-get new passports "to visit France as a tourist." Called before a Senate inquiry soon afterward, he took the fifth amendment when asked if his real purpose was to visit the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, 7 weeks later he was in Moscow attending the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. At these sessions he spoke bitterly against the United States in a speech radioed throughout the world. Finally returning home, he again appeared under subpena before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, but refused even to identify his photograph. In order to conceal the truth about his trip, he took the fifth amendment 88 times at a single sitting.

Why have these gravediggers of democracy, these servants of a foreign power, been allowed to get away with their activity? The evidence and most of the case histories cited here were available to our legislators throughout their last session. Why has Congress failed to act?

Three weeks after the High Court's ruling, Robert D. Johnson, legal adviser of the State Department's Passport Office, warned: "If an espionage agent walked into the Passport Office today and proved his citizenship, we would have to issue him a passport."

Secretary of State Dulles rushed a draft of remedial legislation to the Capitol. "The international Communist movement seeks * * * on every front to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States and eventually by every means, including violence, to encircle the United States and subordinate us to its will," he wrote House Speaker SAM RAYBURN. "Surely our Government should be in a position to deny passports to such persons." Still our Congressmen failed to enact remedial legislation.

President Eisenhower sent a special message to them. "It is essential that the Government today have power to deny passports where their possession would seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States or would be inimical to the security of the United States. * * * Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger." Month after month now has passed—and still no action by Congress.

Recently the American Bar Association has come forward urging Congress to take effective steps quickly. It says there are ways of permitting the Secretary of State to use information from secret sources without violating individual liberties.

Isn't it about time that we demand that our legislators read the record and awaken to the realization that action is imperative?

[2] "Decision and Findings in the Case of Henry and Anita Willcox," by Secretary of State Dulles, Nov. 11, 1957.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY—ESSAY BY MURIEL ELLIS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Nevada winner of the 1959–60 broadcast scriptwriting contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters was Miss Muriel Ellis, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Jack V. Ellis, of Sparks, Nev. In an era when complacency is threatening the existence of our civilization, her words of warning against this indifference are especially significant.

The Nation must maintain a constant alert for the preservation of our freedoms. It gives me great pleasure to be able to include her script in the RECORD, so that thousands of Americans may be reminded that our cherished liberties should not be forgotten in the quest for material comforts.

I ask that Miss Ellis' essay be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Muriel Ellis)

"Give me your tired, your poor;
Your huddled masses yearning to be free;
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore;
Send these the homeless, tempest tossed, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden shore."

These words written at the feet of the Statue of Liberty express the hope that many people place in America and democracy, for within the definition of "democracy" lies the richest possibility of the complete fulfillment of an ideal.

I speak for democracy because democracy stands for freedom of the individual. Democracy is the expression and exchange of ideas. Democracy is based on the principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity. These things I believe in.

Our basic civil liberties are stated in the Bill of Rights, including freedom of speech, press, and religion.

We, the people of America, have the privilege and right to express our differences of opinion without fear of being molested, for though Americans differ, they have a common respect for conflicting views. We can express these conflicting views with a speech, a ballot, or a newspaper article.

This freedom of the press is not to be underestimated, because, in fact, it is one of our greatest privileges. Without free press Americans would not be fully informed and would not hear the opinions of others in agreement or disagreement. The formation of intelligent opinions hinges upon the reliability of information. Our press is dedicated to the truth, and its effectiveness can be measured only by its freedom.

Another of our most cherished freedoms is the freedom of religion. Our country was formed because a group of people recognized and realized the need for religious freedom, and today it is one of the great strengths of our Nation, for peace and love are a part of every faith, just as war and hate are condemned by every faith.

Our system of justice has grown out of many years of opposition to wrong and oppression. Anyone can challenge injustice with the surety of a fair hearing. Our law insists that any accused person is presumed innocent unless and until proven guilty. Our system of justice, though, depends upon the attitudes and actions of the people themselves, as does everything else for which democracy stands.

Our attitudes and actions must never become complacent or indifferent, but we must be constantly alert to guard our proud heritage, that system of government which has served us, the people, so well, that our forefathers fought so bravely for, and that which we must enrich and pass on to the next generation.

We realize that our democracy is not perfect, for there are many things that can be improved upon. The belief in equality of races is still striving to overcome the inevitable prejudices of imperfect men. We know that we cannot attain complete, absolute liberty while living in an ordered society, for our own individual liberty ends when it begins to interfere with the liberty of others. Liberty has its limits, just as authority must have its limits. Democracy strives for a just balance between those needs of the individual and those of society.

Democracy stands for the hopes and aspirations of every free spirited person, and our Statue of Liberty will always remain an eternal symbol of this, for as long as there is an America, there will be a democracy, and the simultaneous definition of these two words—America, democracy—will stand as a barrier forever against tyranny.

FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last week, the Maryland Branch of the Ukrainian Congress of America observed the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian national independence.

Since I was unable to be with my friends on this occasion, I expressed my thoughts in a letter which was read at the meeting.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 22, 1960.

MR. KLEMENS BABIAK,
Chairman, Maryland Branch, Ukrainian Congress of America, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. BABIAK: Please extend my greetings to those in attendance at the meeting to observe the 42d anniversary of Ukrainian national independence. I wish it were possible for me to be with you and the other good Americans of Ukrainian descent and their friends, as I have been on previous occasions.

Our country is a finer country today because of the Ukrainians who came here and cast their lot with others of other lands to build this Nation. No better people ever came to American shores. In the veins of many of our fine people flows the proud Ukrainian blood—pillars of our society—foremost in good works. I am glad to be known as a friend of the Ukrainian people.

You are now celebrating the independence which your nation won in 1918. Unhappily, the Ukrainian Republic ceased to exist only 2 short years after its birth. However, independence of spirit lives on in all people of Ukrainian descent, and you are to be commended upon this faithful observance of your independence day.

Over 300 years ago Ukraine was an independent state and the center of a rich culture and thriving commerce that linked Europe and Asia. Then, it fell under Russian rule, but Russia was never able to make Russians out of Ukrainians. Your people have kept their identity and proud heritage. Ukrainian people have been in the forefront of the movement of non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union to throw off the yoke of the occupier.

I salute all Ukrainian people everywhere.

Sincerely yours,

J. GLENN BEALL.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—A NATIONAL PROBLEM

MR. HENNINGS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate approved S. 694, a bill which offers a small amount of Federal help to States and communities now struggling with the very serious problem of juvenile delinquency and crime. As chairman of the Senate subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency—and as one long interested in youth work—I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will give its speedy approval to this legislation.

That juvenile delinquency is a national problem—indeed, an international one—is being recognized and acknowledged in nearly every community of the country. Examples of this recognition and concern on the local level is readily evident by editorial comment which comes to my desk.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two of these editorials entitled "Treating Delinquency as a National Concern," from the Hackensack (N.J.) Bergen Evening Record, and "Delinquency in the Spotlight," from the Miami (Fla.) Herald, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Bergen Evening Record, Sept. 28, 1959]

TREATING DELINQUENCY AS A NATIONAL CONCERN

The recognizable status of so-called juvenile delinquency as a national problem is one good reason for Federal assistance in control and prevention. Juvenile gangsterism, as Mayor Wagner pointed out at the opening of Senate hearings, in New York, involves itself in narcotic traffic and addiction. It is a part of such general violations of law as the illegal mailing and possession of guns and other weapons.

The substance of Federal aid would be financial, but the implications of Government participation would have a breadth beyond the immediate economic. There is need for a generalized and comprehensive training among municipal officials and social workers in the field of custodial care as well as in methods of control. The New York plan for youth conservation camps is widely applicable, and if widely applied would benefit from unified attention to its particulars and general purposes. Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Democrat, Missouri, chairman of the committee investigating juvenile delinquency, is cosponsor of a bill to establish a national youth conservation corps. Other aspects of possible Federal participation include assistance to the States in the development of vocational training and recreational programs, turning over to the States surplus Federal property for minimum security detention, and broadening the Federal program for outpatient treatment of narcotic addicts.

These are correctives of a stature which points up the economic waste and practical inefficiency of unilateral State or local action. The most critical problems of delinquency and youthful crime have no boundaries or geographical habitat other than the kind indicated in their definition as urban, suburban, or rural, and even here the degree of difference is dwindling. Any way one looks at it—from the standpoint of money or preventives or treatment or complex human psychology—the problem is national.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Sept. 22, 1959]

DELINQUENCY IN THE SPOTLIGHT

The Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency will begin a study this week of the outbreak of savage teenage violence in New York that has shocked the Nation. Terror has indeed walked the streets of the Nation's largest city. Innocent persons have been beaten and killed by the juvenile hoodlums.

Chairman THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Missouri Democrat, said his committee will confer with Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner, who already have been working on the problem. It will receive testimony from the police and from the experts who are close to the situation.

But Senator HENNINGS made the point that this is not a problem unique to New York City—that it transcends State and even national boundaries.

Teenage assaults and murders have been reported elsewhere. And juvenile crime of all kinds has been increasing.

The primary interest of the Senate committee is, as it must be under the law, to discover how the Federal Government may help in meeting the situation. The hearings in New York will demonstrate, however, the valuable service a Senate investigating committee does in focusing attention on a problem wherever it occurs and getting action on it.

When Senator ESTES KEFAUVER headed the Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, he held hearings in Miami which opened the eyes of Dade County citizens to conditions here. The committee underscored facts which we already knew but kept buried in the back part of our minds. The same was true of the Senate crime investigating committee which met in Miami twice. It smashed rackets here and inaugurated an era of law enforcement which makes this community a vastly better place in which to live than it was before.

Beyond that the committee's work caused communities elsewhere to look at the dirt and corruption that has been swept beneath their own rugs. Many cleaned house.

Crime was not wholly stamped out, of course, but many conditions uncovered by the Kefauver committee, such as open gambling here, no longer exist.

Juvenile delinquency will not be solved by the Hennings committee, nor could it ever be wholly. But if the committee delves deeply into conditions in New York's tenement jungles, if it brings out the meager homelife and the relaxing of disciplines that permit such shocking conditions, it will contribute to understanding in other communities. That will not only be a service to New York, where the headlines have been blackest, but to the Nation at large.

DEATH OF FRANCIS M. PINCKNEY

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, last Saturday Francis M. Pinckney, of Columbia and Charleston, S.C., died following a long illness. Mr. Pinckney was a distinguished public servant and had been a member of the South Carolina Tax Commission for the past 20 years. He was appointed to that post by the late Burnet R. Maybank when he was Governor.

The name Pinckney has been distinguished throughout the history of South Carolina from the very birth of our Nation. The death of Francis M. Pinckney, the son of a Confederate Army officer, marks the passing of another era of service to the people of South Carolina by the Pinckney family. Mr. Pinckney not only was a public servant of unimpeachable character in civil life but he served his Nation with an outstanding record in World War I as a combat officer in the Air Corps.

Mr. President, I ask that an editorial from the State newspaper of January 25, 1960, entitled "Francis M. Pinckney," be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

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

FRANCIS M. PINCKNEY

Francis M. Pinckney, who died Saturday, was a man of unimpeachable character, who entered the State service as executive secretary to his close friend, the late Burnet R. Maybank, and later went on to the State Tax Commission to succeed former Gov. John G. Richards, deceased, in which high post he had served with credit since 1940.

A Charlestonian of distinguished lineage, Mr. Pinckney was a gentleman of the old school, ever courteous, ever honorable in his public and private acts. He was a civil servant prompted by only the highest motives and leaves a proud record of duty well performed, both in peace and in war.

FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there is no further morning business, I ask that

the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as the resolution which is now before us, Senate Joint Resolution 39, has previously passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote, I hope that we will be able to pass it after full but unprotracted consideration.

In brief, the resolution would empower the Governors of the several States to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives in case of a nuclear or other kind of attack on Washington.

Although the present resolution was introduced only by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and me, much credit for it is due to the former minority leader and former Senator from California, Senator Knowland. He introduced resolutions on this subject in both the 81st and 82d Congresses, and public hearings were held in March 1952. At that time a number of Members of the Senate, political scientists, political leaders, and other persons interested in Government testified.

Senator Knowland reintroduced his proposal in the 83d Congress and public hearings were held in May 1954. On June 4, 1954, the resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 39—as amended, passed the Senate by a vote of 70 to 1. Unfortunately, the House took no action on this Senate-passed resolution.

The history of the legislation in the 84th Congress was very much the same. The proposal was embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 8. Public hearings were held in March of 1955, and the resolution passed the Senate on May 19, 1955, by a vote of 76 to 3 after a full and thorough debate. I believe I had the privilege of being the sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 8 in the 84th Congress, together with other Senators. Again, unfortunately, no action was taken by the House.

It is my hope that the present resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 39 of the 86th Congress, can be passed by an overwhelming vote and that the present House of Representatives will give it their prompt attention. The resolution is certainly as urgently needed today as in the past. In fact, I believe the concensus would be that, if anything, it is more urgently needed than ever.

The purpose and method of operation of the proposed amendment are set forth quite succinctly in the report of the Judiciary Committee. As the report is very brief, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 561) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommends that the resolution do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the Constitution to enable the executive authority of each State to make temporary appointments to fill vacancies in representation in the House of Representatives whenever such vacancies exceed half the authorized membership of that body.

STATEMENT

When the Constitution was drafted, the ability to destroy people on a mass basis by use of weapons of war had not been developed. It was, therefore, highly unlikely that the membership of the House of Representatives could be so decimated as to render that body incapable of exercising its constitutional functions. Indeed, the Founding Fathers had no basis on which to predicate any such assumption.

Regrettably, this is not the situation today. The Federal Administrator of Civil Defense has testified:

"Today, with the advent of the atomic bomb and similar devices, we know that vast areas can be devastated almost instantaneously. We also know that no system of defense is likely to be 100 percent effective. In other words, we realize that in any future war it is probable that the enemy would succeed in attacking our civilian communities."

This advance in the technique of destruction has necessitated a reexamination of the ability of our representative Government to function in time of national disaster. A brief review establishes that continuity of the Executive authority is protected by the act of June 25, 1948 (ch. 644, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 672), regulating presidential succession. The judiciary could be reconstituted fairly readily by appointments by the Chief Executive. Any vacancies in the Senate could be temporarily filled by appointments by the Governors of the respective States. But in the House of Representatives, where revenue measures must originate, vacancies must be filled by special elections, and such elections may require a minimum lapse of 60 days.

Thus, as it stands today, the Constitution confers no authority on State Governors to appoint Members to the House of Representatives. This inability to provide for continuity of representation offers no insurmountable difficulty in ordinary times. But in periods of national emergency or disaster, it could well paralyze the functioning of representative government. As the Administrator of Civil Defense has observed:

"It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of Congress continuing to function in time of national emergency. The functions of the Congress become ever more important under such circumstances. The ability of the Congress to act swiftly is essential to the successful defense of the Nation."

If a sufficient number of Representatives were killed by an atomic blast, through germ warfare, or in the course of violent attacks by irresponsible partisans, the House of Representatives would be compelled to function without a majority of its Members. In such an event, any Member might raise a point of order, suggesting the absence of a quorum. Precedents indicate that such a point of order would not be sustained. But, even so, it is likely that in such times exceedingly important legislation would be adopted and any disfranchisement to a substantial portion of our Nation would represent a distinct loss.

It is true that the House of Representatives might, by amendment of its rules in advance, provide that a quorum should consist of a majority of the remaining Members whenever vacancies occur on a wholesale scale. Yet this change would not eliminate this danger entirely, for it is certainly possible that in an atomic attack, a sufficient number of Representatives would be incapacitated so that it might well prove incapable of mustering a quorum of the surviving Members.

This does not necessarily mean chaos in this country, for the Chief Executive would undoubtedly step into the breach and act without legislative sanction in the national interest as he perceived it at that time. However, there need be no departure from constitutional representative government if precautionary steps are taken in advance of atomic catastrophe. This legislation represents such a precautionary step. It is not born of hysteria, but evolves from a desire to protect this Nation from undesirable consequences which may be occasioned by indifference to the dangers of the age in which we live.

The subject matter of this resolution has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary since the 81st Congress (S.J. Res. 145). In the 82d Congress, public hearings were held on Senate Joint Resolution 59. In the 83d Congress, public hearings were held on Senate Joint Resolution 39, and this resolution passed the Senate by a vote of 70 to 1 on June 4, 1954. In the 84th Congress, public hearings were held on Senate Joint Resolution 8, and this resolution, as amended, passed the Senate by a vote of 76 to 3 on May 19, 1955. During the 85th Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 157 was introduced, but no action was taken on it. During the present Congress, Senators KEFAUVER and DODD sponsored Senate Joint Resolution 39, which is identical in text with the resolution (S.J. Res. 8) which passed the Senate in the 84th Congress. On March 9, 1959, the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, to which the resolution had been referred, decided that no further hearings were necessary and voted unanimously to recommend to the Committee on the Judiciary that it report the resolution favorably and without amendment.

The text of the resolution contains no reference to a disaster. Certain problems arise if the power may be invoked only when there is a disaster which causes a given number of vacancies. For instance, the question quickly arises as to what officer of Government is to proclaim the disaster and how he is to determine which of the vacancies were caused by the disaster. Those problems are not presented here, for under this resolution the power which would be vested in the executive authority of each State is not predicated on any certification or proclamation. It is brought into being by an ascertainable fact, namely, the existence of 219 vacancies in the House of Representatives. In this manner, the amendment avoids the complications inherent in a proposal which requires that the vacancies must be caused by, or be the result of, a disaster. Yet there is no likelihood of abuse of this privilege for the very evidence of so many vacancies in the House of Representatives presupposes a disaster. Another complication which this concept avoids, and which must be reckoned with if the vacancies must be occasioned by a disaster, is the probability that appointments could not be made to fill vacancies created by natural causes either before or after the catastrophe.

The number of vacancies required by the amendment is substantial. The reason for

this is apparent: there being no reference to a disaster the committee wanted to be sure that utilization of this authority would be sufficiently restricted, so that it would remain an emergency measure for the preservation and continuity of representative government. The maintenance of a large number of vacancies as a prerequisite to the use of the power constitutes insurance that it will be used only in the event of a disaster.

The committee desires to stress that these appointments will be temporary appointments. Article I, section 2, of the Constitution requires that a Governor issue writs of election when vacancies occur in the representation of his State in the House of Representatives. This amendment, by specific reference, emphasizes this requirement, so that, in most cases, an appointee's term will be limited to 60 to 90 days.

An analysis of the resolution will give some idea of its operation. Under the terms of the resolution, the power to appoint Representatives occurs only when the vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds one-half of the authorized membership. The present membership of the House being 436, 219 vacancies would have to exist before this extraordinary power could be invoked. The number of vacancies could exist for several days, but, as appointments are made by the Governors pursuant to this amendment, the number of vacancies naturally will diminish. On that date that the vacancies total less than 219, the time limit on this power begins to run. From that date, by the terms of the amendment, the Governors have 60 days within which to make the temporary appointment or the authority lapses and the office must be filled by election. If, within the 60-day period, additional vacancies arise from any cause, they also may be filled by gubernatorial appointment. Also, if for some reason the number of vacancies (having dropped below 219) rises again above that figure, the power to appoint again comes into existence.

These interpretations of the amendment are given by way of explanation, not in anticipation of difficulties in operation. Should unforeseen difficulties arise as the result of this grant of authority, the House of Representatives would act as final arbiter by reason of its constitutional authority to be the judge of the qualifications of its own Members (art. 1, sec. 5, of the Constitution).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Naturally it is the fervent hope of the committee that the authority granted in this resolution need never be used. However, with some knowledge of the tremendous destructive power of thermonuclear weapons, it would be the height of folly to leave a constitutional gap of this nature in a representative government such as ours. When whole cities may be obliterated in a split second, the Congress cannot ignore, should it have any inclination to do so, the realities of this danger. The time for action to erase a defect in our Constitution, which could not have been contemplated at the time of its adoption, is at hand. It is pertinent to recall that, as a constitutional amendment, this measure must secure the approval of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and the ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Since this action is somewhat time consuming the committee believes that this legislation should be approved promptly by the Senate, and the committee so recommends.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In a word, the amendment would plug a loophole in the Constitution—a loophole which could not have been foreseen by the Founding Fathers and which has developed as a serious threat only over the past dozen years or so.

At the time the Constitution was drafted, no one could have foreseen the terrible and destructive power of our modern weapons. I see no necessity whatever to dwell upon either the possibility of a nuclear attack on Washington or the probable results of such an attack. Suffice it to say that such an attack might occur—although we hope and pray it will never occur—and, if it did, it is possible, even probable, that a large percentage of the Members of the House of Representatives, along with a large number of Senators, would be killed immediately or fatally wounded.

Under the Constitution as it now stands, only the House of Representatives could not be readily reconstituted after a devastating attack.

Both the Constitution and Federal statutes provide a long line of succession to the office of Chief Executive.

Vacancies in the judicial branch could be quickly filled by appointment by the President.

In the legislative branch, there is no problem with respect to one House, to wit, the Senate. Under the Constitution, as amended by the 17th amendment, the chief executives of the several States are authorized to fill vacancies in the Senate temporarily by appointment pending an election. There is no such authority, however, in connection with vacancies occurring in the House of Representatives. Under article I, section 2, clause 4, of the Constitution, vacancies can be filled only by election of the people.

It is not my contention that without the adoption of the resolution before us there would be inevitable paralysis of the Federal Government. It seems certain that the President—or whoever succeeds to that office—would take whatever emergency action appears to be necessary, whether or not either House of Congress were able to function.

Furthermore, precedents indicate that the House can operate with a quorum of its existing Members, and does not require a majority of elected Members. However, after a nuclear attack the Congress would necessarily be required to pass exceedingly important legislation, and any wholesale disenfranchisement would be both unfortunate and undemocratic. In such times, the House should not be forced to operate with a relative handful of the Members, even if its rules permit this.

I might add, parenthetically, that if per chance an attack occurred on the opening day of Congress, before the new Congress met and before new rules were adopted, a point of order could be made in the House that a quorum consisted of a majority of all Members chosen. It is likely that under parliamentary rules such a point of order could be sustained.

However, if an attack occurred at a later date, and if a truncated House could operate under its rules, some States—in fact, many States—might be wholly unrepresented. Such disenfranchisement would be most undemocratic. In times of emergency, as in other times, or possibly more so than in other times, our Government should remain a government of the people. Membership should be brought back as closely to the authorized number as quickly as possible. Under our present Constitution, this would require special or general elections. At present, this would take considerable time. Also, we could expect attacks on many of our major centers of population, and it might not be possible to hold elections in many States for many months. If we are to have representative government during this period, Governors must have the power of appointment.

There are several technical aspects of the proposal which require some comment.

There is no reference in the resolution to a disaster. The resolution becomes effective when the total number of vacancies in the House exceeds half of the authorized membership. These vacancies would not exist except as a result of a disaster. However, it was thought preferable to omit mention of a disaster as both unnecessary and complicating. For example, the question would arise as to what officer is to proclaim the disaster and what vacancies were caused by it. There might be some uncertainty for a time as to which officer was in a position to proclaim such a disaster and the vacancies which occurred.

The maintenance of a large number of vacancies as a condition to the use of the power constitutes insurance that it will be used only in the event of a disaster.

The time during which Governors would have the power to make appointments is very limited: 60 days after any date that the total number of vacancies exceeds half the authorized membership. Any vacancies which are not filled within this 60-day period must be filled by election in the regular way. Furthermore, any person temporarily appointed to fill such vacancy is permitted to serve only until the people fill the vacancy by election, as provided by section 1, article II, of the Constitution—which, of course, is the way vacancies are filled now.

I should like to make two or three other points. Without the provisions of the pending resolution, disenfranchisement might last for considerable periods of time in many States. Under the laws of most States, a minimum period of 60 days is required before an election can be held after its proclamation. Furthermore, after a nuclear attack, which we must assume would result in damage to many other areas than the District of Columbia, the holding of elections might be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for many months. Even in States where the destruction might not be widespread, the people would be extremely busy and might not wish to attempt an immediate election. Senate Joint Resolution 39 would provide a method for temporary appointments until such time as the people of the State believed that it was feasible to undertake an election of new representatives.

Even if a majority of the Members chosen, sworn, and living would constitute a quorum, it might be utterly impossible to assembly such a majority either in Washington or any other seat of government if many Members were seriously wounded rather than killed outright. Thus, incapacity of Members,

rather than death of Members, might be the most serious stumbling block to operation of the House. A method should be provided for quick, though temporary, replacement of Members who have been killed, so that the House can function with as little hindrance and loss of time as possible.

Mr. President, I should like to point out also that so long as we have a House which can function and choose a Speaker, we have assurance that we will have a President, even under the dire circumstance of an attack in which the President, Vice President, and all Cabinet members are killed or incapacitated. Of course, under the Presidential Succession Act, the President pro tempore of the Senate succeeds to the office if there is no Speaker. However, there may be no President pro tempore, and the Senate requires a majority of those chosen and sworn for a quorum. Moreover, the Speaker was selected as the second alternate, and, whenever possible, he, rather than the President pro tempore of the Senate, should succeed to the office of President. We should make certain that there will always be a Speaker of the House; the only way to do this is to assure that there will be a House capable of meeting and choosing a Speaker without delay.

The primary argument which has been made against the adoption of this resolution is that it is born out of fear and panic. To me, this is tantamount to saying that a husband should never purchase life insurance because of fear of frightening his wife, or that a parent should never have his child vaccinated for fear of frightening the child.

This resolution was not born of fear, and it was not born of hysteria. It merely embodies a desire to protect the representative nature of our Government in this second half of the 20th century. Our Constitution must be adjusted to cope with the dangers of the age in which we live.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to pass Senate Joint Resolution 39, and I also urge our colleagues in the House of Representatives to give full and prompt consideration to this measure.

FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER REGISTRATION OF VOTERS—VOTING REFEREES IN STATES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice that I intend to ask that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from the further consideration of S. 2535, S. 2684, S. 2719, S. 2722, S. 2783, and S. 2814, and that these bills be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee so that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights may give this proposed legislation further consideration.

Mr. President, I intend also to request, when the bill entitled "An act to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by providing for court appointment of U.S. voting referees, and for other purposes," is presented to the Senate, that it be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee for the purpose of having it considered by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, backed by the Attorney General of the United States, has said that, in his opinion, the legislation now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration dealing with Federal registration of voters is unconstitutional.

The Attorney General of the United States has stated that, as a matter of policy of the Eisenhower administration, this measure now before the Rules and Administration Committee must be replaced by other proposed legislation which the administration intends to send to the Congress.

The Attorney General stated in a press conference yesterday that this proposed legislation would, basically, provide for the appointment of U.S. voting referees whose powers would include authority to circumvent State registration laws, and certify as eligible to vote, any citizen of any State, regardless of State requirements.

Mr. President, there is no need at this time to go into every detail of the legislation being proposed by Members of Congress and by the administration in this field.

My main point is this:

Legislation proposed by Members of the Congress in this field has been questioned on constitutional grounds by the President of the United States and by the Attorney General of the United States, as well as by Members of the Congress, including myself.

The legislation in this field which is being presented to the Congress by the administration is being questioned by Members of Congress, including myself, on constitutional grounds.

On every hand we have grave constitutional questions arising in all proposed legislation relating to Federal intervention in State registration matters, and yet this proposed legislation has never been before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has as its chairman the same Senator who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which is now considering this proposed legislation.

Certainly the chairman of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee should not be unwilling to transfer to his own Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights the consideration of this legislation which deals with constitutional rights.

There is no committee of the U.S. Senate that is more properly cloaked with authority to deal with the constitutional right of voting than is the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee.

The personal opinion I hold in this controversy is that no legislation dealing with any change in voting rights and qualifications of various citizens of various States has any right to come before the Congress of the United States, unless it is a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States. The right to control elections has been delegated to the State governments without question until now. Any attempt to change this delegation of authority in the Constitution without a constitutional amendment is an outrage against the men who wrote the Constitution.

The right to vote in a local precinct in South Carolina is not something to be controlled arbitrarily by some person elected to Congress to represent New York, Illinois, California, or Georgia. This is a right preserved by the Constitution to South Carolina. Any attempt to take this right away from South Carolina or any other State without the orderly procedure of constitutional amendment is, in effect, an attempt to abridge the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, we have a committee of the Congress, of which I am a member, which specifically deals with proposed legislation concerning constitutional rights of all nature. Even the supporters of legislation in this field base their support of such legislation upon their concern that some American citizens may be having a constitutional right abridged. We who oppose legislation of this character charge that it is violating the Constitution of the United States to tamper with this State right.

There is no question that constitutionality is involved in all such legislation, whether one is for it or against it. That is the reason why I have asked that all this type of proposed legislation be referred to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. In my opinion, there is no committee in the U.S. Senate which is better equipped or cloaked with more authority to deal with such legislation, which digs so deeply into the heart of our Constitution.

Mr. President, one last warning to those who may be inclined to support such legislation via the short route; that is, without proper hearings and study by the appropriate committee of the Senate. It is this same kind of legislation which helped men in past history, like Hitler, gain control of entire nations. When Hitler rose to power in Germany, the German constitution was still on the books. It had been broken only by Hitler's own assumption of powers through legislative violations of the constitution.

To play politics in Congress with questions within our proper scope of authority is one thing. But to play politics with the heart of the Constitution and the very "innards" of our Nation is to play with an explosive matter more dangerous than atomic or hydrogen bombs.

To change the Constitution of the United States, either by delegating constitutional authorities to bureaucratic officials of the Federal Government or by directing or relinquishing constitutional authorities to the courts of the Nation, can be more damaging to the people of this Nation and the entire free world than anything imaginable.

I hope we will never forget, in the Senate of the United States, that each of us was elected by the people of the States from which we come. The very life of our Constitution is at stake in this issue, and thus the life of our Nation and of free representative government.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Carolina for what I think is a very timely and a very sound observation with reference to consideration of this far-reaching proposed legislation.

There are involved many constitutional questions, which should not be considered solely by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I do not object to consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but, in addition, the matter certainly should be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is the chairman, as the Senator pointed out, of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and is a very fine lawyer. At the same time, there is no legal mind on the Committee on Rules and Administration to espouse the side of this involved question taken by the Senator from South Carolina.

I should like to observe further that I know some very good Members of this body who are not lawyers but who know much about law and who have in great degree good legal minds. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is outstanding in that regard, but he has trained his mind and has a natural grasp of such matters. It is the exception, rather than the rule, to find a person of that type.

The Senator from South Carolina is certainly eminently correct in pointing out the need to have the thinking of the best minds on these questions, minds trained in the law, regardless of which side they take.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi, who sat on the bench for many years. I know the Senator agrees with me that on matters involving questions of constitutionality of acts of Congress certainly there should be consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, before we take the matter up on the floor. That is my position.

I am making no motion at this time to refer any bill. I believe that the committee, after hearing what the Attorney General has recently said, since the President concurred with him, will probably wait until he sends to us in this body the bill which he thinks is constitutional.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All I am doing at the present time is to serve notice on the Senate that at the appropriate time I am going to ask that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate also be allowed to look into the constitutionality of the matter before it is presented to this body for action.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know how I became involved in this matter, but I express appreciation for the collateral compliment directed to me.

HOW WE CAN BEST ATTAIN MAXIMUM, FULL EMPLOYMENT AND STABLE PRICES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the report of the Joint Economic Committee on maximum employment, and adequate rate of growth, and substantial stability in the price level, which I laid before the Senate yesterday.

INTRODUCTION

Mr. President, on March 24, 1959, Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 was passed by the Congress. It authorized the Joint Economic Committee to conduct a thorough study of our economy with special reference to the problems of simultaneously providing maximum employment, an adequate rate of economic growth, as well as maintaining price stability and preventing inflation.

The committee immediately set about its task, and in the course of 9 months we have held nine sets of hearings on virtually all phases of our economy. We heard over 100 witnesses on over 40 days of hearings and took some 3,700 pages of testimony. I am proud of the fact that in each case the witness was selected for his technical and intellectual knowledge and that we avoided merely parading a series of witnesses representing special interest groups before us. In fact, I think not a single witness was selected other than for his special knowledge.

I hold in my hand the printed record of this series of hearings. Senators can see it is a very large volume.

In addition to that, we commissioned some 23 special study papers on a variety of subjects affecting growth, employment, and inflation. All of these have either now been published or are at the Government Printing Office and will be published within a few days. Some of them have made original contributions to knowledge and have received the highest commendation from the academic community.

Yesterday I listed these special studies by title and by author.

Furthermore, under the direction of Dr. Otto Eckstein, the staff prepared a staff report which was published at the end of December. This is an amazingly able document. It consists of some 500 pages of detailed analysis of almost every aspect of our economy. It has received the highest praise from members of the academic community and even from the American Bankers Association which, while criticising it in some respects, stated that it was a tour de force.

This was a most unique report in that the committee determined that the staff should write this report, which included numerous policy recommendations, without interference from either the majority or minority of the committee. This they did, and the result is one of the finest documents of analysis which any group could produce in such a short length of time.

What is unique about this document, in addition to the fact that it represents no political group or special interest group, is that no other organization, either public or private, has done a comparable job.

I think it is not unfair to point out that the Nixon Committee on Inflation, which has been in existence longer than our special study, has not published a single analytical document concerning the problems of the economy, let alone a thorough analysis of the economy. That group operated entirely by press releases and the mimeograph machine. They have produced nothing in the way of analysis on which the academic community or the public could draw. This is quite extraordinary because they have had the entire resources of the executive agencies at their disposal, which we did not have.

The Council of Economic Advisers, which has a permanent staff of 12 professional economists plus its 3 members, and an annual budget almost double the amount we had, has produced no such analysis. In fact, their only public document is the yearly Economic Report of the President.

Numerous private groups, with both a great deal more money and a great deal more time, have also not done the kind of analysis which this staff performed in 9 short months. I want to say, however, that fortunately we were able to draw upon the work of numerous individuals who were connected with these groups and that their information proved exceedingly valuable. Nonetheless, no private group has attempted the job that our staff has done.

Yesterday I stated on the floor of the Senate, in a paraphrase to the remark of Mr. Churchill, that I believe that in the history of economic analysis in this country never have so few done so much for so many.

Some 81,000 copies of our original hearings and studies have already been distributed. The Government Printing Office has ordered 60,000 more copies of our studies, some 10,500 copies of which have been distributed. Thus, already there have been distributed some 91,500 copies of our materials. Eight of our staff studies and the committee report which I introduced yesterday remain to be distributed. Thus, without any question, more than 150,000 copies of our materials will directly reach the hands of the academic community, the public, the libraries, and other groups. We have sold or distributed a quantity of analytical economic materials which, had they been sold by a private book firm, would put us on the best seller list. This was done without pressing those materials on anyone. The materials have been distributed by single copies and not by sending out a hundred or a thousand to some special groups.

We are proud of the work of the committee and of the staff. I take this occasion to praise the extraordinary competence and scientific detachment of Dr. Eckstein, who has been the director of the special staff.

One member of the staff, Dr. Frucht, was designated as the special representative of the minority, with instructions to report to the minority, and to be available at all times to the minority. He was appointed by them. I am glad the

minority was allowed, on my motion, to use any member of the staff upon whom they wished to draw, and that they were given more time for the filing of their minority views than the minority, either Democratic or Republican, has had in some 11 years I have been a member of the committee.

WHAT THIS MEANS TO PEOPLE

Mr. President, I have mentioned the impact of our studies on the academic community and the importance of facts and figures and analysis of our economic system. It was Carlyle who called economics the dismal science. Indeed, it must be that to millions of people. Terms such as "gross national product," "inputs and outputs," "production functions," "discount rates," and "reserve requirements," "gross private domestic investment," and "the multiplier effect" must confuse and baffle millions of average people. These seem to be desiccated and bloodless terms, void of human reality. It is because of this that I want to say a word about the effect of the performance of our economy on the actual lives of our people.

Whether or not our economy grows at an adequate rate will make the difference between whether a small businessman can invest in his business and expand it, on the one hand, or whether or not his firm will stagnate or go bankrupt, on the other. What happens to the interest rate on Federal bonds will help to determine whether families will be able to build their own homes or not. The most intimate personal relationships of life depend on what happens to our economy—for example, whether one has a decent home or whether one lives under crowded conditions with in-laws in the spare bedroom.

To some, what happens to monetary policy may seem to be a very distant thing; but if it is too tight and fails to expand with the growth of our population, this will cause millions of persons to make decisions against their personal and their family's welfare which they would not otherwise have to make.

An adequate rate of growth affects the man who is unemployed, for without such a rate of growth he or his children or his wife may find that they must face some of the most cruel and humiliating experiences in life.

Whether our price levels are stable or not will determine in great part whether the growing groups of the aged in our country have a decent or a miserable time in the evening of their lives.

And our country as a whole has a great stake in all of this. This is true not only because an adequate rate of growth and substantially full employment with stable prices affects the material and domestic welfare of people, but it is also true because it may mean the difference between meeting our obligations to those in the world who are less well to do either fully or stintingly and in meeting the very real threat of Russian military and economic imperialism either effectively or only in an inadequate way. In short, when translated into human terms, the jargon of the economist does have meaning, and it has meaning for both our private and personal lives, on the one hand, and the well-being and, in fact, safety of our country and the friends of our country as well.

So in our discussion of these complex and often difficult subjects let us not overlook the point that we are, in fact, really talking about what happens to people and to individuals. It is because of this that we must talk of our economic growth, its failures and its potential, of full employment or the absence of it, and price stability and the policies—both good and bad—which have been followed to bring it about.

FINDINGS

As a result of our numerous studies, the prolonged hearings, and the staff report, the committee was able to arrive at numerous specific findings. I shall first outline shortly the specific conclusions to which we came and then the general policies which are needed to put them into effect. Following that, I shall take up the general questions of growth, unemployment, and prices, monetary, fiscal, and debt management policies, and then other specific areas of the study.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In general, the fundamental conclusions about our economy to which we come on the basis of the study are:

First. It is possible with proper policies to achieve a high and sustained rate of economic growth, with relatively full employment, without creeping or galloping inflation.

Second. Under the present policies followed by the administration, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the Congress, we would have to choose between growth equal to our potential, on the one hand, or price level stability, on the other.

Third. Our future growth will depend on what we do now. If we should pursue policies which will foster growth, the economy could grow at a rate of approximately 4.5 percent a year over the next 15 years. This is in sharp contrast to the rate of 2.3 percent for the last 6 years. These are amounts large enough to spell the differences between a rapid or slow increase in our standards of living and between meeting our public responsibilities at home and abroad fully or very imperfectly. We do not desire growth merely for its own sake. We need it to raise our standards of living, to meet our growing public responsibilities, and to improve our military position.

In fact, if we should grow at 4.5 percent a year between now and 1975 instead of at a rate of 2.5 percent, the gross national product in 1975 would be $971 billion—almost a trillion—or $258 billion greater than it would be at a 2.5 percent growth rate.

If we should grow at 4.5 percent, the gross national product in 1975 would be $139 billion greater in that year alone than if we grow at only 3.5 percent.

The cumulative amounts which we would gain from a growth rate of 4.5 percent per year in this period, instead of 2.5 percent or 3.5 percent, are staggering—so staggering, in fact, that I do not give them, even in round terms.

I have appended a table which shows calculations for the gross national product at different growth rates in future years. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Difference in gross national product in selected years if the economy grows at 2.5 percent, 3.5 percent, or 4.5 percent

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Gross national product in billions of 1959 dollars if economy grows at—		
	2.5 percent per year	3.5 percent per year	4.5 percent per year
1959	[1] 480	[1] 480	[1] 480
1965	557	590	625
1970	630	701	779
1975	713	832	971

[1] Preliminary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The table shows that at a 4½-percent growth rate, the gross national product should be $971 billion in 1975, as compared with $713 billion with a 2.5-percent rate; and $832 billion with a growth rate of 3.5 percent a year.

Fourth. In order to get a rate of growth close to our potential, we must reduce the inflationary bias of the economy so that we will not have to choose between growth on the one hand, or stable prices on the other. We must then pursue sound programs of growth. To grow at a high rate without inflation we must do the following:

(a) Make sure that final money demand for goods and services grows at a rate equal to the increase in the potential supply of them.

(b) Reduce the instability which still troubles the economy. There is nothing inevitable about the periodic recessions and depressions with which we have been plagued. While perfect stability will never be achieved in a dynamic economy, the frequency of recessions and their severity can be reduced.

(c) Improve the structure of the economy by reducing concentrations of market power and by increasing the mobility of resources, namely, of labor, and capital,

(d) Increase the growth of the productive capability of the economy by investment in public and private capital, by raising the productivity of the labor force, and by improving the mobility of resources.

Fifth. Our inadequate economic policies have contributed a great deal to the difficulties of recent years. Since the end of the 1954 recession—and, indeed, perhaps before that—public policy has been concentrated primarily on curbing inflation. This has been done on the mistaken assumption that such policy will automatically promote economic growth. The policies used assume that the inflation of recent years was caused by generally excessive money demand. Our studies find that the real sources of inflation primarily have lain elsewhere. In fact, money demand fell short of the potential output of the economy during most of the period—and, indeed, short of the actual output—and the general

restraints on demand imposed by public policies unduly retarded the growth in output and in employment without preventing price increases.

Sixth. However, we also find that policies designed to promote growth will not automatically prevent inflation. While high output serves to raise productivity, a high rate of growth requires high levels of monetary demand. It is impossible to manage the increase in money demand, particularly with present policy tools, without having some of that demand hit industries in which output is pressing upon capacity. This would result in inflationary strains. The sheer promotion of total output without regard to its composition may therefore very well result in strong inflationary pressures.

Seventh. Concentration of market power partially contributed to the inflation of recent years. Antitrust and similar policies designed to improve the competitiveness of the economy are important in reducing this source of inflationary strain but cannot be relied on exclusively for preventing increases in the general level of prices. Improved monetary and fiscal policies must also share in restraining inflation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRUNSDALE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to preface my question by congratulating the Senator from Illinois on an excellent report, which is extremely competent, and certainly very useful, I am sure, not only to the academic community, but also to businessmen and students of political economy; and also I wish to congratulate him on an excellent speech. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if it is not true that if the economy grows between now and 1975 at the rate of 4½ percent, one of the great virtues will be that the Federal revenues will increase by approximately—as I compute it—$40 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that they would grow by at least that amount. That is, with the present rates of taxation, of course.

Mr. PROXMIRE. With the same rate of taxation. I raise that point because, of course, those of us who advocate policies of aid for education, which, as the Senator from Illinois points out, is central to the growth of our economy, have been criticized as spenders and as being fiscally irresponsible and for having no regard for a balanced budget. It would seem to me that the point the Senator from Illinois makes, that our economy will continue to grow, very well answers that criticism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say that the economy is capable of growing, at a faster rate if we do the right things.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; if it follows the policies advocated by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. With the same rate of taxation it will mean that the Government's revenues will increase proportionately, and we will have adequate funds, therefore, for social benefits, if those are needed, and for national defense, as well, and for a reduction in some of the national debt.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So that we would have revenues which would be approximately 50 percent higher than the present revenue is, and therefore we could very greatly improve our social services and our defense, and we would be in position substantially to retire the national debt at the same time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1959 the gross national product amounted to $480 billion. If we grow at the rate of 4½ percent a year we believe the national gross product can easily reach $971 billion by 1975, which would mean double the present government receipts at the same rate of taxation. In the process, as the Senator from Wisconsin suggests, we would have more money available for welfare, and could also use the money to reduce the national debt.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator, as usual, has asked some very pertinent questions.

POLICIES

Mr. President, in general, the policies that would reduce instability, make our labor force more productive at full employment levels, increase our capital and use it more fully, and maintain our scientific advance, include:

First. Monetary and fiscal policies that permit money demand to grow in line with supply.

Second. Measures to reduce the instability of output, especially the management of our defense orders in such a manner that they do not cause serious instability in the economy.

Third. Greater reliance on fiscal policy so that monetary policy will not have to carry so much of the burden to achieve any desired restraint on total money demand. This means that we should aim for higher budget surpluses during periods of prosperity and a lower level of interest rates than have been achieved in recent years.

Fourth. A comprehensive program for promoting the productivity of the labor force, for technical progress, and for facilitating the introduction of new technology. This program should—

(a) Provide Federal aid to education, without Federal control, particularly for those States with a large school-age population and poor financial resources.

(b) Provide a national scholarship program.

(c) Strengthen Federal programs of medical research and of vocational rehabilitation.

(d) Strengthen the private and public apprenticeship programs.

(e) Continue and increase support of scientific research, especially basic research, even in the event that the strictly military needs for advancement in science diminish.

(f) Set up national productivity centers for raising productivity in the low-wage, low-productivity industries and services in the economy.

(g) Encourage those institutions of collective bargaining that allow for the introduction of new technology and which promote an equitable sharing of the inevitable social costs of technological change.

(h) Provide unemployment benefits and retraining for workers laid off because of technological change, with benefits related to seniority.

(i) Establish special programs for the rehabilitation of depressed areas.

In addition, we should—

Fifth. Reorder the priorities in Federal Government expenditures to place greater emphaiss on those activities which contribute to growth, such as education, research, and health programs, and reduce subsidies for agriculture and business, and prune wasteful Government activities.

Sixth. Reform the Federal tax system to make it fairer, less obstructive to economic growth, and more productive of revenue.

Seventh. Revise monetary policy so that we may have a growth in the money supply in line with the growth in total output and increase the effectiveness of monetary action.

Eighth. Put greater reliance, to the extent possible, on selective policies which will curb excess demands in certain industries without causing general unemployment.

Ninth. Carry out a more vigorous and more effective antitrust policy and, first, attempt to restrain groups that possess market power by voluntary methods; and, second, take whatever steps in the way of hearings and factfinding that may prove necessary.

Tenth. Reduce tariffs gradually.

Eleventh. Revise our farm policy, including more research to find new uses for farm products.

Twelfth. Improve our foreign trade position.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION MOST IMPORTANT

Of these recommendations, Federal aid to education is the most important for raising the long-term rate of growth. This should be done without Federal control over the content of what is taught, the salaries or promotion of teachers, tenure, discipline, or any other feature which historically has been controlled by the local authorities. Historically, increases in productivity account, so many students of the subject believe, for two-thirds of our total increase in output, with only one-third due to increases in the sheer amounts of labor and capital. The rise in productivity must be traced back to the improving skills of the labor force, to improvements in technology, and to better organization of production. Education plays a crucial role in each of these fields.

The untapped potential of further investment in education remains great. For example, a recent study found that 60 percent of students in the top quarter of ability in high school do not go to college. Many cannot afford to go. Religion, race, sex, and place of residence also keep some from attending college. Lack of motivation and the inadequacy of the high schools also are factors.

A large fraction of our labor force even today is the product of poor school systems. Expenditures per pupil vary

enomously among States, and even more among school districts. Average expenditure per pupil in the top 12 States was $429 in 1958–59, and only $216 in the bottom 12 States. Yet the poorer States spend a greater fraction of their income on education. The large differences result both from the differences in income and from the fact that the poorer States have a larger fraction of their population of school age.

With the rising demands for skill and training from an ever more complex technology, we must strengthen our weaker school systems, and make sure that all of our people have the opportunity and the encouragement to develop their talents fully. Federal aid to education is a necessary step to accomplish this aim.

THE RECORD

GROWTH

Since 1890 the economy of the country as measured by the expansion of the gross national product has grown at the rate of 3.2 percent per year.

I wish to say that we are emphasizing the gross national product, not the volume of industrial production, which is that derived from mining and manufacturing, and we are reducing the figures on the gross national product to dollars of constant purchasing power. For the benefit of Senators, I have on the floor a chart, which shows the actual rate of growth and the potential rate of growth. It will be seen how much the depression of the 1930's cost the American people. From 1890 to 1919 the rate of growth was 3.5 percent, and from 1919 to 1959 it was 2.9 percent.

This lower rate of growth was largely due to the severity of the depression of the 1930's.

Even with the slow growth rates of the great depression, the last 60 years have seen a growth rate of over 3 percent per year on the average.

At the end of World War II there was an inevitable decline in the rate of growth. Growth resumed, however, in 1947, was then interrupted by the recession of 1949, and then continued at a very high rate—in part because of the Korean conflict—through 1952. For the period, 1947–53, the average rate of growth was 4.6 percent in terms of the gross national product.

Since then growth has been very much slower—2.3 percent a year, on the average, or only half the rate from 1947 to 1953. Some members of the minority seem to be very sensitive about the choice of these years, and imply that we should not have made the comparison between the years 1947–53, when a Democratic administration was in power, and the years 1953–59, when a Republican administration was in power. We chose those years not because of any difference in political leadership but because it was in 1953 that the growth rate began to slow down. If those facts have political implications, let the chips fall where they may.

Even when we allow for the expected further expansion in 1960, the average growth of output over the previous and the present business cycle will be below the longrun historical average. It will be even further below the growth of our potential capacity.

I may say, in this connection, that the President's economic report covers up this sharp difference between the record for the years 1947–53, on the one hand, and the years 1953–59 on the other. The President's report, at page 1, takes the 14 years since the passage of the Employment Act and says that the growth has been at the rate of 3.2 percent a year. That is correct. But the average rate of 3.2 percent is the result of an average of 4.6 percent for the years 1947–53 and only 2.3 percent for the years 1953–59. So the President's Council of Economic Advisers has been somewhat disingenuous in covering up the decrease in the rate of growth in the last 6 years by taking the average rate for the period as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparative table showing rates of growth by varying periods.

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

TABLE 2.—*Comparative rates of growth of gross national product in the United States by varying periods* [1]

Periods	GNP in constant 1958 dollars	GNP per person	GNP per person engaged in production	GNP per unweighted man-hour
1890–1959	3.2	1.6	[2] 1.4	[3] 2.3
1890–1919	3.5	2.2	1.2	1.9
1919–59	2.9	1.2	[2] 1.6	[3] 2.6
1919–47	2.6	1.1	1.4	2.4
1947–53	4.6	2.5	2.6	4.1
1953–59	[4] 2.3	[4] .6	[2] 1.8	[3] 2.6

[1] Sources: All data for 1890–1919 and gross national product per person engaged in production for all years are from "Productivity Trends in the United States," a study by Dr. John Kendrick for the National Bureau of Economic Research, now in process of preparation. Data used by courtesy of the bureau. Gross national product and GNP per person, 1919–58, U.S. Department of Commerce. GNP per unweighted man-hour, Fabricant, "Basic Facts on Productivity Change," hearings, vol. II, table A. Figures are all rates of change between annual figures.

[2] Series ends with 1958.

[3] Series ends with 1957.

[4] 1959 dollars. It would be 2.4 in 1954 or in 1958 dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent also to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table prepared by the Committee for Economic Development, which produces geometrically the growth rates from 1910 to 1959.

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

TABLE 5.—*U.S. average annual growth rates, 1909–59*

[Percent]

Terminal year	Initial year																								
	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933
1910	2.6																								
1911	2.6	2.5																							
1912	3.7	4.3	6.0																						
1913	3.0	3.1	3.4	0.8																					
1914	1.5	1.2	.8	−1.7	−4.2																				
1915	1.1	.8	.4	−1.4	−3.4	−0.9																			
1916	2.1	2.0	1.8	.8	.8	3.5	7.7																		
1917	1.8	1.7	1.6	.7	.7	2.4	4.0	0.4																	
1918	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.6	4.3	6.1	5.2	10.3																
1919	2.4	2.4	2.4	1.9	2.1	3.4	4.4	3.4	4.9	−0.2															
1920	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.9	2.4	1.1	1.4	−2.8	−5.3														
1921	.8	.7	.5	−.1	−.2	.4	.5	−.9	−1.2	−4.7	−6.9	−8.5													
1922	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.4	1.5	2.2	2.6	1.8	2.0	.1	.2	3.0	15.9												
1923	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.5	3.2	3.7	3.2	3.6	2.3	3.0	5.9	13.9	12.0											
1924	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.9	3.3	2.7	3.1	1.9	2.4	4.4	9.0	5.8	−0.1										
1925	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.4	3.8	3.4	3.8	2.8	3.4	5.2	8.9	6.7	4.1	8.6									
1926	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.6	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.2	3.7	5.3	8.3	6.4	4.6	7.1	5.6								
1927	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.5	2.8	3.2	4.5	6.8	5.1	3.4	4.6	2.7	−0.2							
1928	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.4	3.0	3.3	2.6	2.9	4.0	5.9	4.3	2.9	3.6	2.0	.3	0.8						
1929	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.8	3.3	3.6	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.2	4.2	5.9	4.5	3.3	4.1	3.0	2.1	3.3	5.8					
1930	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.4	1.8	2.0	2.7	4.1	2.7	1.4	1.7	.3	−.9	−1.2	−2.1	−9.5				
1931	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.8	2.0	1.6	1.7	1.1	1.2	1.8	2.9	1.6	.3	.4	−.9	−2.2	−2.7	−3.8	−8.3	−7.0			
1932	1.0	.9	.8	.6	.6	.8	.9	.5	.5	−.2	−.1	.3	1.1	−.2	−1.5	−1.7	−3.1	−4.4	−5.3	−6.7	−10.6	−11.1	−15.0		
1933	.8	.7	.7	.4	.4	.6	.7	.3	.3	−.3	−.3	.1	.8	−.5	−1.6	−1.8	−3.0	−4.2	−4.8	−5.9	−8.6	−8.4	−9.0	−2.7	
1934	1.1	1.1	1.0	.8	.8	1.1	1.2	.8	.8	.3	.3	.7	1.4	.3	−.7	−.7	−1.7	−2.6	−2.9	−3.5	−5.3	−4.2	−3.3	3.2	9.4
1935	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.3	1.3	.8	.9	1.3	2.1	1.1	.2	.2	−.6	−1.2	−1.4	−1.7	−2.8	−1.5	0	5.5	9.9
1936	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.5	1.6	2.0	2.8	1.9	1.2	1.3	.6	.1	.2	.1	−.7	.9	2.5	7.4	11.0
1937	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.0	2.1	1.7	1.8	2.3	3.0	2.2	1.5	1.6	1.0	.7	.7	.7	.1	1.6	3.1	7.1	9.7
1938	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.9	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.4	1.5	1.9	2.5	1.7	1.1	1.2	.6	.2	.2	.2	−.4	.8	1.9	5.1	6.7
1939	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.1	1.7	1.8	2.2	2.8	2.1	1.5	1.6	1.1	.8	.9	.9	.4	1.6	2.7	5.5	6.9
1940	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.0	2.1	2.5	3.1	2.4	1.9	2.0	1.6	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.1	2.3	3.3	5.9	7.2
1941	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.7	3.1	3.7	3.1	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.3	3.4	4.5	6.9	8.2
1942	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.5	4.1	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.0	4.1	5.2	7.5	8.6
1943	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.8	4.4	3.9	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.6	4.6	5.7	7.8	8.9

TABLE 5.—*U.S. average annual growth rates, 1909–59*—Continued

[Percent]

Terminal year	Initial year																							
	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933
1944	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.9	4.5	4.0	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.8	4.8	5.8	5.8	8.7
1945	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.7	4.3	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.5	4.4	5.3	7.0	7.9
1946	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.8	3.2	3.7	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.6	3.4	4.2	5.7	6.4
1947	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.5	3.1	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.5	3.2	3.9	5.3	5.9
1948	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.5	3.3	3.9	5.2	5.8
1949	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.0	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.4	3.1	3.7	4.9	5.4
1950	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.6	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.7	3.4	3.9	5.1	5.6
1951	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.5	4.1	5.2	5.7
1952	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.5	4.1	5.1	5.6
1953	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.6	4.1	5.1	5.5
1954	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.2	3.5	3.2	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.4	3.8	4.8	5.1
1955	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.9	5.3
1956	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.9	4.8	5.1
1957	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.2	3.6	3.3	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.8	4.7	5.0
1958	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.6	4.4	4.7
1959	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.7	4.5	4.8

Terminal year	Initial year																								
	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
1910																									
1911																									
1912																									
1913																									
1914																									
1915																									
1916																									
1917																									
1918																									
1919																									
1920																									
1921																									
1922																									
1923																									
1924																									
1925																									
1926																									
1927																									
1928																									
1929																									
1930																									
1931																									
1932																									
1933																									
1934																									
1935	10.4																								
1936	11.9	13.3																							
1937	9.8	9.5	5.9																						
1938	6.0	4.6	.5	−4.6																					
1939	6.4	5.5	3.0	1.6	8.1																				
1940	6.8	6.1	4.4	3.9	8.4	8.7																			
1941	8.0	7.7	6.6	6.7	10.8	12.1	15.7																		
1942	8.5	8.3	7.5	7.8	11.1	12.1	13.9	12.1																	
1943	8.8	8.6	8.0	8.3	11.2	11.9	13.0	11.6	11.2																
1944	8.7	8.5	7.9	8.2	10.5	10.9	11.5	10.1	9.1	7.1															
1945	7.7	7.5	6.8	6.9	8.7	8.8	8.8	7.2	5.6	2.9	−1.2														
1946	6.1	5.7	5.0	4.9	6.2	5.9	5.4	3.5	1.4	−1.8	−5.7	−10.0													
1947	5.6	5.2	4.5	4.4	5.5	5.1	4.6	2.9	1.1	−1.2	−3.8	−5.2	−0.1												
1948	5.5	5.1	4.5	4.3	5.3	5.0	4.5	3.0	1.6	−.2	−2.0	−2.3	1.9	3.8											
1949	5.1	4.7	4.1	4.0	4.8	4.5	4.0	2.6	1.3	−.2	−1.6	−1.7	1.2	1.8	−0.1										
1950	5.3	5.0	4.4	4.3	5.1	4.8	4.5	3.3	2.2	1.0	0	.3	3.0	4.1	4.2	8.7									
1951	5.5	5.2	4.6	4.5	5.3	5.0	4.7	3.7	2.8	1.8	1.0	1.4	3.9	4.9	5.3	8.1	7.4								
1952	5.3	5.1	4.6	4.5	5.1	4.9	4.6	3.7	2.8	2.0	1.3	1.7	3.8	4.6	4.8	6.5	5.4	3.4							
1953	5.3	5.0	4.5	4.5	5.1	4.9	4.6	3.7	3.0	2.2	1.7	2.0	3.9	4.6	4.7	6.0	5.1	3.9	4.4						
1954	4.9	4.7	4.2	4.1	4.7	4.4	4.1	3.3	2.6	1.9	1.3	1.6	3.2	3.7	3.6	4.4	3.4	2.0	1.3	−1.6					
1955	5.1	4.8	4.4	4.3	4.9	4.7	4.4	3.6	3.0	2.4	1.9	2.3	3.7	4.2	4.3	5.0	4.3	3.5	3.6	3.2	8.1				
1956	4.9	4.7	4.3	4.2	4.7	4.5	4.3	3.5	2.9	2.3	2.0	2.2	3.6	4.0	4.0	4.6	3.9	3.2	3.2	2.8	5.1	2.1			
1957	4.8	4.6	4.2	4.1	4.6	4.4	4.1	3.4	2.9	2.3	1.9	2.2	3.4	3.8	3.8	4.2	3.6	3.0	2.9	2.6	4.0	2.0	1.8		
1958	4.5	4.3	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.7	3.1	2.5	2.0	1.6	1.9	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.5	2.9	2.2	2.0	1.6	2.4	.5	−.2	−2.3	
1959	4.6	4.4	4.0	3.9	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.3	2.8	2.3	2.0	2.2	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.8	3.3	2.8	2.6	2.4	3.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	7.0

NOTE.—Figures in this table show the average annual compounded rates of change between any 2 years in the period from 1909 to 1959. To obtain the annual rate of change between any 2 years, find the column for the initial year at the top of the table and read the figure in the row of that column opposite the terminal year shown at the left. The growth rates are based on the real gross national product expressed in 1954 dollars.

SOURCE: This table was made available by the Committee for Economic Development.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The movements in total output per capita show a similar pattern. However, because population growth continues at a more steady rate than output, a decline in the growth of total output has a magnified effect on the growth of output per person. Thus its increase, which had been 2.5 percent from 1947 to 1953, was only 0.6 percent in the last 6 years.

Total output per person engaged in production has increased in a somewhat more even pattern. This is because the total number of people working rises less in periods of slow growth. Thus, growth in output per capita, which had been 2.5 percent from 1947 to 1953, was only 0.6 percent in the last 3 years. In other words, halving the total rate of growth produced a quartering in the total rate of growth per capita, which is extremely significant.

Gross national product per unweighted man-hour, a crude measure of productivity, has risen at a longrun average rate of 2.3 percent a year. Since 1919, the average has been 2.6 percent. In the early postwar period, when the country's capital stock was being modernized after a long period of deferral, and when demand was very strong, this figure rose at a rate of 4.1 percent. From 1953 to 1957, the most recent period for which comparable data are available, it has returned to the average rate since 1919, an annual gain of 2.6 percent.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

The recent growth record of the American economy contrast with that of most of the advanced economies of the world. The rate of increase of output was much larger elsewhere. In the OEEC countries of Europe as a whole, gross national product rose at a rate of 4.6 percent for the period 1950–57, the

most recent dates for which comparable figures are available. Industrial production, which differs from gross national product, rose at a rate of 4.4 percent in this country from 1950–57, rose at 6.2 percent in OEEC countries. Economic growth in the Soviet Union has been at an even higher rate, with total output growing at approximately 7 percent.

We have had conflicting estimates of the growth of the Soviet economy. A special committee of the Joint Economic Committee has been studying this question and has been producing excellent studies and figures. But I do not believe anyone will question the fact that probably Mr. Allen Dulles, the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, knows more about this subject than does anyone else; and I do not believe our friends across the aisle can question his devotion to the tenets and perpetuation in office of the Republican Party.

As everyone knows, he is the brother of the late Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. Mr. Allen Dulles, in testimony before the subcommittee which dealt with this subject, estimated the average Russian rate of growth in recent years as 7 percent. That is almost three times the rate of growth of the American economy during this period; in fact, it is three times the rate of growth of the American economy, our rate of growth being 2.3 percent.

We have a head start on Western Europe, and a still greater headstart on the Soviet Union, but they have been growing at a very much faster rate than we are running.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table which presents these statistics in tabular form.

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

United States of America compared with other advanced countries—Annual average growth rates

	United States of America [1]	Canada	All member countries OEEC	France	Germany	Italy	United Kingdom	Sweden
Industrial production: 1950–57	4.4	5.4	6.2	6.6	10.7	8.5	3.0	3.3
Real GNP at market price (1954 prices and exchange rates): 1950–57	3.6	4.4	4.6	4.7	8.0	5.8	2.4	3.3

[1] From FRB Index, revised, and "U.S. Income and Output," U.S. Department of Commerce.

Sources: Industrial production and GNP figures from OEEC statistical bulletins, except for United States of America figures.

REASONS FOR SLOW GROWTH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the slow rate of growth of the last 6 years is a serious matter. While some slowdown from the very high rates of the early fifties was to be expected, the severity of the slowdown was unnecessary, and much of the blame rests with the Federal policies that were pursued.

First, Federal policies helped to bring about the two recessions, which were the main causes of the retarded growth. Sudden changes in defense orders clearly helped to trigger both of the downturns—as they also did in the downturn of 1949—because orders were cut clumsily and without offsetting fiscal measures which would have let civilian private and public spending grow.

Second, when the signs of recession became clear, we did not take sufficiently prompt action to halt and reverse the declines.

Third, monetary policy, which under the leadership of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. William McChesney Martin, became progressively more restrictive over the period, kept the supply of credit too tight.

This had its main effect on residential construction. In much of the period the industry was capable of building more houses than the supply of credit allowed. It also had some effect on investment spending by small business, State and local governments, public utilities, and private business generally, and through its effects on personal incomes, on consumption as well.

The overall effect of these policies was to let total demand grow at a lower rate than the rate at which capacity was expanding.

When I say total demand, I mean, of course, the total monetary demand.

From 1953 to 1959, industrial capacity grew by approximately 30 percent, but industrial output by only 15 percent. Thus production remained below our potential output in most of the period.

THE MINORITY VIEW ON GROWTH

The minority report complains that our figure of potential growth as high as 4.5 percent per year is "phony"—page 78.

While they assert this, they offer no evidence to support it. In fact, they take an amazingly defeatist attitude. We did this well from 1947 to 1954. The Western allies are doing even better. The Russians, according to Mr. Allen Dulles, as I have said, are expanding at a 7-percent rate.

During the present administration, the economy has failed to grow even at a 3-percent rate over the period of 7 years in which they have been in power.

But it is true that in the past 6 years the economy has grown at only half the rate it grew in the preceding 6 years.

The President's Economic Report tries to obscure this failure by using figures starting with 1946 and 1947 which show that since then we have grown at slightly more than the historical average. This is true. But it is only true because of the rate of 4.6 percent between 1947 and 1953 as contrasted with a 2.3-percent growth since 1953. In other words, the economy has grown at half the rate in the last 6 years as it did in the preceding 6 years.

They may be satisfied with a 2.3-percent rate, but we are not. We suspect that the minority attacks the 4.5-percent potential because they are unwilling to take the steps which are needed to bring it about.

So much for the growth in the gross national product. What about employment? I have had placed in the rear of the Senate Chamber a chart for the benefit of Senators.

EMPLOYMENT

The general level of unemployment now appears to be higher both in good periods and in recession periods than it has been previously in the postwar years.

In the prosperous periods of 1956 and 1957, average unemployment was 4.2 and 4.3 percent, respectively. This compares with figures of 3.1 and 2.9 percent in 1952 and 1953, and with 3.9 and 3.8 percent in 1947 and in 1948.

In other words, on the whole, the average percentage of unemployment in 1956 and 1957, even including the recession at the latter part of the year, and even prior to the recession at the later part of the year, was 1 percent higher than it had been in 1951 and 1952. Then came a second recession and revival. The figure for 1959 was 5.5 percent, more than 2 percent higher than it had been in the previous revival periods of 1951 and 1952. Thus, in roughly comparable good periods unemployment levels are now higher.

In the recession year of 1958, average unemployment was 6.8 percent. This compares with 5.6 percent in 1954 and 5.9 percent in 1949. While there were individual months in the 1949 recession when the specific unemployment figure was as high as or higher than in the most recent one, there is no question that we are now experiencing a generally higher level of unemployment in both good and bad periods than at any time since World War II.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force, by quarters, with seasonally adjusted annual rates, 1946–59, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force, by quarters, seasonally adjusted annual rates, 1946–59

Year and quarter	Unemployment rate
	Percent
1946—1st	4.7
2d	4.2
3d	3.6
4th	3.4
Total	3.9
1947—1st	3.8
2d	4.1
3d	4.1
4th	3.7
Total	3.9
1948—1st	3.8
2d	3.7
3d	3.7
4th	4.0
Total	3.8

Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force, by quarters, seasonally adjusted annual rates, 1946–59—Continued

Year and quarter	Unemployment rate
	Percent
1949—1st	4.7
2d	5.8
3d	6.5
4th	7.1
Total	5.9
1950—1st	6.5
2d	5.6
3d	4.6
4th	4.2
Total	5.3
1951—1st	3.5
2d	3.2
3d	3.2
4th	3.4
Total	3.3
1952—1st	3.1
2d	3.1
3d	3.2
4th	2.8
Total	3.1
1953—1st	2.7
2d	2.7
3d	2.7
4th	3.7
Total	2.9
1954—1st	5.3
2d	5.7
3d	5.9
4th	5.4
Total	5.6
1955—1st	4.8
2d	4.4
3d	4.2
4th	4.2
Total	4.4
1956—1st	4.1
2d	4.3
3d	4.2
4th	4.1
Total	4.2
1957—1st	4.1
2d	4.1
3d	4.3
4th	4.9
Total	4.3
1958—1st	6.5
2d	7.2
3d	7.4
4th	6.3
Total	6.8
1959—1st	6.0
2d	5.0
3d	5.4
4th	5.6
Total	5.5

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these figures do not include the involuntary part-time unemployed. Two men each working only half time are the equivalent of one man fully unemployed. The full-time equivalent unemployment of those who are only allowed to work part time was 1 million persons in November of 1958 and 0.998 million in December 1959, or, for all intents and purposes, a million in both cases. In general, the full-time equivalent of those who work part time would add another 1 percent to the unemployment rate in good times and about 1.5 percent in periods of recession. Thus in a period like the third quarter of 1958, when the full-time unemployment rate was 7.4 percent, the rate when the part-time involuntary workers were included would be 8.5 to 9 percent.

With these changes in employment conditions, there has been a trend toward a lower rate of increase in productivity—see table above. To a substantial extent this can be traced to the changes in the use of the civilian labor force. A pronounced shift has occurred from employment of production workers in manufacturing to employment in services, that is, from relatively high productivity to lower productivity uses.

To a significant extent, this weakening of the employment situation is another reflection of public policies pursued since 1953. The slow growth in total monetary demand after 1955 served to reduce employment demands in manufacturing industries and to encourage the shift of labor from these industries to services. Had more expansionary fiscal and monetary policies been followed in 1956 and 1957, the overall unemployment rate would have been lower and productivity would have been greater.

THE BEHAVIOR OF PRICES

When we examine prices since the end of World War II, we note that the major increases we have had have come in a relatively few years of the period. This is true for both the wholesale and the consumer price index.

In order to interpret these movements of the price indexes, their limitations must be kept in mind. The failure of the indexes to reflect changes in quality and the methods of introducing new products give some upward bias to these indexes. These biases are not sufficient to explain away all of the increase in the index. But it should be stressed that small changes in the indexes, on the order of 1 percent a year, fall within the margin of statistical error.

The first increase in prices, or inflation, came in the period 1946–48, and was the result of a limited supply of consumer goods against which an excessive amount of liquid funds was used to bid up prices. The consumer price level rose about 19 points in the period. At least some of these increases were inevitable, but some of the blame must also lie with those who advocated and put through a hasty abandonment of controls which, while not necessary or desirable in normal periods, are quite properly necessary in war and immediate post-war periods.

From 1948 to 1950 prices were again stable, but with the beginning of the Korean war, they rose once again. There was an increase in the Consumer Price Index between 1950 and 1952 of 10.6 points, from 102.8 to 113.5. Wholesale prices, however, declined during the second half of 1952—at a time when retail prices were rising slowly—and probably from June, and possibly from April, on, the composite of the two price levels was constant, that is, if one takes the wholesale and consumer price indexes together and strikes an average of the two.

Even so, from late 1951 through 1955, the Consumer Price Index was as stable as any period in our recent history. The figure for 1952 was 113.5 and that for 1955 was 114.5—or only 1 point in 3 years.

Yet, this was the very period—beginning in 1953 following over a year of stable prices—that the new administration and Mr. George Humphrey started their fight on inflation. The result of this and other policies was the recession of 1953–54.

In the 1955 to 1958 period—perhaps I should more accurately define that as 1955 to July of 1957—prices again rose. The index was 114.5 in 1955 and 123.5 in 1958, an increase of 9 points in a little more than 2 years. The period 1955–57 was again a period when monetary demand was dampened down by tight money. Inflation was not only fought in 1955 and 1956, but the tightness continued until October 1957, some 2 months after the recession had actually begun and some 10 months after the signs that the 1955–56 boom had lost its forward motion, because the index of production was not rising during this period. It was falling slightly. The point is that tight money in the period of 1955 to 1957 did not stop inflation.

For the last year and a half at least, prices have again been as stable as any period in modern history. Yet, beginning in November of 1958, after the Republican disaster at the polls, the administration and the monetary authorities, backed up by the great metropolitan Republican newspapers and the insurance companies, began a powerful campaign against inflation. This has been going on now for some 14 months; yet it has thus far been a period when price rises have been within the statistical margins of error of the indexes. At the same time, unemployment has been excessive and our growth rate has been inadequate.

If one looks at the wholesale price index, it is at exactly the same level as of December 1959 as it was in January of 1958—namely, at 118.9.

In other words, in 23 months the wholesale price index has remained steady. The present level of the index is in fact below the average for 1958 and only 1.3 percent above 1957.

I was especially pleased to note that the minority in their views in our report claim—page 80—that "except for the period from early 1956 to early 1958, the Consumer Price Index has been remarkably stable—since President Eisenhower took office."

We are glad to welcome them to the fold. I have been saying this for several years, and have been charged with trying to cover up the inflation which has allegedly existed. But we must ask the question, if all this is true—and it is true—"What, then, is all the hullabaloo about? Why are we having tight money, high interest rates, budget cuts, and committees and propaganda to fight an inflation which they admit does not now exist?"

Incidentally, this hullabaloo about inflation has made investors become concerned about the future purchasing power of Government bonds, has sent up the prices of stocks, and has discouraged investment in Government bonds, because the people feared that there would be a diminishing purchasing power of

the bond principal. Consequently, this fear has resulted in diminishing prices of Government bonds, then the lowered prices of Government bonds, and the increase in interest rates, partially induced by the propaganda claiming the existence of a nonexistent inflation, is used as an excuse for further increasing the interest rates and further tightening the money supply.

This admission from the minority is a devastating one and cuts the ground from underneath the administration's negative policies which have slowed down growth, increased unemployment, and which have resisted all attempts to provide both adequate defense and needed public services such as schools, slum clearance, hospitals, aid to depressed areas, and the other programs so necessary if our economy is to grow in line with the increase in our population and our potential production and of our responsibilities both at home and abroad.

What we did in our report was to analyze the kind of inflation which we had really had. We found that the inflation in the period 1955–57 could not be accounted for by excessive monetary demand or by the classical expression of "too much money chasing too few goods."

Rather, it was accounted for by a series of other factors. Three fundamental factors account for this inflation of recent years.

First. Inflation has been a byproduct of instability of output. Business investment has come in rapid surges. This has led to excess demands and rising prices in the capital goods industries. Consumer investment in durable goods has also come in sudden bursts, particularly in the first year of recovery after recession. Besides directly leading to price increases, these surges led to very rapid increases in profits which formed the basis for relatively large long-term wage settlements. Business was also encouraged to incur large fixed capital, research, and administrative costs by the sharp upswing of 1955. When total demand failed to grow in accordance with the optimistic expectations established in 1955, business found itself with a higher level of overhead costs which served to raise unit costs.

Second. Concentrations of market power have also contributed to inflation. The history of price increases in steel, the ability of many industries to pass on higher overhead costs even in the absence of excess demands, and the failure of prices to fall in the recession periods, are three clear instances of the influence of market power on the price level.

Third. The prices of services, which loom particularly large among consumer prices, rose steadily through the postwar period. The rise in service prices is due partly to the fact that these sectors have lower productivity increases than the average of the economy. In addition, in some areas, particularly in the case of medical care, the imbalance between demand and supply has continued to worsen.

I would say, a very large portion of the increase in the Consumer Price Index is due solely to the increase in the price of services, of which the increase in the cost of medical service has been the greatest, being well over 50 percent above the 1947–49 base. Tight money does not help that situation in the slightest degree.

The policies pursued by the Federal Government were on the whole poorly suited to deal effectively with the specific kinds of inflationary pressures in recent years. These policies were of a type that is effective in curbing an inflation stemming from generally excessive money demand. This did not work. The actual increase in money demand was low. The principal inflationary forces were the strong shifts in demand among industries, the concentration of market power, and the low productivity and the inadequate supply of services. The attempt to restrain total demand by the Federal Reserve System brought unemployment and a low growth of total output, while it did not stop the upward movement of prices over the period.

The programs we should have to deal with this kind of inflation differ fundamentally from those pursued by the administration and the Federal Reserve. To meet this kind of inflation and to get at the root causes, the Government should pursue a vigorous antitrust policy against those industries which exercise market power. If this were done the demands of labor in those industries would be less, for the industries would be more competitive and the excessive profit margins which led to high labor demands, especially in 1955, would consequently be less. Our industry must be made more competitive.

In addition, our program should also carry with it the gradual lowering of tariffs for foreign competition in these market-power industries can bring a lessening of the inflationary impact of their pricing methods.

Furthermore, the economy must continue to grow at a high level. This would mean that fewer people would transfer from the high-productivity manufacturing industries into the low-productivity service industries. When industry is not operating at or near full capacity, as in recent years, then labor seeks employment in the less-productive areas of the economy. This has brought a general lowering of productivity, an increase in unit costs of services, and rise in prices. In fact, the bulk of the increases in the Consumer Price Index can be accounted for by an increase in the price of services.

Moreover, in many areas, of which medical costs are the single most important, the inflation has been caused by a shortage of supply of these services. This requires the building of more medical schools and hospitals and training a greater number of competent doctors.

The administration, has, on the other hand, done just the opposite. It fights inflation by cutting back on the services we need. This in turn means a shortage of supply, and prices rise. In these areas, inflation can be offset only by providing an increase in the supply of the services, as well as by improving their efficiency.

Now that we have analyzed the true nature of the recent inflation, we find that our Republican friends say that it does not exist and criticize us for exaggerating its importance. The real reason they have done this is that they are unwilling to fight the kind of inflation which we actually have.

Of course, we should realize that the stability of the general price level has been purchased at the expense of a great fall in the prices of products on the farm. Prices of services have gone up. Prices of consumers' goods have gone up. The general price level has been kept steady in large part because of the great price decline which the farmers have suffered.

Having fought the wrong battles at the wrong time with the wrong weapons, the minority is now unwilling to fight the right battles at the right time with the right weapons.

We believe that the main reason for this is that if they are to fight the real battles, they will have to do something about the excessive market power which is exercised by the big business community. They will have to help build hospitals and schools. Interest rates would have to come down and monetary policies would have to be eased.

Once again let me say, if the price stability record is as good as our Republican friends say it is, what is all the shouting about?

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I should like to tell the Senator I have heard every word he has said. Once again let me say that I am very much impressed and informed by his excellent speech. I was imprisoned in the Presiding Officer's chair, and hence was unable to engage in the colloquy. It was a most frustrating experience, but at long last I have an opportunity to ask two or three questions. I will make them as concise and brief as I can.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the table on unemployment, the Senator points out that there are only a few periods in which unemployment has exceeded that of 1959, the year ended last month.

I should like to ask the Senator if it is true—it seems to me it is—that there were only 4 years of the past 14—and all of those have been since World War II, of course, in which the average level of unemployment has been as high as it was in 1959.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1949 unemployment was 5.9 percent. That was a year of recession.

In 1954 it was 5.6 percent, or slightly higher than 1959.

In 1958 it was 6.8 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What of 1950?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The figure was slightly lower than in 1959, namely, 5.3 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What about the first quarter of 1950?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We were speaking of annual average rates. Now this is interesting. In 1959, a period of so-called recovery, we had a percentage of unemployment as high as during the previous postwar recession periods.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly. That is the point I wanted to stress. The whole case for the minority has been that excessive demand for products made it necessary to adopt stringent money policies, policies of a tight budget, and so forth; but the Senator from Illinois is emphasizing very well in the table and in his remarks that this has been a period of excessive supply of service. Labor is very heavily unemployed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Compared with the most recent experience, since 1946, 1959 was a very, very bad year. Yet all during 1959, as I understand, the Federal Reserve was following a policy of tight money, and the President was emphasizing over and over and over again the dangers of inflation caused by excessive demand for products and a deficiency in their supply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. We never heard very much from the administration about the high volume of unemployment.

We should remember that, if we include the involuntary part-time unemployed, as most students of this subject believe we should, the actual rate would be increased by 1 percent or more, so that the average for the year would be 6.5 percent or more. We do not hear much about that.

Prices were relatively steady but the Federal Reserve and the administration believed in a policy of contraction at a time when we had underutilization of labor and underutilization of capital.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Illinois that involuntary unemployment did rise in 1959 as compared with the earlier years?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. Does the Senator refer to involuntary part-time unemployment

Mr. PROXMIRE. Involuntary part-time unemployment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, it did not rise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It did not rise, compared to the period 1946 on?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In fact, it probably fell relative to the base, but at all times it would raise the total unemployment figure by from 1 to 1½ percent. It would raise the level by 1 percent in the so-called good times and by about 1½ percent in the recession periods.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to refer to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois with reference to the difference between the growth rate of the Soviet economy and our own growth rate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator from Illinois is making an extrmely useful distinction. We can talk about growth in this country and growth in the Soviet Union and simply rely on statistics which do not necessarily mean much. We might have a period of prosperity in which we sell many cars with tail fins.

I think the Senator added enormously to the quality of his presentation by emphasizing the educational aspects of the problem. What troubles me is that all reliable reports we have received relative to the Soviet Union, including the report by the U.S. Commissioner of Education himself, Lawrence Derthick, show that the Soviet Union is pouring two to three times as much of its resources into education as we are.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A larger portion of actual resources, or a larger percentage?

Mr. PROXMIRE. A larger proportion of resources, a larger percentage. The Soviets, therefore, are concentrating much of their resources and growth in the areas which are going to produce greater productivity and greater growth in the future.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator is completely correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Soviet figure of 7 percent compared to our 2.3 percent is likely to be even more threatening than it might appear simply by looking at the statistics.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I wish to make one point further. We are measuring growth in gross national product. In a democracy, I suppose almost inevitably, we tend to lay greater stress upon consumer goods than does a dictatorship, so that in the struggle for military strength, or comparative military strength, the picture on a relative basis may be even less favorable than is indicated by the comparative rates of 7 percent and 2.3 percent, respectively.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has stressed the fact that education is the heart of the problem which he is discussing. While he is making an economic analysis—a profound and very competent economic analysis—he is showing that assistance to education, providing more teachers and better qualified teachers, is extremely important in developing our own economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Our goal of a rate of growth of 4½ percent is most conservative, because it did not take into account the speedup in the rate of productivity which we could effect by devoting greater effort to the problem. We have merely projected the existing rate into the future.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The rate to which the Senator refers is the rate at which he says we can achieve growth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. That merely assumes that we continue the improvement in the quality of our work force at the same rate which has prevailed for the past 40 years.

However, if we should place greater emphasis on individual capacity, the rate of growth might be still greater. We have not taken that factor into account. So I believe our estimate is most conservative. If we grow at the rate of 4.5 percent, as compared with the Soviet rate of more than 7 percent, perhaps the Soviets will not be able to hold the 7-percent plus rate, and we shall maintain superiority for a longer period of time, and we could afford greater military expenditures to protect physical security than we otherwise could, in the hope that with the passage of time the Soviets may decide to live and let live, and not try to take over the world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Illinois that the analysis of the Soviet budget made by Mr. Dulles and others indicates that the Soviet Union is pouring a great amount of its resources into research?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As a result, we can expect from this investment, too, a very great increase in their productivity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me ask one further question with relation to what the Senator is discussing.

The Senator from Illinois points out that—

> Inflation was not only fought in 1955 and 1956, but the tightness continued until October 1957, some 2 months after the recession had actually begun and some 10 months after the signs that the 1955–56 boom had lost its forward motion. The point is that tight money in this period did not stop inflation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It not only did not stop inflation, but the Federal Reserve Board made the egregious error of raising the interest rate in August 1957, just as the economy began to go into a tailspin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has certainly not been a dogmatist on monetary policy. In fact, he was a critic of the policy during the previous administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. During the Truman administration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that during the very period when interest rates were rising, at the instigation of the Federal Reserve Board, business loans increased very substantially, and that it is a fair inference that such loans contributed very greatly to the capital goods inflation. There was an enormous expansion in capital goods during this period.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the classic situation, one would assume that a tight money policy would be effective in discouraging business from borrowing money to enable it to expand. However, it would seem that the policy was inadequate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; although, of course, the impact was unevenly distributed. I do not believe that a rise in interest rates affects the investment policy of big business, because it can expand in large part from its own surpluses and earnings. But it would affect, and decrease, the expansion of small business, and such other areas in the economy as homebuilding.

The more I go into the subject the more firmly convinced I become that a previous hunch which I had was probably correct; namely, that as we increase the interest rate in the attempt to choke off the total volume of money, we increase the velocity of money, due to the fact that bank balances are kept more liquid and inventories are turned over more rapidly, because the costs of holding inventories and borrowing are greater. Therefore, although the Reserve tries to check inflation from coming in the front door through an increase in the total money supply, it nevertheless comes in through the back door by reason of a change in velocity.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that at the very same time, at least in the time payment sector of the economy, which admittedly is limited, there is an inflation in connection with buying homes, buying cars, buying television sets, building schools and hospitals, and in financing the building of schools and hospitals? The interest rate constitutes a very great part of the cost of buying or building such things. So the policies of the Federal Reserve Board contributed to inflation, at least to this limited extent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. Whether business loans diminish or increase, the figures show the Senator to be correct.

In 1954 loans by all commercial banks amounted to $70.6 billion; in 1955, to $82.6 billion; in 1956, to $90.3 billion; and in 1957, to $93.9 billion, or a very real increase, at the time the Federal Reserve Board was tightening up the interest rate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The effort to restrict the business demand for limited resources apparently did not have a decisive effect. At least it did not stop the substantially sharp increase in business borrowing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. During this period the Federal Reserve Board was 100 percent wrong in virtually everything it did. Its record for this period is zero.

Generally, of course, tight money has a selective effect, in that it hits the small businessman, the homebuilder——

Mr. PROXMIRE. And community money to construct hospitals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It hits communities, local governments, State governments, and farmers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Illinois to one very significant observation during this period. I recall very well that the cost of living rose in April of 1959, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, because it was said that State and local taxes had increased, and it was said that the increase in State and local taxes was largely responsible for the increase in the cost of living in that month. Anyone who has paid any attention to the costs of municipalities and States these days knows that they must borrow to build schools, hospitals, streets, community buildings, and so forth, and that interest constitutes a very important part of their expenditures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the increase in those 2 months was approximately six-tenths of 1 percent—from 123.9 in April to 124.5 in June, which, incidentally, is about half the increase which has occurred during the past 20 months.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I recall, the Bureau of Labor Statistics highlighted this fact. It said that this was one of the most important elements—in fact, that there would not have been such a substantial increase had it not been for this feature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the administration wants to fight the real battles, it will have to do something about the excessive market power which is exercised by the big business communities. They will have to help build hospitals and schools. Interest rates would come down and monetary policies would have to be eased.

Once again let me say, if the price stability record is as good as our Republican friends say it is, what is all the shouting about?

THE FUTURE

From our studies we conclude that it is possible to achieve a high rate of economic growth and relatively full employment with a high degree of stability in the general level of prices. This can be done. It should be done.

These three main objectives must be carried out within the framework of a dynamic, free, competitive, private enterprise system. This means that there should be a minimum of restraint, from both public and private sources, on the freedom of entry into competitive business and on changes in demand and in our productive activity. It also means that there should be substantial equality in economic opportunity.

GROWTH POTENTIAL

We want to emphasize again that we do not advocate a high level of growth for its own sake. We are not for forced draft growth, as our report makes abundantly clear. We need to increase our growth rate in order to raise our standards of living, to meet our growing public responsibilities, and to improve our military position.

Our economy can grow at a rate as high as 4.5 percent per year without changing our economic system in any fundamental way. Even if the economy performs no better than in the past, except that we avoid stumbling into a serious depression similar to the 1930's, the rate of growth of the economy may be only as low as 3.5 percent a year. Thus there is a considerable range of potential growth rates even within a range of assumptions which exclude a serious and prolonged depression on the one hand and a forced draft economy on the other. Within this range, the rate of growth is subject to our own control through public and private economic policies.

This conclusion, arrived at by the committee staff in its report to the committee, presents a range of growth rates in which the lowest rate is higher than the average rate of increase in real output of about 3 percent per year, which was achieved over the past 50 years. Why is it that the future possibilities are significantly more optimistic than actual past achievements?

A large number of factors were considered in the staff analysis of our past growth, including: the rate and character of scientific progress; the proportion of output which is plowed back into capital assets; the average age of our capital assets and, hence, the extent to which the current capital stock embodies the most up-to-date technology; rising levels of educational attainment and health; the ratio of labor force to the population; changes in average number of hours worked per year per person employed; changes in the average degree of skill exhibited in managing productive activities; the degree of stimulation of advancement in efficiency from competition at home and abroad; a wide variety of considerations concerning the social and political environment in which the economy operates; and the availability of natural resources and their average quality. Some of these factors cannot be measured directly at the present time.

The staff analysis takes explicit quantitative account of available manhours—number of persons available for work multiplied by average hours of work per year—the ratio of the stock of capital to labor, and time, as a proxy for changes in managerial skill, technological progress, improvements in the health and education of labor force, etc., which increase our productive capacity each year even though they cannot be directly measured. Allowance was also made for the fact that an increase in the average age of the stock of capital tends to reduce potential output and a fall in the average age tends to increase potential output because the average age of the capital stock is an indirect measure of the degree to which the capital stock existing at any particular time incorporates the latest available technology. The time trend accounts for between one-half and two-thirds of the annual increase in the economy's capacity or potential output.

If we look at the future potentials developed by the staff, we find three main reasons for the fact that the growth rate in the future can be significantly higher than the economy has realized in the past:

First. The annual average rate of growth in the total labor force over the next 15 years is likely to range between 1.5 percent and 1.9 percent per year as compared to an average over the previous 50 years of about 1.4 percent. The growth of the population of working age, therefore, will cause a somewhat higher rate of growth in the future than the past 50-year average.

Second. The stock of private plant and equipment in constant prices is assumed to grow between 2.2 percent and 3.2 percent per year over the next 15 years compared to an average of about 2.2 percent per year over the preceding half century. It is notable that the average rate of increase over the past 50 years has been held down by the fact that between 1929 and 1939 there was very little growth in the stock of capital due to the low levels of investment during this decade.

Third. The average age of capital stock is assumed to remain constant or decline slightly over the next 15 years, whereas the average age of the capital stock actually increased over the preceding 50 years, reaching a peak during World War II and declining since that time. The average rate of increase over the entire 50-year period was about one-half of 1 percent a year, but over most of the period 1909–45—the rate of increase was slightly over 1 percent per year. Since an increase in the average age of the capital stock tends to retard the rate of growth, and a decline in the average age tends to stimulate the rate of growth, this factor will be a modest stimulant to the economy over the next

15 years, whereas it has been a restrictive influence over most of the preceding half century.

Selected indicators of economic growth potentials, 1959–75 [1]

[Percent increase per year] [2]

Indicator	Projected potential growth rates, 1959–75		
	A	B	C
Total labor force	1.9	1.7	1.5
Total employment, including the Armed Forces	[3] 1.9	[4] 1.7	[5] 1.5
Average annual hours of work	−.4	−.5	−.6
Total man-hours	1.6	1.2	.9
Stock of private plant and equipment in constant prices	3.2	2.7	2.2
Average age of capital stock	−.2	−.1	0
Gross national product in constant prices:			
From 1959, actual (preliminary estimate)	5.2	4.7	4.2
From 1959 potential	4.6	4.0	3.5

[1] Some rates of change in this table vary slightly from those given in the similar table 4–1, p. 101 of the "Staff Report on Employment Growth and Price Levels" because of the incorporation of later data and refinements of analysis not then available.

[2] Computed by compound interest formula, using initial and terminal years.

[3] Assumes 97 percent of the labor force employed in 1975.

[4] Assumes 96 percent of the labor force employed in 1975.

[5] Assumes 95 percent of the labor force employed in 1975.

These factors mean that we can have a rate of growth at least as good, if not slightly better, than in the past so long as deep or prolonged depressions are avoided, such as interrupted our growth in the past 50 years, namely between 1929 and 1939. On the other hand, if we take full advantage of the opportunities for growth provided by an economy which operates with only minor interruptions to its progress and adopt policies to mend this process of growth without producing inflation, then our economy would tend to grow at a significantly higher rate than in the past. Whether we attain these higher rates will depend on whether public and private economic policies are adopted which facilitate growth, and whether we avoid deep and prolonged interruptions to expansion.

EMPLOYMENT

This future growth can occur with full-time unemployment of 4 percent or less. Our calculations of a growth rate of 4.5 percent per year include a level of unemployment of 3 percent. However, our analysis shows that the direct effect of unemployment at 3 percent and at 4 percent is about two-hundredths of 1 percent in the growth rate. The major difference between the growth rates with unemployment at 3 percent and at 4 percent is due to changes in the other associated variables: the labor force, hours of work, and capital.

Our calculations were made on a most conservative basis. We are using the figure of 4.5 percent even though the calculations show that it might in fact be 4.6 or 4.7 percent. In addition, we have used the variable, time, as a proxy for increases in education, training, the decrease in frictional unemployment, and so forth, and have calculated these on the basis of the past record. If we do the things we have recommended, there should be a considerable improvement in the rate of education and training, the rate of decrease in frictional barriers to employment, the increase in competition in the ecenomy, the use of women, the aged, minority groups, and others whose labor is now used at a rate considerably less than its potential, and so forth, so that the growth rate would be in excess of our calculations.

It is for this reason that we believe that we can get a growth rate of as much as 4.5 percent with full-time unemployment of 4 percent or less.

If we really did a good job in these areas, full-time unemployment could be reduced to as little as 3 percent.

PRICES

We need not have inflation of either the creeping or galloping variety. The major means among others of achieving such a stability in the price level at increased growth rates are a greater use of fiscal policy and larger budget surpluses in good times, a decrease in the instability in the economy, a more competitive and hence lower interest rate, increasing competition which would bring both smaller increases in prices and wages in the market power industries, and a decline in the rate of shift from industrial to service employment which would accompany the relatively full use of our industrial capacity.

If these things were done, then monetary policy could work more effectively with a smaller degree of restraint. I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for us all to use fiscal policy more fully and not to throw all the burden upon monetary policy. The accumulation of larger surpluses in periods of prosperity and the use of this surplus to retire some of the public debt would reduce and perhaps eliminate undue price increases at the same time that it would raise the price of Government bonds and reduce their yields. This lowering of the interest rates would have a general beneficial effect.

When we reduce the yield on Governments we reduce the general interest rate, because the general private interest rate is built up from the basic yield upon long-term Governments. I cannot emphasize that too strongly. If we examine the figures month by month, we find, generally speaking, that it is the yield on Governments which precedes and leads the increase in the yield on private and corporate bonds; and the decrease in yields on Government securities precedes and leads the decrease in yields from private corporate bonds.

In recessions and depressions, a quicker and more conscious use of the overall budget as a stabilizing force would help to offset the cumulative decline of economic activity and help to hasten revival. I shall return to this theme later, but I want to stress its importance here. It is worthy of note that some months after we had come to this conclusion, the report of the Radcliffe Commission was issued in England. It is a most significant report, and advocates the same changes of policy there which we are advocating here, namely, greater use of fiscal policy so that monetary policy can be more effective without excessive restriction.

I wish to say, in connection with the Radcliffe Commission, that it was appointed by a Tory government, headed by a Tory judge, and heavily packed with conservative economists and lawyers. However, they came to the conclusion that apparently England had used a too severe monetary policy and that the Bank of England and the Treasury under conservative management had been too restrictive, and should have made greater use of fiscal policy.

It is interesting to note how central bank authorities stick together. The Federal Reserve Board will quote the Bank of England as an authority. Here is a bank policy in England which has now been largely repudiated by a conservative commission.

I commend a study of the Radcliffe Commission report to the authorities in the Federal Reserve and in the U.S. Treasury. I will be glad to buy copies of it from Her Majesty's Stationery Office and send them to these gentlemen. I will mark the salient passages in the Radcliffe Commission report. I am referring to pages 183 and 185 of the report of the Radcliffe Commission.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In this connection, I have just had the opportunity of reading the monograph entitled "The Influence on Prices of Changes in the Effect of Supply of Money," which is a part of the whole joint committee study, as I understand it. I was very much impressed by the testimony of four economists who appeared before the Joint Economic Committee. The first man who appeared was Milton Friedman, of the University of Chicago and National Bureau of Economic Research. I understand that he is recognized as one of the outstanding conservative economists, a very brilliant and very competent and able man.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; Mr. Friedman is generally regarded as the leading conservative economist in the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I presume he was invited to appear before the committee because he was considered by the joint committee as a man of great ability, and one of the leading economists in the country, and also as one of the leading figures in the country on this issue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that Professor Friedman felt that the monetary policy was such an unsure and unproven kind of reed for the Govermnent to rely or lean upon that, in his judgment, it would be better simply to forget it as any kind of lean-against-the-wind policy, and simply increase the supply of money at a regular rate, year after year. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. He advocated a regular rate of 3 percent a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not correct to say that Richard P. Selden, the second economist called by the committee, and who is a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research, and associate professor of banking at Colum-

bia University, tended to agree with Professor Friedman, and felt that the recommendation of Professor Friedman was correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is true. He and Mr. Friedman are of the same school of thought.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The third economist called by the committee was Robert Eisner, professor at Northwestern University. I call attention to page 787 of the hearings, where Mr. Eisner is quoted as saying:

> I think in the interests of the longrun growth the policy of the Federal Reserve should be directed to keeping money as plentiful as possible, keeping the rate of interest as low as possible. I think that every time it leans against the wind in a period of inflation, it, of course, in that period raises the rate of interest and makes money tighter, and it makes it more difficult to get the rate of interest down to a reasonable minimum in periods when there are not inflationary pressures.

Mr. Eisner was the third of the four economists who appeared before the committee. Obviously, from this statement, it is very clear that he took the same position which was taken by Professor Friedman and Professor Selden, that the Federal Reserve would serve the national interest far better if it simply followed the policy of increasing the supply of money as the economy grows. His is a slightly different position, because he favored a greater increase in the supply of money; but, nevertheless, it is a consistent position with that of the other professors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is true. I should say, however, that I am not in favor of an unlimited increase in the supply of money.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not, either. I disagree with Mr. Eisner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That qualification should be made. I would be satisfied with a 3-percent increase if production goes up 3 percent, but with an adjustment for genuine changes in velocity, not with any statistical juggling. If we have a rate of growth of 3 percent, I would agree to an increase in the money supply of 3 percent. Three percent has been the rate, roughly, in the past. It is very conservative.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am very much persuaded by what Mr. Friedman said. I disagree with what Mr. Eisner said. It must be remembered that Mr. Friedman is an outstanding conservative economist. He has shown, as the Senator from Illinois has said, that the Federal Reserve could hardly be more wrong. They are honest people and they are trying to do the right thing. However, there is a lag of from 6 to 18 months in their action, in that when they are attempting to tighten money that action may have virtue at that minute but the effects are not felt for half a year or a year and a half, and by that time the growth should have increased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Federal Reserve has been increasing the money supply at the rate of 1.8 percent a year. This is less than the annual growth rate of 2.3 percent, and much less than the growth rate which we should have, and which I believe we can have, and when, instead, the Federal Reserve is following a generally restrictive policy.

I must say this: Members of the committee and members of the majority—of the Democratic Party—have been taking a drubbing from many financial writers and editorial writers in the country, and from members of the administration. We have been charged with fiscal irresponsibility. Here we are advocating a policy of throwing more emphasis on fiscal policy and less on monetary policy, with which the conservatives of Great Britain agree. Now, does the administration say that the British Tories are fiscally irresponsible? The report of the Radcliffe Commission is just as strong as our report in this connection, and implicitly condemns the policy of the Bank of England. Of all the nations of the Western World, Great Britain has had the slowest rate of growth. It has been exceeded by France, by Italy—at least by northern Italy—and greatly exceeded by West Germany.

Mr. PROXMIRE. To complete this point, I should also mention the last economist who was called by the committee, John G. Gurley, the senior staff member of the Brookings Institution. He felt the Federal Reserve Board should have gone farther than it did in tightening money. However, he was primarily concerned with a different matter, and that is their failure to take into account other financial institutions which have developed during the past 20 or 30 years, such as insurance companies, Federal loan and savings institutions, and so forth, and he concentrated almost his whole analysis on those points, and was brought into the tight money controversy only by questions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So, in conclusion, of the outstanding monetary experts in the country, including, as the Senator has said, the most conservative economists, three out of four say that the Federal Reserve is now following a policy which is wrong, which is too tight, which is too restrictive, and which has been proven, on the basis of their analysis and experience, to be ineffective.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true; also, history has proved it to be wrong. I like the members of the Federal Reserve as individuals, but I would like to let some of their theories go into the dustbin of history.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was very much interested in what the distinguished Senator said about the charge of fiscal irresponsibility or monetary irresponsibility being made against the majority of the Joint Economic Committee.

I have read most of the articles written by the financial writers during the current period of rapid escalation of interest rates.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which the Senator from Oklahoma has so well stated. Notice how they go up, up, up, higher, higher, higher.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the majority has shown much more fiscal responsibility and monetary responsibility than the financial writers. I refer to such financial writers as those on the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, and more particularly the financial writer for the Washington Post and Times Herald, none of whom has ever found it necessary to give the history of the 4¼-percent ceiling which now exists on long-term bonds.

Surely those who purport to write for the Nation on financial matters should exercise some journalistic responsibility before they begin to charge the distinguished committee, Members of Congress who have had years of experience in this work, with fiscal and monetary irresponsibility. Those writers would only have to look up a little of the history of the United States to find that no President in history, from George Washington until the present occupant of the White House, has ever been given the right to issue long-term bonds without having the interest ceiling fixed by Congress.

The Library of Congress has performed research on this subject for me, and I checked it, to be doubly certain, with experts from the Federal Reserve Board. This is a historic fact. How can President Eisenhower ask for powers which no other President has ever had and demand a complete surrender of congressional power, which Congress, throughout the Nation's long history, has insisted upon retaining. We do not find anything in the columns of the financial writers which indicates that such an action would breach all historic precedent. Instead, such a restraint is very casually described as a rather obsolete, antiquated, World War I restriction, as though it had been imposed by Congress in a moment of misunderstanding in 1918.

What Congress did in 1918 was to give to the Secretary of the Treasury, Carter Glass, the right to issue a certain amount of bonds without fixing the amount of each issue, as Congress throughout the country's history had always done. Traditionally Congress had not only set the maximum rate of interest terms, but also the total amount of the issue in each series. When it was necessary to engage in rapid financing during World War I, Congress granted Carter Glass this authority, perhaps because Congress had special confidence in him, he being a former Democratic United States Senator and the author of the Federal Reserve Act.

But in waiving its prerogative as to the amount, Congress kept the control it had always exercised on the rate of interest which could be paid.

Does not the Senator from Illinois believe that journalistic irresponsibility is being practiced by financial news writers who write, day after day, that the interest rate ceiling is simply a phony old, archaic restriction which Congress happened to impose in 1918?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad it is the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, rather than the Senator from Illinois, who is charging the financial writers with journalistic irresponsibility. The junior Senator from Oklahoma is a distinguished former journalist himself. Journalists are permitted to criticize

journalists, but politicians are not permitted to criticize journalists. Politicians become irresponsible when they criticize journalists. Journalists may criticize politicians, but politicians are not permitted to criticize journalists. So I am very glad the Senator from Oklahoma, who was a journalist, and a very distinguished one, is criticizing the journalists.

I am somewhat nonetheless annoyed. I wish the persons who write the editorials would read the reports of our committee. Instead of tilting at windmills and misrepresenting the position of the Democratic members of the committee, I appeal to them to read the reports of our committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not the position of the Democratic members of the committee, with respect to the interest rate ceiling, that Uncle Sam's interest cost is not lowered by increasing the interest rate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is more complicated than that. I wish it were that simple. But all the complications work in our favor.

Mr. President, thus far I have been analyzing what has happened. Now I should like to turn to the constructive element in what I have to say, and to outline a program for the future.

INTRODUCTION

The most effective way in which the rate of economic growth can be speeded up in the immediate future and unemployment reduced is by introducing much-needed reforms into the operations of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. The fiscal and monetary policies of these two bodies have hampered growth and fostered unemployment.

The Treasury, for example, has neglected to work either for a much-needed reform of our tax system or to make the total of public receipts and expenditures offset some of the cyclical up and down swings of production and employment. It is only fair to add that certain groups in Congress must bear some responsibility as well for this failure to use fiscal policy as a stabilizing force. The Senator from Illinois, however, wants to say that his own conscience is fairly clear on this point. The Treasury has also failed in its management of the public debt. Instead of lengthening out the debt when interest rates were low, it is now seeking to do so when interest rates are high.

During these last 7 years, both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve have combined to raise interest rates above what they should have been and, in the process, have kept unemployment high and production down below what it could have been. For lower interest rates would mean more homebuilding, more investment and activity by small business and greater investment in durable improvements by State and local governments. This would reduce unemployment and increase production both directly and indirectly.

As I have said the Treasury and the Federal Reserve were unsuccessful in preventing the rise in prices from 1955 to 1957, inclusive, and during the subsequent period since then of relative price stability have been largely tilting at windmills. They have held back production, helped to keep unemployment high and—by raising the interest rates have increased the incomes of the money lending groups.

Let me make it clear that I do not charge these men or the administration behind them with having bad motives. On the contrary, I think the present Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board are both decent and sincere men. They are acting according to their lights.

I think Secretary of the Treasury Anderson is one of the most courteous, one of the most gentlemanly, one of the most agreeable men in conversation and in his general attitude whom I have ever met. Certainly, to my mind, he is the most courteous and gentlemanly bureaucrat I have ever seen come up to Capitol Hill.

But it is easy for these men and for the groups behind and about them who make monetary policy to absorb the general philosophy of the wealthy banking interests.

This philosophy is that the best way to check inflation is by raising the interest rate and keeping a relatively high percentage of the workers unemployed in order to keep wage rates down. This is comforting doctrine for those who lend money and capital. It is similar to the companion doctrine formerly widely and publicly advanced and still secretly held by many that the best cure for a sharp business recession or depression is to cut wage rates and, hence, reduce labor costs per unit of output. Under these theories unemployment is treated, either consciously or unconsciously, as a built-in stabilizer, and the fact that the unemployed are human beings is frequently ignored.

But the fact that this doctrine is widely held in financial and banking circles, and conforms to their narrow and more immediate economic interest, should not make us accept it if it does not fit modern conditions and is contrary to the true national interest.

We therefore recommend the following reforms in the policies of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve:

LACK OF COMPETITION IN THE GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET

First. Make the flotation of Government securities more truly competitive and prevent the Treasury from artificially increasing the interest rate.

In the main, the Treasury has constantly insisted that it does not influence the interest rate but that it merely has to accept the outside interest rate which is fixed by the impersonal and competitive forces of supply and demand.

In support of this contention, the former Secretary of the Treasury, and still probably the economic policymaker for the Republican Party, Mr. George M. Humphrey, in testifying before a senatorial committee, of which I was a member, introduced his celebrated "egg" analogy. As Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey blandly asserted he had no more power to raise the interest rate than he had the power to raise the price of eggs, when, as a shopper for his family, he went to market to buy a dozen eggs.

This analogy interested me. I wanted to find out how many eggs were produced and sold in the market each year. So I went to the statistics of agriculture. If anyone wants to know about this and thinks it is important, I can tell him that the statistics show that about 60 billion eggs are produced and sold each year, or 5 billion dozen.

When Mr. Humphrey went to market with his basket on his arm to purchase eggs for his family and bought a dozen eggs, he would, therefore, buy only one five-billionths of the total number of eggs sold during the year. I agree with him that this purchase would be as unimportant in the total egg market as a grain of sand would be upon the seashore.

But the case is very different for both Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Anderson, when, as Secretaries of the Treasury, they go forth to borrow money in the money market. I suggest that these facts be studied very carefully. In 1958, the Treasury borrowed more than three-quarters of the funds—excluding 91-day bills, excluding mortgages, and excluding consumer credit—in the relatively long term market, or $62 billion out of the some $81 billion of securities floated.

In economic language, this situation approaches monopsony—or a market in which one buyer purchases such a large proportion of the supply that imperfect competition results. This shows the absurdity of Mr. Humphrey's analogy. Using the most guarded language, it is obvious that, at the very least, the policies and actions of the Treasury have a considerable influence on the cost of money. If the huge borrower is not alert to press for the best possible terms, the interest rate is likely to be higher than it need be. And if the dominant borrower itself believes in high interest rates and gets and accepts advice primarily from lenders, who naturally want these high interest rates, then I think the Treasury can be fairly charged with helping to make the interest rate higher than it should be.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is not this exactly what happened under the Humphrey-Dumphrey bonds? We were financing the public debt, at 2½ and 2¾ percent. Mr. Humphrey came along and, without any necessity for it, suddenly surprised the money market with an offer of 3¾ percent interest. There was no sitdown strike by Wall Street or the bankers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had intended to develop, in a moment, that the Secretary of the Treasury took the advice of the bankers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Although the Government was the greatest borrower, he allowed those who would lend to fix the price of lending, which is as though the labor leaders would fix the price, without question, of their wages, pensions, and other benefits. I am sure

neither the administration nor Mr. Humphrey would think that would be a sound policy in the fixing of wages. Yet Mr. Humphrey allowed those who benefit from the wages of lending money to fix the wages which they think the money is worth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma, with his keen, sharp mind, has come to the point which the Senator from Illinois was slow to arrive at, but which he hoped to develop in a moment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I apologize.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the sharp comment of the Senator from Oklahoma may point up the significance of what I shall say in a moment on that point.

ADVICE OF INTERESTED GROUPS

Our committee in its investigations developed the fact that before any appreciable bond issue is floated, the Treasury calls in advisory committees from the American Bankers Association, the Investment Bankers Association, and also from time to time from mutual savings banks, insurance companies, and savings and loan institutions.

At the request of the Joint Economic Committee, the American Bankers Association provided a list of its recommendations to the Treasury and corresponding Treasury action with respect to its advice from 1952 to 1959. Some 103 specific recommendations were involved.

I ask unanimous consent that the full comparative analysis of these requests and actions taken be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let us examine the statistics. In the period 1952–59, some 83 or 80.6 percent of the recommendations were accepted by the Treasury, while only 20 or 19.4 percent were rejected. In almost 60 percent of the cases, the advice was accepted as given, and in another 17.5 percent of the cases, it was accepted with only very minor changes.

Now let us compare the record in 1952, which is a rather significant year, when we had a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, and the record of 1953 to 1959, when we had a Republican Secretary of the Treasury.

In the period 1953–59, the advice of the American Bankers Association was accepted on 71 occasions, or in 84.5 percent of the cases, and rejected only 13 occasions, or 15.5 percent of the time. The rejection rate, therefore, since 1953 has been only 40 percent of what it was in the year 1952.

It is interesting to note that in 1952, the advice was rejected in 37 percent of the cases, as compared with only 15 percent of the cases in the period 1953–59. The rejection rate, therefore, has been since 1953, 60 percent less than in 1952. A table giving the results of the American Bankers Association's recommendations is given below. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Period	Total	Advice accepted				Advice rejected
		As given	But with minor changes	Partially but with some major changes	Total accepted	
1952—Number	19	11	1	0	12	7
Percent	100.0	57.9	5.3	0	63.2	36.8
1953–59—Number	84	50	17	4	71	13
Percent	100.0	59.5	20.2	4.8	84.5	15.5
1952–59—Number	103	61	18	4	83	20
Percent	100.0	50.2	17.5	3.2	80.6	19.4

Mr. DOUGLAS. If, in a country which we shall call X, there was a labor government in power; and if the basic wage was determined periodically by the Minister or Secretary of Labor; and if he sought his advice in the main from a committee set up by the counterparts of the heads of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; and if in over 60 percent of the cases, their advice was accepted without any change; and if in another 20 percent of the cases it was accepted with only minor changes, and if in 5 percent of the cases it was accepted with some major changes; and if in only 15 percent of the cases it was rejected, what would the financial community and the financial writers and the financial editors, to whom the Senator from Oklahoma has referred, say in those circumstances? I think they would certainly say that this was a noncompetitive wage rate and one which, in fact, was set in large part by the labor movement in that country and the Government Minister or Secretary who was most sympathetic with its views.

In fact, judging from past performances and comments, I think it almost certain that if a Democratic administration in this country were to fix wage rates in this fashion, the financial community, business writers, and our Republican friends would indulge in bitter and violent charges that we were merely the tools of those they call the "labor bosses."

Like virtually all my colleagues on this side of the aisle, I believe in sober and restrained speech and I shall not indulge in similar charges. I submit, however, that the interest rate which is set by the Treasury is not—repeat, is not—a free competitive rate. It is, in the most charitable terms, a collectively bargained rate—or a negotiated rate—but it is not a competitive rate. There is most certainly an extraordinary degree of "conscious parallelism" between the advice of the bankers and the decisions of the Treasury. And in these last few years, when those parties have assembled together, the words of the poet have been largely true: "Two souls with but a single thought, two hearts that beat as one." And if the leaders of the Federal Reserve Board were to meet with them, it would be a most happy and harmonious threesome.

LACK OF AUCTIONS

A second crucial error in the practices of the Treasury is that after it has taken the advice of the bankers and adopted it in five-sixths of the cases, it then sells its securities—that is, all except 91-day bills—at a fixed price (par), a fixed interest rate, a fixed maturity and a fixed volume. There is no chance for price competition among the bidders. They cannot offer more—or less—than par. They must take it or leave it. All they can do is to pledge themselves to take a given quantity.

In recent years, virtually every one of these issues of securities has been heavily oversubscribed. This is shown in volume 6–A of our hearings, on page 1108 and pages 1173, 1174, and 1175. It is there shown that the most common oversubscription is for those who buy the bonds to subscribe for approximately twice the amount of bonds offered. In a few cases it is less than twice. In many cases it is much more than twice, and it has gone up as high as four, five, or six times as much.

In recent years, virtually every one of these issues of securities has been oversubscribed, as I have said. It is possible that some of this oversubscription is fictitious. Subscribers may know the bonds will be oversubscribed, and therefore the amount they ask for is increased, in order that they may get the fraction which is apportioned to everyone. But this indicates that, basically, they know there is going to be an oversubscription. There is not a single competitive aspect to this sale of bonds.

If the offers were competitive, and if at the price charged a greater quantity was demanded than was offered, the result would be competition among the buyers and a forcing up of prices. That is the way the competitive system works. If at a given price there is a greater demand than the supply of that which is offered, there is competition between the buyers or demanders. That forces up the price, and the seller gets a higher price than would otherwise be the case. Relative prices determine who gets the goods. But the Treasury does not permit this. The price cannot be above par. It cannot be below par. It must be at par. And the fact that there is oversubscription indicates that, generally, at the interest rates indicated, if there were competition the price would be above that price, and consequently the yields would be lower and there would be a decrease in interest rates.

Mr. President, I do not like to use this analogy; I introduce it without any invidious connotation; but the Secretary is really using the Russian price system. The Russians, under their control system, have prices which are fixed. If at a given price more is demanded

than is supplied, the Russians do not increase the prices. They ration the quantity of goods among the demanders. One can tell the degree to which the price is actually below what the competitive price would be by the length of the queues of customers standing outside the stores, trying to get in to buy.

Let me make it clear that I do not think in the slightest degree that Mr. Martin and Mr. Anderson are in sympathy with the Russian system, but it is an extraordinary thing that they have adopted the Russian communistic price system for the sale of Government securities.

This is an extraordinary fact. What I am pleading for is the introduction of the competitive price system. I plead for the scrapping of this fixed price system, in which the bonds are offered, and that we adopt instead the auction system, which would permit the purchaser of the bond to bid above or below par and the Treasury to get the best buy.

But the very fact that the purchasers know there will be a greater quantity of bonds demanded on the given terms than are offered is strong proof that if there were competitive bidding, a higher price could generally be obtained by the Government. This higher price of the bonds would mean a lower yield and, hence, would at once bring some reduction in interest rates and a lower cost of borrowed money to the taxpayers. This would lower the whole structure of interest rates which is built up from the rate on long-term payment bonds.

It is highly desirable, therefore, that the Treasury should throw the sale of its securities open for competitive bidding, much in the same way as is done in the case of 91-day bills. This has been pointed out to the Treasury both privately and publicly on many occasions but while there has been a little timid experimentation with this method, in the main, the Treasury has refused to act.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How would the Senator's proposal work with relation to the statutory limit on the interest rate of long-term issues?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Coupled with the other reforms which I shall advocate, it is my belief that the question of the ceiling on the long-term bonds would become purely academic. The methods which we are advocating would result in such a lowering of interest rates that the interest rate then would not push against the ceiling.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator be willing to include in his proposal some assurance that bonds which are sold at the statutory ceiling will not be sold by the Government at a discount? It seems to me if the Government discounts bonds which are sold at the ceiling, that is simply another way of getting around the statutory interest ceiling on long-term issues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to say that I do not want to have the auction system used as an excuse for getting around the ceiling, without having the introduction of other reforms I advocate. I think the introduction of these reforms would mean that the question of the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling would become purely academic.

I fully accept the auction principle. One must be ready for discounts as well as surpluses if he accepts the principle. If one accepts the principle of free enterprise, one cannot object if the price falls below a certain point, if he accepts that it may go above it. What I am asking for is the competitive system. I am confident that in the vast majority of instances the bonds would sell at a premium, and hence interest rates would be lower. As proof of this, I offer the fact that all of these bond issues are oversubscribed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will yield further, I do not wish to reveal the source of information from which I am speaking, because I do not think the author of the statement would care to be revealed without his consent, although he is a person who has quite a bit of contact with this problem and who should know about the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The person to whom I am referring was discussing the matter of how many people it takes to fix the market on credit in this country; that is, if the Federal Reserve Board does not use its power. I suggested that it took perhaps 50. His answer was that it would be much fewer than 50.

My impression is that if the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury do not use the powers which are reposed in the executive branch of the Government to keep interest rates at a reasonable level, there is very little limit we can expect to have, and very little control we can expect to be exercised on that small number of persons who for their own personal advantage and for the advantage of their investment concerns want to see interest rates at the highest possible level.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has made a very good point. It is directly connected with the next paragraph in my speech, which is this: Along with this should, of course, go the preparation of a much broader market for Government bonds. The Treasury should build up its own staff of bond and market analysts so that they will no longer be dependent upon interested parties for advice and guidance. They should establish direct connections with financial intermediaries, institutional investors, and corporate and individual savers so that the Treasury can better know their needs and the types of securities they could buy, and so that they can participate more fully in the market.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to add this thought. At present those in the market for outstanding issues deal only with the 17 authorized dealers in the Government securities market, of whom 14 are the New York dealers. I believe five of them are banks, and most of the others are really "grubstaked" by the banks.

As a matter of fact, the dealers do an enormous amount of business on a very small capital. The turnover rate of their capital is incredible.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is undoubtedly true that the Government should make every effort to increase the number of dealers instead of having everything channeled through this limited group of security houses.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some time ago the junior Senator from Louisiana made a computation in regard to the interest rates on new issues, to arrive at the average interest rate on such issues. He had the computation printed in the RECORD in connection with previous speeches. The rate was averaged out over 20 years of Democratic administrations. I simply added up the average rates over 20 years and divided by 20. The 20-year average interest rate on new issues, under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, was 1.7 percent, which would appear to be about one-third of the interest rate on new issues under the present administration.

On a national debt approaching $300 billion, this means a difference of $9 billion each year. The thought occurs to me that if the present high rates are continued for the next 20 years, and the national debt were carried at the existing interest rates, compared to those which existed under the debt management policies of the previous Democratic administrations, by simply multiplying $9 billion by 20 years, we find there would be a difference of $180 billion over a 20-year period, caused by the difference between the policies of this administration and the way it would propose to handle the national debt compared to the policies of the previous Democratic administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

What some of us fear very much is that before this administration goes out of office there will be an effort made to put the entire national debt of almost $300 billion on the longest possible basis, to try to saddle the people, or the next generation, with what I believe to be unwise policies of this administration I certainly hope we will not fall into that trap.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is a very real danger. In our report we call for the lengthening of the term of the debt in periods primarily when the interest rates are low, rather than in periods when the interest rates are high. We also propose that the bonds issued should be callable, so that if the interest rate falls the Government can call in the high interest rate bonds and float low interest rate bonds, and thereby reduce charges which the Government would otherwise have to pay.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is familiar with the quotation of Mark Anthony, taken from the play, "Julius Caesar": "The evil that men do lives after them." I believe it was intended facetiously in the context in which it was used by Shakespeare, but

referring to that thought I would certainly hope that the Congress would not permit the misguided debt management and fiscal policies of this administration to be extended forward for another 20 or 30 years. I hope the Senator's proposal will not in anywise permit such a result.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should especially like to refer to the point of the lack of competition and the lack of the Government-sought competition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The public is asked and invited and cajoled, through donated radio and television time, newspaper ads, and billboard ads, to "Come in, please, and help buy defense bonds. We are going to pay you 3¾ percent interest on these E-bonds."

However, when we get up to the 5-percent interest rate, it is a rather closely held secret for the club members.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the "juicy stuff" which the insiders are going to get.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to read an article, to demonstrate how clever the public is. I read this for the record, because I think it is very significant. I mentioned it in my speech January 13, on the floor of the Senate.

This is an article from the New York Times. It is not from Ashtabula, or Okmulgee, Okla., or Olney, Ill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say there is frequently more sound sense on this subject in the villages and towns of the country than in the deep financial canyons of New York.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree. Here we are getting it "from the horse's mouth," so to speak, from the great financial writer of the New York Times.

In the issue of January 12 there was a headline, "Public Discovers U.S. Bill Market—Institutions Are Swamped by Inquiries for the New Treasury Issue."

The article reads:

The public discovered the Treasury bill market yesterday and sent bankers scurrying to textbooks to help explain how it operates.

Lured by predictions that the Treasury's special offering today of $1,500 million of 1-year bills might be sold at prices to bring investors 5 percent and possibly 5¼ percent, investors flooded banks, savings banks, and investment houses with inquiries about the issue.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York, where bids will be accepted until 1:30 p.m. today, reported hundreds of telephone calls and a lineup of investors, cash in hand, ready to buy.

By way of contrast, the regular weekly bill auctions yesterday occasioned only the routine interest of Government securities dealers and other professionals.

Bankers, in many cases, were forced to confess to depositors who wanted to shift funds from savings accounts into the new bills that they weren't entirely sure how the auction worked. After a bit of quick research, however, a number were able to explain that—

Unlike other Government securities, which are usually sold at $1,000 and bear interest in regular installments, Treasury bills are sold at a discount from their redemption price. An investor realizes his return by appreciation of the bill to $1,000 at maturity.

Bills are sold at auction, with prices and return to investors determined by the strength of the bidding, in contrast to other Government securities which are offered at fixed interest rates. Thus, in contrast to the Treasury's offering last October of its "magic 5"—5-percent, 4-year, 10-month notes—the return to investors on today's bill offering won't be known until all the bids are in and tallied. This may not be until a late hour tonight.

Small investors may buy $1,000 to $400,000 in bills ($200,000 in the regular weekly auctions) without naming a price merely by indicating on their bids how many they want. This indicates their willingness to accept the average price determined in the competitive bidding.

These noncompetitive bids are then awarded in full. Competitive bidders, usually professional, have to take their chances with what is left.

Because of the considerable interest in today's issue, Government securities dealers estimated that the noncompetitive bidding might total $500 million, compared with their earlier estimates of $300 million. They guessed that this might cut the rate discount on the new issue to 5.05 to 5.10 percent.

Bankers said that while investors were flooding them with inquiries, withdrawals were smaller than those in October to purchase the "magic 5s." The Bowery Savings Banks, for instance, reported 60 withdrawals totaling $327,000. On the first day after announcement of the "magic 5s," it lost $3,400,000.

This has been going on constantly under the present administration. If we are to pay 3¾ percent interest, we make it very simple for the little fellow, but for the big fellow, at the higher interest rates, the securities can be bought only in $1,000 quantities or more, and it is a rather close fraternity secret.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oklahoma has put his finger on a very important point.

In regard to the other securities, one cannot buy less than $1,000 and in $1,000 lots.

That reminds me of the famous story which is told about John W. "Bet You a Million" Gates and Charles Schwab, who were playing poker on the 20th Century train one night, when a man looked through the open door of the stateroom, saw them playing poker with their friends, and said he wanted to get into the game. He said, "My money is as good as anyone else's. Let me in. Here is $1,000." And "Bet You a Million" said, "Give the man one white chip."

So the requirement that one has to have $1,000 means that is really not open to everybody.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, in line with the questions asked and the information given by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], that people have stated to me within the past 30 days that they went to the bank with money, desiring to buy some of the Government bonds at the 5-percent rate. Many of them had more than $1,000 to invest. They were told that any sales of less than $25,000 to one person were called broken lot sales; and if they were broken lot sales, there would be a premium or brokerage fee to pay.

They were further advised that such sales were made only through brokerage houses. After computing the brokerage fee, if they were buying less than $25,000 worth, in so-called broken lots, the would-be investors were indignant. They said they would do just as well by buying the cheaper bonds.

This practice represents a gift to those with $25,000 or more to invest at one time. If one has less than $25,000 to invest at one time, he is out of the 5-percent Government bond market.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he thinks that is fair in this American democracy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not.

I want to see the general interest rate reduced, but I also want to see it competitively determined, and I want to see the Treasury break through the tight network of a limited number of buyers, and get to the investing public.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is not only unfair to the investing public, as the distinguished Senator has mentioned, but it is unfair to the taxpayers of America, who are paying an exorbitant rate because of the tight clique.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The members of the big-money fraternity are able to monopolize the lush returns, while they allow the crumbs to fall to the public, who buy the E-bonds.

The record will show that the small investors in E-bonds still have the greatest faith; and the largest accumulation of Government securities is still found in the present 3¾-percent E-bonds. Even though the return is knocked down, because of their faith in the Government they still invest in Uncle Sam's securities because they are loyal Americans.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for their service in calling these inequities and injustices to the attention of the American public, and for calling attention to the unfairness of the administration in its manipulation of the money market, in handling Government bonds so as to give preference to those with more than $25,000 to invest at one time, giving them a bigger bonus for having more money.

I congratulate the two able Senators for pointing out these injustices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

If I may now return to the text of my remarks, with respect to the New York bond market, instead of dealing with only 17 formal dealers, of whom all but 3 are in New York, there should be a

vigorous attempt to expand their numbers and bring in more competition. Furthermore, the Federal Reserve should immediately determine what proper regulation of these dealers and specialists there should be. We have recommended that the regulations should be like those now applied to the specialists in the stock exchange. In addition, if legislation is needed, the Federal Reserve should ask for it in order to impose margins on the customers of the dealers.

There are almost no margins required now; and the result was seen in the late spring and early summer of 1958, when there was a disparity between the low rates on short-time notes and the relatively higher rates on longer issues. Many people took money out of the short-time market and put it into the long-time market. They bought bonds on almost no margins. Then the roof fell in on them, with the rise in the interest rate, and the price of Governments went down. Their margins were wiped out, and they had to indulge in distress selling, very similar to the distress selling which occurred in the stock market in 1929.

So I think there should be some regulation of the securities market, and, in my judgment, some margins imposed on customers. That would reduce the purely speculative feature of dealing with outstanding issues of Government bonds, and of gambling on changes in the interest rate and in differences between the yields on short-term and long-term securities.

I do not want to see the credit of the United States impaired by the wrong guesses of speculators. The fall in Government bond prices in 1958 damaged the financial standing of the United States abroad.

I remember Mr. Martin coming back white-faced, and saying that he had attended a meeting of the World Bank in New Delhi. There various international bankers have been speaking derogatively about the securities of the United States. Mr. Martin used that fact as a reason for jacking up the interest rates still more.

I say, "Look Homeward, Angel." Look homeward to the securities market in New York, and at least to the regulation of the member and to margins for the customers.

We held hearings in New York on this subject last summer. One of our requests was that at least the Federal Reserve should inform itself as to what was going on. It should collect statistics on the transactions in the bond market.

We met with a cold reception at that time. The Federal Reserve stood pat; but last night, Mr. Hays, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, announced that hereafter they would collect figures on the transactions of security dealers, and that they would publish the selected aggregates. They named a very able woman, Miss Madeline McWhinney, as the person in charge of these statistics.

I congratulate the Federal Reserve Bank of New York for its action in this respect. It is interesting that it took such action only after the Joint Economic Committee had prodded it for months to do so. Now, to save their faces, they will say that they did it on their own initiative.

I do not wish to exult over those gentlemen. We are not engaged in warfare with the Federal Reserve System. I will not be heard to say that I now have one scalp of theirs dangling at my waist. But I will say that we are making some progress. Even the Federal Reserve can take good suggestions from Congress, if they are persistently urged. The Federal Reserve is not totally unresponsive to argument and to fact. There is a big improvement in the Federal Reserve Bank. I congratulate that institution. I hope the improvement will continue, and that further signs of reform will be manifest.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release giving the details of the action of the New York Federal Reserve Bank be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK STATEMENT FOR THE PRESS

Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, today announced the creation of a new market statistics department. The department will collect and process data on the Government securities market.

The new department is being established by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as a result of conclusions reached by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System following an extensive study of the U.S. Government securities market made last year. On completion of the study and evaluation of its findings, the Federal Reserve and the Treasury decided that the range of factual information which has been available on the Government securities market should be broadened in order to serve more effectively the interest of the public and the interests of those participating in the market.

The new department, which will become a part of the research and statistics function of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, will gather data relating to their transactions from all Government securities dealers with whom the bank transacts business for the account of the Federal Reserve System or the Treasury. In addition to making these data available for official use, it is contemplated that selected, aggregative data will eventually be published regularly on a current basis with appropriate timelag, and with suitable safeguards to insure the confidentiality of individual dealer information.

Mr. Hayes also announced that the directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York have appointed Miss Madeline H. McWhinney an officer of the bank, and that he has assigned her as manager of the new department. Miss McWhinney has been an economist on the staff of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York since 1943. From 1955 to March 1959 she served as chief of the financial and trade statistics division. Since that time she has been a special assistant, and had an important part in preparation of the data on the operation of the Government securities market which served as a basis for the recent study of the market by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System. She has also served from time to time on special assignments in the securities department of the New York bank, assisting the manager of the system open market account, and as chairman of various research and statistical committees within the Federal Reserve System.

Miss McWhinney received her A.B. degree from Smith College and holds a master's degree in business administration from New York University. She has served as elected trustee of the retirement system of the Federal Reserve banks and as president of the alumni association of the Graduate School of Business of New York University. She is a former director of the American Finance Association and has held positions in other professional organizations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only in the ways I have suggested, I believe, can true competition be introduced. By decreasing the monopolistic features of the present arrangement, interest rates could and should be reduced. A prudent Secretary of the Treasury would also do many of these things to remove any possible charges of a failure fully to defend the interests of the people.

It should not escape notice that it is the supposed defenders of competition who have been resisting the extension of this principle into the Government bond market, which we are urging. It is very interesting to note that people are generally in favor of competition for the other fellow, but never for themselves. I am afraid that is the attitude of the Treasury and of the Federal Reserve Board and of the big financial interests in New York.

While I am on this point I should like to say that it is very interesting that, while the banks of the country are so vehement in urging that the 4¼-percent interest ceiling on Government bonds should be lifted—of which bonds they are the purchasers, of course—they do not want to have the 3-percent interest ceiling on the interest rate which national banks can pay on time deposits raised. They want to maintain that 3-percent rate on what they pay out in interest. They say, "You can't go above that." However, they want no ceiling on the interest rate which the people must pay.

SELL LONG-TERM BONDS WHEN INTEREST RATES ARE LOW

One of the reasons why we are fearful of the proposals of the administration—and this was touched on by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—is that after neglecting to lengthen the bond issues adequately in 1958 when interest rates were relatively low, it now proposes to do so in a period when the interest rates which they and the Federal Reserve had to raise are at the highest point in years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator said "the highest point in years." Can he tell me how long it is since the interest rates on the national debt were as high as they are today?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The copy of the economic indicators I have does not go back that far. The statistics break down. However, I do not know of any time when interest rates were as high as they are now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would that go back more than 30 years?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we went back that far would we find that the national debt was only about 6 or 7 percent as much as it is now?

Mr. DOUGLAS. More than that, I believe. The national debt was about $30 billion at the time of the First World War. I would say about 10 percent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The First World War? That would be more than 30 years, would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is now going back to my birthday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure the Senator would be going back about 40 years, because I was born at about the time World War I ended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has had an outstanding career, I will say, and came to the Senate when he was just over the constitutional age for membership in the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What I had in mind was that my impression is that the last time we would find the interest rates as high as they are today would be perhaps during the Hoover administration and perhaps during the Coolidge administration. If the latter were the case, that would be over 30 years ago. At that time the national debt was about $20 billion, which would be about 7 or 8 percent of what the national debt is today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The point I had in mind was that at that time, just as a matter of fiscal responsibility in managing the national debt, there was as much the compulsion on the Government to seeing to it that the interest rate be kept low.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think there was, but the people did not press it. The burden of the interest rate on the national income at the time was not far different from the present, but the people did not discuss it. There were not so many questions asked on the floor of the Senate, for one thing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The prevailing philosophy of Government was that when the poor people of the country got the worst of it, it was no concern of the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is still the philosophy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But even a very conservative and even a very reactionary national administration in control of the executive branch should certainly look at the impact on the Government's costs and should not permit interest rates on the Government debt itself—on its own debt, not on the people's debt—to go so high. However, a superconservative reactionary government, which concerns itself not with the welfare of the people, but, rather, with the welfare of the Government itself, and which takes such a narrow view of governmental responsibility, could more easily escape responsibility for unreasonably high interest rates, when there was a small national debt, relatively speaking, than when the national debt is as high as it is today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that Mr. Mellon and Mr. Hoover should have been more concerned with the burden of the interest rate on the national income than they were.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But I am sure the Senator from Illinois can well realize that when one takes the attitude that the Government should not concern itself with measures which will promote the welfare of the citizens, whether individual citizens or groups of citizens, he could more nearly excuse himself at the stage when the cost of managing the debt of the Government was not nearly so great as it is today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the children of darkness did not have as much light surrounding them as now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With regard to the interest rate problem, if one is inclined to wear blinders and say, "We are only going to concern ourselves with the impact of the interest rate on the debt management," one could condone a high interest rate on a low national debt more easily than condone a high interest rate on a national debt which is 10 to 15 times greater.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana, as usual, is being charitable.

At this time the Treasury is advocating the removal of the long-term interest ceiling in order to refund as much as $20 billion in long-term bonds. At least it would be possible to do so. I understand that the Under Secretary of the Secretary, Mr. Baird, in a speech recently said that that was roughly their aim. If I am in error, I will correct the RECORD later. This would raise interest costs to the taxpayer for many years and increase the general level of interest rates in the economy.

In company with most economic students, we do not believe that these high interest rates will be permanent and that some reduction in them may be expected. But if the Government issues are greatly lengthened by the conversion of short-term Governments into long, then unless we introduce proper safeguards, the people will be saddled for long years to come with the payment of high interest charges when these have in fact receded.

Thus, we strongly recommend that, in the future, the Treasury should sell its long-term bonds when interest rates are low rather than high.

Even though the Treasury has lengthened its debt structure somewhat during times of recession when interest rates are low, the average length of the debt has shortened. In 1952, the average length of the debt was 5 years and 8 months.

Then the administration came in with the slogan that it was going to lengthen the term of the debt. The Under Secretary of the Treasury who was put in charge of debt management and financial affairs was a good personal friend of mine, W. Randolph Burgess, formerly one of the great New York bankers, whom I have known for 40 years and of whom I have a high personal opinion. Mr. Burgess had been advocating it for years. He had been advocating that the terms of the national debt should be lengthened. This was the position of Mr. George W. Humphrey, the economic czar of the Eisenhower administration. When they had the opportunity, what did they do? Did they lengthen the term of debt? No; they shortened it.

As of the 1st of June, 1959, it had fallen to 4 years and 7 months, even though the administration boasted it was going to lengthen the term of the debt. Thus the average maturity had fallen by 1 year and 1 month before the administration requested that the interest rate ceiling be removed. I wish to emphasize that point. The administration requested that the interest rate ceiling be removed after the average maturity had fallen.

In other words, long before they came in for removal of the ceiling, they promised to lengthen the maturity of the debt. Then they fell asleep at the switch and allowed the maturity to shorten. It is a principle of equity—and the Senator from Louisiana, who is a fine lawyer, will correct me if I am wrong—that those who seek equity must come into court with clean hands. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I charge the administration with coming into court without clean hands. They did not lengthen the debt maturities. They only become concerned about this primarily when interest rates are high.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator will recall that when the first Secretary of the Treasury of this administration, Mr. George Humphrey, issued long-term bonds at 3¼ percent, they sold at a premium.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think they sold for about 110.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They sold at a very substantial premium.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is after they were floated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At 100.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the people who bought them had a great profit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. In short order, they then went down to a discount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; because the interest rate was rising.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator can interpret this any way he wishes to, but to the junior Senator from Louisiana it meant that those in position to know and those who had large amounts of money to lend the Government said, "Wait a minute. Three and one-fourth percent is fine, but this Government is not going to use the policies which have been followed in the past to protect the interest rate on the national debt, and the rate will be much higher later on."

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be higher.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. It would be better for the investors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At 3¼ percent the Treasury could no longer sell long-term bonds. When the rate went up to 4 percent, they still could not sell long-term bonds. Now they are saying that the interest rate will have to go higher. That is just about the history of the subject; is it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the administration at the time it let the interest rates go to 3¼ percent on long terms had taken the attitude that having fixed the interest rate at higher than the prevailing rates on long-term issues prior to that time, it was going to hold right at that point, would it not stand to reason that the Government could have sold many more long-term bonds if it had protected those bonds from subsequently being sold at a discount?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is true; but I think I should make it clear at this point, as I shall later reemphasize, that I am not in favor of pegging the bond market. The Senator from Louisiana and I may differ on this point, but lest there be an imputation that I favor the artificial pegging of the bond market at a fixed price, I dissociate myself from such a policy. But I am not for pegging the bond market at a high rate, either.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some persons take the attitude which is expressed in the old song, "It's not what you do; it's the way you do it"; but it seems to me that as an overall policy the Government tends to prosper more and to be fairer to the average citizen who supports the Government and who is a part of the Nation if it maintains the lowest possible level of interest consistent with reasonably sound commercial prices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Consistent with comparative stability in the pricing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Many persons feel, as I do, that there are many things which can be done to stabilize prices which are preferable to using high interest rates to try to stabilize prices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the whole burden of the song of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For example, the basic antitrust laws are now 70 years old. The Sherman Antitrust Act is about 70 years old. The last significant amendment to that act occurred in 1914, unless one would call the Robinson-Patman Act a very minor phase in the amendment of the antitrust laws. But the basic antitrust legislation was written in 1890 and amended 24 years later, in 1914. So far as breaking up and preventing monopolies is concerned, the antitrust laws have not been effectively amended subsequent to that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. One of the recommendations which we make is for a more effective antitrust, antimonopoly policy, in order that we may reduce the price levels, stimulate competition, and expand production. This is crucial. I am glad the Senator from Louisiana touches upon it. Very frankly, I think this is one subject on which northern Democrats and southern Democrats can get together.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to ask a question about one other point related to that subject, namely, the Government's tariff policies. The Government in its trade and tariff policies has some ability to restrain price advances both on the part of management and on the part of labor. Furthermore, in some of the price negotiations, such as recently occurred in the steel industry, some agreements for increased wages and better working conditions must necessarily result in a price increase in the commodity, which may very well set off an inflationary spiral. At the present time there is no requirement whatever that anyone representing the general public shall sit in on the negotiations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator from Louisiana is hitting on all 4 cylinders. This is precisely what we recommend. We are carrying out the recommendation of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and Representative REUSS in their bills introduced last year, which provide for compulsory hearings on these questions.

It is extraordinary how the Senator from Louisiana, with his quick mind, siezes almost instantaneously on points which the rest of us poor, plodding fellows take months and years getting into our heads.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps I studied from the economics book which the Senator from Illinois wrote; [Laughter] but the fact of the matter is that many things can be done to help stabilize prices without raising interest rates.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

ISSUE CALLABLE BONDS

Let me touch on another point. In recent years, the Treasury has issued no callable securities. Yet, private business finds it profitable to do so regularly. While such a feature might increase the immediate cost of financing the debt by some small amount, in the long run such a feature would permit the Treasury to refinance its structure to take advantage of favorable movements in the interest rates in future years. Consequently, the Treasury would not be permanently saddled with long-term issues sold when interest rates were at their peak. We, therefore, advocate that such a feature be included in at least some long-term securities.

We believe that the primary purpose of the Treasury with respect to debt management should be to get the best possible bargain for the people of the United States in the sale of Government securities. Consequently, fiscal policy and not debt management should be the main Treasury countercyclical weapon. We believe that insufficient effort has been made to use fiscal policy in this way.

If it is necessary for short-run stabilization purposes to alter the composition of the publicly held debt, this should be the responsibility of the Federal Reserve System.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is an extremely responsible, careful Senator. I do not desire to ask him a question which cannot be responsibly answered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has been charged with being irresponsible, but he believes he is the soul of responsibility.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Those who know him well know that he is the soul of responsibility.

Can the Senator from Illinois make any kind of estimate—I do not ask for a precise figure, of course—as to the cost, or possible savings—let me put it that way—to the American people of the kind of debt management policies which the Senator from Illinois has been discussing? In other words, would this be something which might result in a saving of hundreds of millions of dollars to the American people in a year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is very hard to tell that. I think the saving would be very appreciable. I believe one of its effects would be not only to save money for the people, but also, by raising the prices of Government bonds, it would lower the yields and interest rates, and therefore be a great stimulus to industry, in that it would induce investment, induce more homebuilding, induce expansion by private small businesses, and hence reduce unemployment at the same time it was increasing production and the national income.

How much that would be, I do not know. It might be as much as 1 percent or 2 percent of the national income, which would be from $5 billion to $10 billion a year. But I do not want to throw such figures as that around.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wanted to distinguish between the cost to the Federal Reserve, on the one hand, the Federal Reserve being at least, in a sense, a nonpolitical agency——

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a nonpolitical political agency.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is a nonpolitical political agency, which is presumably not a creature of the administration. I wanted to distinguish between the cost to the Federal Reserve and the cost to the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a synchronization of thought which binds them together.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Treasury Department, of course, is headed by a political officer appointed by the administration. On fiscal matters he is the representative and the spokesman of the administration.

I am trying to determine whether there is any degree of responsibility for the cost of our national debt as between the Federal Reserve, on the one hand, and the Treasury, on the other.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are both guilty.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Both are of very substantial importance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I come now to a summary of the major reforms which we advocate.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR REFORMS

The Treasury, therefore, should accept new principles. It should make its issues more competitive and less monopolistic than is now the case; it should lengthen out its issues when interest rates are low rather than high and protect itself by issuing callable bonds so it can take advantage of subsequent reductions in the interest rate; it should lessen the hold of the 17 dealers upon the Government securities market and broaden the market; and the Federal Reserve, should require adequate margins of the customers of the New York bond market to prevent undue speculation in Government bonds which—as in 1958—may damage the public credit.

These and other reforms which the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board should adopt and which will shortly be discussed are far more important than the raising of the 4¼-percent ceiling on bonds of over 5 years' duration. If these reforms were actually carried out, they would lower the interest rate and make the question of the ceiling purely academic. Public attention and opinion should be primarily fastened upon them, and we should not allow the Treasury and the Federal Reserve to divert the attention of the public away from the main problems to what is a comparatively minor issue.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I understand correctly that the minority has charged the majority in this case with political blackmail?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the ground, as they seem to imply, that somehow—it is not true, I am sure—the majority would be willing to approve the elimination of the 4¼-percent limit, provided certain reforms were put into effect. It is my understanding that what the Senator from Illinois has been saying, and saying very consistently and very emphatically, is that the 4¼-percent limit would become academic and unimportant if reforms were put into effect which would have the effect of reducing the interest rate and making it possible to sell long-term bonds at far less than 4¼ percent. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. We are not trying to blackmail the administration in any respect. We are not holding out for dams, judgeships, or patronage jobs; we are holding out for actions which will serve the public interest. We do not see how we can agree to raise the ceiling in a market which is now noncompetitive and is essentially an administered market.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To make the Senator's terms completely correct, when he speaks of the bond market as being an administered market, it is a market which is being controlled by a small number of persons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And who also affect the decisions of the Treasury.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Persons who also affect the decisions of the Treasury. They are those who are in a position to control, within certain limits, and for their own selfish advantages, the bond market itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator another question at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Illinois believe, speaking in general terms, that the Government long-term bonds should bear a rate of return exceeding that of the short-issue bonds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes I think so in most cases because there is a greater degree of risk in the price level of the long-term bonds.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A person who was willing to lend his money over a period of time——

Mr. DOUGLAS. He takes the risk of changes in the price level.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He takes a greater risk of changes in the price level and other unknown factors, with a result that he is entitled to a higher interest rate than one who lends over a shorter period of time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Based on that analogy, does the Senator feel that, in general, the Government should try to see to it that a person who buys Government bonds in good faith, and who subsequently is forced to dispose of them, should not have to sell those bonds at a substantial loss?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We do not want anybody to have to take a substantial loss. As a matter of fact, if the Senator will look at my further development of this point, I am advocating that just because small investors find it difficult to put their savings into an investment medium which is protected against inflation and is relatively risk free, the Treasury should issue some savings bonds which are adjusted to changes in the price level. In order to confine these bonds to individuals of modest means who do not have available to them other investment media which are secure against inflation, such bonds should be issued in limited quantity to any individual.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to call them inflation-proof bonds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, inflation-proof bonds. I am in favor of it, not in unlimited quantities, but in limited quantities, available to small investors.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has seemed to this Senator for some time that it would be a very fine thing if the Government did make available to persons of modest means securities which would be a safe investment and would bring a good return.

I wonder if the Senator from Illinois will agree with me that it is not quite economic justice, when the Government encourages persons of modest means to invest their money in government bonds, to require such persons to receive a smaller return than is received by those who speculate and those who are in a position to invest in other bonds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the history of the E-bond is that when it was issued during the war it brought a greater rate of return than did other government bonds issued at the same time. That is the reason why a $5,000 limitation was put on the E-bonds. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not seem to be a matter of economic and social justice, when we encourage the small investors to invest and hold government bonds, rather than dispose of them, that when the Government raises interest rates it should automatically raise the return on the bonds of this sort, along with the interest rate on bonds which are sold at higher interest rates?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would prefer to protect such investors through savings bonds which are adjusted to changes in the price level.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, of course. The Senator would seek to achieve the same result by seeking to adjust to any changes in the price level, or, to use the term which appeals to the Senator from Louisiana, make them inflationproof.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say, briefly, I would not adjust bond values to compensate for changes in interest rates, but for changes in price levels.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

ADVANCE REFUNDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Incidentally there is one other reform which the Treasury should also introduce which I shall discuss only briefly. It deals with advance refunding.

Advance refunding, which give holders of existing long-term maturities a chance to exchange them for new long-term securities before they reach maturity, can be an important means of lengthening the debt. Through advance refunding the Treasury substantially reduces the attrition which it ordinarily suffers when long-term issues are refinanced. Long-term investors who ordinarily might sell a bond near maturity to individuals interested in short-terms, and who then might invest the freed funds in non-Government long-term securities, are thereby encouraged to keep their funds in Governments. Advance refunding has to be done gradually and in moderation, in order to prevent the interest costs from being driven up.

REFORMS IN MONETARY AND FEDERAL RESERVE POLICY

Mr. President, thus far I have been talking about reforms which are primarily needed in Treasury policies.

We now come to the great reforms which are needed in Federal Reserve policy if we are to realize our full possibilities for growth and for keeping unemployment low, and yet, to do so without inflation.

NO PEGGING

Let us clear up the misrepresentations and the economic red herrings which many administration officials and financial writers have persisted in applying to the proposals of the majority members of the committee. We are not proposing that the Federal Reserve Board should peg the price of Government bonds by buying unlimited quantities at low interest rates. If the rates were appreciably below market rates, this would commit the Reserve to buy large quantities in the open market. This would increase member bank reserves in the Reserve System by the amount of the purchases. If they purchased $2 billion worth, that would increase the member bank reserves by $2 billion. This in turn would permit the member banks to increase the amount of credit which they would create and lend out by approximately six times the increase in their reserves.

I understand it may be seven times the increase, but I am using the figure six times. If the member bank's reserves were increased by $2 billion, the loans by the member banks could increase by $12 billion, and this would take the form of an increase in demand deposits of $12 billion. Unless this was accompanied by a corresponding increase in the quantity of goods and services, it would lead to an increase in price levels which might have disastrous results.

It was to prevent this from happening that in 1950 and 1951, I, as a comparatively new Senator, urged that the pegging practice be discontinued by the Reserve. I think I can truthfully say, without undue egotism, that I played a considerable part in the final accord negotiated between the Treasury and the Reserve in March of 1951 which put an end to this practice. Let me say most solemnly for the RECORD that I am proud of having helped to effect this change of policy, and I am not proposing that we return to the pegging practices of the pre-accord nor with one exception are my fellow majority members of the committee. So let this pet hobgoblin of the administration and of the financial writers be laid to a deserved rest.

But just as I opposed the Truman administration for using the Federal Reserve to keep interest rates unduly low, and by so doing to bring on inflation, so do I similarly oppose the present policies of the Eisenhower administration and of the Reserve Board to force interest rates up to an excessive height. This is no new concern of mine. For as far back as 1950, in a report of the subcommittee of which I was chairman, we recommended that "as a long-run matter, we favor interest rates as low as they can be without inducing inflation, for low rates stimulate capital investment" and we might have added—tend to reduce unemployment. The Government and the Federal Reserve should therefore throw their weight upon the side of reducing rather than increasing the interest rate but do so in a manner that will not create inflation.

A PROPER SECULAR EXPANSION OF THE MONEY SUPPLY

One of the ways in which this can be done is for the Federal Reserve to expand the money supply at approximately the same rate as economic growth and to do so by purchasing Government bonds in the open market rather than by lowering the reserve ratios.

The Federal Reserve and the banking system operate under what is known as the fractional reserve system.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I notice that two of the four economists who testified—there were two who, as I recall, did not express an opinion—proposed that the Federal Reserve Board surrender its powers over the rediscount rates and over reserves, and concentrate entirely on open-market operations. While this was conceived primarily from an economic, and not a political, standpoint, it makes a lot of good political sense, and here is why: It seems to me that when the Federal Reserve varies the reserves of banks, it varies them in one way, and that, of course, is down, in order to make it possible for the banks to make greater profits. They do it sincerely. Yet it is done with all the pressure that comes on the Board and from its own inclinations and prejudices in that direction. Therefore, this recommendation, made by competent economists, based on nonpolitical considerations, makes good sense, and adds particular emphasis to the proposal made by the Senator from Illinois, which is not so extreme as these proposals simply to emphasize open-market operations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Wisconsin, who has courage and who has had experience in Wall Street and knows what he is talking about, realizes this is one of the most crucial recommendations we have made. In the recessions of 1953–54 and 1957–58, what the Reserve Board did, in order to increase the supply of funds, was not to participate in open-market operations, but to lower the reserve levels.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which has been prepared on reductions in member bank reserve requirements and comparisons with equivalent open-market purchases by the Federal Reserve System be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE 7.—*Reductions in member bank reserve requirements and comparisons with equivalent open market purchases by Federal Reserve System, July 1, 1953, to Dec. 31, 1959*

Date	Reserve requirements as percent of deposits in—				Reduction in requirements in—					Interest per annum on open market purchases of amount equivalent to reserve reduction if placed—		Estimated added payment U.S. Treasury assuming equivalent open market purchase and transfer to Treasury of 90 percent of net in lieu of franchise tax			
												Per annum at—		Cumulative to Dec. 31, 1959, at—	
	Central Reserve cities	Reserve cities	Country	Time deposits	Central Reserve cities	Reserve cities	Country	Time deposits	Total	In "bills only"	At prevailing bond rate	Bill rate [1]	Bond rate	Bill rate	Bond rate
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
In effect prior to July 1953	24	20	14	6											
1953, July 1, 9 [2]	22	19	13		$500	$345	$311		$1,156	$25.7	$37.6	$23.1	$33.8	$150.3	$219.7
1954															
June 16, 24 [2]	21			5	520	350	310	$375	1,555	26.9	42.0	24.2	37.8	133.2	207.9
July 29, Aug. 1 [2]	20	18	12												
1958															
Feb. 27, Mar. 1 [2]	19½	17½	11½		125	195	180		500	12.4	16.3	11.2	14.7	19.6	25.7
Mar. 30, Apr. 1 [2]	19	17	11		125	190	175		490						
Apr. 17	18				130	190			450	24.7	29.3	22.2	26.4	36.8	43.8
Apr. 24	18	16½			130										
Total					1,530	1,270	976	375	4,151	89.7	125.2	80.7	112.7	339.9	497.1

[1] Quarterly average rate for period.
[2] First-of-month or midmonth dates are changes at country banks, and other dates (usually Thursday), are the central Reserve or Reserve city banks.

Source: Based upon data from Federal Reserve bulletins and announcements.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then when business revives, the Board does not increase the ratio; so that there is a secular, long-time, downward movement in the reserve ratios which the Board puts into effect.

Mr. Martin actually testified, that he believed the ultimate goal should be a reserve ratio of 10 percent, approximately, the present ratio being somewhere between 14¼ and 16⅔ percent.

Every time the ratio on a given amount of bank reserves is lowered, the banks can expand credit proportionately, without cost to themselves, and with the entire gain going to the banks, both in the increase in capital assets and in interest, and none of it goes to the Federal Reserve or to the Treasury. This is one of the most serious questions we have before the Nation—whether the money supply is to be expanded in such a way that the banks create all of it, and derive the full profit, without any of it going to the Treasury. Apparently the Federal Reserve Board believes that in the main that should be so. It wants to go substantially to the British and German ratios, which are somewhere around 8 or 10 percent. I think this would be a great mistake.

If the speech of the Senator from Illinois does nothing else than to help alert some of the people to the dangers of this policy, it may not be utterly in vain.

Again and again in the discussions of last summer with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. REUSS, the very able Representative from Wisconsin, and the Senator from Illinois urged the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to get his credit expansion by means of open market operations rather than by lowering reserve ratios.

When the Federal Reserve makes purchases in the open market it issues checks which the purchasers of the bonds then deposit in their banks. The banks turn these in to the Federal Reserve, and they are credited to their accounts, thereby increasing the member bank reserves. Therefore, the open market purchases directly increase the member bank reserves, and based upon these reserves the member banks can expand their loans by 6 or 7 times. This is the point. The banks do not get a full 100-percent increase in capital assets. They get five-sixths or six-sevenths of the total, but the Federal Reserve gets from one-seventh to one-sixth of the total, because it is taking title to the bonds purchased. This is extremely important.

Suppose we say that the money supply should grow at the rate of 3 percent a year. And let us say that the member bank reserves should grow at the rate of 3 percent a year, in order that they may expand. The member bank reserves are somewhat in excess of $20 billion. A 3 percent growth rate on $20 billion would be approximately $600 million a year. This would mean that the Federal Reserve would be buying $600 million worth of bonds each year. Think what a strengthening of the bond market would be created by the purchase of $600 million worth of bonds. This would raise the price of the bonds, lower the yields, and lower the interest rates.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would this not mean that the Federal Reserve Board would be holding and the Treasury would be receiving the interest income from those bonds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So this is a way, in a very important sense, of retiring some of the national debt?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we talk about a $600 million purchase each year, and 3⅔ percent interest, let us say, in the first year that would yield an interest return of $22 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Each year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Each year 90 percent of that would be turned over to the Treasury. The next year it would be $44 million, $22 million plus $22 million. The next year it would be $66 million. The next year it would be $88 million. The year after it would be $110 million. The next year it would be $132 million. The next year it would be $154 million. The year after that it would be $176 million. And so on.

We have made a computation to show that had the Federal Reserve adopted this policy in 1953, and carried it out to the present day, the net increase in revenue to the Treasury at the bond rate would have amounted to almost $500 million for the period as a whole, and would be going at a present annual rate of approximately $113 million; the capital assets of the Federal Reserve System would have been increased by several billion dollars; the Government bond market would have been strengthened; and interest rates would have been lowered.

I think this is the most important banking issue before the American public. As fine a man as Mr. Martin is, I will say he is obdurate in his demand and in the policy that the lending capacity of the banking system of the country should be increased primarily by a reduction in the reserve ratios—down, down, down to 10 percent—rather than through open-market purchases. Either way the expansion will come about. It is a question of whether the public receives a share of the profits, as it would under the open-market method, or whether the banks get all the profits, as would be the case under the method of lowering reserve requirements.

Let me make it clear that I have nothing against the banks. They are fine institutions. I want to see them prosper. There are some great banks in Chicago. I hope Chicago will come to surpass New York as the financial center of the country. I have played my part in trying to help the banks prosper. I am ready to let them have five-sixths or six-sevenths of the gain to be made through the expansion of credit and money.

I am not advocating that the Federal Government should take all of this. My good friend, Representative PATMAN, points to the fact that the Constitution gives to the Congress the power "to coin money, and to regulate the value thereof." Those are the exact words. The coining of money carries with it the creation of money. The creation of money is a public function which we have delegated to the Federal Reserve Board, which it in turn has delegated to the banks.

I am not proposing to disturb that relationship. Let me make that clear. I am not proposing "green-backism," or "credit-backism," though I think Representative PATMAN has a case for which his critics have not given him due credit. I am simply proposing that at least we do not lower the existing reserve ratios, and that from future increases the Treasury and the people should get from one-sixth to one-seventh in the money assets and collect the interest for delegating this constitutional power to the private banking system. Is that not moderate? I am not even proposing that the reserve ratio be increased. I am simply saying, "Hold steady. Do not lower it still further."

The Federal Reserve has a very peculiar policy. In periods of recession the Federal Reserve lowers the reserve ratios. This increases the lending power of the banks and gives them costless creation of monetary purchasing power. This is not changed when business revives and we go into a period of prosperity. Then what the reserve does is to raise the discount rate, or the interest rate. So in one case they increase the multiplicand and in the other case they increase the multiplier. In both recession and recovery, the Federal Reserve follows that policy most beneficial to the banks.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The head of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, according to what the Senator has said, has indicated he feels the objective should be 10 percent, which would be a drop from approximately 15 or 16 percent down to 10 percent. If this were to be done, the cost to the Federal Government would be very, very substantial, as compared with the alternative policy which the Senator from Illinois is proposing, of expanding the money supply by buying Federal securities. This is a case of what is going to be. This is not a matter of history. This is a matter of future cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me use an illustration, if I may. The figures I shall give are roughly correct. They are not precise, because I do not have the precise figures with me.

Let us assume that the member bank reserves amount to approximately $20 billion, which I think is substantially the correct figure. This means the banks can create approximately $120 billion worth of demand deposits. We all know that in the commercial banks the loan

precedes the deposit. The loan creates the deposit. This is unlike investment banking, where the deposit creates the loan to a different business.

That would be the case if the ratio were 16⅔. If the ratio were 14⅔ percent, as some people believe it is in fact, we would have to multiply by seven, and the banks could create $140 billion worth of deposits.

If the rates were to be reduced to 10 percent, on the same amount of member bank reserves, with no greater earnings for the Federal Reserve, the banks could create $200 billion of demand deposits, or between $60 and $80 billion more than is the case now.

All I am asking is that the Federal Reserve, the Treasury and the people should get one-sixth or one-seventh of that. Let the banks expand credit by $80 billion over time as the Federal Reserve determines it is proper for the money supply to increase. I am simply proposing that we should allow the banks to have $67 billion of that expansion instead of the full $80 billion. All I am asking is that the people receive $13 billion.

My friend Representative PATMAN would want to have the people get more than that. I do not think he should be denounced for that. On the contrary, I think he is a pretty brave man. In many ways I admire the position he takes. But I am not advocating that.

I do not say this for "show." I am not proposing that we increase the Reserve ratios. I am merely proposing that we hold the ratios steady and that when we expand bank credit it be done by open market purchases, under which the Reserve would get one-sixth or one-seventh for the amount of credit thus created, and the Treasury would then pay the Reserve the interest on those securities. The purchasers of securities at the rate of $600 million, let us say, would greatly strengthen the bond market. In 10 years they would buy $6 billion worth of securities. Do Senators not think that would raise the price of outstanding bonds, and lower the yield on such bonds? The reduction in the yield would lower general interest rates, because the general structure of interest rates is built upon the yield on longtime Governments, and the effect would be stimulative. Instead of having the heavy burden of unemployment which hangs over us, which in 1959 ran at the rate of 5½ percent, and which, if we include involuntary part time, is 6½ percent, I am sure we could have a reduction in unemployment which would certainly be good both for the unemployed and the Nation. There would be an increase in productivity, which would be good for everyone concerned. Our rate of growth would be accelerated.

The Senator from Illinois knows what to expect tomorrow morning. The financial writers will charge him with advocating inflation. For the sake of the RECORD, I make it clear that I am not making such a proposal. I am merely proposing that the total money supply should rise in some proportion to the increase in goods and services, and that this be accomplished by open-market operations rather than by reducing the Reserve ratio.

The issue is not whether the money supply should expand or not. The issue is by what method will it be expanded. The open-market method would gain one-sixth of the profit for the public. By doing it by lowering Reserve requirements, as the Federal Reserve and the banks desire, the banks will get all the profits.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The entire subject of monetary policy involves differences of opinion. It is a subtle, difficult, and complicated subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is very difficult to make it understood by someone with such a limited background as I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has a good background, because he has been a Wall Street banker, in a minor capacity. I do not believe the Senate loaned out enormous sums of money, but he watched it being done. The Senator was also a distinguished member of the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not sure whether to thank the Senator for mentioning that or not. At any rate, he speaks accurately.

I think we can perhaps simplify the argument by emphasizing that the use of open-market operations, when it is proper to expand the money supply, would save money for the American taxpayers. It would be just as effective, so far as the Treasury is concerned, as though the Congress, after extensive debate, were to pass a new tax law to raise revenue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Furthermore, it would have the effect of expanding the money supply, just as really and with approximately the same speed, as would lowering the Reserve ratios. And I emphasize again, we are not advocating pegging, but talking about how to expand the money supply when it is proper to do so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly; but I think there has been so much steam behind the economy move, and such a ready and easy public acceptance of economy, that people will go for anything that will save money. There has been a great deal of pressure from the White House, newspapers, and so forth.

I think no one on any side of the argument can deny that open-market operations represent the economical way to expand the money supply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If Mr. Martin had adopted this policy in 1953, instead of lowering the reserve ratio, the Federal Reserve would have made $500 million more in interest than it did make, and under the informal agreement it would have turned over 90 percent of that sum to the Treasury. Now, $450 million or $500 million may not be very much to Mr. Martin; $500 million may not be very much to George M. Humphrey; it may not be very much to that fine man, Mr. Robert Anderson—and he is a fine man—but to me $500 million is a great deal of money. To the people of the United States it is a great deal of money. It would pay for the school bill.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Can we not expect that next week, when the school construction bill is under consideration and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] offers an amendment to increase Federal aid so that we can improve teachers' salaries by $500 million, we shall hear the cry from the other side of the aisle emphasizing the cost and burden to the taxpayer? That cry will be loud, clear, and emphatic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Judging by the past, that is likely to be the case.

I thank the Senator.

ABANDON BILLS ONLY

If the Federal Reserve resorts, as it should resort, to open market operations as a means of properly expanding the money supply, which is contrary to what it has said it wants to do, then it must make another change. It must abandon its present policy of trading in "bills only."

Mr. Martin adopted this policy shortly after he became chairman of the Board. The policy was that the Reserve would buy and sell short-time Government bills of 91 days' duration, but would not buy long-term bonds, or, indeed, certificates. With three exceptions it has held rigidly to this policy. This is known as the "Martin 'bills only' policy."

If they resort to open market operations for proper secular expansion, in my judgment, they must discard the "bills only" policy. Whatever the views of people may be on the general thesis I have recently been expounding, I think the "bills only" policy has been denounced by virtually every competent authority. It has been condemned by the New York Federal Reserve Bank—and while I do not always agree with the New York Federal Reserve Bank, I believe in this respect it is correct. I wish to pay tribute to the leaders of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, including the former president, Mr. Sproul, Alfred Hays, the present president, and the experts attached to the New York Federal Reserve Bank. They have been in open rebellion against the "bills only" policy. I think most competent economists call for the abandonment of the "bills only" policy; and our committee asks for its abandonment.

The Reserve Board seems to hold the curious doctrine that it is proper for the Reserve to affect the shorttime interest rate but not for the longtime rate. It is all right to affect the shorttime interest rate, but not the longtime interest rate. I do not see why one should draw any distinction between the shorttime rate and the longtime rate. As a matter of fact, I think the case affecting the longtime rate is stronger than the case for affecting the shorttime rate, because it is the longtime rate which more directly affects the market rate of interest for corporations and private borrowers.

The Federal Reserve is very curious in its inconsistency. I would have thought

that the able men attached to the Federal Reserve would have perceived their inconsistency. In one breath they say that it is proper to affect the shorttime interest rate but not the longtime interest rate. Then, in the next breath, and in a contradictory fashion, they assert that the best way to affect the longtime rate is through the shorttime rate. In other words, it is better to do it indirectly than to do it directly; but we should not do it at all. In its arguments, therefore, the Reserve Board resembles the character in one of Stephen Leacock's novels who mounted his horse and rode off in all directions. Or, in the language of Edmund Burke, as applied to one of the cabinets of King George, in this respect it is a candidate for contradictory honors.

There is no good reason why the Federal Reserve should not operate on the longtime as well as the shorttime side of the market. The idea that the longtime rate can be affected better indirectly than directly is similar to Tom Sawyer's quaint and romantic notion that it was better to get Jim out of the cabin by digging an elaborate tunnel rather than by opening a door. The truth of the matter is that shorttime rates can fall sharply, while longtime rates decrease but slightly. In 1958 the shorttime rate went down sharply. The longtime rate did not go down appreciably. This illustrates how rapidly the shorttime rate falls. It falls sharply and abruptly; and while there was a decline in the longtime rate—of which the Treasury did not take full advantage—nevertheless, the decline in the longtime rate was much less than the decline in the shorttime rate.

So the idea that we can affect the longtime rate better by working on the shorttime rate rather than working directly on the longtime rate is ridiculous. It is remarkable that sensible people should maintain such an argument.

Similarly, shorttime interest rates can at times be forced up by the Reserve without much effect on the longtime rate.

Since it is the longtime rate which furnishes the basic riskless rate of interest upon which other and private rates of interest depend, it would seem better for the Reserve to operate directly rather than indirectly upon this rate. This is necessary in order to better effect a reduction in interest rates and thus stimulate investment and employment without inflation.

This ability to trade across the board is also necessary to prevent dangerous differences from developing between the longtime and shorttime rates, which led to the wild speculation in Government bonds and their subsequent collapse in the early summer of 1958.

If the Reserve is to help reduce unemployment, increase production and stimulate investment by open-market operations it should not try to do so with one arm tied behind its back. It should operate with both arms.

It should furthermore be realized that if an undue disparity develops between the shorttime and longtime rate, this can be corrected by the process of "exchanging" or "swapping" without expanding the total member bank reserves or the total money supply. For example if the shorttime rate is excessively low in relation to the longtime rate, the Reserve could simultaneously buy bonds and sell bills in equal amounts. This would keep total reserves and hence the money supply constant. It would merely alter the position of the bondholdings of the Federal Reserve. It would however raise the price of bonds and lower their yields or the true interest rate while it would lower the price of bills and raise their yields. Since it is the longtime interest rate which has the greater influence on investment, this would have a net stimulative effect without increasing prices. This can only be done, however, if the bills-only policy is abandoned.

In conclusion we can only hope that the Treasury and the Reserve will abandon their obstinate refusal to set their houses in order and instead adopt a policy of monetary responsibility.

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. President, this has already been a long speech, and I regret that it must go on, but I will try not to prolong it unduly.

But even more important than debt management and monetary policy is fiscal policy. Here the administration and the Congress must both bear the responsibility.

For the Federal Government is far and away the largest economic unit in the Nation. It handles over one-sixth of the gross national product. It has a very large effect on economic activity, on economic stability, and on growth.

In the postwar period we have not used the full possibilities of fiscal policy to achieve the Employment Act's objectives. This has been particularly true since the end of the Korean war. Indeed, Federal fiscal actions have been a major source of the low growth, of the upward trend in unemployment, and of the rising price level. In addition, the decrease in the use of fiscal policy has imposed too great a burden on monetary policy.

The Federal Government should use fiscal policy more fully than it has in recent years.

Excessive reliance on monetary policy is unsatisfactory because it acts selectively on a relatively few sections of the economy and because of inevitable delays before its effects are felt. Fiscal policy, while more difficult to use, has prompter and larger effects.

LARGER BUDGET SURPLUS

Greater reliance on fiscal policy calls for two things. First, there should be larger budget surpluses than have been realized in recovery and prosperity. This is necessary to achieve the desired amount of restraint on total demand in these periods. Second, there should be more prompt budget deficits when recession conditions are developing. If this course is followed, less reliance will have to be placed on monetary restraints against inflation and on monetary expansion to head off or moderate a recession. Interest rates in general will be lower than they would otherwise be. Moreover, while interest rates would still be flexible, they would fluctuate within a much more limited range. Greater reliance on fiscal policy, therefore, will not only be more effective in promoting stability in the rate of employment and output and in the price level, but will also contribute to greater stability in the Nation's financial markets.

In the long run, a more rapid expansion of the Nation's productive capacity will probably require a higher rate of national saving. The surest way to attain this is to have larger budget surpluses during periods when there is a high level of employment and output.

A budget surplus in such periods reduces the purchasing power of the private economy. To the extent that these surpluses reduce consumption, they increase the total amount of resources available for investment. Of course, this process will only operate successfully if other policies, particularly monetary, keep the total money demand high. Otherwise the private investment will not take place. Budget surpluses in these periods permit debt retirement. This releases funds for private investment and would lower interest rates.

Since the end of the Korean war, the total of Federal surpluses in prosperous periods has represented a much smaller proportion of the gross national product than in the period prior to the Korean war. Federal fiscal activities, therefore, have made a smaller contribution to total national saving in recent years than in the earlier postwar period.

DEFENSE ORDER CHANGES

Changes in defense orders and purchases have been an important cause of economic instability in the postwar period. These changes should be based upon the Nation's longrun defense requirements, and not upon considerations of the debt limit or other narrow budgetary concerns. Changes in defense demands should be treated as signals that offsetting changes in taxes or other expenditures may have to be made if recessionary or inflationary strains are to be avoided.

TAX CUTS IN RECESSION PERIODS

The principal weapon which should be used to prevent recession trends from gaining momentum and to promote recovery from recession is a reduction in tax rates. Such countercyclical tax cuts should be enacted on a temporary basis, and should automatically end when the forces of recovery become strong.

Since no two recessions are likely to be the same in all important respects, no single prescription for tax reduction is likely to fit all cases. In general, however, the aim should be to reduce individual income taxes, because they have the widest and quickest impact on the economy. Moreover, provision should be made for reversing tax reductions on a timely basis as recovery proceeds, in order to maintain the Federal Government's revenue base in the long run.

STRENGTHEN AUTOMATIC STABILIZERS

In addition to vigorous use of discretionary tax changes, the automatic fiscal stabilizers should be strengthened. In particular, the unemployment insurance

system should be liberalized to increase the response of fiscal policy to changes in employment.

We give elaborate treatment to that subject in our report, and indicate that the rate of unemployment benefits and their duration should be increased as unemployment rises.

The present Federal fiscal structure contains elements which respond automatically to offset changes in the national income. Tax liabilities react to changes in economic activity. They moderate fluctuations in private incomes and expenditures. On the expenditure side, certain payments go up and down automatically with changes in economic conditions. Unemployment compensation benefits rise with increases in unemployment and fall off as unemployment drops. Public assistance payments and old-age and survivors insurance benefits do the same. Tax collections fall as corporate and individual incomes fall.

Automatic stabilizers do not reverse recessions. They slow down and reduce the size of the decline but they provide no upward stimulus of their own. However, even if the Government is more willing to act than in the recent past, there will always be some delay. Therefore the automatic fiscal stabilizers should be strengthened wherever possible as a first line of defense against recessions.

TAX REFORM

Improvements can be made in the Federal tax system. Tax reform would bring back into the income tax base certain items of income, for example, capital gains, which are highly sensitive to changes in economic activity. In addition, increasing the progression at the lower end of the income scale would improve the response of the tax system to economic ups and downs. Splitting the first bracket in the individual income tax would be a major gain in this respect.

Experience in the 1957–58 recession showed that the unemployment compensation system is a major area in which improvements can be made. The emergency action by the Federal Government in supplementing State employment benefits when these were exhausted was certainly the most heartening feature of the Federal fiscal policy in the last recession.

The unemployment insurance system should be strengthened. Both the amount of benefits and their duration should be increased. Of course there is an upper limit on how much can be done without hurting incentives, even in good times. At present, however, this limit has not been reached.

Improvements in the unemployment compensation system should not wait for the next recession. Work should begin on this program now.

As we place more emphasis on fiscal policy and larger budget surpluses to restrain total money demand, reform of the Federal tax structure, particularly of the income and estate and gift taxes, becomes more urgent.

If the "mix" of monetary and fiscal policy is to be changed, as we propose, we must have the fairest possible tax system. The weaknesses of the present tax system, particularly of the income and estate and gift taxes, are legion. They have been set out in hearings and studies by the Joint Economic Committee and most recently by the House Committee on Ways and Means. Both the individual and corporate tax systems are full of preferential provisions which allow some taxpayers, because of the source of their income or the use they make of it, to pay lower taxes than others with equal incomes. The result is that many taxpayers, particularly individuals, pay taxes on only a fraction of the income they actually receive. This requires others to pay higher taxes than would otherwise be needed. Moreover, since not all taxpayers can take advantage of the preferential provisions, these high tax rates have a very uneven impact.

These discriminations cannot be concealed. Widespread knowledge of them has undermined confidence in the fairness of the tax system. As greater reliance is placed on fiscal policy it is particularly urgent that these injustices should be done away with. Those with equal income should pay equal taxes without regard to how the income is obtained or what use is made of it.

What a simple standard I am suggesting. People with equal income should pay equal taxes. I am not proposing any increase in the progression of the Federal tax structure. In fact, I propose a decrease. I am merely saying that people with equal income should pay equal taxes. What is so revolutionary about that? It is so simple, and, stated in that way, one could hardly expect any disagreement with it.

In addition, tax loopholes distort the use of resources. When taxes are lower on some sources or uses of income than on others, taxpayers spend or invest for tax reasons rather than because of sound business judgments or the dictates of the market. Resources then flow into areas where they get the best tax treatment rather than where they are most efficient or most needed. This means that our economy is less efficient than it could be. Tax preferences, therefore, limit the growth in our real output and in our productive capacity.

We cannot list all of the necessary reforms in the Federal tax structure. Among the most urgent, however, are the following:

First. Repeal of the dividends-received credit and exclusion: These provisions primarily benefit a small minority of the largest stockholders. They do little, if anything at all, to encourage corporations to increase external equity financing, rather than debt or internal financing. Repeal of these provisions would add $400 million to $500 million to Federal revenues.

Second. Provide for withholding on interest and dividend payments: At present, between $4 billion and $5 billion of dividends and interest received by individuals which should be reported on their tax returns escapes the individual income tax through deliberate evasion, forgetfulness, or ignorance of the law's requirements. Withholding at the source on dividend and interest payments at the same rate as for wages and salaries is entirely practicable, would involve extremely small costs of compliance by withholding agents, and would increase Federal revenues by about $800 million. The argument that this would involve overwithholding on widows and orphans, upon which proposals for dividend and interest withholding have foundered in the past, is without merit. Tax has been withheld on wages and salaries for years. This withholding system has involved greater overwithholding on wage and salary earners than would occur in the case of dividend and interest withholding. Yet those who oppose the latter on the grounds that it would be unfair to dividend and interest recipients seldom mention the far greater overwithholding burdens which are borne by those who receive wages and salaries.

A basic 20 percent is withheld on wages and salaries for taxes, but not on dividends and interest, resulting in the distribution of some $6 billion of taxable dividends and interest, which is not reported by the recipients.

Third. Rigorously limit employee expense accounts: Business expense accounts have been carried to such extremes that as much as $5 billion to $10 billion of personal income now escapes taxation. Moreover, these practices feed on themselves by setting up pressures for more generous allowances among competing firms. These practices are among the most glaring injustices now tolerated by the law. Limiting deductions to those expenses without which the basic business of the employer could not be carried out would add as much as $800 million to Federal receipts.

I repeat, we should rigorously limit expense accounts for managerial and salaried employees—and not make payola a deductible expense.

Fourth. Limit the types of income to which capital gains treatment is given to true capital gains: Under present law, capital gains treatment, with a maximum tax rate of 25 percent, is given in many circumstances, where income involves no sale or exchange of capital assets. The low capital gains rate has been widely used as a tax relief device. Examples where the capital gain rate is given where no true capital gain is involved include: coal royalties, the sale of cut timber, and the gains from the sale by corporations of depreciable assets. Perhaps the present provisions are not the best way to treat legitimate capital gains. But the use of these provisions where no capital asset is involved and where no sale or exchange occurs is clearly unjustified. Eliminating these cases would add about $600 million to Federal revenues from the corporation income tax alone.

Fifth. Progressively reduce the percentage depletion rates allowed on oil and gas: Percentage depletion permits the taxpayer to recover his investment in a property many times over. The cumulative total of these deductions is limited by the income from the property and not by the taxpayer's invest-

ment in it. These provisions are grossly unjust. In addition, they encourage a wasteful rate of investment in these properties and discourage sound conservation practices. The total elimination of percentage depletion for oil and gas alone, that is, permitting only actual investment to be recovered for tax purposes, would add between $1 billion and $1.2 billion in Federal receipts. A more limited approach which would retain the present 27½ percent depletion rate for small oil and gas operators and reduce the rate to 15 percent for the giant firms in this industry would add about $400 million to Federal tax receipts.

This is very important. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Illinois have crusaded on this subject for a good many years. When the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I started this back in 1951, we got eight votes. That is all. A Senator rose in the Senate—and he was my dear friend—and said, "I warn you not to commit political suicide. If you push this, you will be defeated for reelection, and you will go into the limbo of forgotten Senators." I noticed a smile of satisfaction creep over the faces of many of my colleagues when that warning was issued.

I can only say that I survived the second election. The same predictions are being made today.

I remind Senators that my State is the eighth oil-producing State in the Nation. In one congressional district, oil is the predominant industry. So it is not politically expedient for me to urge the reduction of the depletion allowance; but as a matter of justice I can only urge it, because in its present form it means that the oil and gas industries pay an average of only 17 percent on corporate profits in comparison with the average for other corporations of 51 percent. Some gas and oil companies which have tremendous earnings pay no taxes. One company actually got a refund on as much as $65 million in profits.

Out of consideration for those people, and because I do not like to deal in personalities, I have never published the names of those companies; but I have a list of names, and if pushed I might publish them, although I do not want to do so because I do not believe in putting anyone in the pillory.

Some predictions are being made that I will not be back here next year. As I have heard those predictions made, I have again noticed smiles of satisfaction spread over the countenances of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It may be so; I do not want to pose in any false sense as a martyr, because that is always somewhat unesthetic. I can only take the stand which I have always taken.

Incidentally, the method which I am proposing would reduce the depletion allowance from 27½ percent to only 15 percent on those having incomes of more than $5 million a year, and to 21 percent on those having a gross income of from $1 million to $5 million. Those having gross incomes of under $1 million would not be touched at all. The rate on those having gross incomes under $1 million would not hurt the small operator in the slightest degree. It would not hurt any farmer. It would only reduce the advantages which go to the "big boys," to the "colossi," so to speak. But they are very influential in trying to convince everyone who owns a share of stock in an oil or a gas company that I am out to scalp them; or to convince every farmer who owns a royalty right that I am trying to hurt him.

I have gone into the oil producing areas of Illinois and have spoken my mind. I have advocated these policies wherever the representatives of the large oil companies have wished to debate, and I have taken them on. I shall continue to go into that region again. I did so, as a matter of fact, last fall. I find that when this issue is presented to the people, when it can really be gotten to the people, and they see the essential justice of what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Illinois are trying to do, the popular result is most unfavorable for the prophets of gloom and doom, and they realize it.

The simple reform which the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Illinois are proposing would add $400 million to the Federal Reserve. If this is turned down, then in the long run the storm of popular indignation will be so great that, instead of the mild measure which I am proposing, there will be a much more stringent measure.

I am really the best friend the oil industry has; but, as is true in so many instances, my friendship is not acknowledged by the oil journals or by the oil associations or the gas associations.

Sixth. Mr. President, another thing which we advocate is the improvement of the enforcement of the income tax laws. It is estimated that as much as $25 billion of taxable income is not reported on individual income tax returns. A larger number of employees is needed in the Internal Revenue Service.

The revenue gain which could come from more vigorous enforcement efforts is, therefore, substantial. It has been shown by Internal Revenue Service studies that each additional dollar applied to enforcement brings in receipts many times greater. Even a modest investment in expanding and improving enforcement techniques would yield an additional $1 billion in Federal revenues.

Seventh. Eliminate the numerous preferential provisions in the estate and gift taxes: At present, these taxes fail to serve either their social purpose of preventing great accumulations and concentrations of wealth or of producing any substantial amounts of revenue. Revision of the marital deduction, closing the avoidance device of life estates, and possibly integrating the two taxes into a single wealth transfer tax with a single system of rates, deductions, and exemptions would add at least an additional $1 billion to Federal tax receipts annually.

These revisions altogether would bring in an additional $4 billion to $5 billon in tax income annually. Numerous other revisions can and should be made to improve the fairness and the revenue potential of the Federal tax system and to reduce its bad effects on economic growth. The additional revenues which would result from these reforms could be used in part—notice this—to reduce the high marginal income tax rates, particularly those above, say, 65 percent in the individual income tax.

I do not like the 91-percent tax. I think it is far too high. When paid it almost kills initiative. I would not like to see the maximum rate go above 65 percent, or certainly not above 75 percent. If we can make the people who evade and avoid taxes pay their taxes, then the tax rate can be reduced for the honest billionaire or the honest hundred millionaire. My heart bleeds for them as well as for others.

In Chicago, when we had a very unjust personal property tax system, there were three multimillionaires who played square. The McCormick family—the International Harvester McCormick family—would always declare a million dollars of personal property. I think every member of the family would declare a million dollars of personal property. They did not have to; they could have got by with less; but they felt it was only proper to do so.

Julius Rosenwald did so; and I believe Charles R. Crane did the same. I am very happy that all three of those families were great friends and supporters of Woodrow Wilson.

So there are many wealthy men and women who have a high sense of social responsibility, and who would not think of evading or avoiding their taxes. These present high rates put a tremendous temptation upon them.

If we can plug the loopholes and get more revenue, we can reduce the rates and reduce the temptation to which the wealthy are exposed. Such a procedure would subject them to less temptation and help to make them as honest as they would like to be. I want to smooth that path.

The added revenues could also be used to reduce the Federal debt and thereby ease pressure in the money market, and to finance a modest amount of expenditures aimed at encouraging the Nation's economic growth. The added revenues should also be used to make some reductions in the taxes on the lower and middle income groups. We are not going to have all the benefits go to those in the upper brackets. The lower and middle income groups deserve a cut too. Quite a lot of money—perhaps from $4 billion to $5 billion—could be raised by this method. But at least half should also be used in periods of prosperity to reduce the Federal debt. This would have the incidental effect of raising bond prices and reducing bond yields, and hence reducing the interest rates.

We should reorder the priorities in the Federal budget. Greater emphasis should be placed on those Government programs which are essential to the Nation's and the free world's defense, to promote the well-being of our people, and to contribute to a higher rate of economic growth. We should reduce those outlays which support the inefficient use of the Nation's resources.

Now I shall indicate some of the ways in which I think there can be productive expenditures.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I could not agree more strongly with what the Senator from Illinois has said about tax reform. I am concerned, however, with the significance of the proposals the Senator has made in the context of his speech. He has suggested—and I agree with him—that more emphasis should be placed on fiscal policy for stability than on monetary policy. I am very much concerned with the difficulty of increasing taxes in times of prosperity, which is a simple, plain, obvious political difficulty with which we are all acquainted; and, as a matter of fact, the very great difficulty of decreasing taxes in periods of recession, such as we experienced in 1958, when the Senator from Illinois and I were two of those who advocated, as did many other Senators on both sides of the aisle, a reduction of taxes in a depression period.

Has the Senator from Illinois any feeling about how this fiscal policy can be made a more practical tool for stability?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Prof. Albert G. Hart, of Columbia University, has proposed a policy for an automatic change in tax rates according to the indexes. In periods of prosperity, as business improved, taxes would be increased. This would have the advantage of celerity.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that is very good. What must be overcome is a tendency on the part of people to say, in periods of recession, "We are going to have a $12 billion deficit; therefore, we should increase taxes."

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is exactly the opposite of the compensatory policy. In periods of prosperity, it is said that because we have a surplus, we should cut taxes. That is exactly the opposite of what should be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is exactly the opposite. This is one of the greatest fallacies and must be overcome.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is something which dates back at least 15 years. Many economists have recognized the wisdom of compensatory fiscal policies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope I will not be regarded as being unduly egotistical when I say that I advocated the theory of compensatory expenditures of the Government and compensatory tax rates as early as 1930. I can remember in 1931 making a speech before an international conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on this topic. I think there was a general feeling that I was out of my mind. Then John Maynard Keynes took it up—independently, of course. It did not take my writing to stimulate his own brilliant mind. And Marriner Eccles, of Utah, without knowing either one of us existed, testified to that effect before the Senate Finance Committee in the early winter of 1931, before the new administration took over. He was the only witness who so testified. Everybody else testified we were running into a deficit; we should increase taxes and balance the budget.

Since then this idea has gained greater acceptance. It is up to the administration and to Representatives and Senators in Congress to do something about applying it. It should take some form which would remove obstacles to making up our minds so that it will operate in some more automatic way.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The reason I make the comment is I have a feeling that perhaps the suggestion that we would not lose on monetary policy or lose on fiscal policy depends on whether or not the second recommendation can be put into effect, and I am afraid that perhaps it cannot be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we say it cannot be, then we abandon the field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should have said that it can be accomplished only with great difficulty. I think what the Senator has said is most encouraging. He said he made that recommendation in 1930——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thirty years ago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The suggestion has made progress. According to the report being made, the majority espouses that recommendation, and so does the speech of the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee which he is now making. I think on that basis the compensatory fiscal policy idea is moving ahead, but I think it faces the problem that we need to talk about it a great deal more in order to have the public accept it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

REORDER EXPENDITURE PRIORITIES

To improve Federal expenditure policy, we should put a high priority on:

First. Better provision for defense, especially for missiles and for combat troops;

Second. An improved foreign aid program;

Third. Federal aid to education;

Fourth. Continued support for research and development in line with the growing demands and opportunities that science offers;

Fifth. An enlarged and improved program of medical care and research and especially for hospitals and medical schools;

Sixth. A sound program of natural resource conservation and development; and

Seventh. Programs for restoring and improving the economic health of areas which have been bypassed by economic progress or which are the victims of the adjustments of a dynamic economy.

Until a major change occurs in the relationships among the world's great powers, and a real and secure peace comes about, the United States must be prepared to commit whatever proportion of its vast resources that may be necessary to our defense and to assist in the defense of the free world and in the economic development of the less developed nations. The progress of Soviet military technology increases our peril. It requires us to speed our own advances, if the present delicate balance of military strength which keeps the nuclear peace is not to be lost. If we cannot thereby deter nuclear war, we must be in a position to strike back. For this purpose, we need better missiles and space programs.

In addition, we must improve our ability to fight and to win limited wars without nuclear weapons. All-out nuclear warfare is not the sole threat, and perhaps not the major threat, to world peace. The piecemeal weakening of the free world through limited aggressive wars is still a threat. In partnership with our allies, we must be ready, if necessary, to fight limited battles wherever they may arise, to protect the free world. As the destructive power of nuclear weapons becomes greater, the possible use of them to win limited war is, therefore, essential to our safety. Finally, we must provide military aid to our allies so that they can resist external aggression and internal subversion.

It does not follow that any great increase in total spending for defense will be needed. Parts of our defense program are wasteful and inefficient. This involves the inefficient use of both men and materials. It is also true of procurement practices and the building up and disposal of huge amounts of surplus property. The stockpiling of obsolete and redundant materials and supplies, the unnecessary duplication of facilities and lines of supply now available in the private sectors of the economy, the failure to centralize purchasing, and numerous other inefficient procurement practices remain. The savings in procurement and management could be the major means of financing more missiles and combat troops.

During its study, the committee was told again and again that we must improve our education—in both quality and quantity—that we must increase our efforts in research and development, both basic and applied. This is necessary for a higher rate of economic growth over the long run. Our industrial technology is more complex and makes greater demands on the labor force. To develop our people's talents to the full, and to increase labor productivity at a rate which can cope with the new technology, the standards and amount of education will have to rise rapidly.

Funds for research and development, for which the Federal Government now provides at least half, will also have to rise if a higher rate of economic growth is to come about. The productivity of many of these activities is very great. The civilian byproducts of applied military research alone provide a dramatic catalog of the high return in such activity.

Funds for improving the quality and quantity of medical care will also have to increase substantially in the future. Most of these will come from private sources, but the expenses of the Federal, State, and local governments in medical services depend on research. Medical research has long since passed from the bunsen burner stage to extremely complicated and costly techniques, the financing of which very often exceeds private means.

We wish to warn here that while medical and other research is very costly and therefore requires large sums, it does not follow that such research should be done by committees or through gang research. The administrative arrangements through which such funds are channeled, whether they

be private or Government agencies, should not interfere with the job of research, which still remains largely an individual one.

There are numerous depressed economic areas in this country which are withering on the vine. Even at the peak of prosperity they suffer from depressed conditions. As there are now huge public investments in these areas, in terms of the communities, their public utilities and their human resources, assistance in the form of some public works, repayable loans, as well as technical assistance and retraining, could revive many of them. It is wasteful to allow these areas and resources to remain unused and undeveloped.

The specific elements of a Federal program for area assistance should include: (a) technical assistance to the areas in planning a redevelopment program with reasonable chances for success; (b) financial assistance to chronically depressed areas for community facilities necessary to attract new industry; (c) long-term loans to new industries locating in the area; and (d) retraining allowances for workers who can thus be qualified for reemployment.

Poverty in the United States, however, is not merely a matter of depressed areas. It exists in prosperous cities, and throughout the agricultural regions of the Nation, particularly among migrant farmworkers. The programs necessary to raise low incomes, therefore, will have to be flexible enough to meet a variety of situations. Slum clearance and urban renewal are important parts of such a program. More important is raising educational standards, since this is the surest way to increase productivity and eliminate the basic source of poverty. Public assistance must continue to play a large role.

Numerous other public services should also be expected to increase as the Nation grows. The blight in the centers of our cities is not only bad of itself, but it draws off resources for police, penal, and mental institutions, and wastes the human resources found there, all of which slows down our growth. Additional public services in the fields of public utilities and public works, such as roads and highways, public medical facilities, schools, and libraries, will also be needed. The failure to meet these demands will limit the increase in productivity and the Nation's growth.

These basic improvements in fiscal policy require that we halt the erosion of the Federal budget and restore it to meaningful accounting integrity.

In the past several years, gimmicks and financing outside the budget have been used to mask or obscure the effects and costs of a number of programs. The effect of Government spending on the economy is also obscured and understated. In terms of the number of dollars involved, the highway trust fund is certainly the most important example. Neither the expenditures nor the receipts under the Federal highway program are shown in the conventional budget. Why this program should be separated from the budget, while most other Federal public works programs are shown, is difficult to explain. Its purpose appears to be to present the illusion of a balanced budget and of a lower level of Government outlays and receipts than in fact exists. In addition, extrabudgetary financing of programs, such as that of the Federal National Mortgage Association, can hardly be justified as sound budget procedure. The exchange of FNMA's holdings of certain mortgages for certain outstanding nonmarketable Federal debt issues, according to the Treasury's own testimony, is aimed at keeping debt operations within the statutory debt ceiling. The economic impact of FNMA operations on the flow of funds and demands in the mortgage market is therefore not clear. Selling off Federal assets as a means of reducing net budget outlays is poor financial management and makes it difficult to judge the effect of fiscal operations on the economy. The leasing of facilities, instead of outright purchases, particularly of post offices, is expensive and inefficient. Its principal purpose is to conceal the real cost of acquiring these facilities which are needed for essential public services. Proposals to use the reserves of various Federal Government trust funds to finance unrelated Federal expenditures must be rejected as only further compounding the inaccuracy of the conventional budget. Finally, end-of-the-year adjustments in both revenues and expenditures, made by hastening or delaying disbursements and by speeding or delaying the processing of tax receipts, should be brought to a halt. This merely transfers receipts or expenditures from one fiscal year to another. Its major effect, however, is to obscure the actual budget results for the year just ending and the estimates of likely results for the year just beginning.

The ceiling on the national debt could be removed if proper fiscal, monetary, and debt management reforms were made.

IMPROVING THE STRUCTURE OF OUR ECONOMY

Thus far, we have been speaking about the necessary reforms in fiscal policy, debt management, and monetary policy which should be carried into effect. But there are other factors which affect growth, employment, and prices, and these should not be neglected. We must also deal with the structure of our economy as a whole and how to improve it.

REDUCE THE EXERCISE OF MARKET POWER

The first method of reducing the exercise of market power is to strengthen the antitrust laws so that our economy becomes more competitive. Monopolies and quasimonopolies tend to reduce output and raise prices above what they would be under effective competition. The committee makes a series of recommendations in this respect in its report.

In addition, we call for the gradual reduction of tariffs, which would be a healthy stimulus to American producers to modernize their technology, increase their efficiency, and hold down costs and prices.

Furthermore, while the patent system has provided a great stimulus to private inventors, it has often been used as a means of restricting the introduction of new products and processes and for sharing markets and fixing prices. We believe that a system of leasing patents upon the payment of a royalty, which would protect the inventor but provide for their freer use, may be an appropriate method to avoid the monopolistic stimulus of the patent system.

In addition to this, we recommend a series of proposals, increasing in severity, to deal with market power. These include an annual labor-management conference on the general economic outlook which—over the long run—might have some good effects on wages and prices in key industries. We also call for a reduction in prices during the upswing of booms, when productivity increases.

Finally, while we recognize the difficulties and share the presumption against Government participation in the price-wage setting process, there is a need—at least on a standby basis—for a factfinding procedure in key price and associated wage increases which seriously threaten economic stability. Such procedures should be invoked at the discretion of the President and they should result in the issuance of a report and recommendations regarding the justification and desirability of such proposed increases.

If we effect more competition in industry, then these procedures will not be needed. But, if all else fails, then factfinding on key price and wage decisions by the President would be helpful.

OTHER METHODS FOR IMPROVING THE STRUCTURE OF THE ECONOMY

We also advocate a number of other policies to improve the structure of the economy. These include:

First. A program to aid the depressed areas, including a more liberal system of unemployment compensation.

Second. Coordination of the State employment agencies into an effective national system of information about job opportunities. This could reduce the frictional unemployment.

Third. Special provisions in our unemployment compensation system for those who have been laid off by technological change. This would include payments while they were being retrained. However, the best means of easing the introduction of technological change is to maintain full employment.

Fourth. The promotion of small business, especially in their access to credit.

Fifth. The reduction or elimination of Federal subsidies for uneconomic activities. This would free these resources for more productive uses.

HOW TO PAY FOR IT

In citing the increasing demands for defense and public services, and for the adoption of policies which will bring a higher rate of growth, we are mindful that they must be paid for. How can this be done?

In the first place, a great many programs will pay for themselves. The clearing of our slums reduces the amounts which are needed for police, social workers, health, and mental institutions, to cite only a few of the benefits which arise.

Second, a higher rate of economic growth without inflation would also help to pay for them. If the gross national product in constant prices had grown

without interruption at a rate of 3.5 percent since 1953, the total output in 1959 would have been some $34 billion more than in fact it was. Federal revenues for fiscal year 1960—the fiscal year which comes to a close in June—would be $5 to $6 billion more than in fact they will be. The $5 billion to $6 billion would give us revenue with which we could effect tremendous changes.

These additional revenues would have made possible modest beginnings in programs which increase productive capacity and productivity, namely, growth, and at the same time permit some reduction in the national debt, and even reduction in some tax rates.

Economic growth in itself, therefore, is a major source for financing improvements and expansion in necessary Federal programs without increasing tax rates.

Third, we can finance a large part of these public programs by eliminating or reducing subsidies and other resource-wasting Government programs. Very substantial savings can be realized in this way.

Finally, the tax reforms which we suggest would increase revenues while making the tax system fairer, more just, and more conducive to economic growth.

We stress that putting more emphasis on these programs is not a plea for big spending or deficit financing. On the contrary, these programs can and should occur in the framework of a much tighter fiscal policy than there has been during the past several years.

These programs are perfectly consistent with our recommendations that there should be larger surpluses during periods of high output and employment than there have been in the recent past.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I shall be glad to yield. Then, after one statement, I am going to yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want to congratulate the Senator from Illinois on another outstanding, extremely constructive speech. This speech is particularly significant because, as I understand the speech, it expresses the viewpoint generally of the Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. With the exception of the Senator from Arkansas, who I understand was unable to be present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Because of his duties on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to read into the RECORD the names of those members of the Joint Economic Committee because I think they represent an outstanding assembly of gifted, able, and representative U.S. Senators and Representatives.

In addition to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is recognized as the outstanding economist in Congress, the Democratic Members are the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri, Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, my own colleague, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, and Representative FRANK M. COFFIN, of Maine. I think everyone will agree on the outstanding ability——

Mr. DOUGLAS. And Representative PATMAN, of Texas, who, though he dissented on some features, agreed to most of the recommendations. I wish to say he was most constructive in the work of the committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, Representative PATMAN, who is certainly a distinguished Representative and a fine Member of the Congress.

I think this group of able Representatives and Senators represent an extremely significant recommendation, particularly in view of the fact that the majority leader, or perhaps the assistant majority leader—I think it was the assistant majority leader—when I was discussing the lack of conferences in the Democratic Party and the lack of economic policies, pointed repeatedly at the Joint Economic Committee and said, "If you want an economic policy for the Democratic Party, take it up with the Senator from Illinois and his committee."

If this principle can be accepted generally, with individual differences, as the general economic policy of the Democratic Party, it is highly encouraging. It charts a program, in 1960, at the very beginning of the year, which I think is constructive, thoughtful, and mighty promising.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. May I say to him that the policy can be adopted only to the degree that it lends itself to the free support of free men who, after considering the issues on their merits, come to the decision that, in the main, our recommendations are correct.

I hope it will be the policy of the Democratic Party. I also hope it will become the policy of the country. I welcome criticisms or corrections, so that we may have an honest debate of this issue.

Mr. President, anyone who takes up the cause of the people is likely to find himself called a demagog. The Senator from Illinois has had that experience in recent days. Two of our great papers in Chicago, and there are only four papers there, called the Senator from Illinois a demagog and said he was going to join the ranks of the demagogs.

Mr. President, the word "demagog" has had a very interesting history. In its Greek form, it means one who speaks for the people. I do not see anything wrong about speaking for the people. In the main, that is what Pericles did. He spoke for the people of Athens. But, as you know, Mr. President, there was a tremendous struggle inside the Greek city-states, and the aristocratic and wealthy, who generally grouped themselves around Sparta, used the term "demagog," which originally was employed to refer to one who spoke for the people, to refer to one who used unworthy arguments in making appeals to the people. By this process of semantic obfuscation and through use over the centuries, the word "demagog" means anyone who speaks for the people, but the implication is he speaks unworthily. Of course, some of those who speak for the interests of the people use unworthy arguments, and if they do, they should be corrected. I hope that I have not spoken in this sense. If there are any errors in my speech, as I say, I want them corrected. If there are any arguments which are unsound, I want them refuted.

We are not afraid to let truth emerge from the process of discussion. We ask only that there may be a fair field and no favor, that arguments may be presented on their merits. I will trust public opinion to winnow out the false from the true and to ultimately result in a better synthesis.

It is curious, Mr. President, that while demagogery is denounced as the worst evil, plutogogery is not denounced. Plutogogery was used by the Greeks, also. It was meant to refer to one who spoke for the wealthy and the powerful.

This word has fallen somewhat into disuse, but if the term "demagog" has acquired derogatory connotations throughout the centuries, I would say that we should revive the term "plutogog."

If "demagogery" has been twisted to mean unworthy arguments in support of the people, then "plutogogery" should have a meaning attached to it of using unworthy arguments in support of the wealthy and the powerful, of the few.

I want to say, Mr. President, a lot of arguments which masquerade under the term "fiscal responsibility" are plutogogic arguments, which conceal the reality. While this may be a new term to introduce into the dictionary of politics, I suggest that those who revise Webster's Dictionary, those who compile the Century Dictionary, and those who work on the new Thorndyke Dictionary, should consider this question of plutogogery. If one who defends the people but tries to do so in a worthy manner is called a demagog, then I think perhaps it would be legitimate for us to apply the term "plutogog" to certain other gentlemen who, I am sure, honestly think they are not plutogogs but who in reality are plutogogs.

Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer, and other Senators, for their patience in listening to me.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On the contrary, it took no patience. This was one of the most illuminating and thoughtful debates I have heard during my brief period in the Senate, and I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate that comment.

Mr. President, there may be only a few Senators on the floor of the Senate this afternoon; indeed, there have been only a few. These remarks, however, will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which circulates to some 40,000 people. I do not know how many of them read the RECORD, but probably some thousands do. I hope these remarks will be carried to the Nation, and that they may induce a higher level of discussion into these matters than might otherwise be the case.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

Recommendations of the American Bankers Association Advisory Committee to the Treasury, 1952–59 (excerpt from hearings, pp. 1221–1228)

Date of committee report	Financing problem	Committee recommendations	Treasury offerings
1952			
Feb. 8	Refunding of 2½-percent bonds maturing Mar. 15, 1952.	Offer exchange for notes or bonds with maturity of 3 to 6 years and coupon of 2¼ to 2⅝ percent, depending on maturity.	Offered exchange for 2⅝-percent bonds due Mar. 15, 1959.
	Refunding of 1⅞-percent certificates maturing Apr. 1, 1952.	Offer optional exchange for 1⅞ percent, 11½- or 12-month certificates or the same notes or bonds suggested above.	Offered single exchange for 1⅞-percent 11-month certificates.
	Call of 2- and 2¼-percent bonds eligible for redemption.	Do not make call at this time	Call was not made.
	Cash offering of long-term bonds	Offer $1 billion on Mar. 15 or Apr. 1 of 35-year 3-percent bonds.	No long-term bonds issued.
Apr. 4	Cash required to cover deficit of upward of $10 billion.	Offer long-term marketable 3-percent bond with maturity of 30 years. Market should be approached experimentally with initial offering of $1 billion to $1½ billion.	Marketable bond not offered. Reopened 2¾-percent nonmarketable bonds due 1980 in May for cash and exchange for outstanding marketable 2½-percent bonds.
		For short-term borrowing, increase offerings of bills	Weekly issues of bills were increased by an aggregate of $1.6 billion between Apr. 7 and July 3.
		Revise savings bond program: Increase yield on series E to 3 percent; offer new 3 percent current-income bond as companion to series E bonds; adopt more favorable yield curve modified to yield 2¾ percent for 12 years on series F and G bonds.	Savings bond program was revised on May 1 along the basic lines recommended by committee.
	Refunding of short-term bills and certificates.	Treasury should feel its way as year goes on, and roll over maturities into similar issues or wherever possible, into medium-term issues.	All maturities were rolled over.
	Call of 2- and 2¼-percent bonds eligible for redemption.	Under present conditions issues should not be called	Call was not made.
June 27	Refunding of certificates due Aug. 15 and Sept. 1, 1952.	Suggested combined refunding into a similar certificate or note.	Offered exchange for 2-percent certificates due Aug. 15, 1953.
	Refunding of 1⅞-percent certificates due Oct. 1, 1952.	Roll over into similar obligation	Offered 2⅛-percent 14-month note due Dec. 1, 1953.
	New cash of $5 billion in second half of year.	Issue long-term marketable bonds at appropriate rate in autumn; revise rates on tax notes; issue tax bills maturing around the March tax date; sell larger amounts of 90-day bills.	No long-term bonds issued. Sold in October $2.5 billion tax-anticipation bills due Mar. 18, 1953; also in November $2 billion tax anticipation bills due June 19, 1953.
	Call by Aug. 15 of 2- and 2¼-percent bonds eligible for redemption on Dec. 15, 1952.	Do not call under present circumstances	Call was not made.
Dec. 5	Refunding of 1⅞-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1953.	Optional exchange for a certificate or note due in about 1 year at an appropriate rate, or a bond maturing in 1956, 1957, or 1959.	Offered optional exchange for 2¼-percent 1-year certificates or 2½-percent 5-year 10-month bonds due Dec. 15, 1958.
	Call of 2- and 2½-percent bonds eligible for redemption.	Call partially tax exempt 2-percent bonds of June 1953–55.	Call of 2-percent bonds was made.
		Do not call fully taxable 2½-percent bonds.	Call of 2½-percent bonds was not made.
	Handling maturity of series F and G bonds.	Secure broad permissive legislation to extend series F and G bonds at maturity.	Series F and G bonds were not extended.
	Cash offering of long-term bonds in first half of 1953.	Extension of maturities can be determined from time to time only in light of investment market; sound out market for long-term bond as conditions appear propitious.	(See meeting of Mar. 20 (1953.)
1953			
Mar. 20	Refunding of 1⅞-percent certificates due June 1, 1953, and 2-percent bonds recalled for redemption on June 15, 1953.	Offer optional exchange for either 1-year 2¼-percent certificates or a short-term bond, due around 1961.	Offered single issue of 2⅝-percent certificates due June 1, 1954.
	Cash offering to cover attrition on refunding and apparent cash deficit.	Time was not opportune for sale of long-term bond and no cash offering should be made in May or June. Suggested consideration of the short-term bond due around 1961.	Offered for cash subscription $1 billion of 3¼-percent bonds, dated May 1, 1953, and maturing June 15, 1983.
	Refunding maturing series F and G bonds.	Offer holders in exchange a 3-percent marketable bond maturing in 15 years to test the market for a moderately long-term bond.	Exchange offer was made for 3¼-percent bonds maturing June 15, 1983.
June 19	New cash of $5 billion in July	Offer tax anticipation certificates maturing Mar. 15, 1954, at rate determined by market conditions which would prevail in July.	Sold for cash $5.9 billion 2½-percent tax anticipation certificates due Mar. 22, 1954.
	Refunding of 2-percent certificates on Aug. 15, 1953.	Refund with 1-year certificates, or possibly a somewhat longer issue if conditions at time favor it.	Offered exchange for 1-year 2⅝-percent certificates.
Aug. 26	Refunding of 2-percent bonds maturing Sept. 15, 1953.	Offer optional exchange for 1-year 2⅝-percent certificates or 2⅞-percent notes maturing in about 3½ years.	Offered optional exchange into 1-year 2⅝-percent certificates or 3½-year 2⅞-percent notes.
	New cash of about $2.5 billion in October.	Preliminary recommendation to sell additional notes of about 3½-year maturity, or longer if market conditions are favorable. Would not be prudent to sell new long-term bonds at his time.	(See meeting of Oct. 13, 1953, below.)
Oct. 13	New cash of $1½ to $2 billion in early November.	Issue $2 billion of 2¾-percent bonds maturing in 3½ to 6 years.	Offered late in October $2.2 billion of 2¾-percent bonds maturing Sept. 15, 1961.
	Refunding of 2⅛-percent notes on Dec. 1, 1953.	Preliminary recommendation for offer of an optional exchange for short-term and intermediate-term bonds (12- to 14-year 3-percent bond, or longer if market conditions permit). Exact terms would have to be determined by prevailing conditions at time of offering.	(See meeting of Nov. 13, 1953, below.)
Nov. 13	Refunding of 2⅛-percent notes on Dec. 1, 1953.	Offer optional exchange for 2-percent notes maturing Mar. 15, 1955, or 3-percent bonds of about 15-year maturity; however, if holders of series F and G bonds maturing in 1st half of 1954 are not also offered the right to exchange into the same 3-percent bonds, the longer part of the optional exchange should be 2½-percent bonds maturing Dec. 15, 1958.	Offered optional exchange of 1⅞-percent notes maturing Dec. 15, 1954, or 2½-percent bonds maturing Dec. 15, 1958.
Nov. 13	Refunding 2¼-percent certificates on Feb. 15, 1954, and 1⅝-percent notes on Mar. 15, 1954.	Consolidate issues in single refunding operation. Specific recommendations could not be presented at this time.	(See meeting of Jan. 20, 1954, below.)
1954			
Jan. 20	Refunding of 2¼-percent certificates of Feb. 15, 1954, and 1⅝-percent notes of Mar. 15, 1954.	Combine refunding on Feb. 15, 1954, with option to exchange for 13-month 1⅝-percent notes or 2½-percent bonds maturing in 6½ years or slightly longer.	Offered optional exchange of maturing issues for 12-month 1⅝-percent certificates or 2½-percent bonds maturing in 7 years 9 months.
	Call on Feb. 15, 1954, for redemption on June 15 of the 2¼-percent bonds of 1954–56 and 2¼-percent bonds of 1952–55.	Call should be made for redemption on June 15	Call was made on Feb. 15, but redemption of these issues, as well as the 2-percent bonds due June 15, was anticipated by offering holders right to exchange on Feb. 15 for the 2½-percent bonds maturing in 7 years 9 months also offered on the refunding.
	New cash of $2 billion to $3 billion after Mar. 15.	Sale of 3-percent long-term bonds, maturity to depend upon market conditions at time of offering.	Offered $1.5 billion of tax anticipation bills due June 24, 1954.

EXHIBIT 1

Recommendations of the American Bankers Association Advisory Committee to the Treasury, 1952–59 (excerpt from hearings, pp. 1221–1228)—Continued

Date of committee report	Financing problem	Committee recommendations	Treasury offerings
1954			
Apr. 23	Refunding of 2⅝-percent certificates due June 1, 1954.	Offer holders option of a short obligation maturing within 18 months or 2¼-percent bonds maturing in last half 1960.	Offered optional exchange for 1-year 1⅛-percent certificates or 1⅞-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1959.
	Refunding on June 15, 1954, of 2-percent bonds and remaining 2¼-percent called bonds that were not exchanged in February.	Offer an exchange into only the short obligation maturing within 18 months.	Offered exchange into 1-year 1⅛-percent certificates.
	New cash of $2 billion in May	Sale for cash of $2 billion of 2¼-percent bonds maturing in last half of 1960.	Offered $2 billion of 1⅞-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1959.
	Refunding of 2-percent bonds maturing or callable in December 1954.	Maturity should be anticipated by giving holders the privilege of exchanging into the 2¼-percent bond maturing in 1960.	December maturities were not included in this financing operation.
		(Committee recommended that all of the above financing be combined in 1 operation in May.)	(Financing was combined in 1 operation in May.)
July 9	New cash of $4 billion by Aug. 1, 1954.	Majority of committee recommended $2 billion each of 1-percent notes maturing Sept. 15, 1955, and 1⅝-percent notes maturing Sept. 15, 1957; minority favored tax-anticipation certificates or notes maturing Mar. 18, 1955.	Sold $3.7 billion 1-percent tax anticipation certificates maturing on Mar. 22, 1955.
	Refunding of 2⅝-percent certificates due Aug. 15 and Sept. 15, 1954.	Refund together their optional exchange for 1-percent certificates maturing Sept. 15, 1955, or 2⅛-percent bonds maturing Sept. 15, 1960.	Offered optional exchange into 1-year 1¼-percent certificates or 2⅛-percent bonds due Nov. 15, 1960.
	Call on Aug. 15, 1954, for redemption on Dec. 15 the 2-percent bonds of 1951–55.	Call should be made on Aug. 15	Call was made.
Sept. 17	New cash of about $3.5 billion in October.	Dual offering of 1⅛-percent tax certificates maturing June 22, 1955, and 1-year certificates of indebtedness.	Sold $4.1 billion of 1⅝-percent notes maturing May 15, 1957.
	New cash of about $1.5 billion in December.	Preliminary recommendation that 3-percent long-term bonds be offered, maturity to be determined by market conditions.	(See meeting of Nov. 18, 1954, below.)
	Refunding of 1⅞-percent notes and 2-percent bonds on Dec. 15, 1954.	Preliminary recommendation that holders be offered an optional exchange of 1-year certificates or medium-term obligations with a maturity not to exceed 10 years.	Do.
Nov. 18	Refunding of 1⅞-percent notes and 2-percent bonds on Dec. 15, 1954.	Offer holders option of a short obligation—either 1-year 1¼-percent certificates or 1⅛-percent certificates maturing Aug. 15, 1955; or a longer obligation—2½-percent bonds maturing in about 8 years.	Offered optional exchange into either: 1-year 1¼-percent certificates or 1⅛-percent certificates maturing Aug. 15, 1955; or 2½-percent bonds maturing in 8 years 8 months.
	New cash in December	December cash financing anticipated in September proved unnecessary. Therefore committee recommended that long-term bond should not be offered at that time but should be done on the 1st appropriate occasion.	No new bond financing was undertaken.
	Issuance of FNMA debentures	Expressed view that Treasury could sell at least $500 million FNMA debentures if conditions were set forth as to FNMA credit from the Treasury, restrictions on amount offered against portfolio, maturity, and rate, and fiscal arrangements.	Offered $500 million of 2½-percent FNMA 3-year notes in January 1955.
1955			
Jan. 27	Refunding of 1⅝-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1955, and 1½-percent notes due Mar. 15, 1955.	Offer optional exchange of 1⅝-percent 13-month notes or 2⅛-percent notes maturing Dec. 15, 1957.	Offered optional exchange of 1⅝-percent 13-month notes or 2-percent notes maturing Aug. 15, 1957.
	Refunding of 2⅞-percent bonds called for redemption on Mar. 15, 1955.	Majority favored optional exchange for 1⅝-percent 13-month notes or 3-percent 40-year bonds. Minority favored $1.5 billion cash offering of 3-percent 40-year bonds, with the 2⅞-percent bonds receiving same exchange option indicated above for the maturing notes and certificates.	Offered optional exchange of 1⅝-percent 13-month notes or 3-percent 40-year bonds.
Apr. 17	Refunding of 1⅛-percent certificates due May 17, 1955.	Offer optional exchange for 1⅞-percent 1-year certificates or 2½-percent bonds due Dec. 15, 1958.	Offered exchange for only 2-percent 15-month notes.
	New cash of $2.5 billion to cover maturity of tax-savings notes in May and June.	Make cash offering of $2.5 billion of 1⅞-percent 1-year certificates.	Offered $2.5 billion of 2-percent 15-month notes for cash.
		(Committee recommended that the refunding and cash offering be combined in one operation.)	(Financing was combined in 1 operation.)
June 24	New cash of $3 billion in July	Reopen subscriptions to 3-percent 40-year bonds due in 1995 for cash of $750 million to $1 billion; obtain balance through sale of 1⅞-percent tax anticipation certificates due Mar. 22, 1956.	Offered $750 million of 3-percent bonds of 1995 and $2 billion of tax-anticipation certificates due Mar. 22, 1956.
	Refunding of 1⅛-percent certificates due Aug. 15, 1955.	Offer optional exchange for 1-year 2-percent certificates (or 11-month certificates), or the outstanding 2½-percent bonds maturing Dec. 15, 1958. (Suggested refunding be done at time of cash offering.)	Offered optional exchange for 1-year 2-percent notes due Aug. 15, 1956, or 2-percent tax-anticipation certificates due June 22, 1956. Did not offer the longer option. (Terms of financing were withheld until payment date of cash tax certificate financing announced earlier.)
	Retirement of maturing tax savings notes.	Obtain funds by increasing bill offerings by at least $100 million each week for cycle of 13 weeks.	Offered $100 million of additional bills each week between July 27 and Sept. 29.
Sept. 25	New cash of $2.5 billion at end of September.	Offer 2¼-percent tax-anticipation certificates due June 22, 1956.	Sold $3 billion of 2¼-percent tax-anticipation certificates due June 22, 1956.
Nov. 18	Refunding of 1¼-percent certificates and 1¾-percent notes on Dec. 15, 1955.	Offer single exchange for 1-year 2⅝-percent certificates	Offered optional exchange of 1-year 2⅝-percent certificates or 2½-year 2⅞-percent notes.
	New cash of $1 billion by year end	Make cash offering of tax-anticipation bills due Mar. 22, 1956.	Sold in December $1.5 billion of tax-anticipation bills due Mar. 23, 1956, on competitive bids.
1956			
Feb. 29	Refunding of 1⅝-percent notes due Mar. 15, 1956, and 1½-percent notes due Apr. 1, 1956.	Suggested combined refunding. Majority favored optional exchange for 2⅝-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1957, or outstanding 2⅞-percent notes due June 15, 1958; also later offering of $500 million additional 3-percent bonds of 1995 for cash or advance exchange of 2½-percent bonds of 1956–58. Minority favored single exchange for 2⅝-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1957, to be coupled with $500 million cash offering of 3-percent bonds of 1955 at time of refunding.	Offered optional exchange for 2⅝-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1957, or 2⅞-percent notes due June 15, 1958. No long-term bonds were offered.
	Call by May 15, 1956, of 2¾-percent bonds of 1956–59 for payment on Sept. 15, 1956.	Call should be made	Call was made.
July 12	Refunding of 2-percent notes due Aug. 15, 1956.	Offer exchange for 2¾-percent notes due Aug. 1, 1957	Offered exchange for 2¾-percent notes due Aug. 1, 1957.
	Refunding of 2¾-percent bonds called for redemption on Sept. 15, 1956.	Obtained funds by increasing bill offerings by $100 million weekly for a 13-week cycle.	Paid off the bonds in cash. Did not increase weekly bill offering.
	New cash of $2½ billion in August or September.	Offer tax anticipation issue due on or about Mar. 22, 1957.	Sold in August $3.2 billion of 2¾-percent-tax-anticipation certificates due Mar. 22, 1957.
Nov. 15	Refunding of 2⅝-percent certificates due Dec. 1, 1956.	Offer optional exchange for 3¼-percent-tax-anticipation certificates due June 21 or 24, 1957, or 3⅜-percent certificates due Nov. 29, 1957.	Offered optional exchange for 3¾-percent-tax-anticipation certificates due June 24, 1957, for 3¼-percent certificates due October 1, 1957.

EXHIBIT 1

Recommendations of the American Bankers Association Advisory Committee to the Treasury, 1952–59 (excerpt from hearings, pp. 1221–1228)—Continued

Date of committee report	Financing problem	Committee recommendations	Treasury offerings
1957			
Jan. 31	Refunding of special bills due Feb. 15, 1957, 2⅝-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1957, 2⅞-percent notes due Mar. 15, 1957, and 1½-percent notes due Apr. 1, 1957.	Offer holders of all 4 issues optional exchange for 3⅜-percent certificates due Feb. 14, 1958, or 3½-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1960.	Refunded bills with tax anticipation bills due June 24, 1957. Offered 2⅝-percent certificates and 2⅞-percent notes optional exchange for 3⅜-percent certificates due Feb. 14, 1958, or 3½-percent notes due May 15, 1960. Offered 1½-percent notes exchange for the 3⅜-percent notes due Feb. 14, 1958.
Mar. 13	New cash of about $3 billion after March tax date.	Sale for cash of 3½-percent notes due Apr. 15, 1958, with-privilege of conversion at maturity into bonds of 12- to 14-year maturity.	Offered $2¼ billion of 3⅜-percent certificates due Feb. 14, 1958, and $¾ billion 3½-percent notes due May 15, 1960. (This was a reopening of issues offered in February refunding.)
Apr. 14	Refunding of 1⅝-percent notes due May 15, 1957.	Offer optional exchange for (1) certificates due May 1, 1958, at rate of not more than 3½ percent (or a shorter maturity if market rates so dictated) or (2) 3½-percent notes due May 1, 1960, and convertible into 3½ percent 15-year bonds.	Offered optional exchange for 3½-percent certificates due Apr. 15, 1958, or 3⅝-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1962.
July 17	Refunding of 2¾-percent notes due Aug. 1, 1957, 2-percent notes due Aug. 15, 1957, 3¼-percent certificates due Oct. 1, 1957, and 1½-percent notes due Oct. 1, 1957.	Offer holders of all four issues optional exchange for 3⅞-percent certificates due Apr. 15, 1958, or 4-percent notes due in July 1959, with right of holder to extend maturity for 3 additional years.	Offered optional exchange for 3⅝-percent certificates due Dec. 1, 1957, 4-percent certificates due Aug. 1 1958, or 4-percent notes due Aug. 1, 1961, but redeemable at option of holder on 3 months' advance notice on Aug. 1, 1959. However, October maturities were restricted to 4 percent certificates or extendable notes.
Sept. 10	New cash of about $3.5 billion in late September and early October. To keep within debt ceiling, $3 billion before Oct. 1, and the other $0.5 billion after maturity of Oct. 1 issues.	To obtain $3 billion, offer $1 billion of 4-percent certificates due Aug. 1, 1958, and $2 billion of 4-percent notes due Aug. 1, 1961, redeemable on Aug. 1, 1959 at holder's option. To obtain $0.5 billion, concurrent with above offering announce offering of 10-year 4-percent bonds, payment to be made in early October.	Offered $3 billion for cash as follows: $500 million of 4-percent bonds due Oct. 1, 1969, $1.75 billion of 4-percent notes due Aug. 1, 1962, but redeemable at option of holder at end of 2½ years, and $750 million of 4-percent certificates due Aug. 1, 1958.
Nov. 14	Refunding of 3⅝-percent certificates due Dec. 1, 1957.	Offer exchange for 3⅞-percent certificates due Dec. 1, 1958.	(See meeting of Nov. 18, 1957, below.)
	New cash of about $1.5 billion	Offer $1 billion of 4 percent 5-year notes and $500 million 4 percent 17-year bonds. Because of debt limit, payment on two issues to be 50 percent on Nov. 26, and 50 percent on or about Dec. 2. If 17-year bond not offered, all $1.5 billion should be in a 5-year note.	(See meeting of Nov. 18, 1957, below.)
Nov. 18	Review recommendations of Nov. 14, 1957, due to change in market following lowering of discount rate.	Offer exchange for 3¾-percent certificates due Dec. 1, 1958. New cash offering of $1 billion of 3⅞ percent 5-year notes and $500 million of 3⅞ percent 17-year bonds.	Offered for exchange 3¾-percent 1-year certificates due Dec. 1, 1958. Offered for cash $1 billion 3¾-percent notes due Nov. 15, 1962, and $500 million 3⅞-percent bonds due Nov. 15, 1974.
1958			
Jan. 28	Refunding: recommend which issues of notes, certificates, and bonds maturing in first half of 1958 should be refunded in early February; whether special bills maturing Apr. 15 should be offered an exchange; and refunding terms.	Offer holders of 3¾-percent certificates due Feb. 14, 1958, 2½-percent bonds due Mar. 15, 1958, 1½-percent exchange notes due Apr. 1, 1958, 3½-percent certificates due Apr. 15, 1958, and special bills due Apr. 15, 1958, an optional exchange for 2½-percent 1-year certificates, 3-percent obligations maturing in 5 or 6 years, or 3½-percent 30-year bonds.	Offered recommended issues optional exchange for 2½-percent certificates due Feb. 14, 1959, 3-percent bonds due Feb. 15, 1964, or 3½-percent bonds due Feb. 15, 1990.
		Defer refunding of June maturities	
	Cash: should offering be made at time of refunding, if legislation raising debt limit passed by then?	Delay consideration of cash financing until after the refunding and change in the debt limit.	Following refunding operation and raising of debt limit, offered for cash $1.25 billion 3-percent bonds due Aug. 15, 1966.
	Call on Feb. 14, 1958, for redemption on June 15, the 2¾-percent tax exempt bonds of 1958–63.	Call should be made	Call was made.
Apr. 1	New cash of about $3,500,000,000	Offer $3,500,000,000 of 2½-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1963	Offered $3,500,000,000 of 2½-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1963.
May 29	Refunding of 2⅞-percent notes, 2¾-percent bonds, and 2⅜-percent bonds on June 15, 1958.	Offer holders optional exchange for 1⅜-percent notes due Aug. 14, 1959, 2⅝-percent bonds due Feb. 15, 1965, 3-percent bonds due May 16, 1971, or 3¼-percent bonds due May 15, 1985.	Offered optional exchange for 1¼-percent certificates due May 15, 1959, or 2⅝-percent bonds due Feb. 15, 1965. Offered for cash $1,000,000,000 of 3¼-percent bonds due May 15, 1985, at price of 100½.
	Inclusion of 2 bond issues called for redemption on Sept. 15, 1958, in June refunding.	Refunding of called bonds should be deferred.	Refunding limited to June maturities.
July 17	Refunding of 4-percent certificates due Aug. 1, 1958, and bond issues called for redemption Sept. 15, 1958.	Offer holders of all issues exchange for 1⅝-percent 1-year certificates due July 31, 1959.	Offered exchange for 1⅝-percent certificates due Aug. 1, 1959.
	Cash financing of undetermined amount in August.	Refunding announcement should assure the market that the August cash financing would be in securities with maturity of less than 1 year. Offering should be tax anticipation certificates or bills maturing in March 1959 but exact terms would depend upon amount of cash to be raised and condition of short-term market at time of offering.	Announcement made as suggested. Offered $3,500,000,000 of 1½-percent tax anticipation certificates due Mar. 24, 1959.
Sept. 23	New cash of about $3,500,000,000	Offer up to $1,000,000,000 of 3½-percent notes due May 15, 1960; and later auction about $2,750,000,000 of special bills due May 15, 1959.	Offered $1,000,000,000 of 3½-percent notes due Nov. 15, 1959, at par and $2,500,000,000 special bills due May 15, 1959, at a price of 98.023 to yield 3.25 percent.
Nov. 7	Refunding of 3¾-percent certificates due Dec. 1, 1958, and 2½ percent bonds due Dec. 15, 1958.	Offer optional exchange for certificates due in November 1959 or notes due in 4 to 5 years. Securities should be priced at rates sufficient at time of offering to avoid large attrition and with the longer issue above the shorter issue to encourage extension of debt.	Offered optional exchange into 3¾-percent certificates due Nov. 15, 1959, at 99.95 percent of par or 3⅝ percent notes due May 15, 1961, at 99⅞ percent of par.
	New cash in December	Offer $3,000,000,000 of tax anticipation bills due June 22, 1959, on auction basis.	Offered at auction $3,000,000,000 tax anticipation bills due June 22, 1959.
	Should part of about $4,500,000,000 cash needed for period January to March 1959, be obtained by additional weekly bills.	Meet the problem by making offering during January–March period.	Undertook additional bill financing by introducing new cycle of both 13-week and 26-week bills.
1959			
Jan. 8	New cash of about $2.25 billion	Offer $750 million of 4-percent bonds due Feb. 15, 1980, at price of 99 to yield 4.07 percent, and auction $1.5 billion of tax anticipated bills due Sept. 22, 1959.	Offered $750 million of 4-percent bonds due Feb. 15, 1980, at a price of 99 and $2.5 billion of 3¼ percent notes due May 15, 1960, at a price of 99¾ to yield 3.45 percent.
	Preliminary recommendations on February refunding.	Under then existing conditions a 3-way optional exchange for 1-year certificates, 3-year to 5-year notes, or bonds with maturity of about 10 years.	
Jan. 29	Refunding of 2½-percent certificates due Feb. 14, 1959, and 1⅞-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1959.	Offer optional exchange for 3¾-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1960, or 4-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1962.	Offered optional exchange for 3¾-percent certificates due Feb. 15, 1960, or 4-percent notes due Feb. 15, 1962.

EXHIBIT 1

Recommendations of the American Bankers Association Advisory Committee to the Treasury, 1952–59 (excerpt from hearings, pp. 1221–1228)—Continued

Date of committee report	Financing problem	Committee recommendations	Treasury offerings
1959			
Mar. 19	New cash of about $4 billion	Offer $500 million of additional 4-percent bonds due Oct. 1, 1969, at par, $1.5 billion 4-percent notes due May 15, 1963, at par, and approximately $2 billion special bills due Nov. 15, 1959, at auction.	Offered $500 million additional 4-percent bonds due Oct. 1, 1969, at par, about $1.5 billion 4-percent notes due May 15, 1963, at par, and about $2 billion of special bills due Jan 15, 1960. Bill auction followed subscription closing on bonds and notes.
Apr. 19	Refunding of special bills and 1¼-percent certificates due May 15, 1959.	Offer holders of special bills exchange for 3¾-percent tax anticipation obligations due Dec. 22, 1959, and holders of 1¼-percent certificates exchange for 3⅞-percent certificates due May 15, 1960, at price to yield about 4 percent.	Redeemed special bills in cash. Offered 1¼-percent certificates exchange for 4-percent certificates due May 15, 1960, at 99.95 to yield 4.05 percent.
	New cash of about $1.5 to $2 billion	Auction for cash special bills due Apr. 15, 1960	Auctioned for cash $2 billion special bills due Apr. 15, 1960, and $1.5 billion tax anticipation bills due Dec. 22, 1959.
June 25	New cash of about $5 billion	Auction for cash $3 billion of tax anticipation bills due Mar. 22, 1960, and later, $2 billion special bills due July 15, 1960.	Offered at auction $3 billion of tax anticipation bills due Mar. 22, 1960, and $2 billion special bills due July 15, 1960.
July 16	Refunding of 1⅝-percent certificates and 4-percent notes, due Aug. 1, 1959.	Redeem 4-percent notes in cash. Offer 1⅝-percent certificates optional exchange for 4¾-percent issue due Aug. 1 or 15, 1960, or 4⅞-percent notes due May 15, 1964.	Offered notes and certificates optional exchange for 4¾-percent notes due Aug. 15, 1960 or 4¾-percent notes due May 15, 1964.
	New cash in August	Refunding announcement should state August cash financing to be limited to short-term securities maturing in less than 1 year.	(Not yet announced.)

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION—MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT BORROWING, 1958–59

Robert V. Fleming (chairman), chairman of board, the Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C.

Henry C. Alexander, chairman of board, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, New York, N.Y.

Bruce Baird, president, National Savings & Trust Co., Washington, D.C.

S. Clark Beise, president, Bank of America N.T. & S.A., San Francisco, Calif.

Kenton R. Cravens, president, Mercantile Trust Co., St. Louis Mo.

Fred F. Florence, chairman executive committee, Republic National Bank of Dallas, Dallas, Tex.

John M. Griffith, president, City National Bank, Taylor, Tex.

H. Frederick Hagemann, Jr., president, Rockland-Atlas National Bank of Boston, Boston, Mass.

N. Baxter Jackson, chairman of executive committee, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank, New York, N.Y.

David M. Kennedy, chairman of board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Homer J. Livingston, president, the First National Bank of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

John J. McCloy, chairman of board, the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.

Reno Odlin, president, Puget Sound National Bank, Tacoma, Wash.

F. Raymond Peterson, chairman of board, First National Bank of Passaic County, Peterson, N.J.

Dietrich Schmitz, chairman of board, Washington Mutual Savings Bank, Seattle, Wash.

Earl B. Schwulst, president, the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, N.Y.

James E. Shelton, chairman of board, Security-First National Bank of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Norfleet Turner, president, First National Bank of Memphis, Memphis, Tenn.

Joseph C. Welman, president, Bank of Kennett, Kennett, Mo.

A. L. M. Wiggins, chairman of board, the Bank of Hartsville, Hartsville, S.C.

Paul I. Wren, executive vice president, Old Colony Trust Co., 1 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

OFFICERS AND STAFF

Lee P. Miller, president, Citizens Fidelity Bank & Trust Co., Louisville, Ky. (president of the American Bankers Association).

John W. Remington, president, Lincoln Rochester Trust Co., Rochester, N.Y. (vice president of the American Bankers Association).

Merle E. Selecman, executive vice president, American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

Eugene C. Zorn, Jr. (secretary of the committee), deputy manager and director of research, American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.

NOTICE OF MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to announce that memorial services for the late Senator William Langer, of North Dakota, will be held on Thursday, February 4, after the conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

HOUSING FOR MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to help provide better housing for our migratory agricultural workers. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey.

(See exhibit 1.)

The bill (S. 2928) to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide financial assistance for the provision of housing and related facilities for migratory farm labor, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in essence, this bill attempts to stimulate activity in the construction and improvement of housing for migratory workers by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to insure commercial loans up to $35 million a year for this type of housing. The concepts employed are similar to those which have proved so successful under the Federal Housing Administration's insurance program for home loans.

The bill also authorizes the establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which direct loans may be made to farmers, farmers' associations and State or county governments wishing to provide migrant housing on a nonprofit basis.

Mr. President, I regard this bill, together with the proposed legislation I introduced last week to provide Federal assistance for the education of the migratory workers and their children, as a workable approach toward two very serious problems; namely housing and education.

Our migratory workers face many problems, and I believe that action must be taken in these specific areas, for they are among the most important in the migrants' life, relating, as they do, to their homes.

These migrant workers are on the road, far from whatever permanent home they may have, for most of the months of the year. They are the perennial strangers in our midst, spending a few weeks here, a few months there, always moving to the immutable laws of season and crop.

In such circumstances, the house in which they live takes on special meaning and importance. It is all they can cling to in a town they will never get to know as we know the communities in which we live.

Yet from what was seen in six States visited by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, it is obvious that entirely too many migratory workers still do not have access to adequate and clean shelter. To many farmers, the migrant is a temporary visitor, and they believe that their investment in housing should be kept to a minimum, often a very bare minimum. The subcommittee has seen shacks which have been made somewhat livable by the migrants; we have also seen buildings which had been oc-

cupied by entire families until condemned by State agencies.

On the other hand, we have also seen earnest and very encouraging efforts by some growers to provide good housing despite slim profit margins and with no assurance that their competitors will provide equally good housing.

We have seen, for example, camps in which central dining areas were provided, in which rooms were painted in attractive colors, and in which sanitary facilities were new, well maintained, and adequate. One grower told us that his model camp was a source of pride to him. He also said that it helped attract a steady supply of skilled workers to his farm each year, thus decreasing the rate of turnovers and replacement costs.

To help such growers—and others who would provide such facilities if they had adequate capital—I introduce this bill today.

I think, Mr. President, it is worth emphasizing the very real and substantial benefits of this bill to the farmer employing migratory labor, in terms of worker morale, willingness to work, stability, efficiency, and the rate and cost of worker dropouts and replacements.

I believe this bill and the ones on education, unlike many other divisive legislative proposals, have the happy merit of serving the interests of both groups concerned—the migrants and the farmers themselves.

While the advantages of having good housing are apparent to many employers of migrant labor, there are, unfortunately, several stumbling blocks in the way of its attainment.

It is not only, or perhaps even primarily, a problem because of the temporary stay of the migrant. In some areas, this is no doubt true, but in other areas the migrant worker is almost a year-round phenomenon, and there are a good many large employers of migratory workers who could profitably provide better housing, and who would like to do so.

Why do they not?

Those who are normally considered financially sound often find there are no lending institutions interested in financing migrant-worker housing even at going interest rates. Migrant-worker housing is called a poor investment risk by lenders, and one can easily imagine how poor a risk it is in comparison with the risk of financing normal, year-round residential housing in rural areas. It is difficult even to find capital for such housing; imagine how much more difficult it is to find capital for migrant-worker housing.

For these reasons, the bill provides for guaranteed loans up to $35 million to take the risk out of this type of investment, and thus facilitate the flow of more mortgage money into this vitally needed kind of housing.

The first section of the bill provides for the insurance of commercial loans to any person up to 90 percent of estimated value for the construction or rehabilitation of housing and related facilities, such as clinics or infirmaries.

It places the FHA limit of 6 percent interest on the loan and a limit of 1 percent on service charges by the borrower to the Government.

The second section of the bill permits a farmer, farmers' association, or a State or county government to obtain direct loans from a $25 million revolving fund, provided that the housing is operated on a nonprofit basis, with rental charges limited to the cost of providing reasonable maintenance.

The applicant must also be unable to secure the necessary funds from other sources and must satisfy the Secretary of Agriculture that the construction will be economical, without elaborate or extravagant designs or materials.

Mr. President, I believe the provisions I have outlined constitute a sound approach to the housing problems of our migratory workers. And while it is a good bill in its present form, I certainly hope it will be made even better by the committee when it is taken up for consideration.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. President, that this bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the committee to which it is referred. The migrant workers need legislation of this character. The farmers need it, and we need to see at long last that they get it.

[EXHIBIT 1]

S. 2928

A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide financial assistance for the provision of housing and related facilities for migratory farm labor

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"INSURANCE OF LOANS FOR THE PROVISION OF HOUSING AND RELATED FACILITIES FOR MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

"SEC. 514. (a) The Secretary is authorized to insure and make commitments to insure loans made by lenders other than the United States to any person for the purpose of providing housing and related facilities for migratory farm labor in accordance with terms and conditions substantially identical with those specified in section 502; except that—

"(1) no such loan shall be insured in an amount in excess of 90 per centum of the estimated value of the structures and facilities with respect to which the loan is made after the construction thereof or the proposed improvements are made;

"(2) no such loan shall be insured if it bears interest at a rate in excess of 6 per centum per annum;

"(3) the borrower shall be required to pay such insurance charges as the Secretary deems proper but not to exceed 1 per centum per annum of the principal amount of the loan;

"(4) the insurance contracts and agreements with respect to any loan may contain provisions for servicing the loan by the Secretary or by the lender, and for the purchase by the Secretary of the loan if it is not in default, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe; and

"(5) the Secretary may take mortgages creating a lien running to the United States for the benefit of the insurance fund referred to in subsection (b) notwithstanding the fact that the note may be held by the lender or his assignee.

"(b) The Secretary shall utilize the insurance fund created by section 11 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1005a) and the provisions of section 13(b) and (c) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1005c(b) and (c)) to discharge obligations under insurance contracts made pursuant to this section, and

"(1) the Secretary may utilize the insurance fund to pay taxes, insurance, and other expenses to protect the security for loans which have been insured hereunder and to acquire such security property at foreclosure sale or otherwise;

"(2) the notes and security therefor acquired by the Secretary under insurance contracts made pursuant to this section shall become a part of the insurance fund. Loans insured under this section may be held in the fund and collected in accordance with their terms or may be sold and reinsured. All proceeds from such collections, including the liquidation of security and the proceeds of sales, shall become a part of the insurance fund; and

"(3) one-half of all insurance charges shall become a part of the insurance fund. The other half of such charges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and shall be available for administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, to be transferred annually to and become merged with any appropriation for such expenses.

"(c) Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this section shall be an obligation of the United States and incontestable except for fraud or misrepresentation of which the holder of the contract has actual knowledge.

"(d) The aggregate amount of the principal obligations of the loans insured under this section shall not exceed $35 million in any one fiscal year.

"(e) Amounts made available pursuant to section 513 of this Act shall be available for administrative expenses incurred under this section.

"(f) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'housing' means (A) new structures suitable for dwelling use by migratory farm labor, and (B) existing structures which can be made suitable for dwelling use by migratory farm labor by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvements;

"(2) the term 'related facilities' means (A) new structures suitable for use as dining halls, community rooms or buildings, or infirmaries, or for other essential service facilities, and (B) existing structures which can be made suitable for the above uses by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement; and

"(3) the term 'person' means any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or unincorporated organization.

"DIRECT LOANS FOR THE PROVISION OF HOUSING AND RELATED FACILITIES FOR MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

"SEC. 515. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to the owner of any farm, any association of farmers, and any State or political subdivision thereof for the provision of housing and related facilities for migratory farm labor, except that no such loan shall be made unless (A) the applicant shows that he or it is unable to secure the necessary funds from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this section, (B) the Secretary finds that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner, and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and (C) the applicant agrees that any income in the form of rent derived from housing and related facilities provided under this section shall not exceed an amount necessary to defray reasonable maintenance costs.

"(b) Any loan under this section may be in an amount not exceeding 98 per centum of

the total development cost, as determined by the Secretary; shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by him; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by him which shall be not more than the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum added to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the loan is made, and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000,000 which shall constitute a revolving fund to be used by the Secretary in carrying out this section. The amount outstanding from such fund at any one time for related facilities shall not exceed $3,000,000.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'housing' means (A) new structures suitable for dwelling use by migratory farm labor, and (B) existing structures which can be made suitable for dwelling use by migratory farm labor by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement;

"(2) the term 'development cost' means costs of construction of housing and of other related facilities, and of the land on which it is located, including necessary site improvement;

"(3) the term 'construction' means erection of new structures or rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures; and

"(4) the term 'related facilities' means (A) new structures suitable for use as dining halls, community rooms or buildings, or infirmaries or for other essential service facilities, and (B) existing structures which can be made suitable for the above uses by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement."

SEC. 2. Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is further amended—

(1) by inserting in section 506(a) "and sections 514 and 515," immediately following the phrase "501 to 504, inclusive," each place that such phrase appears;

(2) by striking out "under this title" in section 507 and inserting in lieu thereof "under sections 501 to 504, inclusive";

(3) by inserting in section 510(c) "and section 515," immediately following the phrase "502 to 505, inclusive,"; and

(4) by adding after "section 504(b)" in section 511 the phrase "and section 515."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) is amended by inserting after "the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended" the following: ", or title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended".

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR MEETING AT 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I announce that it is contemplated that the Senate will remain in session into the evening, tomorrow, and that yea-and-nay votes are expected tomorrow.

GREAT WHITE FLEET—RESOLUTION BY ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is wonderful to note day by day the strong support from so many Americans for the proposal to outfit a Great White Fleet of mercy ships. I ask unanimous consent that a resolution from the 24th annual national convention of the Italian American War Veterans be printed at this point in the RECORD. It relates to the proposal sponsored by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

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

Whereas an imaginative and meritorious proposal has been dramatically presented on the floor of the U.S. Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and on the floor of the House by several outstanding Congressmen to the effect that a white fleet of demothed Navy vessels be sent around the world by our Nation to render aid and assistance to any distressed area as a gesture of democracy in action; and

Whereas the commissioning of the U.S. white fleet shall demonstrate in a tangible and effective manner to the peoples of the world that we not only advocate but that we practice as well an abiding concern for our striken brothers wherever they may reside on the face of the globe; and

Whereas each and every voyage undertaken by a white fleet sailing under the colors of Old Glory shall bring to the peoples of any nation which has sustained the misfortune of disaster an extension of America's traditional hand of human compassion; and

Whereas out of a humanitarian program of this kind, a manifold bounty of good will shall accrue upon us at a time when we—and all other freedom-loving peoples—are engaged in an all-out struggle against the insidious spread of godless communism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., during national convention assembled in Fall River, Mass., do strongly urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation leading to the establishment, furnishing, and operation of a white fleet; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY, senior U.S. Senator from Minnesota; and to the majority and minority leaders in the House and Senate.

ALBERT P. RUSSO,
National Rehabilitation Officer.

DAIRY PRODUCTS—FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy today to join the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in the sponsorship of a bill which would set the support price for manufacturing milk and butterfat at more realistic levels, levels which would fulfill the basic purposes of the law, to support the prices of the commodities.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has ably and concisely set forth the reasons why this increased support price is essential and just. He pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of dairy products were depleted. The releases and reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture speak complacently of the fact that consumption and supplies of all dairy products are likely to be in approximate balance in 1960. There is an implication in the official statements that there is no longer a "surplus" in dairy products.

There are two points I would like to make in regard to this balance, this lack of surplus.

First, this apparent balance is not a victory for or a justification of Secretary Benson's overworked theory that lowering the support price of commodity brings the production of that commodity down to a point where the diminished supply has a price-lifting effect.

On April 1, 1954, the Secretary of Agriculture slashed the support price of manufacturing milk and butterfat from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent—from $3.74 to $3.15 per hundredweight.

Since that date, the production of milk has gone up every year except for the last two—and in 1958 and 1959 the price of beef cattle made it more profitable to sell the milk cows than to keep them and sell milk at Benson prices. During these past 2 years, more than 1 million head of milk cows have been removed from the farms.

Milk cows are not the only things that have moved off the dairy farms of our Nation. Hundreds of dairy farmers each year have been forced to give up their dairy enterprises. Far from being a respectable economic approach to the dairy dilemma, this is a cruel approach.

The second point I want to make relates to the consumption of milk. Milk consumption per capita has fallen from 700 pounds in 1954 to 687 pounds in 1959. If it were not for two laws passed by Congress, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be overwhelmed by dairy products today. Congress saw fit to recognize that there was an unmet demand for milk from a group whose health and well-being are of importance to every citizen in this country—the schoolchildren of America. The special milk program was enacted into law. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a table showing the consumption of milk in the schools through the regular school-lunch program and the special milk programs since 1954.

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

Milk supply and disposition, U.S. milk equivalent (fat solids basis)—civilian disposition

Milk distribution through milk programs (regular school lunch and special milk):

	Million pounds
1954	942
1955	1,422
1956	1,767
1957	1,951
1958	[1] 2,147
1959	[2] 2,365

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Forecast.

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S.D.A.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in 1954 prior to the enactment of the special milk program, 942 million pounds of milk were used in the schools. With the program in effect in 1955, 1,422 million pounds were used. In 1959, school use of milk had jumped to 2,365 million pounds.

This is an additional use of milk. This is a use of our blessing of abundance. It is true that this program was undertaken as a price support measure, and funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation are therefore used to finance. But I say that this use of milk by our schoolchildren is a source of strength to our country, and the program should be considered an essential use of a life-giving, health-giving product. It should not be charged up as a cost of the price-support program. This should not be considered as a surplus disposal use to be abandoned at some mythical point of balance between supply and demand.

In 1954 Congress approved the International Trade Development and Assistance Act, the act to which we refer as Public Law 480, but which I believe should, by act of Congress, be called the International Food for Peace Act.

Under this law, the bounteous production of our dairy farms has brought food and hope to millions of unfortunate people in the struggling, newly-developing countries of the free world. In some cases this has come about through commercial sales for local currencies. In cases of famine and dire need abroad, our dairy products have been donated to the voluntary relief agencies for distribution. In addition, quantities of dry milk have been used through UNESCO, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, for child-feeding programs under UNICEF. Since 1954, more than 2 billion pounds of dry milk have gone into this use.

The tremendous contribution toward world peace and world health cannot be valued in terms of dollars spent for price support programs.

Rather than a surplus disposal program, this use of food should be an integral part of a "food for peace" program. The charitable agencies should be able to plan their programs to achieve the maximum benefits. As long as we look on this use of food as a means of surplus disposal, the charitable agencies and UNICEF will not be able to make plans which they are sure of carrying out. The United States lost the confidence of many participating nations last year when the Department of Agriculture and Department of State failed to keep commitments to supply these groups with dry milk. Details of the dry milk fiasco of 1959 are set forth in a letter which I sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the International Cooperation Administration on November 11. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

NOVEMBER 11, 1959.

Together with a great many other people, I have been shocked by the crisis situation facing American overseas relief programs because of the sudden failure of the Department of Agriculture to supply the voluntary agencies with nonfat dry milk according to planned allocations.

Nineteen relief agencies have been helping the needy and hungry in 91 countries. Through these groups—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and secular—American citizens express their generous humanitarian feelings toward those less fortunate people who live in countries where they are not blessed with the agricultural abundance that some here in the United States consider a burden. Because so many needy children receive help from these agencies, the dry milk donated from the government-owned surplus store under Public Law 480 has been of great value in the feeding programs.

The voluntary agencies, I understand, made definite commitments to the recipient countries only after consultation with officials of the State Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the International Cooperation Administration.

Careful plans were made in accordance with specific allocations of each of the surplus commodities. Therefore, the relief agencies went ahead with their programs in good faith, confident that the supplies would be available. They contracted with foreign governments to supply personnel and facilities to assist in the distribution programs. Failure of American agencies to meet their commitments certainly may have serious international repercussions.

Surely the Department of Agriculture should have been able to foresee any possible shortages involving any commodity. The fact that the dry milk donations were cut off without a word of warning to the agencies involved is proof that administrative clearances and understandings were not adequate. This looks very much like still another instance where the right hand of government does not know what the left hand is doing. There is also, unfortunately, an inescapable implication that in this case some officials not only did not know, they did not care.

This situation clearly underlines the need for a single agency to integrate all operations under Public Law 480—in short, the Peace Food Administration which I have proposed legislatively.

I have noted that the Department of Agriculture in this past year sold millions of pounds of nonfat dry milk at cut-rate prices for use as animal feed. Which use of this commodity seems most important—as feed for livestock and pets or as food for hungry children? Most people have little hesitation in putting the needs of children first.

I sincerely hope and urge that immediate steps be taken by the Department of Agriculture and the ICA to assist the voluntary agencies in acquiring dry milk in order to meet their relief feeding commitments. All possible means to do so should be considered. It may be that stocks of other commodities acquired by the government under price support operations, such as edible oils, might be used to supplement the donations to the agencies above those already committed.

The humanitarian and worthy efforts of the voluntary relief agencies certainly merit the most sympathetic assistance and support from both individual citizens and government agencies.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, replies received from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of State, and the ICA all indicated sympathy for the plight of the agencies. Arrangements were made to purchase some amounts of dry milk in order that the most pressing needs would be met. But these arrangements were inadequate to fill programed needs and cast serious reflection upon the ability and responsibility of the U.S. Government agencies involved.

The Agricultural Act of 1949, title II, section 201(c), reads as follows:

The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at such levels not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Such price support shall be provided through loans on, or purchases of, the products of milk and butterfat.

The quantity, "adequate supply," is not defined. I say it should be defined, and in the definition all uses of milk should be included, not just the amount that moves on the commercial market. Milk for children, milk for the needy, and milk as a food for peace should be included.

Let us not talk about surplus until we have taken care of some of the crying needs. The filling of these needs, or our failure to fill them, can be the act that shapes the future of the world.

Instead of driving farmers off the farm under the threat of poverty, let us bring some order into our agricultural program.

And, because at this time, all is in disorder, I am pleased to join Senator PROXMIRE in sponsorship of this bill which would give some encouragement and hope to the dairy farmers for the year ahead.

Mr. President, in other years I sponsored legislation like this. I am happy to say that because of the activity of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry relating to this particular kind of legislation, we have been able to forestall more drastic cuts in the dairy price support program.

I conclude my statement in reference to our dairy program by saying that no single program that we have had in terms of food for the needy, food for the hungry, food for the children of America, has been more significant than the special milk program at home and the use of the dried milk and dairy products program abroad.

Anyone who has traveled abroad to examine our foreign aid program, knows that food can be a powerful force for good, for decency, and for freedom in the world.

A few minutes ago I met with approximately 100 of our Midwestern farmers in the New Senate Office Building. They are representatives of the National Farmers Union from Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana. I wish that every Member of Congress could have visited with these fine farm representatives. They earned their trip to Washington. They came to the Nation's Capital to visit with their representatives in Congress and their many friends. They came to learn, and they also came to inform.

I have in my possession, as a result of this meeting, a statement from one of the farmers on the price of eggs. He is Joe Solberg, Sr. I shall give the prices this farmer received, on the 18th day of

January, from Land O'Lakes Creamery, which pays the market price, at New Richland, Minn., these prices. I want my Washington friends, who may be either in the press gallery or in the other galleries, to think of how sad it would be if they were in this business. These are the prices he received.

Grade A eggs—that is the best that can be bought—21 cents a dozen. A-medium—that is the kind of egg that is sold in the big supermarkets—17 cents a dozen. A-small, 12 cents a dozen. Grade B, 17 cents a dozen.

That is the current market price for fresh, grade A, top grade eggs. No farmer can make a living from that kind of price.

When milk sells for $3.06 a hundredweight, which is the support price of manufacturing milk, it is difficult even to eke out a living under that price structure.

I am hopeful that before Congress adjourns it will establish a long range food program, employing the resources of American agriculture as a great force and instrument in our foreign policy. I believe it can do great good.

The Soviets are producing sputniks and rockets and missiles. They are building steel factories. They are erecting huge buildings, and huge hydroelectric projects, all of which have been described to us by our colleagues who have visited the Soviet Union. But there is one thing the Soviets have not been able to produce or offer to the world in adequate quantity, and that is food. What is more, the Soviet Union does not have one single family farm as an exhibit of the independence, the integrity, and the individualism of the farmer.

The United States has an example of wholesome living and of economical and efficient production on the family farm that is unexcelled and unequaled anywhere in the world. I suggest that the policy of our Government be designed to honor the institution of the family farm and to make it profitable, rather than to abuse it and to cause our agricultural system to be literally fighting for its very existence.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

DISARMAMENT POLICY IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a speech on "Disarmament in the Nuclear Age," which I delivered on December 6 at Yale University.

This speech was directed at the task of outlining a possible future long-range as well as short-range disarmament policy for the United States. Several specific goals and proposals are included, and it is my hope they might stimulate discussion and criticism from others.

It saddens me, however, to realize that our own U.S. executive branch is about to enter general disarmament negotiations in less than 6 weeks with no established policy as yet. We knew about these negotiations at least 7 months ago. We knew as long as 2 years ago that some day soon disarmament negotiations would be resumed. What a tragedy. Yes, it is a tragedy that this administration, with almost endless resources at its disposal, has developed no policy.

At this very moment high-ranking officials from four of our close partners in the free world—the United Kingdom, France, Canada, and Italy—are in Washington for the specific purpose of working out an agreed Western policy prior to the opening of the general disarmament negotiations with the Soviet bloc in March. These Western leaders are important people. They have come to Washington on a major assignment. What a waste of their time to come and find that the United States has nothing specific to offer. What an embarrassment to our great country to find us so lacking in leadership, so devoid of ideas and proposals.

Mr. President, I realize that in a little more than 9 months the American people will have an opportunity to show their disdain for the refusal of this administration to assume the responsibility that the people so earnestly and soberly gave it 4 years ago. But I wonder even whether we can afford to wait that long. I implore this administration to wake up, to start moving, and to get on with the task of developing a coherent, effective, imaginative policy for the control and reduction of the world's armaments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

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

DISARMAMENT IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

(Speech of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at Yale University, December 6, 1959)

Disarmament should be the core of American foreign policy. We are a nation dedicated to peace and we know that peace is always threatened by an arms race. A case can be built for an armament structure as a holding action, but a world armed to the teeth is a dangerous world. Progress on controlling arms is urgently needed so that the people of all nations may devote their full talents and energies to peaceful and constructive pursuits. The control and reduction of armaments is an immensely difficult problem. I have chosen this evening to discuss certain of its aspects and to put before you a program for the future.

During the early part of this year's session of the United Nations General Assembly, Premier Khrushchev spoke on the subject of disarmament. He made some rather sweeping proposals including a proposal for total disarmament in 4 years. The Soviet Union was not the only country to offer disarmament proposals before the U.N. The British advanced an equally comprehensive scheme for substantial cutback in armaments in stages. The Irish submitted a resolution to bar the transfer of nuclear weapons from nuclear powers to nonnuclear. A resolution, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly, and sponsored by a large group of nations in Asia and Africa, called on the French to call off their scheduled atomic tests in the Sahara.

The significance of this activity in the United Nations, to me, is twofold. First, the question of disarmament, or arms control to use a broader phrase, is mounting in interest and intensity throughout the world. Second, it was most unfortunate that in all of this debate and discussion, the United States was on the sidelines because we did not have any concrete proposals of our own to advocate. Our position throughout the debate was confined to one of assuring U.N. members that our policy is under review and that all proposals of other nations should be submitted to the forthcoming disarmament negotiations between five Western nations and five Soviet bloc nations.

My complaint is not that we told the U.N. that we were studying the matter. My criticism is that such a position was far from adequate—a far cry from the position the leader of the free world should be prepared to take on one of the most vital issues facing the world at this time.

The most recent overall position of the United States on the broad subject of disarmament was stated in August 1957. Yet the administration waited until August of 1959 before appointing a group to review the policy to determine what we should seek in 1960.

Our policy should be under constant scrutiny all the time. But to say we are reviewing past policy on arms control puts the matter in the wrong perspective. It is not enough to review what has gone before. What is urgently needed is a policy for the future, one that can be used as a basis for discussion and negotiations. A policy that states goals and the concrete steps to realize the goals is what the world wants to hear from the United States.

Progress toward any kind of arms control requires infinite patience. But there is a difference between the patience that is based on planning and prodding and the patience of procrastination, timidity, and indecision.

The President, in a letter to me of November 17, did reaffirm his belief in the need for progress on disarmament. I commend the President for his statement of purpose. Too bad so many of his advisers fail to share his aims and vision. Although it is belated, it is encouraging that the President has begun to see that goals, in order to be translated into specific steps, demand preparation, study, and even funds.

Progress on arms control can be made. But it takes the kind of stubborn concentration of people who refuse to give up at the first signs of delay or the first obstacles to progress.

During the recent session of Congress I tried on four different appropriation bills to get $400,000 earmarked for disarmament studies. Each time the administration failed to give support. Regrettably, the Congress failed also.

Next year I shall try again. The Department of State has indicated that it will recommend funds for arms control preparation and studies.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN AGREEMENT CLOSER

Today, I offer three arms control proposals which should be given the highest priority. In proposing them I am assuming there will be continued negotiations for a ban on nuclear weapons tests. I give the test ban talks a better than even chance of being successful. I believe the outcome will be based on a control system for the cessation of all atomic tests, initiated perhaps in stages and possibly along the lines I recently outlined in an address at Pontiac, Mich.

Many people within the administration have fought the concept of a comprehensive and controlled test ban agreement. They have fought it all year and they are still fighting it. I was sorry to note opponents of a test ban seem to have recruited Governor Rockefeller to their side. Whether Vice President NIXON is there too no one can be sure. The political wind evidently is not yet strong enough for him to tell which way it is going and, therefore, which direction he should likewise go.

One of the ways test ban opponents try to scuttle an agreement is to call for a control and inspection system that is 100 per-

cent perfect. The AEC and the Pentagon know themselves that perfection in an arms control system is no more possible than perfection in an early warning radar system against surprise attack or perfection in the safety precautions taken to prevent radioactivity from escaping from a nuclear reactor.

The President has now begun to shake up his subordinates on this matter. In his November 17 letter to me he said:

"* * * The best and most carefully elaborated disarmament agreements are likely to carry with them some risks, at least theoretically, of evasion. But one must ponder, in reaching decisions on the very complex and difficult subject of arms control, the enormous risks entailed if reasonable steps are not taken to curb the international competition in armaments and to move effectively in the direction of disarmament."

The President is right. There are risks in the failure to act, just as there are risks in carefully designed action.

With continued and concentrated bargaining and perseverance a test ban agreement may be reached within the next several months. The President wants a test ban agreement before he leaves office and the Russians seem to want to limit the nuclear club. The votes in the U.N. General Assembly indicate world opinion insists upon a test ban. I am convinced the people of the United States want the tests stopped. They want to make a start on controlling the arms race. When Governor Rockefeller made his unfortunate and, in my opinion, misguided statement over TV on resuming underground tests, the TV studio was besieged with calls of protest.

But we must prepare to go beyond a controlled and inspected nuclear weapons test ban agreement. This merely opens the door to genuine disarmament. We should make a concerted attack on three major problems in the arms-control field.

GOALS TO WORK TOWARD

Let me make it clear I stand for a world free from the burden of massive armaments. I support the goal of a United Nations police force equipped to guard all nations, large and small, from aggression. I am for a system of world order in which law takes the place of force as a means of settling disputes. And I believe that eventually the nations of the world must agree to view any act of an individual, group, or nation that seeks to disturb world peace as a crime against mankind. Specific steps now must be taken to assure the ultimate fulfillment of these long-range goals.

DEFENSE MUST BE MAINTAINED UNTIL DISARMAMENT IS REACHED

The proposals I offer are all based on the concept of mutual agreement. I do not support unilateral disarmament. We have already had too much of this in the name of a balanced budget. Until we have concrete progress in arms control our own defense posture must not only be maintained but even strengthened in key respects.

Now my proposals:

No. 1. Control and reduction of missiles and bombers and maintenance of outer space for peaceful purposes

We must seek the control and reduction of long-range missiles and long-range bombers. We must increase our efforts to preserve outer space for peaceful purposes.

The universe waits to be explored and understood. The nations of the earth must together seek knowledge about the unknown. They must simultaneously develop a law of conduct in the universe if peaceful undertakings are not to be turned into warfare. Insofar as we possibly can, therefore, the delivery vehicles of warfare should be controlled and curtailed. Of these the most important are the missiles and then the bombers.

This means inspectors and control posts located at every strategic airbase. Inspectors and control posts will need to be established near the launching sites for missiles as well as aboard every naval vessel equipped for missile launchings.

But control is not enough. The missiles and bombers must either be eliminated or they must be placed under international control. Further tests of missiles under such a system would be prohibited and a monitoring system installed to see that they were, in fact, stopped.

Such a program as this cannot be accomplished overnight. Long-range missile and bomber control is an enormously difficult problem. I am told, for example, that enough missiles might be launched from one site to effect a major knockout blow. A control system for missiles and bombers involving bases and launching sites throughout the world would be far more difficult to negotiate than a ban on nuclear weapons tests. Therefore, studies on control measures should be begun immediately. They should be started at home, internally by the United States, and also joint talks should be proposed with the Soviet Union and other powers that would be affected. The studies might first be conducted on a technical level prior to political negotiations.

For years we have talked about the threat of the nuclear delivery systems. The talk must now be translated into action.

No. 2. Cessation of nuclear weapons production

The production of fissionable material for weapons purposes should be curtailed under effective safeguards.

Here again there has been a lot of talk but little action. We need first to work out, preferably jointly with the Soviet Union and Great Britain, the necessary technical means of control. We need a control system adequate to prevent the secret diversion of fissionable materials from peaceful pursuits to weapons purposes. This control system should be adequate but not more than is required. The last estimate I have seen given by the AEC for such a control system involved about 5,000 inspectors in the Soviet Union. I cannot judge at this point whether this is necessary. It appears to me rather high considering tht the test ban control system for the U.S.S.R. would involve far less than 1,000 inspectors.

A controlled ban on the production of nuclear weapons would affect not only the three nuclear powers. It would also stop other nations from arming themselves with their own nuclear weapons. The French, for example, have said repeatedly they would give up their plans to test and produce nuclear weapons if other nations stopped their nuclear weapons production. A control system for the prohibition of nuclear weapons production might be fitted into the functions of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

No. 3. Worldwide multi-nation system against surprise attack

We need a worldwide antisurprise attack system against the use of any kind of military force by one country against another.

The term, surprise attack, has come to mean within the United States, primarily an attack by long-range missiles and aircraft. This does not include all that I mean. The problem is not solely one of missiles and bombers nor of the three nuclear powers. It includes surprise attack by Chinese Communists on India, Nepal, Burma, Laos, Korea, or Formosa. It concerns a possible aggression in the Middle East. It concerns a possible aggression in Central and Eastern Europe. And finally it even concerns possible aggression in Latin America.

A focus on the prevention of this kind of surprise attack is essential and urgent for two major reasons. First, it is important because most of the real threats of warfare come from the kinds of situations I have mentioned. Every time a local or regional war breaks out it threatens to drag in the major powers with their large-scale and devastating weapons.

Second, it is important because if the nuclear powers place under control and limit their missiles, bombers, and fissionable material for weapons purposes this might give other powers the idea they can afford to become more reckless. In other words, the possession of weapons of mass destruction has acted to some extent as a deterrent on nonnuclear powers as well as nuclear. No nation can be sure that what it hopes may be a small war won't turn into a worldwide catastrophe. If the big weapons were controlled or removed, some irresponsible dictator with heavy conventional armaments somewhere might feel the risk of aggression was not too great. Until you have assurance of protection from surprise attack you have an unstable world situation where the finger is never far from the trigger.

An antisurprise attack system should include many elements. In some areas the withdrawal or pullback of troops would be called for. In other areas a controlled demilitarized zone would be needed. Still other areas might require the stationing of an international police force. Special inspection posts would need to be established in all areas. The U.N. would truly become the eyes and ears of peace.

You may think this sounds like a lot of inspection and inspectors. It would be. But it is necessary to have what each situation demands.

IMPORTANCE OF INSPECTION FOR A PEACEFUL WORLD

In our country I think we believe inspection and control are necessary because we don't trust the Russians. This is certainly an element but this is not the entire explanation. It is deeper than that.

Inspection and control recognize something about human nature. It recognizes that man is not perfect.

If controls and regulations are needed in a well-organized national society, and they certainly are, they are even more important in relations among nation states.

Americans are a peace-loving, honest and just people. The overwhelming majority of us want to obey the law, do well unto others, and avoid harm wherever and whenever we can. Yet we have dotted our society from stem to stern inside and out with inspectors. Just let me list for you some of the ways we inspect each other.

At the Federal level we have inspectors for a multitude of purposes: Food and drug inspectors; Coast Guard inspectors; narcotics inspectors; the Customs Service; the Secret Service; FBI agents; Civil Service investigators; and Atomic Energy inspectors.

In the armed services we have a military police system that consists of 23,976 Army police, 2,407 Navy police, and 34,894 Air Force police.

And in the Internal Revenue Service we have inspectors in the thousands including a couple of hundred to inspect the inspectors.

James Madison said many years ago: "If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary." It goes without saying, I think, that international relations are not conducted by angels either.

Inspection, therefore, is highly essential for a peaceful world as well as a just and functioning society. The sooner we start detailed studies and negotiations combining inspection and control with the reduction of armaments and the prevention of surprise attack the sooner we may reach our goal.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need to get started. We are going into our third year of serious discussion for a test ban.

Each of the three fields I have mentioned may take at least that long to show progress.

REGIONAL DISARMAMENT CONFERENCES NEEDED

These three proposals cannot be negotiated by the same people at the same conference. The missile-bomber problem and the cut-off of fissionable material for weapons purposes can be undertaken primarily by the nuclear powers with assistance from others. But separate conferences will be necessary. It will be necessary to initiate regional conferences to handle the creation of anti-surprise attack systems in the different areas of the world.

What I am suggesting here is that the 10-nation disarmament negotiations to be convened early next year can only make a start on the problem. They will not be able in one conference to settle the problems I have discussed here as well as others that also must be tackled. Perhaps the greatest contribution the forthcoming 10-nation disarmament conference can make is to undertake serious negotiations for a system to prevent surprise attack in Europe.

OTHER ARMS CONTROL PROBLEMS

As I have advanced my three major proposals many of you may have been thinking about still other problems. We are all aware of many other areas on which work must be done. In the arms control field there are weapons of bacteriological and chemical warfare. There are the armed forces of nations. There are the delivery vehicles other than missiles and bombers. In the matter of prevention of aggression there is the overriding problem of settling the disputes and removing the friction among nations that lead to aggression. And there is the special problem of China.

All of these matters require thought, study, and action. But I submit we must make a start. I have chosen three areas that are particularly important.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEM OF CHINA

Now before closing, a word about China. The Communist Government of China would have to be bound by any arms control system that dealt effectively with missiles and bombers and the prevention of surprise attack. Without China no system for the prevention of surprise attack in Eastern and Southern Asia could be successful. Without China in an arms control agreement affecting Asia, the entire power balance in the world could be dangerously upset. National security and world security demand the inclusion of Communist China in major arms control agreements.

Unfortunately, Communist China is still highly irresponsible and aggressive. It may take the combined persuasiveness of the Soviet Union, the United States, and all the countries of Asia to impress on China the need to forego plans of aggression and defiance of the international community. Strange as it may seem to think of United States-Soviet cooperation on persuading China to participate in a disarmament agreement, the world situation may yet produce such a result.

We are entering a period in which the subject of arms reduction and control is taking on new meaning. There are dangers as well as opportunities. But the goal of a peaceful world demands our best efforts.

And the goal of peace must not be a sterile and cold concept meaning merely the absence of war or hostilities. It is a peace with justice and opportunity, better living conditions, education and health for all mankind. Peace is not slogans but programs. This kind of peace is not easy; it is sacrifice. Peace requires more than public relations. It demands a continuity and depth of public policy. My wish is that my program of disarmament offered here tonight will help to stimulate and inspire others.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Minnesota Air National Guard unit at Wold Chamberlain Field of Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., was converted from an air defense mission to a MATS-type mission, and the 109th Air National Guard has now received the first of its fleet of C–97 Stratofreighters.

I have been assured by the Department of Defense that the withdrawal of the guard jet fighters from Minneapolis has not adversely altered our defense position, and that the transport mission assigned to the Air National Guard will make a continuing contribution to the transport requirements of the National and State defense and disaster relief planners.

I wish to commend the Secretary of the Air Force and the other officials responsible for establishing this mission at Wold Chamberlain Field. It is a far-sighted and pioneering action. Every Minnesotan is indeed proud that the first multiengine aircraft ever to be assigned to a Reserve component has now been assigned to the Minnesota Air National Guard.

It is also a pleasure to take this moment to commend the loyal and efficient Minnesota air guardsmen who have made a splendid record in their previous air defense mission. I know that they are anxious to undertake the new mission assigned to them by the Air Force and they will carry it forward with their typical elan and enthusiasm.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

RECESS TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, under the order previously entered, until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 1960, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1960:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

John J. Grady, of Illinois, to be Deputy Director for Management of the International Cooperation Administration, in the Department of State.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Neil R. Farmelo, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice John O. Henderson, resigned.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Capt. Henry J. Wuensch
Capt. George H. Miller
Capt. George A. Knudsen
Capt. Christopher C. Knapp

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1960:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

Tyler Thompson, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Robert Cutler, of Massachusetts, to be an Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 3 years and until his successor has been appointed.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Dennis A. FitzGerald, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration in the Department of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service:

To be consuls general

Ward P. Allen, of Virginia.
Harlan B. Clark, of Ohio.
George W. Renchard, of Michigan.
William D. Wright, of the District of Columbia.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 2, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service

Joseph Mintzes, of Pennsylvania.

Now Foreign Service officer of class 3 and secretary in the diplomatic service:

To be also consul general

Merritt N. Cootes, of Oregon.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 3, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service

Harold E. Howland, of Virginia.
Norman F. Johnson, of Maryland.
Barney B. Taylor, of Michigan.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 4, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service

George A. Landry, of New Hampshire.
T. Howard Peters, of Washington.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 5, consul, and secretary in the diplomatic service

Henry W. Kemp, of Pennsylvania.
Harry Kushner, of California.
Thomas E. Summers, of California.

To be consuls

Chris C. Pappas, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Edward M. Rowell, of California.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 6, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service.

Spiros A. Siafacas, of Florida.
Miss Anita R. Wharton, of Florida.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 7, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service

Miss Frances L. Adams, of Arizona.
Mrs. Ethel Balashova, of California.
Roger A. Provencher, of Colorado.

To be Foreign Service officer of class 8, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service

David Anderson, of New York.
Rodney E. Armstrong, of California.
Donald P. Black, of California.
Richard L. Bowen, of South Dakota.
Thomas Gordon Brown, Jr., of New Mexico.
John Allen Buche, of Indiana.
John B. Connely, of California.
John P. Crawford, of Ohio.
Douglas James Harwood, of Connecticut.
Marvin W. Humphreys, of the District of Columbia.
Robert E. Kaufman, of the District of Columbia.
Kenneth A. Kurze, of Rhode Island.
Paul L. Laase, of Nebraska.
Stephen J. Ledogar, of New York.
Jon S. Lodeesen, of Tennessee.
Edward V. Nef, of the District of Columbia.
Jack R. Perry, of Georgia.
Paul B. Remmey, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Charles W. Schaller, of Wisconsin.
Lincoln F. Stelk, of Illinois.
Charles H. Thomas II, of New Hampshire.
Joseph W. Twinam, of Tennessee.
Thomas H. Walsh, of Texas.
E. Allan Wendt, of Illinois.
A. Norman Willims, of Michigan.

To be consul general

William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut.

To be consuls

Valentin E. Blacque, of Minnesota.
Seymour Chalfin, of New York.
Ross L. Collins, of Missouri.
Daren J. Flitcroft, of Virginia.
Albert W. Hennig, of Massachusetts.
Philip G. Hodge, of Connecticut.
Eric Neff, of the District of Columbia.
Michael Pavlyak, of Virginia.
John B. Perkey, Jr., of West Virginia.
Philip B. K. Potter, of Connecticut.
William H. Strong, of Virginia.
Rutherford T. Walsh, of California.

To be consul and secretary in the diplomatic service

Alex A. Cohen, of California.

To be vice consuls

Charles J. Baker, of Virginia.
Christopher H. Ballou, of Vermont.
Robert B. Clark, of Massachusetts.
George L. Coale, Jr., of California.
James R. Connelly, of California.
Richard K. Cooke, of Texas.
John W. Hennessy, of Connecticut.
John A. Holizna, of Pennsylvania.
Starr M. King, Jr., of Massachusetts.
James F. Shea, of Maryland.
Joseph P. Sherman, of Michigan.
Jack Stewart, of Illinois.
Robert L. Taylor, of New York.

To be vice consul and secretary in the diplomatic service

William T. Brown, of New Jersey.
Ralph W. Stephan, Jr., of Ohio.

To be secretary in the diplomatic service

Edgar J. Applewhite, of the District of Columbia.
Howard W. Bovee, of Wisconsin.
Edward P. Brown, of Virginia.
Dudley R. Burris, of Texas.
Robert G. Caldwell, Jr., of Virginia.
Laughlin A. Campbell, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur C. Close, of Virginia.
Raymond H. Close, of New Jersey.
Richard J. Cornish, of Kansas.
Aldo D'Alessandro, of New York.
Philo Dibble, of Utah.
Edward A. Dow, Jr., of New York.
Charles L. Duthie, of Colorado.
Mrs. Virginia H. Emmons, of Michigan.
John F. Fay, of Virginia.
John S. Foster, of Virginia.
Joseph C. Goodwin, of Utah.
Tucker P. E. Gougelmann, of New York.
Charles C. Hall, Jr., of Virginia.
John J. Hicks, of Virginia.
Leo J. Horvath, of Pennsylvania.
Boris Ilyin, of Virginia.
George A. Ives, Jr., of North Carolina.
Hans J. Jensen, of California.
Thane A. Kuhlman, of Michigan.
George V. Lauder, of Connecticut.
Lawrence G. Leisersohn, of the District of Columbia.

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service

Richard M. Long, of Colorado.
Edward S. Lynch, of Maryland.
Joseph A. Minott, Jr., of Oregon.
Nicholas A. Montesano, of New York.
Duncan Purcell, of Pennsylvania.
Ralph H. Redford, of Utah.
Carl J. Schoepe, of Ohio.
Edward H. Splain, of Virginia.
Richard F. Stolz, Jr., of Vermont.
Clifton R. Strathern, of Massachusetts.
John M. Turner, of Georgia.
Frederick D. Vreeland, of New York.
Frederick U. Wells, of the District of Columbia.

Now Foreign Service staff officers:

To be consuls

K. Marshal Berg, of Iowa.
Edmund R. Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Max W. Kraus, of Maryland.
Miss Ellen I. McCullough, of New Jersey.
Stephen N. Sestanovich, of California.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 27, 1960:

POSTMASTER

Arnold W. Langner, Sr., to be postmaster at Sheboygan Falls, Wis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

I John 5: 4: *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.*

O Thou God of all love and righteousness, may we now turn the thoughts of our minds and the meditations of our hearts toward Thee without hesitation or misgiving.

We rejoice that the record of a thousand yesterdays testify that Thou art more ready to grant our requests than we are willing to ask or receive.

Make us daily more sensitive and responsive to those great moral and spiritual impulses and imperatives which Thou hast planted within our souls.

May we long to be numbered among that vast company of honorable and dedicated men and women who sympathize with the needs of humanity and are laboring for the welfare of all mankind.

Help us to meet the problems and perplexities of our distraught and disordered world with a faith that is courageous and invincible.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Master. 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 a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1508. An act to provide for economic regulation of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution proposing observance of week beginning January 31, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOW. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers, there is consternation within the ranks of the majority because the beloved chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], has decided to retire and his colleagues are somewhat less than pleased with his possible successor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

May I suggest that blood pressures are rising unnecessarily, for there is every reason to suppose that the next chairman of this important committee will be the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS]. All we have to do is elect a Republican majority in the House, and I believe the voters of America are going to do just that.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS: ISSUE OF THE DAY

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, my purpose and the purpose of many of my colleagues today in addressing this body is certainly not to engage in any discussion as a means of perfecting merely a speaking technique for the coming campaign. It is for one reason and one

reason alone, as it is for my distinguished colleagues who will shortly address the House, and that is to pinpoint the regrettable fact that this Congress has yet to act in assuring to all our citizens the dignity and rights which are inherent in our democratic concepts, specified in our cherished documents and woven into our ethical and religious fabric.

Mr. Speaker, there has been an effort made to indicate that while civil rights supporters are fighting for more democracy for deprived citizens, they, themselves, are not using democratic procedures; to wit, they are bypassing the rules of the House through the use of the discharge petition to release the civil rights measure from the Rules Committee. This is simply not true.

How can it be when the House rules provide for the use of the discharge petition? To use this tactic of attack is merely to attempt to deflect from the real issue and that issue is, do we have a chance to act on civil rights legislation and if so, what kind of a bill will we eventually evolve?

I am happy to see that the New York Times of January 25, 1960, stated editorially, and I quote:

> House Republican leaders explain that they are against discharge petitions "in principle" because they do not believe in "circumventing" House rules. They say the Democrats, as the majority party, bear the full responsibility for the bill. They express assurance that the bill will get to the floor and promise to vote for it there.

Then the Times' editorial pierces this Republican demonstration of "doublethink" by noting, and I quote again:

> To put it bluntly, those explanations are lame. It can hardly be circumventing House rules to sign a discharge petition when the rules provide for such a petition. It is no secret that the Democratic Party is divided between South and North. Republican votes are needed to get the bill to the floor as well as pass it there. Most important, failure of the discharge petition will permit the bill to reach the floor only under unfavorable terms—perhaps including a ban on amendments—dictated by Rules Committee conservatives.

Then this January 25 editorial concludes with an incisive paragraph which I also quote:

> The Republican Party, unlike its opposition, should be free to give wholehearted support to civil rights legislation. Its failure to do so can only give credence to charges of a deal between House Republicans and southern Democrats. The discharge petition will be open for signatures when the House meets at noon today. If the issue is recognized for what it is—a chance for meaningful civil rights legislation—it should not take long to get the 43 more signatures needed.

The reference to the 43 additional signatures needed was based on the Times' published list of that date, January 25. Happily, the required number yet needed has been lowered and since today offers a lengthy session, I respectfully remind my colleagues who have not signed that there is ample opportunity to do so. I might add also that two-thirds of the required 219 signatures have already come from members of the Democratic Party. It is thus obvious, without drawing pictures, where the remaining names are to be found in order to reach the required 219 signatures.

Frankly, I am indeed anxious to learn from the minority leadership why it is failing to give impetus to the signing of the discharge petition since the bill we are trying to bring to the floor, H.R. 8601, represents the mild proposals of the Administration offered last session. Why? Is it because the executive leadership doesn't really want to see its own proposals enacted, and the Civil Rights Commission recommendations considered by this Congress as the President urged in his State of the Union message, and so merely went on record last year to soothe the American public? Or is it because the civil rights issue is better used for election-year purposes than for human purposes? I can't help but note that there was no hesitancy on the part of the minority leadership in firming up its position, in line with that of the President and the Vice President, in the matter of labor-management reform legislation. Why, then, does this not hold true now? Is the minority leadership ready to say it does not believe in the substance of even this mildest of mild civil rights bills?

I would like at this time to yield to the most distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who, without any question, through the years has proved, through his leadership, that he knows the rules of the House, and second, that he knows the basic issue involved in the question of civil rights.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for yielding to me.

I want to say at the outset that I know of no man who is more dedicated to the subject of civil rights than he is. He has rendered yeoman service in an attempt to get signatures to this petition to which he has adverted.

Mr. Speaker, no one single domestic issue has received the study, the deliberation, or the scrutiny than has that of civil rights.

Hearings were held on March 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, and on April 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, and May 1, 1959. Discussion was held within the full committee on the civil rights bill before it on July 9, 14, 22, 28, 29, 30, August 4 and 5, 1959. The testimony before this committee was printed in a volume containing 960 pages, and the report on the bill contained 42 pages. All interested parties were heard; those in opposition to the bill, as well as those supporting it. It cannot now be said that there is any Member in this House who does not know how he will vote on H.R. 8601, the civil rights bill reported by the committee, and why.

It will be admitted, even by the opponents of the bill, that every argument for and against it, was permitted expression. Why then is a bill, with which all are familiar, a bill on which each Member has already made his resolution, not permitted to come on the floor of the House so that the Members of Congress may work their will upon it?

A request has been made of the Rules Committee, before which it now lies dormant, for a rule to bring it to the floor; the Rules Committee will not act. Can we then stand aside and shrug away the adamacy of the Committee on Rules? We know quite well how the members of the Committee on Rules from the South regard the bill—this comes as no shock or surprise to anyone. The southern members have made no secret of their antipathy toward the provisions of the bill. They testified in open session before the Committee on the Judiciary in bitter protest, but it would not have been too difficult to bring this bill to the floor had the Republican members of the Rules Committee, in concert with approving Democratic members of the Rules Committee, brought forth a rule. It was evident that this was not to be; the Republican members, despite the claims that the Republican Party was the champion of civil rights, took no action toward the securing of the rule.

It was evident then that the machinery provided for by the rules of the House would have to be put into motion. Consequently, on August 26, 1959, I introduced House Resolution 359 to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the civil rights bill, opening the way toward consideration of the bill through petition. There are now some 188 names placed on the petition—219 will bring the bill to the floor. It is pertinent, then to ask: Why has not the requisite number of names as yet been reached? The answer is a simple and obvious one to those who have examined the signatures on the petition. The Republican Members of the House, by and large, are not signing.

Let us examine the arguments advanced by the Republican leadership in the House for not signing the petition:

First. Republicans say that they prefer the orderly processes of the House. Is not the discharge petition an orderly process of the House? It was made a part of the process by incorporation in the Rules of the House. It is as much a part of the machinery of legislation as is the Suspension Calendar, the Consent Calendar, the Private Calendar, and Calendar Wednesday. It exists to meet the exact circumstances which the Rules Committee has created.

Second. It is argued that the Democratic Party is the majority party in the House of Representatives and that, therefore, the failure to bring the bill to the floor is a failure of the Democratic leadership. This is very sorry arithmetic, indeed. When the Republican Members of the House refuse, together with the southern Democrats, to sign the discharge petition, the balance of numbers is the other way. The southern Democrats are doing what comes naturally. They have made no pretense of their opposition to the bill. They have openly and insistently used every parliamentary device to thwart the enactment of a civil rights bill. They have made their opposition vocal and articulate. They have never made any protestations to the contrary. There are those of us who believe they are wrong in the stand they have taken but we know what that stand is. However, when the Republican member-

ship—the party of Abraham Lincoln—descends to the specious arguments I have outlined to you, I must confess, that I feel there is a huge chunk of hypocrisy at work. It has all the semblance of a deal, a deal between the southern Democrats and the Republicans to the effect that the southern Democrats will stand with the Republicans in defeating all welfare legislation so that the holiness of the Eisenhower budget be not tainted while the Republicans in turn will withhold any positive move to help insure the passage of a Civil Rights Act in this session. It has the semblance of a neat political game.

This is an election year, this is a Democratic Congress; if no civil rights legislation is enacted, the Republicans, in pious horror, can point the finger of shame at a Democratic-controlled Congress and keep silent about the part they played. I think the country should know this. To permit a deception of this kind to go unmarked would make a mockery of the truth. The Republicans can either wrest the civil rights bill out of the Rules Committee or sign the petition. They do neither.

The Eisenhower administration is forever, in all areas, using the phrase "deeds, not words." The Eisenhower administration, together with the Republican Members of Congress, in 1957 killed any chance for the strengthening of a civil rights bill. In this Congress, as in the 85th, after their own Attorney General had advocated strong measures such as the well-known part III of the 1957 bill which would have given the Attorney General the power to protect the civil rights of all peoples in all areas under the Constitution, the Republicans disowned and rejected that recommendation.

The President in his economic message stated:

> I urge the Congress to enact the remaining six points of the civil rights program that I recommended last year.

An then concluded the paragraph by saying:

> The Civil Rights Commission, extended for an additional 2 years by the last session of Congress, continues its important work and has developed additional constructive recommendations, particularly for protecting the right of every citizen to vote. I hope these recommendations will also be earnestly considered by the Congress.

Let us note that the President said "enact the remaining six points" and then for any further strengthening of the bill merely asked that they be "earnestly considered." This is an immeasurable difference in emphasis.

I quote again, but this time from the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

> But in terms of securing and protecting the right to vote, the record of the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division under the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is hardly more encouraging than it was before.
>
> Nearly 2 years after passage of the act, the Department of Justice had brought only three actions under its new powers to seek preventive civil relief rather than criminal conviction against any interference with the right to vote.

This kind of passivity, this kind of lip service, without action, befits those who are using civil rights legislation only as a political football, shutting from their conscience the pleading and yearning of American citizens who have been deprived of their civil rights, theirs by virtue of the U.S. Constitution.

If President Eisenhower really means what he says about civil rights he should summon Minority Leader HALLECK, his mouthpiece in this House, to the White House and instruct him to urge his Republican conferees to sign the petition.

If this petition fails for lack of proper number of signatures and if the four Republican members of the Rules Committee refuse to join with the four northern Democrats of that committee to force out a rule, then I shall blame the Republicans, from President Eisenhower down, for the civil rights debacle.

If I have been harsh, it is only because the truth is harsh. If the Republican Members of the Congress want to answer me, there is a very direct, simple way of so doing. Let them sign the petition—either they are for civil rights legislation or against it. They cannot have it both ways.

I am only too well aware of the position taken by many members of the Republican Party in the House and forcefully advocated by the minority leader that the civil rights bill should be taken up under the rule of the House providing for Calendar Wednesday business. In order that there may be no misunderstanding of my position, I will state here and now that I do not oppose the use of Calendar Wednesday for the consideration of that legislation but I cannot accept it except as a last resort. Naturally, my preference is for consideration of the measure either under a rule or under consideration by my discharge petition, House Resolution 359.

I am sure that the Members of this body are well aware of the provision contained in clause 7, rule XXIV of the rules of this body which provide for consideration of legislative business by the Calendar Wednesday procedure. My reluctance to utilize this procedure except as a last resort is predicated upon the practical problems which would confront us. Supporters of this procedure allege that by proceeding under the Calendar Wednesday rule we will be adhering to the orderly procedure of the House. I see no difference between that position and my position under the discharge petition which the same rules of the House make provision for.

Under a discharge petition, or under a rule from the Rules Committee, the parliamentary procedure is clear, definite and expeditious, but I would like to point out that under the Calendar Wednesday procedure the opposite conditions will be encountered. For example, under the Calendar Wednesday rule, debate in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union is limited to 2 hours to be equally divided between those who are for the bill and those who are against it. A rule on the bill could grant more time than a mere 2 hours and my discharge resolution provides for 2 days of legislative debate. Surely, everyone acquainted with this legislation recognizes and must admit the need for more than 2 hours' general debate.

The most immediate consideration in the problem of considering a civil rights measure is the element of time. Action now is of the essence and clause 7 of rule XXIV would not present an opportunity for early consideration. This is because the procedure calls for a call of committees of the House in alphabetical order. Of the 20 committees listed in such order, the Committee on the Judiciary ranks No. 12. What does this mean? This means that before the chairman is recognized on a particular Wednesday, 11 committees must be called and either they may not answer the call or they may. A mere look at bills now pending on the House and Union Calendars indicate we have pieces of legislation that might well be called up by any one of those committees on a particular Wednesday. These committees may well occupy the whole of a particular Wednesday under the rule so that if a week from today Calendar Wednesday is called, it would be 12 Wednesdays before the Committee on the Judiciary would be reached.

A factor which must be borne in mind at this point is that the chairmen of many of the committees of the House are from the southern section of our Nation and are on record as being unalterably opposed to civil rights measures and are committed to utilize every means, strategy, and effort, and particularly parliamentarywise, to prevent consideration or bring about the defeat of a civil rights bill.

It must be remembered that even though the Committee on the Judiciary answers to the call on a Calendar Wednesday, it still finds a difficult parliamentary position. If, after the 2-hour general debate and upon completion of the proceedings under the 5-minute rule, the previous question must be ordered or else further consideration of the civil rights bill shall be postponed until all the committees after Judiciary, in alphabetical order, have been called on succeeding Wednesdays. Then, after the call of No. 20, the Committee on Ways and Means, on the proper Wednesday, the call would revert back to Committee No. 1, the Committee on Agriculture, and so on down until the Committee on the Judiciary, No. 12, is again reached. It takes no imagination to see a possibility that final consideration and passage of the bill could be postponed by parliamentary maneuvering to the closing days of the session. And here, may I add, that Calendar Wednesday cannot take place during the last 2 weeks of the session.

These are some of my reasons for preferring consideration of the bill either by a rule or under a discharge petition. To anyone who may be naive or uneducated in the ways of southern opposition to civil rights legislation, let me refer you to the situation which confronted the Committee on Education and Labor in the 81st Congress when, under this proposed procedure of Calendar Wednesday, the so-called FEPC bill was considered. I recommend that those individuals who purport to be supporters of civil rights

but prefer consideration under the Calendar Wednesday provision, read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22, 1950. Those pages of the RECORD will educate them clearly and forcefully to the problems I have outlined and anticipate under such procedure.

Let me project myself, as it were, to a possible Calendar Wednesday, and say the Judiciary Committee may be called. Let me give you some idea of what might happen. We are 12th on the alphabetical list. We have waited 3 months. Most of the committees preceding the Judiciary will have bills and will use their opportunities under Calendar Wednesday. The Speaker recognizes me as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. We are in the House at the outset. Immediately a point of order is made that there is no quorum. There is a call of the House, with yeas and nays. Then a motion is made to adjourn. The yeas and nays are demanded and granted. Then there is a motion made to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, which is proper under the rules, and there is permitted 10 minutes of debate on that motion, 5 on each side. The yeas and nays are demanded on that. Again a point of order of no quorum is made, because those opposed to civil rights will leave the Chamber. The quorum gradually melts so that there is no quorum to answer the call of the House. More time is taken.

Then there is another motion to adjourn. The yeas and nays are demanded. Thus at that point we have had five rollcalls, on two motions to adjourn, on two points of order of no quorum and one to dispense with Calendar Wednesday. There may be additional points of order of no quorum and additional motions to adjourn. I cannot anticiapte how many there may be. Recognition along those lines depends upon the point of view of whoever may be in the chair, or the Speaker. I am sure the Speaker will be fair in that regard and when a point of order is made that there is no quorum and the yeas and nays are demanded, he will wait a sufficient length of time and will not recognize the gentleman who makes the point of order of no quorum until a fair amount of time has passed.

Finally I am recognized in the House automatically, as it were, to call up the bill. I must be authorized by my committee to bring up the bill. I may not be caught unawares. My committee must have given me, prior to that day, authority to recognize the call on Calendar Wednesday. If they have not done it, I lose my chance and the Judiciary Committee loses its chance to bring up the bill.

But I am prepared. I have the authority of the Judiciary Committee. I so express myself to the Speaker, and he recognizes me. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Then we have 2 hours of general debate. Then the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule. Points of order can be raised to amendments, and there will be lengthy arguments, I assure you, on germaneness. There are all manners and kinds of complications under the 5-minute rule.

Finally the Committee rises automatically. Now we are in the House. Separate votes undoubtedly will be demanded on any amendments that have been passed in the Committee of the Whole, with record votes. There will be the usual motion to strike out the enacting clause, with a yea-and-nay vote. There will be a motion to recommit, with a yea-and-nay vote. Motions will be made to adjourn while in the House, with a yea-and-nay vote.

Let me tell you something of what happened with the FEPC legislation to which I made reference. The Calendar Wednesday proceedings started in August of 1949. The Committee on Education and Labor was reached on February 22, 1950. There was a recess between those two dates, there was a time lag between August 1949 and February 1950. All intervening committees answered the call and offered their respective bills. When the FEPC bill was considered, all manners and kinds of dilatory motions were made of the type that I have indicated.

The previous question was ordered at 3 a.m. on the morning of February 23, 1950. The House adjourned until 12 noon, February 23, when the bill was finally passed. The previous question having been ordered on February 23 at 3 a.m. the status of unfinished business was preserved, hence it was in order to adjourn to noon, February 23, and vote on the bill. If the previous question had not been ordered that night, then the bill could not have been taken up again until the remaining committees had been passed and answered the call on Calendar Wednesday, unless under the rule there was a two-thirds vote to take the bill up the following Wednesday. It is almost impossible to get such a two-thirds vote.

If we do not conclude on Calendar Wednesday, and we have no two-thirds vote to bring up the bill the following Wednesday, we have to wait until all the committees following the Judiciary Committee, as I said before, will have been called, the 13th, 14th, 15th 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, and 20th, and then you go back to No. 1 down to 11, inclusive—a total of 19 Wednesdays, 5 months, plus the 3 months we have already waited.

Then there is no Calendar Wednesday during the last 2 weeks of the session. Thus, you see, my good friends, how cumbersome and irksome and full of pitfalls is the Calendar Wednesday procedure. Calendar Wednesday may be like a siren call. It should not fool you. As I indicated before, I shall accept it only as a last resort, if all else fails. But all else should not fail and we should get the required number of signatures on that petition and then we can debate and deliberate and finally pass the civil rights bill.

The record of those proceedings make it inescapably clear that anyone who is sincere in his desire and effort to procure civil rights legislation must prefer other procedures to the Calendar Wednesday procedure. As I said at the outset, resort to Calendar Wednesday must only be a last resort. It is fraught with difficulty; it is pregnant with dangers and parliamentary snares. It limits proper debate and consideration by the membership which the subject deserves and offers to the opponents of the legislation the greatest opportunity by the use of dilatory tactics to postpone, if not even to defeat, final passage. I say, then, to those on the Republican side that if you are sincere, if you want a civil rights bill enacted in this Congress, then retreat here and now from your advocacy of Calendar Wednesday procedure and sign the discharge petition, then the House will have an immediate, clear-cut, adequate procedure to work its will on this legislation in a manner in which the majority sees fit and in a manner which will reflect credit upon this great body so that no man may say that the House of Representatives has shirked its responsibility.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. In view of the failure of the Republican Members to sign the petition, I would like to ask the gentleman what his reaction is to the statement of the Attorney General of the United States whose statement is found in the New York Times of Wednesday, January 27, in which the Attorney General proposes a bill to protect voting rights and protect civil rights. The question I ask the gentleman is: Does he think the Attorney General is speaking for himself or for the President of the United States, for the Republican Party, or is he speaking for public consumption?

Mr. CELLER. I should imagine he is speaking for public consumption. I believe also he said in that statement that he had conferred with the President of the United States. You must recall in the second message which was brought to the House from the President, as I indicated in my opening remarks, the President made reference in an indirect way to the proposal that the Attorney General was promulgating, namely, that the judiciary should do all and sundry to preserve the integrity of the ballot in certain sections of the country. I take it from that, and I take it from inference, that the President must have had some sort of knowledge of what the Attorney General was going to say, and I deduce from that the administration, from President Eisenhower down, in one breath states it wants civil rights and it particularizes these voting rights that are to be preserved, and in the other breath they do nothing. The inconsistency is past understanding. I would say that that is sheer hyprocrisy, from the President on down. As I said, if the President means what he says, and if the President says what he means, it is a simple matter for him to give the signal and to give the green light to Members on the other side of the aisle to sign this petition. He knows jolly well what is happening in the House of Representatives. He knows that the Committee on Rules has bottled up this bill. He knows that his own Republican members are sharing the blame with certain

other members of that committee. It would be a very simple matter for the President to impress upon the minds of these four distinguished Republican members of the Committee on Rules the necessity for voting out this bill so that the House can work its will and so that the Republican Party can match action with words. These pontifical declarations that are frequently heard from the White House are just meaningless if they are not implemented by action. So my answer to you is, certainly, I am firmly of the conviction that the Attorney General in those remarks is the mouthpiece of the administration.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The President has declared that he is for the civil rights bill. Does the gentleman know whether he has called upon the members of the Republican Party to sign the petition or whether he intends to take to the airwaves and speak over the radio and television the way he did when the labor bill was before the Congress?

Mr. CELLER. You are as familiar as I am with the ways of the President. He is rather loath to act. He sort of takes navigation and travel for policy—and that probably is not too good for the country.

I think we should spend a little more time on civil defense. It has a lot of meaning for this Nation, because constitutional rights are being filched from certain segments of our population, and that should mean a great deal to the President, but apparently all we get from the President are words and words; a veritable Niagara of words. Every message we have heard from the President thus far in this Chamber contains a high protestation that he wants civil rights; he urges civil rights upon us, but his own party in the House are recalcitrant obstructionists, and they refrain from bringing out what he wants. It is a simple matter, if he is the leader—and he is supposed to be the leader of his party if he will exercise leadership and in a forthright manner tell his henchmen in this Chamber that he wants them to act, then we would either get that petition signed or we would get a rule out of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The Attorney General has said he has proposed a bill. Do you know whether or not he has given it to the Republican Members of the House to introduce or whether this bill has been introduced?

Mr. CELLER. I am unaware whether or not the Attorney General has given the bill to Members of this House I will say I have a copy of the proposed bill and a copy of the Attorney General's remarks, and I am giving study to it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I would call upon any member of the Republican Party to give us information whether or not a member of the Republican Party intends to introduce the bill which the Attorney General has proposed, as submitted in the newspapers.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I can appreciate the frustration you gentlemen on the Democratic side must be going through with regard to this legislation. Since President Eisenhower has been in office more consideration has been given to civil rights than has ever been made before. I do not notice any great consideration having been made in the area of civil rights in the administrations prior to that.

I do not know if the Speaker has any henchmen in the House. If so he ought to yield to them. The gentleman has been talking about leadership. Let us have real leadership. You Democrats are in control. You have 280-some Members, to 150 Republicans. You are admitting you cannot run your own show. That is what it amounts to. I have always supported civil rights since I have been here. I believe in the procedures in this House. I think you are taking a little time to exercise the frustration that I think you must be going through.

Mr. CELLER. It is interesting to note that it was a Democratic-controlled Congress that gave us the first civil rights bill, since 1870. It was not the President. It was the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who offered the first bill. It was the chairman of the Judiciary Committee who conducted the first hearings. The first time it was the Judiciary Committee that produced a bill. It was the Democratic-controlled Congress which, for the first time since 1870, proposed a civil rights bill.

I offer no credit whatsoever to the President. We got no encouragement from the President while the bill was in the Judiciary Committee.

Beyond that, we asked in 1955 in the 84th Congress a number of Cabinet officers to come down to testify at the very beginning; we could get no Cabinet officers to come down at first. If the President was so anxious to get a civil rights bill passed he could have easily said to his Cabinet officers: "Go down to the committee and testify in favor of the civil rights bill"; but he did not do it until 1956.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In further amplification of what the gentleman from New York said, and calling attention to my Republican friend who made the observation a few minutes ago that there was no civil rights program under President Eisenhower, I would call attention to the fact that only 4 years before, in the 83d Congress, the Republicans were in control of the House that year, and President Eisenhower was in the White House. The Republican Party had complete control of our Government, legislative and executive, and the Republicans controlled Congress, yet the 83d Congress did not even report a civil rights bill out of committee in the House or in the Senate.

What the gentleman from New York says is correct, but it is remarkable that when they had complete control they did not even report a bill out of committee.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not take anything away from the achievements of the gentleman from New York in the area of civil rights, but I just say that the Democrats are in control and it is up to them to pass the civil rights bill. They have not and apparently cannot and I can appreciate the feeling of frustration you have. I do not know why you do not do it; and you would have a number of votes on this side; there is no question about our having the votes. I sympathize with you in your frustration when you Democrats in control cannot get things done.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that while I am very happy to have his sympathy, I think the people of the country at large are more interested in his actions. If he will get people on his side to sign the petition that would be action. The number, the percentage on the Republican side, is different than it is on the Democratic side. Two-thirds of the necessary signatures are on the petition.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. There is a big difference between Democrats and Republicans in this regard. As far as the southern Democrats are concerned we know exactly where they stand. They make no pretense. They have been unequivocally opposed to civil rights. They do not out of one side of the mouth say that they are against civil rights and out of the other side of the mouth say, "Let us do something about it." But the northern Republicans, while they have pronounced time and again that they are for civil rights, do nothing to bring a civil-rights bill forward. They help stymie the bill in committee; they help stymie the bill by refusing to sign the petition. I call that sheer rank hypocrisy. That is the difference.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DIGGS. I appreciate the sympathy of the gentleman from Michigan with respect to this issue, but call to the attention of the Members of the House that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has not signed the petition; and in my opinion, it is a rather unusual position for him to speak so positively with respect to this issue.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I could make a point of order against the gentleman but I am not going to. I signed the last civil-rights petition, but I have not signed this one; and that is the first one I ever

signed. As a matter of fact I do not believe in the discharge-petition route. I do not think I am ever going to sign any more. I do not have any qualms about signing discharge petitions but I do not think that is the right way to do it. There are other ways to bring a bill out for consideration than the discharge petition. You do not have to use that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman has been listening to the debate he will see there are only two ways to bring a bill up for consideration; one is through the Rules Committee and the gentleman knows his Republican friends are not assisting in bringing it out of the Rules Committee; and, secondly, the gentleman has just heard the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, give the obvious reasons why the Calendar Wednesday procedure should not be used. To urge its use is to engage in subterfuge. That would keep it from ever coming to the House.

Certainly, therefore, if the gentleman has a better way, I think the time has come to give us the proper way to bring it to the House outside of the method of the discharge petition.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I do not know if suspending the rules in this matter would be in order.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It takes a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules and bring it to the floor. The gentleman knows perfectly well it is doubtful that we have two-thirds. He also knows under the two-thirds rule, the suspension rule, there can be no amendments offered to the bill whatsoever. We could not even consider the proposal of the Attorney General which has just been mentioned. If the gentleman wants a gag rule that is the way he could bring it up.

The gentleman knows that the proper way is to bring it to the floor so that there might be full discussion, so that amendments can be properly offered, discussed, and considered. The only way at the moment to assure that is to have the discharge petition signed. I may say to the gentleman if he thought it was all right to sign the discharge petition a couple of years ago I find it very difficult to understand why now he should be so squeemish about signing it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The route via suspension of the rules is not new. We have had some very, very important legislation come by the suspension route.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I also remember that gentlemen on his side objected when we tried to suspend the rules on some labor legislation. They thought it was unfair and undemocratic. The record will speak for itself. It is another of what the New York Times calls lame excuses. Let us do it right if we are going to do it at all.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who has signed the petition and who is a friend of civil rights.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me. But I must say it is somewhat of a disappointment to me that this subject should now become a matter of political wrangle of the most bitter sort. It is regrettable, because I firmly believe that if the majority really wanted a civil rights bill it would have a civil rights bill on the floor today.

The Republicans on this side of the aisle should consider themselves complimented by the suggestion that so few, as against so many, are responsible for holding up civil rights legislation in this Congress. I look back a little bit and it occurs to me that the 1957 Civil Rights Act, which the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee mentioned a moment ago, was legislation drafted by a Republican administration. It was placed in the hopper, naturally, by a Democrat in a Democratic Congress, and also by Republicans. I note with interest that this was the first time after a great many years, two decades, of inaction on the subject of civil rights. It took a Republican administration to do something about civil rights in the District of Columbia, for the first time in that long period of time. It took a Republican Administration to do something about civil rights in interstate transportation facilities for the first time. It took the Republican administration to do something meaningful in the whole area of governmental contracting for the first time. Finally, a bill was drafted by a Republican administration and enacted into law by the Congress, the first legislation since the War Between the States. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if the Democratic majority wanted a civil rights bill they would have had it on the floor 2 weeks ago.

I signed the discharge petition last summer before we adjourned because I have lost complete faith and confidence in the ability of the majority who control the machinery of the House of Representatives to keep their own House in order. The majority, either by inability or by wish, takes no action at all and instead prefers to make a political football out of this subject. If this is the game they wish to play, then let us have a discharge petition. I am glad they agree with me that their leadership is unable to manage their own show. Yes, the discharge petition should be signed under these appalling circumstances and I would hope as many Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, as possible will sign it. My own view is that in its present posture the shortest route is the best route at this time for civil rights, and when the bill comes to the floor, whether it comes to the floor by virtue of the discharge petition, suspension of the rules, or on Calendar Wednesday, or through action of the Rules Committee, the gentleman may be sure that there will not be 10 Republicans who will vote against the bill. On the majority side of the aisle there will be a different situation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy that the gentleman is telling his Republican friends that they should sign the petition in order that this may be considered on a nonpartisan basis. It can only be considered on that basis if the Republican Members will sign and I hope his advice will be taken and I hope the leadership on the Republican side will back up the gentleman.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I wonder if the gentleman from California would ask the gentleman from Michigan what is objectionable about the discharge petition route. As a newcomer to Congress, my investigation reveals that the discharge petition antedates the Committee on Rules in point of precedence. It seems, therefore, that we are looking to precedence as a significant factor to explain what is proper and what is improper, that the discharge petition furnishes a sounder historic basis upon which to proceed than the relative upstart of the Committee on Rules. And, we have heard from many, many people that they never sign discharge petitions. Why can they not sign discharge petitions? I would like to have somebody explain to us what makes this procedure any less regular than any other procedure and why it is that some escape their obvious responsibility behind the cloak of not signing discharge petitions.

Mr. GOODELL. I signed the discharge petition and I am very proud that I have. But, I would like to ask the gentleman if he will ask his own leadership why they have not signed this discharge petition. They apparently do not believe in this route or they would sign it themselves, and I find myself questioning their sincerity in handling this legislation in the manner it has been handled. And, I fear for strong civil rights legislation if it is going to be handled in this manner. It is a political manipulation to try to blame somebody else for their own impotency and leadership.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. That was not my question. My question was for my own edification: What are the bases for refusing to sign? I do not care who gives me the answer. I am asking for an answer.

Mr. GOODELL. I sat on this floor a few days ago and heard the Democratic leadership say that they do not sign discharge petitions themselves personally, and I think the question properly could go to the leadership.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Republicans take the same position. That is a custom on both sides. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] made that statement a few weeks ago, and I do not question him, because where leadership is involved that is a custom that is adhered to. The gentleman raises the question properly, but when it comes to the leadership level there is a custom. Now, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] stated that when he came out of the White House, as I remember, and nobody would be justified in criticizing him, being the leader of his party, in the statement that he made.

Mr. GOODELL. If I understand the discharge petition correctly, it is utilized primarily where you cannot get legislation to the floor by any other means, and this, to me, means that the leadership

has become impotent on the side of the majority to bring this legislation to the floor by legitimate, orderly means. Now, if the leadership will admit that this is the situation over there, then I will believe in their sincerity that they really want civil rights legislation. In the present situation it appears to be simply a political maneuver, and I do not like to see civil rights become a political football.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman should note that the distinguished Speaker of the House has already made a public statement in which he said it was perfectly right and proper for the procedure of discharge to be followed through by Members of the House, and that in this instance he was most certainly for it. I think it would be well to emphasize that we know the problem we have on the Democratic side and we are perfectly willing to face it, but you, on the Republican side, have no such problem.

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

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the President has urged us to balance the budget and reduce our expenditures. In turn, I urge the President of the United States to inform his Attorney General and the Department of Justice to pay attention to their cases and protect the interests of the United States.

The laxity and carelessness of the Attorney General's Office has cost the United States $680,066.01, plus interest. I refer to the case of Carlo Bianchi & Co., Inc., against the United States, Court of Claims Docket No. 466–54. The facts in the case are very simple. A contractor in Framingham, Mass., sought damages against the United States arising out of the construction contract let by the Department of the Army for an earthen dam. This dam was constructed in my State at Hornell, N.Y.

The suit was filed against the Government in the Court of Claims on December 2, 1954, and was not fully tried until 1959. It was assigned for a hearing, pursuant to the Court of Claims rules, to Commissioner William E. Day on December 28, 1954. The Government, after securing several extensions of time, filed its answer in the suit on May 31, 1955.

Following the usual hearings before the Commissioner and the submission of findings of fact and briefs, the suit was argued and submitted to the court on October 8, 1958. On January 14, 1959, the Court of Claims, with an opinion written by Judge Warren E. Madden, found that the Government was liable to the plaintiff for damages and ordered that the amount of such damages should be determined by further hearings before the Commissioner, pursuant to the rules of the Court of Claims.

Thereafter, early in 1959, the plaintiff contractor was granted leave by the court of claims to amend its petition to the effect that the damages incurred amounted to $680,066.01, plus interest. Such amendment was made by the contractor. During 1959, further hearings were held by the Commissioner at Boston, Mass., on the question of damages. The Government, because of its laxity and unpreparedness, failed to submit any adequate proof on its part as to damages and, thereafter, the taking of proof in the suit was closed for both sides by the Commissioner.

Later, the Government woke up and, on December 17, 1959, the Government moved the Court of Claims to reopen the proof. The gist of the motion was that the Government's attorney inadvertently failed to present proof, which he should have offered to the court at an early and more proper time. In short, the basis of the Government's motion to reopen the proof is the Government attorney's feeble attempt to excuse a default on the Government's part in the circumstances.

On December 18, 1959, the Court of Claims denied the motion to reopen the proof for the Government, ruling that the Government's motion to reopen proof is "denied for the reason that the defendant has failed to show that the Commissioner's action in closing proof is erroneous." The Government, therefore, will be compelled to pay to the contractor $680,066.01, plus interest, which perhaps we must raise by issuing bonds at 5 percent, because of the incompetency and laxity of the Attorney General's Office. This is a case I know about and I wonder how much more money the Government has squandered by reason of the laxity and lack of preparation in protecting the Government's interests.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, 1959, H.R. 8601 was reported from the Judiciary Committee. Thereafter, a discharge petition was initiated to have the bill brought to the floor for consideration by all the Members of the House. The petition procedure was necessitated by the relatively short period of time then remaining before the end of last session.

In the abbreviated session of this year the greatest promise for the enactment of civil rights legislation rests once again in the use of the petition route.

Certainly, suspension of the rules is possible, but this obviates sober debate and consideration of the merits and shortcomings of H.R. 8601 by all the Members. Civil rights legislation is far too significant, of far too serious moment to be disposed of without full and thoughtful debate.

The issue is not one of a purely partisan nature. Civil rights is an overriding national concern in the protection of which each one of us, irrespective of party, has a deep and profound individual responsibility.

It is not a particular sectional question. Its ramifications extend into every State of the Union. We are dealing here with the protection of rights belonging to persons in their capacity as citizens of the United States. They are rights derived from God and guaranteed through the secular instrumentalities of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Is there among us anyone who has not witnessed discrimination and deprivation of rights in his own district?

Is there any among us who has not been deeply troubled at the knowledge that due process of law is not fully enjoyed by all citizens in this great Republic?

Responsibility for the tragic denial of what in effect are some of the most fundamental premises of free government is shared by all. None of us is exempt. Too long have we callously turned our backs on the pleas of those in our midst who have never known the blessings of equal protection of the laws. Too long has complacency blurred our moral vision and stifled our conscience.

We would all devoutly prefer that there were no necessity for enacting legislation to assure protection of the civil rights of citizens of the United States. However, long experience has demonstrated again and again that individual responsibility, grown listless and sluggish, is quickened by the spur of legislation from time to time and is stimulated into fuller discharge of its duties.

History can little tolerate a refusal any longer to face up to the need. Powerful moral, political, economic, and social forces are inexorably demanding that we act now if we are to achieve our objectives of persuading others to choose the way of free government.

We do not desire changes so rapid or catastrophic that chaos and disruption of large segments of our society result. We do believe that greater progress than has heretofore been made can be achieved within the bounds of the standard—with all deliberate speed.

Mr. Speaker, adequate protection of the civil rights of citizens of the United States is a national concern in the promotion of which each one of us has a constitutional responsibility above section or party. With full cognizance of the immensity of the duty that lies ahead and with a sense of humility and thankfulness that we are granted this opportunity to enrich and deepen the meaning and practice of democracy, I strongly urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition and bring H.R. 8601 to the floor.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I do not think the question has yet been answered. Simply because the leadership does not sign discharge petitions gives us no valid

reason to call the method illegal or improper or in any other way without the bounds of Congress.

I am still waiting for an answer from those who will not sign, as to why it is not a perfectly correct and proper method of procedure. I might say further that not only has the majority leader said that there is no objection to anyone's signing this discharge petition but that also the minority leader has said the same thing. This is the position of the leadership. We have yet to find out why it is an improper method and I think that question should be answered by those of lesser rank who refuse to sign.

Mr. CELLER. The answer is simple. There is no answer. In addition to the minority and majority leaders who said that Members might well sign, the Speaker has also lent encouragement. He said the Members should sign.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I should like to say that I am afraid we will not get any answer from my colleague from Michigan, since I do not see him any longer on the floor, as to his reasons for refusing to sign the discharge petition. However, in defense of my colleague I should like briefly to state that even though he was not willing or able to explain in what way principle was involved in his refusal to sign, that I am most delighted to see that his refusal is based on principle. I think this is a very salutary development among the Republican ranks. On other measures which we have had before us during this Congress, such as Federal aid to education, depressed areas assistance, water pollution, and aviation, we have had recognition from the Republican Party that the principle was all right but it was the money that stopped them. I think now, if this signifies a trend to base their actions or lack of same on principle, it might end up being a very good thing for the country.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who has, as usual, given substance and light to the discussion of civil rights legislation and the situation before us.

I think it would be well to point out that there are approximately 190 signatures, somewhere in that vicinity, I believe, has been publicly reported, on the civil rights petition. I believe it is correct to say, if the public press is to be believed, that there are somewhere around only 30 Republican signatures. It would seem that under these circumstances the remaining few that are required, roughly 29 or 30, could very easily come—and we will supply a few of them, I think, from the Democratic side—without much strain from the Republican side if in truth they want to make civil rights a nonpartisan matter of national interest. I think that the days ahead will prove how sincere they really are.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, I am indeed anxious to learn from the minority leadership why it is failing to give impetus to the signing of the discharge petition in contrast to the leadership on the Democratic side since the bill that we are trying to bring to the floor, H.R. 8601, actually represents the mild proposals of the administration offered in the last Congress. Why is this? It is because the executive leadership does not really want to see its own proposals enacted, I am afraid. And are the proposals of the Civil Rights Commission recommendations to be considered by this Congress as the President urged in his state of the Union message?

Or is perhaps the reason because the civil rights issue is better used for election year purposes than for human purposes? I cannot help but note that there was no hesitancy on the part of the minority leadership in firming up its position, in line with that of the President and the Vice President, in the matter of labor-management reform legislation. Why, then, does this not hold true now? Is the minority leadership ready to say it does not believe in the substance of this mildest of mild civil rights bills? I hope not.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, we must have a vehicle through which we can face up to the challenge and responsibility to obtain a meaningful civil rights measure. The discharge petition offers the only sure means.

In my considered judgment, the passage of a weak bill will perhaps be used as an election-year facade to point out that civil rights did have its place on the legislative agenda of things accomplished, but it will not be favorably judged by citizens still suffering the daily sting of second-class citizenship, and it certainly will not be favorably recorded or interpreted as real progress when the history of this period is written. Nor will it be claimed as a gigantic stride forward by those sincerely dedicated to the proposition that every American should be treated and protected equally under the Constitution of the United States.

We will not have done our duty as elected officials if we do not recognize the cruel and glaring fact that not all eligible voters are able to exercise their franchise. The President recently, in an aboutface, seems to question the constitutionality of the Civil Rights Commission proposal to provide for temporary Federal registrars when needed to assure voting rights in Federal elections. I beg to suggest to him that he carefully peruse the background information on which this suggestion has been made. And in so doing, he will find there is a sound constitutional base for Federal registrars in those situations where local authorities deprive, through direct or indirect means, the right to register which is the prerequisite to voting.

There is sufficient legal authority backing the constitutionality of the Federal registrar proposal, but the crux of the matter is to be found in the Constitution itself, namely, the 15th amendment which states, without equivocation, in section 1, that—

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

As the Supreme Court stated in 1875:

> The 15th amendment does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one. It prevents the States, or the United States, however, from giving preference in this particular to one citizen of the United States over another on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Before its adoption this could be done. It was as much within the power of a State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race, etc., as it was on account of age, property, or education. Now it is not.

True, now it is not legally, but we have documentation galore to prove that actually denial of voting rights is still existing. It is therefore incumbent upon this Congress to legislate to assure we have constitutional government in this Nation, not government by whim or prejudice.

But if one wants to look to interpretative authorities I direct your attention to the fact that just recently Senator JAVITS made public two letters from authorities on constitutional law.

One, Prof. Paul A. Freund, of the Harvard Law School, stated that the registrar plan is more plainly within Congress' constitutional power to regulate Federal elections than is the Corrupt Practices Act which limits expenditures by candidates for Federal office. He noted that in the latter case it affects "the campaigning phase of an election rather than suffrage itself," and operates on "persons who are not part of the election machinery," unlike registrars.

The other letter has come from Prof. Charles Alan Wright, of the University of Texas Law School, who presently is visiting law professor at the University of Pennsylvania. His communication likewise supports the constitutionality of the plan.

Now, let us head off right now the charge that such a proposal should not be offered on the floor as an amendment to the committee-reported civil rights bill. There will be charges, of course, that such an idea as Federal registrars has not been considered in committee hearings. Well, I cannot help but say that the substitute bill—the Landrum-Griffin bill—did not come in for hearings either in terms of every single one of its provisions, but yet met with approval on this floor. And I might add that certainly no one is going to try to set a precedent for future action regarding the amendment procedure. To do so would be unwise and could well hamstring democratic debate and decisions.

And in this instance, what would be the object of having a Civil Rights Commission if its recommendations, reflecting careful investigation and study, are to be overlooked and its tomes merely relegated to the shelf or to that well-known round file.

We cannot in good conscience overlook the Civil Rights Commission recom-

mendations and factual data in this as well as other areas of civil rights.

It should be recalled, at this juncture, that the 1957 Civil Rights Act was essentially a right-to-vote measure. In this context, I think it important to note the recent remarks of the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission, Dr. John A. Hannah, in relation to the voting situation. He said:

Many thousands of qualified Americans are, in fact, denied the right to vote because they are members of the Negro race—and for no other reason. This is accomplished through the creation of legal impediments and administrative obstacles. Sometimes there are threats of economic reprisal and physical harm.

We learned that doctors, lawyers, schoolteachers, registered nurses have been denied the right to register and to vote on the flimsiest of excuses, the actual reason being that they are Negroes.

We learned that courageous young men who have fought in our country's defense—men who will carry crippling battle scars all of their lives—are being denied the right to vote just because they are Negroes.

Today, in December 1959, there are at least 16 counties in the United States in which one-third or more of the population is nonwhite and in which not a single nonwhite is permitted to register to vote. In a far larger number of counties with very substantial numbers of Negro citizens, only a token, a very small token number are permitted to vote.

The dramatic impact of the denial of voting rights is fully felt if one reads the record of the hearings on voting which were conducted by the Commission and which have been printed for all to read.

I have no intention of reading the hundreds of pages of hearings, but I do ask your kind attention and indulgence in listening to just one of the many witnesses who appeared. This is, in my opinion, real life drama far overshadowing in impact the soap operas on radio and television. This is, indeed, no soap opera—it is a life opera which we must view with concern. We cannot, and we must not, take an ostrichlike stance. The surest way for us to choke progress in our democratic society is to keep our collective face in the sand.

Mr. Speaker, I now read the verbatim transcript involving the appearance of the Reverend Kenneth LeRoy Buford:

TESTIMONY OF REV. KENNETH LEROY BUFORD, MINISTER OF BUTLER CHAPEL, A.M.E. ZION CHURCH, MACON COUNTY, ALA.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Please state your full name, your place of residence, and how old you are.

Reverend BUFORD. My name is Kenneth LeRoy Buford. I live on Bibb Street, Tuskegee Institute, Ala. I am 41 years of age.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Where and when were you born?

Reverend BUFORD. I was born at Pulaski, Va., August the 17th, 1917.

Vice Chairman STOREY. How long have you been living in Alabama?

Reverend BUFORD. Approximately 2½ years.

Vice Chairman STOREY. And where do you live?

Reverend BUFORD. Bibb Street, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Do you have any position with Tuskegee Institute?

Reverend BUFORD. None.

Vice Chairman STOREY. What is your business?

Reverend BUFORD. I am the minister at the Butler Chapel, A.M.E. Zion Church, Tuskegee, Ala.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Is that a public church as distinguished from the college chapel or organization?

Reverend BUFORD. It's a public church, distinguished from the chapel.

Vice Chairman STOREY. About how many members are there in your church?

Reverend BUFORD. We have 407 adult members; approximately 160 youth.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Do you have any degrees from any colleges and, if so, what are they?

Reverend BUFORD. I hold a bachelor of arts degree from City College, New York, and a bachelor of theology degree from the Bloomfield Theological Seminary, Newark, N.J.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Are you a member of any church organizations and, if so, what are they?

Reverend BUFORD. I am a member of the Alabama Conference of the A.M.E. Zion Church; a member and president of the Tuskegee Ministerial Association. I am a member of the Christian Education Board of the A.M.E. Zion Church; a voting representative to the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, which met in its general assembly last year at St. Louis; a member of the East Alabama Council of Churches; several others.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Do you have any physical or mental disabilities?

Reverend BUFORD. None.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you ever been arrested or convicted of a crime?

Reverend BUFORD. I have not.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Do you own any property?

Reverend BUFORD. I do.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Where?

Reverend BUFORD. In Tuskegee Institute.

Vice Chairman STOREY. What is the nature of the property?

Reverend BUFORD. Real estate.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Do you own your home?

Reverend BUFORD. Yes.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Do you own an automobile?

Reverend BUFORD. I do.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Are your taxes paid?

Reverend BUFORD. They are.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you ever attempted to register to vote in Macon County?

Reverend BUFORD. I did.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you paid any poll taxes?

Reverend BUFORD. I have not.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you been registered?

Reverend BUFORD. I have not.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Tell when you applied.

Reverend BUFORD. I first made application the 15th of September 1958.

Vice Chairman STOREY. You say you first made application. Have you made more than one application?

Reverend BUFORD. I attempted to make more than one.

Vice Chairman STOREY. All right. Tell what happened in this application in September.

First, let me ask you: Did you go through the general procedure as stated by these other witnesses?

Reverend BUFORD. The general procedure; yes.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Was there anything extra? If so, what was it?

Reverend BUFORD. No; I think not.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Did you sign a return envelope?

Reverend BUFORD. I did.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you ever heard from that application?

Reverend BUFORD. I have not.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Did you make any further inquiries or attempt to register?

Reverend BUFORD. Yes; I did. Later——

Vice Chairman STOREY. Just tell what happened.

Reverend BUFORD. Later the same day, September 15, another person who had attempted to become a registered voter called me and informed me that one of the members of the board of registrars told her that if she saw me to tell me to come back the following day for registration because I had allegedly made a mistake on my application blank.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Did you go back?

Reverend BUFORD. I did.

Vice Chairman STOREY. What did you find out? What were you told by the election supervisor and what did you do, if anything?

Reverend BUFORD. On my application I stated—there is a question to the effect—that asks, rather: "When did you become a bona fide resident of the State of Alabama?" I placed in answer to that question, a period indicating I had been in the State for 2 years. They told me that answer was wrong, that I should have said, "I became a bona fide resident the day that I came to the State of Alabama."

Vice Chairman STOREY. Did you correct it accordingly?

Reverend BUFORD. I was not given an opportunity to do so.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Why?

Reverend BUFORD. They stated that they were not receiving applications on that day because they were processing applications from as far back as the month of July.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Did you make any further attempt?

Reverend BUFORD. I have not.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you heard anything from your application?

Reverend BUFORD. I have not.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Do you know of any reason why you have not heard?

I mean that you know yourself.

Reverend BUFORD. I don't know of any reason.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you voted in any other State in the United States?

Reverend BUFORD. I have.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Have you been a registered voter in any other State in the United States?

Reverend BUFORD. I have.

Vice Chairman STOREY. If so, what State or States?

Reverend BUFORD. I was a registered voter in the State of New Jersey from 1940 until 1943.

I was a registered voter in the State of California from 1948 until I came to Alabama in 1956.

Vice Chairman STOREY. At the time you made your original application were you a resident of the State of Alabama and the County of Macon and your precinct for 2 years or more?

Reverend BUFORD. I was.

Vice Chairman STOREY. At the time you made your application?

Reverend BUFORD. I was.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Any other questions?

Commissioner WILKINS. I would like, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to correct that question.

You are not required to be a resident of the precinct for the 2 years.

You have been a resident of the State of Alabama for 2 years?

Reverend BUFORD. I have.

Commissioner WILKINS. And whether or not you have been a resident of the precinct is only a matter of 3 months; isn't that right?

Reverend BUFORD. I believe so.

Commissioner WILKINS. Now, I would just like to find out, Reverend: When you were invited back to make this correction, just exactly what was your conversation when you entered the registrars' office and with whom was it held?

Reverend BUFORD. I spoke to a Mr. Grady Rogers.

Commissioner WILKINS. He is one of the registrars?

Reverend BUFORD. He is.

I told him that I had been informed that they wanted me to return at the next day designated for registration or taking applications, and he asked my name. He found my application and indicated that I had made the mistake that I referred to previously.

Commissioner WILKINS. Did he show you the mistake?

Reverend BUFORD. Yes. He pointed it out to me.

Commissioner WILKINS. Did you offer to correct it?

Reverend BUFORD. I did.

Commissioner WILKINS. Just what was that conversation about the correction of that statement?

Reverend BUFORD. I asked him what procedure I would have to go through to fill out another application blank. He told me that they were not receiving applications that day and that I should return on or after November 10.

Commissioner WILKINS. Do you remember what day it was that you went back there?

You say you returned on the 10th of November?

Do you recall what date it was?

Reverend BUFORD. October the 20th.

Commissioner WILKINS. October 20.

And at that time the registrars or one of them indicated they were still processing applications that were filed as far back as July, you say, or June?

Reverend BUFORD. They did.

Commissioner WILKINS. Did they tell you at that time, on October 20, that you would not be issued a certificate of registration because of this mistake?

Reverend BUFORD. He indicated that I would not and stated that this became a part of their permanent record.

Commissioner WILKINS. I want to be sure about this, Reverend.

You answered the question where it was asked you how long you had been a resident of the State of Alabama?

Reverend BUFORD. I did.

Commissioner WILKINS. You said for more than 2 years?

Reverend BUFORD. I did.

Commissioner WILKINS. But you didn't specify the date you came into the State? Was that the objection they raised to it?

Reverend BUFORD. No. I specified the—there are two questions that deal with residence. One asked about your residence for the past 5 years. I answered that question, showing I had been a resident of the State of Alabama for more than 2 years.

Further down on the questionnaire is this question about bona fide residence. I answered that question, showing the date 2 years following the time that I came to the State of Alabama.

Commissioner WILKINS. Did you insert a specific date, Reverend?

Reverend BUFORD. I did. July 22, 1958.

Commissioner WILKINS. July 22, 1958?

Reverend BUFORD. That's right.

Commissioner WILKINS. And you signed this application on October of 1950—what? Fifty-eight?

Reverend BUFORD. That was September 15, 1958.

Commissioner WILKINS. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Father Hesburgh.

Commissioner HESBURGH. Reverend Buford, I think I would like to have you have the opportunity of telling the Commission why you would like to vote.

Reverend BUFORD. I would like to vote because it is a right that should be accorded me as a citizen of the United States. I feel that I cannot be a good citizen unless I do have the right to vote.

I am a taxpayer and I feel that if I am denied the right to vote it represents taxation without representation.

Commissioner HESBURGH. Thank you very much, Reverend Buford.

Vice Chairman STOREY. Any other questions?

Commissioner BATTLE. Can I ask you this one question? I want to get these dates straight. Did I understand you to say, sir, on your application you said you became a bona fide resident of Alabama in July of 1958?

Reverend BUFORD. I did.

Commissioner BATTLE. And this application was filed in September of 1958?

Reverend BUFORD. Yes, sir.

Commissioner BATTLE. That is all.

Vice Chairman STOREY. The witness will be excused.

Reference has been made to the 15th amendment, and I only wish to remind my colleagues that it is now almost 90 years since this amendment was adopted, an amendment which plainly prohibits the denial of the right to vote by reason of race.

Mr. Speaker, some very knowledgeable and instructive views have been shed by Harris Wofford, Jr., visiting associate professor at the Notre Dame Law School. As a staff member of the Commission, he spoke to the City Club of Chicago last November, and, again, with your kind attention and indulgence, I would like to read portions of his address because they state the matter so well:

Now that our full 600-page report, our 200-page abridgment, and our thousands of published pages of hearings have been submitted to the President and Congress, you may still ask the question, Was it worth while after all? The facts have been found, unanimously—facts showing clearly that qualified Negroes are being denied their right to vote in a considerable number of southern counties, facts showing that school integration can be and in some places is being used to raise the standard of education of both Negro and white students but that the constitutional requirement of desegregation is not being complied with nor is likely to be complied with in many areas of the South; and facts showing that discrimination in housing exists in cities north as well as south, west as well as east, and particularly it exists in Federal housing programs which are supposed to be subject to the constitutional rule against discrimination.

But what good will all these facts be? Who will be moved to do something about them? In our New York housing hearing Judge Justine Wise Polier cited Disraeli's remark that there was hardly a woman in England who would not be more disturbed by the smashing of the joint of her small finger in a carriage door than by hearing that a million children had died of famine the preceding week in China.

How many Americans will be moved to action by the knowledge that Negro schoolteachers in Terrell County, Ga., are denied registration because they pronounce "equity" as "eequity"; or that in Louisiana Negroes are denied registration if they fail to give a reasonable interpretation of the following clauses of the State constitution:

"The legislature shall provide by law for change of venue in civil and criminal cases."

"The exercise of the police power of the State shall never be abridged."

And ponder this one:

"Prescription shall not run against the State in any civil matter."

One registrar disqualified a Negro voter for "error in spilling," and in his affidavit the registrar himself spelled it "spilling."

And what good will our collection of county-by-county voting statistics be? While the statistical picture isn't yet complete (there are no statistics county-by-county yet for Tennessee, and Mississippi is not up to date), it is ugly enough. Consider just these few items: The Commission found that there were 16 counties where Negroes constituted a majority of the voting-age population in the last census but where not a single Negro was registered at last report; it found some 49 other Negro-majority counties where a few Negroes were registered, but less than 5 percent of voting-age Negroes. There are 14 Mississippi counties with a total 1950 population of about 230,000, of whom 109,000 were Negroes, where not a single Negro was at last report registered.

But where will this officially documented knowledge take us?

Let me be the optimist and suggest that the Commission's report itself is an important milestone that marks and will henceforth measure the progress in this field. First, the facts found took the Commissioners, or all but one of them, to positions some of them had not expected to reach. Five of the Commissioners, including Dean Robert Storey of Southern Methodist University Law School in Dallas, Tex., and former Gov. Doyle Carlton, of Florida, joined in recommending that in cases of discriminatory denial of the right to register, the President should be empowered to appoint temporary Federal registrars, from existing local Federal employees such as the U.S. Postmaster, who would actually register citizens who qualify under State law, applied without discrimination.

Most southern legislators and newspaper editorials have professed shock that two such respected southern conservatives would have supported so far-reaching a recommendation.

But Commissioners Storey and Carlton state in the report why they supported it: "We strongly believe in the right of every qualified citizen of the United States, irrespective of his color * * * to register, vote, and have his vote counted," they said. "We regard full protection of these rights of suffrage by both State and Federal Governments as necessary and proper." They joined in recommending temporary Federal registrars because, as the Commission unanimously reported, "Against the prejudice of registrars and jurors, the U.S. Government appears under present laws, to be helpless to make good the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution."

Governor Battle of Virginia could not agreed to this drastic remedial action but he did join in the findings of denial of voting rights, he stated that he believed "that all properly qualified American citizens should have the right to vote," and he joined in four less-far-reaching Commission recommendations to strengthen present laws, including a recommendation that voting records be made public records to be preserved for inspection for a period of 5 years.

I am emphasizing the position of the southern members because I believe it points to the way forward. On the right to vote there was no disposition to defend the practices of the black belt counties and two of the three southerners supported all-out preventive action by the President and Congress. As former Governor Carlton of Florida used to say around the Commission on occasion, "We must take the bull by the tail and look

the ugly facts straight in the face." The southern members did not like the facts that were found on denials of voting rights in their region. But they were lawyers and public servants sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. And, it is interesting to note, the southern press, in criticizing the Commission's recommendations, almost unanimously condemned the practices which these recommendations were designed to cure.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say it seems to me very significant that the Attorney General has now felt it is important for him to come forward with a new system, or a new idea, as to how to implement this right to vote. Very few of us have had the time to look at it in detail, but I think it would be safe to say that if Mr. Rogers would make it immediately available to us it can and will be considered fully, especially if we can get the rest of these signatures, and we are only 29 short. Then we can debate whether the so-called registrar plan or the new plan of Mr. Rogers is the best method of doing it. We can by a vote of this House put one or the other in that bill and take a step forward in connection with the constitutional right of every American citizen to vote. If by any chance this proposal of the Attorney General is used as an excuse for delaying the civil-rights bill, then the administration will and should once again be condemned. Months ago they could have brought forward this for consideration, yet they just now bring it forward as an instrumentality for delaying action.

I hope we will not allow this to slow down the action we should take on this civil-rights legislation.

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

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

Mr. KARTH. Would the gentleman not say even if they did introduce the bill at this late date, by the time the bill has had its proper hearings in committee and all of the other necessary activities it must go through before a bill is presented to the floor of the House for ultimate action, that it is pretty late, after they have talked about civil rights for so many years, to introduce such a bill at this stage of the 1960 session?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I may say to the gentleman there is no question in my mind that they are subject to some criticism of the timetable which they have followed; nevertheless, in order that we not be accused of trying to advance this question purely on a partisan basis, I am sure the gentleman will agree if it is presented in good faith the Democratic Members will give it a most sympathetic hearing in an effort to see to it that the best method of guaranteeing the vote to every American citizen is adopted.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. KARTH. I would suggest then that if they really have true intentions of supporting civil rights legislation—and I do agree with you; there are many good points that have been made by Attorney General Rogers in the presentation as it appeared in the newspapers—that if they did sign the discharge petition with us, certainly I and many other members of the Democratic Party would be most receptive to receiving amendments in line with the suggestions of Attorney General Rogers and add those amendments to the Celler bill. This, I would suggest, would be a much more expeditious manner if they truly wanted to see a civil rights bill passed at this session.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to everything the gentleman from California has said.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. In reference to the Federal registrar bill or the alternative that has been suggested by the Attorney General, is there not some question about constitutionality involved here? Is this not the reason the Attorney General brought up this modification of the recommendation that was made by the President's Civil Rights Commission? Is it not also true that the President himself, in a recent press conference, told us that there was some doubt about the constitutionality of the recommendations made by the Civil Rights Commission? Would you care to comment on that, sir?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my friend, and I would say to him what he has said is true, that the question of constitutionality was injected by the President. And it would seem very strange that it was injected, because there was and is available much information on this subject. I hold in my hands some of the material on this very subject: one document by probably as good a constitutional authority, I think, as there is in the country, the Honorable Robert G. Storey, Vice-Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights; another document which was gotten up by a staff of the Civil Rights Commission, and another document which was put out by the Honorable George M. Johnson, a member of the Civil Rights Commission, and a distinguished professor from Howard University.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield at that point, and also from Berkeley, Calif.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct, and all I think the President would have had to do, and for that matter the Attorney General, is to have gone into these documents which were available and from which I quoted earlier. Gentlemen not only from Texas, but also other universities have stated that beyond any question the Commission's proposals are undoubtedly constitutional, and there is, therefore, suspicion that this new feature was thrown into the hopper merely as a blind, merely for the tactic of delay. I think it is part of our job to see that we do not allow it to be a question of delay, and if it is as good and sound method as can be brought out in debate, then, as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, we would undoubtedly be willing to adopt it. In other words, let us not be put aside by specious arguments of constitutionality, now we have the Attorney General coming forward with something that I do not think he would be presenting if there was any doubt about constitutionality.

Mr. COHELAN. I wish my colleague would be more specific. I do not know very much about these things, and the President has said that this might be unconstitutional. I would like to know if, in fact, there is any cloud over the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission on this question of constitutionality as far as any of the legal authorities are concerned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Let me simply say that neither the President nor any other individual that I know of has prepared a treatise of any kind that would lead me or anybody else to have any doubt as to the constitutionality of the Civil Rights Commission recommendations.

Mr. COHELAN. Were there any constitutional lawyers on the Commission?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There were most certainly qualified constitutional lawyers, including Mr. Storey and others; Mr. Wofford, whom I referred to earlier and whose remarks are in the RECORD, states very clearly that, in his opinion—and he is on the faculty of the University of Notre Dame—there can be no question of constitutionality.

Mr. COHELAN. Were there any constitutional lawyers available to the Commission for the purpose of advice, and so forth?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes.

Mr. COHELAN. I cannot understand myself how the President could say that it was unconstitutional under those circumstances; can the gentleman? Or how he can raise a question of constitutionality.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The only reason I can give my friend is that perhaps the administration wanted to have some share of the credit in a proposal to bring about the right to vote and, therefore, being unable to find anything really objectionable in the Civil Rights Commission recommendations, they raised a cloud in order to show that the cloud could be brushed aside easily with a recommendation that was perhaps somewhat more politically useful in an election year. I do not begrudge it, I have to say in all honesty to the gentleman; I do not begrudge them that, if they think that is the way to play the game. I should think it was not the proper way. But if they want to do it that way, then I am sure this House is not going to stand in the way and let any delaying tactic succeed.

Mr. COHELAN. Yes; but is the gentleman from California suggesting that the President of the United States is not for civil rights?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; I am not saying the President is not for civil rights.

I would not like to say that the President is against civil rights.

Mr. COHELAN. Why, of course not.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to say, however, that I think his leadership has been less than vigorous in taking the steps that would assure a good civil rights bill. I hope that he will remedy that.

As was pointed out by an earlier speaker, he took the air to support certain legislation last year that had to do with labor unions. He thought it was important enough to address the Nation on the subject. I cannot help but feel that it is important enough in this issue, if he really feels that he wants to back up the right of every American citizen to vote, that he make it doubly clear that he is behind the civil rights bill and urge his fellow Republican Members to sign the petition, that we may get to the job of considering the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's reference to the effort by the President in behalf of the labor reform bill compels me to say that if he does it this year I think it would be most welcome, but I hope that his remarks with respect to constitutionality and other aspects will be more accurate than were his remarks on the labor bill. I cannot help but remember that evening hearing him say that secondary boycotts should be outlawed, apparently in complete ignorance of the fact that the Taft-Hartley Act in section 8(b)(4) had done it 12 years earlier.

The question of being early or being tardy I think is not too critical here. Any good ideas with respect to labor legislation, civil rights legislation, or anything else, are always welcome. And if, indeed, the constitutionality question has been perfected by the Attorney General in this effort, which certainly must be sound because it was 3 years in coming, then we should welcome, we should support such parts of it as seem to us to be sound, and work on a cooperative basis in this regard. I do hope, however, that if the President does take to the air and gets 60 million or so Americans to listen to him, which they do with great interest, including I am sure the gentleman from California and myself, that he is a little more accurate than he was on the labor question.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman and I join in agreement with what he has said.

Mr. Speaker, there are other significant and timely aspects to a comprehensive and long overdue civil rights legislative program. I shall not preempt all of these various aspects of the civil rights issue since many of my colleagues, from various sections of our Nation, also desire to address this body today.

I do want to add, however, that we have been engaged with consuming our time and efforts on procedure. Would that it be we could spend the fleeting hours of what is going to be a comparatively short session on the substance of the issue presently at hand.

Mr. Speaker, may I end on this note: How we meet the civil rights issue is not the exclusive domain of Congress, although it must share fully in its resolution. It is also the domain of the President. We need, bluntly stated, inspirational and more articulate Presidential leadership. We have a right to ask: Will the President continue to equivocate by implying one thing in his state of the Union message and indicating indecision shortly thereafter at a press conference? Will he back up the Civil Rights Commission report and recommendations? Will he, in his final months of tenure in the White House give this human rights issue his personal and executive attention he has shown he can give if he so wants?

Perhaps, as I stated on another occasion, the probable Republican presidential candidate, RICHARD NIXON, can let us know what the administration position is or should be. The question is, will he give us the direct assistance of his powerful leadership?

I am disturbed that a Republican colleague of mine has reported that the Vice President considers action on his part regarding the civil rights discharge petition might be taken as evidence of unwarranted interference by the Presiding Officer of the other body.

Let me strongly declare on behalf of all of the present Democratic signers of the petition—representing better than two-thirds of the approximate 190 signers—that not only would we not resent his leadership among his Republican colleagues, we would welcome it.

The Vice President has been a Member of the House. He full well knows of the correctness of the use of a discharge petition under the rules of the House. He must be aware that our Speaker has specifically given his approval, in this instance, to the use of this petition.

We can only hope that if the Vice President was justified in entering into the steel strike negotiations, if he was justified in using his leadership in recent controversial labor legislation, then he is fully justified—if he would use his powerful prestige to secure the necessary remaining signatures from the ranks of his presently reluctant Republican colleagues. It would not be exaggerating to say that if he does not, he will be tragically delinquent.

I would go further—if there is political advantage which may be gained from such leadership, on the part of the Vice President, I would not, as a Democrat, begrudge it to him and I would frankly state that he has helped accomplish a needed objective of our country in its fight to defeat communism, in its historic position of democratic defense of the rights of the individual—a principle that belongs to no one political party, to no one political leader, but belongs to every man and woman who has the privilege to serve in public office.

My friends, the only test of actual support of civil rights legislation is whether or not your name is on the petition now on the Clerk's desk. The only thing needed is the energy and the will to sign.

I shall continue for some little time to come, to believe that cheap politics will be cast aside and that the 219 signatures will shortly be achieved, that this House will rise to the challenge of our times by considering and passing a meaningful, a strong and an effective 1960 civil rights bill.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I have sat here and listened with great interest and I have observed through the years the efforts to get some civil rights for people. I have demonstrated my interest in it, I think, in a very sincere fashion and, I hope, in an effective way as well. I should like to call your attention to the fact that it was the party that I represent that first brought about any kind of civil rights.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Does the gentleman refer to President Lincoln?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I certainly do, and I refer to the Emancipation Proclamation. I call your attention to the fact that there was great pressure put on him to issue the Emancipation Proclamation at a much earlier time than he did, but most historians agree now that he probably issued it at about the right time. Then later after the war, the Congress in its wisdom passed the first civil-rights bill. It may be of interest to our colleagues to know that the author of the civil-rights bill that was passed was a gentleman from Iowa by the name of Wilson, who came from the same area that I have the pleasure of serving in Iowa. Since that time we have been trying to do something about this total problem. I think it is a rather sad commentary on something or other that we are still debating the civil-rights question. I am wondering if you really mean what you say when you talk about delinquency and when you point the finger at one of the great leaders of our time who has done so much on the domestic front, which statement in all probability you would question, but who certainly has been a great public servant in trying to resolve this problem that needs so much attention to bring about peace in the world. Of course, you know I am speaking of the President of the United States. You have suggested that he may have been delinquent. I want to suggest to you—and I hope you agree, and I think you will—that this man in his public life has done a great deal for civil rights. The integration of the services and Armed Forces, I think, would not have happened without his leadership and help and encouragement. It has proven to be a great big step forward.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe at the time he was in the military service, he testified against the integration of the services. If President Eisenhower changed his mind later, of course, I think that is a fine and wonderful thing but, perhaps, we could have had it a little earlier.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Again there is the question of timing. But, on this question of delinquency, it is all right to accuse some one person, but you ought to take into consideration the total picture. If the great President of the United States is delinquent and other leaders in the administration are delin-

quent, then is it not true that the Congress may be delinquent too and that some of the leadership in the Congress are delinquent? Would you want to agree that that is true also?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There would be no question in my mind that every day that goes by that the Congress does not pass this bill, we are to that degree delinquent.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. All of us—all of us are delinquent.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You cannot say that all of us are delinquent. Those of us who are truly striving to do something about it are not delinquent. It is those who are not participating in the fight for civil rights who are delinquent.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. Then would you say that those who are opposing it may be delinquent?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I would consider them to be delinquent in that particular sense.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Then would it not be better in that sense for us not to focus attention to just one person?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My good friend, I think, is perhaps going around the barn a little bit when he does not admit, and admit freely, that the influence of the President of the United States and now the influence of the Vice President as the potential heir apparent or next nominee of the Republican Party—that their influence is much greater than yours or mine and that their leadership, if it were put directly on the line, would have a tremendous effect and might well bring about much more rapidly and with greater effectiveness the passing of this civil rights legislation.

Mr. TOLL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. TOLL. If the Republicans are such great champions of civil rights, why have they not signed this petition?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I cannot speak for every Member of Congress. I suppose every Member has his own reason. I have signed it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We welcome the gentleman and thank him.

Mr. PELLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Is it not true that early in the last session certain Members from the other side of the aisle went to the Speaker and asked for a change of rules so that they could get legislation like this, and they were promised action. So, when the gentleman points the finger of criticism at the leaders of the Republican Party, it might be that it should be pointed in the other direction as well.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is the gentleman referring to the reported interview with the Speaker, who said that he would do all he could to get proper legislation, if it was being blocked in the Rules Committee?

Mr. PELLY. I was referring to a newspaper item which I believe stated that the Speaker had promised action.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I point out to the gentleman that of course I was not present so I do not know what was agreed to, but I do know the Speaker has made good on his purported promise, because he has told all Members of the House that in this instance the proper thing to do is to sign this petition and bring it to the floor. So he has done everything that he agreed to, if he did agree to do anything.

Mr. PELLY. I believe the Speaker was quoted as saying that he would like to have the Members sign the discharge petition. Is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As I read it, that is true.

Mr. PELLY. I would hope that some of the leaders on your side would also have signed the petition.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not think he said anything about leadership. I think the majority leader has already covered that point. There is unanimity on both sides of the aisle, that the leadership should not be an actual part of that, but they are stating their position, which on our side has been fully and clearly stated and I do not think it has been clearly stated on your side of the aisle.

Mr. PELLY. I do not want in any way to infer that I am not for action and speedy action on this civil rights legislation. I would only indicate by what I have said here that I wish the partisanship angle would be kept out of it and that the rules would be maintained, and that the names would not be released to the press and the public.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman knows I have not released any names.

Mr. PELLY. I am sure the gentleman has kept within the rules.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman really wants to get the partisanship angle removed, all he has to do is to get about 22 Republicans to sign that petition and there will be no further partisan discussion from our side.

Mr. PELLY. I think, if the gentleman would be fair about this matter, he would know that as far as individual Members go they follow the dictates of their own conscience. I can only say that I believe that after the committee has studied the legislation, then the House itself should have a chance to work its will. I, too, signed this discharge petition. Through many years the gentleman from California and I have been here, we have worked for legislation of this character. I want, if possible, to keep the partisanship angle out of it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. God bless the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MEYER. In this particular matter I am not at all concerned with the partisan aspect, what the Republicans do or what the Democrats may do. Neither am I interested in promoting any sectional hard feelings, or anything like that. To me the important thing is the essential principle involved. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in the efforts today and other efforts connected with the civil rights bill, what we are doing is trying to promote civil rights for Americans—to insure the right to vote.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That would be a very important part of it. The bill also protects civil rights of citizens in other areas of civil rights. But one of the most important things we should have in this bill is to protect the right to vote.

Mr. MEYER. I would like to state my position. Since I returned to Congress I sent out a questionnaire to the people of Vermont, and the seventh question on my list was whether or not they wanted me to work to promote civil rights for all Americans by insuring the right to vote.

I sent that questionnaire to the people of Vermont regardless of political party; in fact, many of them were sent just to "Box Holders." All the replies are not yet in, of course, but to date I would like to report that 90 percent of the people of Vermont who have answered have favored this effort on my part, and only 3 percent have been against it. Seven percent were noncommittal.

I would also say that over 90 percent of them signed their names on this questionnaire in returning what amounts more or less to their vote. Therefore, I think the people of my State want me to support this issue regardless of political party and regardless of sectionalism or anything else.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I might say to the gentleman that just as the people of Vermont showed their good judgment in sending him to this House they are continuing to show good judgment in their answers to his questionnaire.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all heard that lovely spiritual, "He's Got the Whole World in His Hand," and I am sure we have all heard it sung by that very wonderful Negro performer, Marian Anderson, who continues to thrill world audiences with her exceptionally gifted voice. I admire Miss Anderson, who is a graduate of the South Philadelphia High School in my congressional district, for the role she has played in championing the cause of the Negro race, and I think we could all take a lesson from her in human relationships.

On the opening day of this session of the 86th Congress, it was my privilege to sign the civil rights discharge petition because I honestly believe there is today a great need for legislation to insure the rights of all Americans, regardless of color or creed. I further believe we have enough strength in the House of Representatives to overcome any objections to a good bill.

First, we must put an end to discrimination at the polls. There are still many areas in these United States where our colored citizens are being denied the fundamental American right to vote. This is wrong—the right to vote must be guaranteed to all our citizens.

Second, it is my sincere hope that appropriate legislation will be enacted to make lynching a Federal crime. It is unbelievable that today here in America hoodlums can take the law into their own hands and kill their fellow citizens without giving them the benefit of a fair trial.

Mr. Speaker, our country is known throughout the world as the land of opportunity—but at times I wonder. I have heard peoples in foreign countries

express the wish to come to America because it is the land of their dreams—but I wonder. I am very much afraid they would quickly change their minds and reevaluate our American ideals if they were told that certain groups of people were denied their inherited rights as United States citizens.

As representatives of the people here in our Nation's Capital, it is up to us to legislate in their best interests. We are not sent to Congress to represent certain groups, but to represent all our citizens. It is time we stand up and fight for the rights of our colored citizens and other minority groups. It is the Christian thing to do. It is our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, in the First District of Pennsylvania, which I represent, we have some of the finest colored people you would ever wish to know. They come from all walks of life. They are honest, hard working American citizens. They are loyal to their flag, to their country, and tc their God, who is Almighty. "He's got the whole world in His hand."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of civil rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great number of promises about civil rights. It is time we saw a little performance.

It is time that all those who profess their concern about minority rights express that concern in tangible action.

From the tenor of remarks of some of our Republican colleagues, it seems that they are content to talk civil rights and leave the doing to the Democrats.

Again, this year, in his state of the Union message, the President emphasized the vital importance of civil rights legislation, and exhorted Congress to take actions "as a signal to the world that our Government is striving for equality under law for all our people."

The Democratic leadership made it perfectly clear that they were in accord. The leadership had already announced that civil rights would be the first order of business.

Speaker RAYBURN, on January 6, invited all Democrats to sign the discharge petition, so that the civil rights bill can get out of the Rules Committee and onto the floor.

Mr. MCCORMACK, shortly thereafter made a similar plea.

The Democratic leaders determined to go all out for civil rights, because they recognized the inherent justice and righteousness of the cause.

The Republicans, on the other hand, made no such commitment.

When called upon to support the discharge petition, the Republican leadership obliquely refused. As of last week, of about 175 names on the petition, only about 30 were those of Republican Members.

The Republicans, who talked so much about the greatness of Mr. Eisenhower's speech, have as yet chosen to disregard the issue he stressed as so important.

As on prior occasions, the President received the greatest applause from one side of the aisle and the greatest support from the other.

All of us will recall a similar situation last session, when the President placed critical emphasis on the foreign aid program. In the last analysis, he had to depend, not on the members of his own party, but on the Democrats, who, recognizing the vital nature of the issue, came to his support.

Once again, in civil rights, it is the Democrats who choose the path of responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the fate of civil rights legislation hinges on sincere, bipartisan support. There exists in the House some 90-odd Members who are, and always have been, unalterably opposed to civil rights. This is the hard, political reality that we have to cope with.

This does not mean that this group, in itself, can block a civil rights bill.

It does mean that northern Democrats cannot do the job alone.

But it is a job which must be done.

Without the passage of adequate legislative tools a considerable number of Americans will continue to be denied their basic, inalienable rights.

Mr. Speaker, this outrageous record of denial of rights must be rectified.

The immediate job is to get some 45 additional signatures on the discharge petition.

Every single Member who believes what he says about civil rights must affix his signature immediately.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I point out that civil rights legislation cannot succeed without dedicated, bipartisan support.

If our Republican colleagues will come forth with a little of that support, the bill will be out on the floor tomorrow.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there are a multitude of matters before this House awaiting consideration and action. The total impact of these on our national well-being and the future, not only of the United States, but of the entire world staggers our imagination.

Of all of these matters, education, national defense, our national economy, care of the aged and sick, no single item is as important as the enactment of legislation that will assure to every single citizen the rights and the privilege that are not only God given, but guaranteed in our Constitution.

There is no issue before this House that is more fundamentally American or more deeply bedded in democracy than civil rights.

The leaders of the Congress in the closing hours of the first session promised the American people early action on civil rights in this second session.

Although this is an election year and we all anticipate some political maneuvering as both parties head into the campaigns, that the Republican members would join forces, for strictly political gains, with that solid bloc that would forever deny equal rights to certain of our citizens is appalling. To deny these rights for even 1 year, for even a single day or an hour is despicable.

By refusing to join Democratic sponsors of the President's own civil rights bill, Republican members are not only refusing to follow Mr. Eisenhower's leadership in this crucial matter; they are committing themselves and their party to a conspiracy to defeat civil rights.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that our only hope of breaking loose this important legislation rests with the President of the United States and the Vice President, the acknowledged leaders of the Republicans.

I urge, therefore, that the full prestige of their high offices and the party leadership be brought to bear on the Republican Members of the Congress to achieve passage of an effective civil rights bill.

I urged President Eisenhower last August to take the cause of civil rights to the American people in the same manner that he did when he was seeking labor legislation and I again renew that suggestion.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I heard an American veteran soliloquize on his inferiority of citizenship the other day. He said:

> The good Lord was good to me; he caused me to be born. He also gave me a soul. And, as many others, learned through furtive baby looks into mother's soft, pleading eyes of endearment. I belonged to someone whose paternal guidance in life contributed to the building of morals and character. It set the young mind to accept with gratitude the golden love of parenthood.
>
> With the happiness of each day I learned to live with the other members of the human family and although my color seemed to serve to make a difference, it was not important for I was alive and made friends.
>
> In my early schooling I was taught the principles of our Government and its constitutional history; of the immortal leaders, both in war and peace, who made possible the continued existence of its free institutions. I was imbued with the deep feeling of patriotic devotion and love for my country.
>
> Approaching adulthood I learned that complicated methods and laws were enforced to prevent some from enjoying the most sacred rights of citizenship. Those inherent rights that our forefathers said were God-given. I realized that, somehow, I was not accepted. I learned that I was a citizen of color and that I belonged to a stratification of human beings that were deprived of certain high privileges and rights of citizenship.
>
> Local and State enactments made these prejudices certain. I could not understand, for the United States of America was my country. I and my forebears never served under any other nation's flag, for mine was an American heritage.
>
> And so it was that I answered my country's call to arms. In spite of these travesties I marched with my fellow Americans. I fought for its righteous protection of the freedoms of other liberty-loving nations—and yet, upon my return, I and my fellow humankind still live under the same conditions—a state of suppressed servitude and a forfeiture of all rights of citizenship.
>
> Time is passing and I'm tired of complaining to those in authority. The Federal courts do not enforce the voting rights of citizenship. Attack upon local and State laws fail in the offing. The Congress must act—no citizen throughout this land should be deprived of his inherent right to vote and to cast his ballot for his choice to duly represent his interests in representative government.

H.R. 8601 should be acted upon by the Congress immediately. The vote is up to you.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the efforts of my colleagues to get a vote on the civil rights bill. In the words of Adlai Stevenson, "the greatest foreign-aid program ever devised is the Declaration of Independence."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my remarks is to offer a guide to living in multiracial America.

It is often said that the strength of America lies in the diversity of its people. And no other nation possesses such a variety of races and backgrounds as we do.

Yet this very multiracial character has caused some of the gravest and most inhuman transgressions in our democracy.

But what we need now is not lamentations or regrets, but solutions to the problems of living together in a multiracial society.

Recently, in a special supplement of the New York Times, some feature articles were carried on this very subject.

I have picked one by Margaret Mead, Lorraine Hansberry, Rufus Clement, Elmo Roper, and Earl B. Schwulst, which I am offering now as part of my presentation.

AMERICA'S MANY FACES—WE HAVE MANY VERSIONS OF ONE SPECIES

(By Margaret Mead)

(Dr. Mead is associate curator of ethnology, American Museum of Natural History, and president, American Anthropological Association.)

The human species—although one—has many subspecies, many races—as groups of human beings have lived for long periods separated from each other, elaborating differences in shape of face and length of limb, in hair form and eye color, in color of skin. The history of our species, and undoubtedly of those earlier men who preceded us, has been one of isolation, differentiation, meeting and mating, often with intervals of hostility and fear.

In the United States there has taken place a most dramatic gathering in of diverse peoples, long separated by sea and mountain range, so that the child reared here today, knows, perhaps more completely than anywhere else, almost the full diversity of human physique. (There are of course a few groups missing, only a single Australian aboriginal who is also a singer may come to our shores, Eskimos venture south under special conditions, blue black Nubians, and the little pygmies from the Andamans of the depths of African forests, greet us only from the pages of the National Geographic but do not walk our streets, speaking a common language and sharing a common culture.) But in spite of the few who are missing, we have here representatives of all the large groups of mankind, and we have demonstrated how all of them, with equal opportunity, can learn our particular kind of human culture, which we call the American way of life.

In the United States, we have provided a living historical experiment to resolve the questions that have been raised, now by one race and now by another—the earliest immigration barrier on racial grounds is reported for ancient Egypt some 5,000 years ago. Every culturally significant attribute, negative or positive, cowardice, talkativeness, or musical ability, once believed to be associated with some type of physique, has been shown to be a matter of education and opportunity. That the dominant groups in the United States have often been moved by other motives than that of an all-embracing good will toward men, is only relevant because the demonstration has been made in spite of exploitation and ill will.

Just as it is the more significant that no culturally relevant racial differences have been found, because they have been sought for so hard, so it is also relevant that in spite of distrust, misconceptions, nonfelicitous contacts in which people of one physique came from a poor or backward culture, while those with a different physique were well entrenched—still the historical experiment has been made, and is the more convincing. As false conceptions of the importance of physique shift from West to East, from the majority groups of Americans in the Western Hemisphere, to the majority groups in Africa south of the Sahara, it is useful to remember this gift of knowledge of the intrinsic unimportance of differences in physique which the American experience has given to all the peoples of the world, as an equal gift to the young countries of Africa and Asia, to the Japanese smarting under insults received from the Chinese centuries ago, and to Europeans who feared and distrusted kinds of people whom they had never seen.

In America—in some parts, of course, more than in others—people have grown up only to feel at home when the crowds in which they move are a panorama of the people of the earth. True, there are many small occasions in which an audience, or a congregation, or the members of the wedding or the funeral may all be, roughly speaking, one color, the hair of some of them carefully tailored, either to an unnatural curliness or an unnatural straightness. These are the areas where the association between physique and behavior is still maintained, where people only feel comfortable with those who look, in some particular way, more like themselves than they do like other people. But the faces of the United States remain the faces of the people of the earth, people who subscribe to the same beliefs, speak the same language, learn the same lessons in school, people who have fought side by side in the same battles, and are now making their equal and comparable contribution to living in one world. Given an empty continent, long, long ago, the peoples of the world have made their way here, on foot, by small boat and large, and finally by planes which obliterate the boundaries which once separated men, so that, for brief periods in human history, they developed different versions of the same human face.

STANLEY GLEASON AND THE LIGHTS THAT NEED NOT DIE

(By Lorraine Hansberry)

(Miss Hansberry wrote "Raisin in the Sun," winner of the Drama Critics' Award for 1959.)

At 18, Stanley Gleason is a remarkable man. From the very beginning of his school career, Stanley's poor teachers have been, to one degree or another, cowed by their inevitable awareness that Stanley Gleason, despite the fact that he has never been "in trouble," constitutes a problem to his society by his very existence. Like his ancestors, and for reasons his teachers were never able to fully grasp, either, Stanley's presence has seemed associated with a peculiar and gravely silly historical anguish which constantly rises up to expose the very institutions of his culture which are supposed to care for and about him.

Starting with the U.S. Constitution and coming down to the eighth grade visit to a museum of natural history a few years ago, few things have jibed in the teaching of Stanley Gleason. For when Stanley stood back on his legs and looked up at the great painted diagram on the wall of the museum, a caption of which informed him that it was an explanation of the races of man, he did not fail to note that someone had taken pains to show his branch sort of dropping off somewhere only slightly above the apes, while the strong main "trunk" pushed on and ever upward to where, rather crowning all the others, stood a figure with noticeably uncolored skin. Stanley was 13 then, but he did not make a fuss, because he had given up quarreling with the academicians since he was 7 and had lost the argument with his nice teacher from Long Island who had honestly seemed to believe that "outside toilets" were things which existed only in the American rural past.

It was after the museum that Stanley developed his way of walking. It is a gait made up of the alternation of one tautly bent knee and one dragged foot which culminate to give him a bouncy propulsion through life. There is pungent irony in the fact that it resembles nothing quite so much as a limp. Stanley intends to connote something else by the way he walks which, though he would never articulate it that way, has an organic relationship to the lie on the walls of a mighty museum. It was during the same period, for instance, that he took to wearing his hat or cap pulled down deeply in front and his lower jaw a little thrust forward—all of which gives him an air of determined urgency—whether he is going any place or not of an afternoon. There is about his walk something which suggests that, somehow, Stanley knows that his ancestors did survive the middle passage voyage and that he, for his part, has survived a climate which includes tuberculosis, rats, and some of the most insidious hatreds on the face of the earth. His bouncy figure seems to be an act of defiance; a symbol of almost omnipotent awareness that he has played a telling trick on somebody by sticking it out. It is as if he is saying, "Man, I am here."

It is very important to Stanley Gleason that he knows he is not Dwight D. Eisenhower. He knows that and the whole world knows that, but he is confounded by the fact that the rest of the world is less certain that he is not Robert Brown or Thomas Smith or 20 million other people. Whatever counseling for the future that he has been able to glean has come from the lips of rather tired people who came into his interviews knowing that they would automatically try to usher him and every other kid like him into life directions designed to do something with 9 million Robert Smiths who would not be welcome in so many industries and professions. Thus, a dim, vague little light that once lit up Stanley's heart when he saw a bridge built on television has been pummeled into darkness. The last dying manifestations of its flicker are a certain savoring he still gives the word "engineer" and a worn and now seldom looked at stack of Mechanix Illustrated. People who do not know him, who, indeed, do not have the time to know him, and who do not seem to know that the world's most ambitious people come out of the slums of the world, have been appointed or allowed to summarize his problems.

So, at 18, Stanley Gleason is a remarkable man. He may be called a man because the nature of the life which has surrounded him thus far has imparted a certain maturity to his view of the world. That is to say that Stanley has come to assess justice and pain and even beauty with a seasoned realism that the world tends to find heartbreaking in other boys his age in other places; but of Stanley it has been expected, even demanded.

He remembers being told, when he was 12, to "move on" from under a theater marquee where a cop had ushered his horse in order to get it, veiled in black rubber, out of the rain. Stanley had invoked the ancient cultural habit of pursing his lips before also directing the officer's attention to the fact

that it was raining. He had also left an unmistakable implication hanging behind the assertion, which suggested that he had no more desire to get wet than some old horse. The welting blow which he received across his mouth was not, significantly, the part of the incident which stuck in his mind. He has more keenly remembered that he went home and told adults who told a good many other adults and that there were some letters written to the local papers which all culminated, finally, in a little editorial which expressed the paper's satisfaction that the community "needed its protection from hoodlums."

It was one of many experiences by which Stanley came to discover a lack of balance in the world and began the dropping of illusions along his way.

Perhaps the fact that there has never been any reason for authority to pop Stanley Gleason across the mouth amounts to a cruel paradox which signifies one of the dilemmas of his not always coherent society. He does not smoke marihuana and considers gangs strictly an outlet for squares. Consequentially, pragmatically, he gets less attention than those of his contemporaries who are in difficulty with society and themselves. And who, of course, are hardly overattended. As a nonheadline maker, Stanley belongs to a majority whose needs beg for guidance and opportunity rather than correction.

He has found, painfully, that the world outside his ghetto has little relationship to some of the editorials in his community papers (which he only rarely reads) which insist that, since the day he was born, presumably, there has been something wrong with him. Otherwise, the editorials say, he would just roli up his sleeves and "try—simply try to make a significant contribution to the economic development of America." They have also lost Stanley by using words like "imagination" and "industriousness" as if the mere possession of such qualities were equal to the possession of capital itself. As for that host of glamorous occupations—including stock brokerage, diplomatic service, and architecture—which are paraded in feature articles in his favorite monthly magazine (which he does read regularly) well, Stanley has come to regard them as a delightful fantasy which he and the magazine share. As a part of reality they became suspect to him, not because he has or ever will read E. Franklin Frazier, but because for a long time now they have managed to convey the distinct impression that among the other industries Negroes have flooded, so to speak, is that of the motion pictures. But Stanley Gleason knows perfectly well that as much as he digs Sidney Poitier, he just doesn't constitute anybody's flood.

It is a mistake to imply, however, that Stanley's life has been entirely a bundle of negatives. That is not so. His body, a symphony of youthful masculinity at 18, has somehow escaped the ravages of the ghetto; but only escaped, because someone has to make up statistics and it could have been Stanley. Nor has he gone without love, his parents gave him and his brothers a great deal, which must account for the fact that his young face is anything but the mask of bitterness it might well be considering the sum total of his experiences thus far.

But it is a face that we may look out and see from our taxicabs on our way to 57th Street appointments. He will be, like a multitude of other dark youths, behind his little dress cart, waiting for the lights to change at 33d and Sixth Avenue. A rather handsome fellow, American as the streets around him, father and son of a portion of his culture; a portion as rich in imagination and industriousness as any other. Yet, for one insane historical moment, a garment district cart pusher is the only place he has been able to find in his still racist and chaotic social order. The only place for one who wanted to build things.

It is a moment which must, before the waste is too enormous, be rapidly put to death.

To a Democratic Ballot

(By Rufus Clement)

(Dr. Clement is president of Atlanta University and an elected member of the Atlanta Board of Education.)

The fact that the Negro cannot vote as he is entitled to in the South is an uncomfortable proposition for all Americans. It is also undeniable.

One of the excuses advanced by southern politicians for their actions in attempting to limit or to nullify the Negro vote is that they fear that any policy of free and full registration of qualified Negro voters will result in the establishment of a bloc vote by which, in some political subdivisions where more Negro than white people reside, the Negroes would take over government. Many of these same politicians have shown by their actions and have demonstrated in their public speeches the type of racial prejudice which would not hesitate to deny to all Negroes the basic rights promised all citizens by the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the individual States. These politicians who seem to fear bloc voting on the part of Negroes are, for the most part, those individuals who feel that they have so conducted themselves that their candidacies would not be supported by Negro people.

When racial matters are not at issue the Negro vote tends to follow the national as well as local voting trend. If all qualified members of this group were registered and entitled to participate in local and national elections, it would be discovered that, having been victims of biased government, this group would be particularly interested in improving the quality of leadership which is placed in the public offices of Southern States. Previous experience with men who "talked out of both sides of their mouths" would indeed make the Negro wary of supporting such men for public office. The election of officials pledged to fair and equal treatment of all the people, without favoritism to any because of race, creed, economic and social standing, or color—provided, of course, they are otherwise qualified for the positions they seek—would sharply upgrade southern political leadership in many areas. This has already been demonstrated in Nashville, Atlanta, Louisville, Little Rock, and other southern cities.

To the National Economy

(By Elmo Roper)

(Mr. Roper is the nationally known public opinion and market research consultant for American industry.)

Discrimination is an economic luxury this country cannot afford. The moral corrosion and stunted human growth that accompany it are distressing, but it is the cost in dollars to the entire economy that brings the lesson home. That cost is enormous; last year racial discrimination alone robbed the economy of $15 billion of unearned—and unspent—income.

When all the direct and indirect costs of all the varieties of discrimination are taken into consideration—the unearned wages by minority groups denied access to jobs above a certain level, who often spend their time at work machines could do cheaper; the gap in our supply of doctors, scientists, and engineers made larger by arbitrary barriers against certain groups; the heavy cost of crime, delinquency, and social maladjustment which can be traced directly to discrimination and prejudice (the cost of police protection and other city services more than doubles in minority group areas); in addition, the cost of maintaining double facilities where segregation is in effect—the full cost of this drainage is probably twice that of the color bar alone.

In a time when we need all the skill and wisdom our population can summon, that our Nation may not wither on the vine of history, we cannot afford to place an invisible net of discrimination between large segments of that population and the jobs and professions that require talent and ability. The loss in production, in skilled manpower, in unrealized purchasing power, in lost tax revenues, in warped emotional development—this waste of our human and economic resources—is too great to be borne any longer.

To the Homeseeker

(By Earl B. Schwulst)

(Mr. Schwulst is president and chairman of the board of the Bowery Savings Bank of New York City.)

The segregation of the Negro is most obvious in housing and this entails effective segregation in the schools notwithstanding Supreme Court decisions. In fact, housing segregation underlies and promotes segregation in all other aspects of Negro life.

Housing is the one commodity on the American market which the Negro—solely because he is a Negro—cannot freely purchase or rent. Consequently, he pays more for less housing than any other American.

The Negro will never be able to play his full part as an American citizen and will never be able to develop his full potentialities as a human being until he ceases to be segregated as to where he may live.

Such integrated employment and such integrated schools as we have are helpful and necessary if the Negro is to become a complete citizen. They expose him to the white man and expose the white man to him. Exposure is essential to understanding and to the eradication of fear and mutual distrust.

But association in employment and in schools is not sufficient to break down the formality which characterizes most of the contacts between Negro and white. Even that degree of association, as important as it is, is likely to be on the formal side. It is only in the informal and relaxed give-and-take of the neighborhood that people can really come to know and understand each other and learn to cooperate in solving the problems—many unimportant but some of the highest importance—which confront all of us as Americans. To deny an otherwise acceptable and desirable person the right to live where he chooses because of the color of his skin (or because of his religion) is both unjust and damaging to him. And it is also unjust and damaging to those who deny him the right, because they are also denying him the opportunity to develop and are therefore wasting human resources. Are we so rich in those resources that we can continue to afford that waste in the threatening world that now surrounds us?

I believe that you will find that these particular articles cover some of the most important facets of this disturbing problem. Along with other Members of Congress, we recognize the urgency for the passage of this legislation at this time. I plead with the majority Members of the Republican Party and those Members from south of the Mason-Dixon line of the Democratic Party to join with us in order that we may remove this blight from our American way of life.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a Republican and speaking as one who has signed the discharge petition on the civil rights bill, and furthermore speaking as a Member of the House who has before and will again vote for a bill to strengthen the right of all citizens to vote, I want to express my regret in regard to the discussion which has taken place this afternoon.

My reaction to this afternoon's performance is that it is a Democrat divertissement. Bringing the Vice President into this show is simply a pure act of partisanship. Mr. NIXON's responsibility is to preside over the Senate—not to get signatures in the House of Representatives on a discharge petition.

The motives or sincerity of Members who have spoken I do not question. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee wants to get action and I do too; but when the delay and lack of action are blamed on Republicans I disagree. The answer to lack of action lies in the weakness of the congressional Democratic leadership.

Earlier I told the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] I had worked closely with him in other years on civil rights legislation. I shall do so in the future, but our community of interest cannot be effective unless my political party is eliminated as a convenient whipping boy for the other political party's impotence.

The House Chamber is no place for target shooting at DICK NIXON and civil rights is not the proper weapon.

Mr. REUSS. There is nothing very complicated about this petition to discharge H.R. 8601, the bill to guarantee civil rights. Members who believe in civil rights should sign the petition, and sign it promptly.

The Constitution, and the natural law which underlies it, guarantees to all the right to vote, regardless of religion or national origin or color. H.R. 8601 simply follows the recommendation of the bipartisan Civil Rights Commission concerning how most effectively to carry out the constitutional protection of the right to vote.

The discharge petition has been filed because the House Committee on Rules refuses to grant a rule which will let the House vote on this bill. One hundred and ninety Members have so far signed the petition.

The Rules Committee is preventing this House from exercising its own civil right to vote on H.R. 8601. For the political structure which permits the Rules Committee to deny Members of this House the right to vote in an orderly manner on pressing legislation, both parties must bear their share of responsibility. But that is another story.

The simple issue before this House today is: Are there 219 Members who believe in civil rights, and are willing to show their belief by signing a discharge petition?

If you believe in civil rights, you should sign the petition now. If you have a custom or practice of not signing discharge petitions, you should get rid of the custom or practice right now, and sign the book.

This is not a partisan issue. If the Republicans will show their sincerity by coming down and providing the 29 more signatures needed, I will be the first to applaud them as people who are willing to practice what they preach.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I signed the discharge petition on the Clerk's desk the first day it was placed there. Basically I did so for two reasons:

First, because I know that as a matter of parliamentary history this same discharge method and procedure has been used since 1910 by this great legislative body as one of the established and recognized methods proper and appropriate to use, when and if a sufficient numerical number of the Members of this legislative body feel it important enough to personally sign the same. In the present time it requires 218 names total.

Second. I did so, because I verily believe in our constitutional form of government under which this Republic was founded and ordained, and which constitutional form of government I swore to uphold each of the seven times I have now taken my oath as a Member of this great National Congress of the United States of America.

The 15th amendment to our Federal Constitution provides as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Therefore, having raised my right hand and having sworn to uphold this 15th amendment, as well as all and every one of the sections and portions of our Federal Constitution, as a Member of this National Congress, I conceive it as being my sworn and bounden duty to take every step which is recognized as lawful and patriotic and which I deem in the best interests of my beloved Nation to make our constitutional form of government.

Because it so clearly appears to me that my signing of this discharge petition, in accordance with our long established House rules and procedures, beginning back as far as 1910, is in effect complying with the rules of the House as established back in 1910 to bring a bill to the floor of the House under the circumstances which it appears to me presently exist, and, because I vigorously believe that every American citizen should have the same American citizen rights which I have under our Federal Constitution, I join in respectfully inviting and urging all of the members of the California congressional delegation in this House to join with me and the other California congressional Members who have already signed this petition. I believe it is a fact at the present date that all members of the California delegation on my side of the aisle have already signed the same and that two Members on the minority side of the aisle from my native State of California have also signed. I would not want to believe that any California Congressman colleague would fail to take advantage of every lawful, available opportunity to help make it more of a fact, in actual practice, that every American citizen, everyplace, and anyplace in our beloved Nation, would not only have the right to vote, but would have equal opportunity to vote as is made available to every citizen, or to any other citizen in his or her respective voting precinct, district, or State, anywhere in our beloved land.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make my position with respect to H.R. 8601 absolutely clear for the benefit of my colleagues and the people. Let me say that my record during my service in this distinguished body will clearly establish my consistent support of civil rights legislation and related situations whether embodied in education, labor, housing, or any other legislation. I will support this legislation now before the House, to wit: H.R. 8601, when the same comes up for a vote.

When I came to the House in 1953, Mr. Speaker, I established certain policies with regard to procedure to which I would adhere under all circumstances. Among these was a policy of not signing discharge petitions. This is not a capricious or frivolous policy on my part, but was prompted by my sincere conviction in the orderly processes of legislative procedure. I know that in my own conscience I am following what I consider to be the best course, and I am not at all impressed by words such as those used in the course of debate on this important legislation—"Republicans arise and sign the petition or else you shall ever be condemned." Condemned by whom, I ask, Mr. Speaker—members of the opposition party? Let me say that I believe the American people who have always demonstrated their desire to be fair and just in all matters will understand what prompts the action of Members of Congress in carrying out their obligations according to the dictates of their conscience and the appreciation of their responsibility.

Let us be frank with one another—this legislation can be brought on the floor for action any time the majority party really wants it to for in the Rules Committee the majority is 2 to 1; namely, eight Democrats and four Republicans. Obviously the majority can vote this legislation out. There are, however, other vehicles which can be used to bring this essential legislation to the floor. The majority party can either suspend the rules or have action on Calendar Wednesday. Those are the proper parliamentary procedures which should be pursued in the interest of assuring all citizens equal protection under the Constitution.

THE DISCHARGE PETITION ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,

and the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, my distinguished colleague from California.

There is no creditable reason which should preclude any Member of the House from signing the civil rights discharge petition which is now on the Clerk's desk. The procedure is in accordance with the rules of the House.

The fact that the discharge petition is an extraordinary procedure within the rules of the House should not preclude any Member from signing the petition if he is really sympathetic with the general aims of this legislation which are commendable though inadequate, moral rather than political.

The issues involved are above who should get credit for the victory. The enactment of a good civil rights bill this session will redound to the advantage of both political parties and to the Nation. The sooner the great need for equal protection under the law becomes a reality—the sooner the Nation can move on in pride and unity to the other grave problems ahead.

I am among those Members of Congress who deplore the extraordinary powers of the Rules Committee to stifle necessary and worthwhile legislation desired by a great majority of the membership of the House. Prior to the adoption of the rules of this House, I was among those who advocated the adoption of the 21-day rule which would have prevented the embarrassment in which we now find ourselves. We were advised, however, that the militant minority on the other side of the aisle would engage in a coalition to preserve the present control power of the Rules Committee. It is indeed regrettable that a showdown on this issue did not occur during the organization of the 86th Congress.

The ridiculous parliamentary plight in which we find ourselves today on the civil rights issue is the responsibility of all of the Members of the House regardless of party. The rules were adopted by the votes on both sides of the aisle. The correction of this situation through the discharge petition is also the responsibility of all Members of this body who concur in the real need for civil rights legislation.

Members of Congress may suffer in frustrated futility on this vital American problem. If we lack the fortitude now to act under the rules to dispel this futility, the American voters in autumn of 1960 may take necessary steps to relieve us from the pain of further suffering. It has been determined on this issue that the discharge petition is the only effective remedy available now. The denial of this legal process cannot be explained away on the mere refusal to support remedies because they are not routine.

Our leadership on this side of the aisle as well as our national chairman have uniquely concurred in urging civil rights legislation through the discharge petition method. The President and other leaders in his administration—in unique disagreement with many members of their party—have urged the enactment of effective civil rights legislation substantially provided in the legislation adopted by the Judiciary Committee after exhaustive hearings.

The need for Federal registrars or court-appointed referees as recommended by the Civil Rights Commission and the Attorney General can be provided by amendment on the floor of the House after due consideration.

Whether there be registrars or referees, fair administration of the civil rights laws will result.

During the course of the argument on the civil rights bill of 1957 the opponents of the contempt provisions of the legislation argued that the legislation constituted a mass indictment of the integrity of the entire southern populace of the country and that it would be irresponsible to charge that a whole people would be faithless to a solemn juror's oath.

In discussing this point, I argued then that the conduct of contempt proceedings under the civil rights bill would in every case be conducted before distinguished jurists of the Federal bench who have lived and developed in their home communities, in every respect, products of the South and familiar with its traditions and its culture.

It is to be presumed that Federal registrars or court-appointed referees will not be carpetbaggers from the North. In the ordinary course of events and under the law the persons assigned to these necessary tasks would be selected principally from the areas in which they would be expected to serve. Their obligation and responsibility, however, would be to Federal authority under Federal law rather than under State and local authorities, which have proven to be not always in keeping with the spirit of protecting the civil rights of all of their citizens. There is no reason for anyone to suspect that any phase of the civil rights legislation will not be administered in keeping with the highest traditions of American jurisprudence.

This legislation is not directed against one section of the country alone. It may prove useful to insure the right to vote and the right to have a vote counted in many communities in the North and throughout the Nation. This legislation is in effect designed to protect the right to vote and the integrity of the ballot wherever it is in jeopardy.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I commend the gentleman for his splendid statement. I may say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that this morning I phoned the office of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] to inform him that I was accepting his invitation as set forth in his remarks appearing in the RECORD of January 18 to respond to those remarks. I had hoped that the gentleman would be here. However, I have learned he is out of town on official business. Since this time has been set aside I am unable to await his return. I extend to him, however, an invitation to reciprocate in kind at his pleasure.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 18, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] addressed the House on the subject of "The Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat Coalition." His remarks were originally in the form of a letter to his constituents, adapted for delivery on the floor. Since the gentleman specifically invited his colleagues to take exception to his remarks, I am today availing myself of this opportunity.

From his remarks it is quite clear that the gentleman from Missouri is echoing the sentiments of many of his Republican colleagues who have not yet signed the discharge petition to bring the moderate civil rights bill to the House floor—legislation that was recommended by the President and the Republican administration.

The gentleman from Missouri complains about efforts of the Democratic leadership to bring the civil rights bill to the floor by discharge petition and pointed out that Republicans compose only one-third of the total membership of the House. According to published lists of signers of the discharge petition, Democrats have already produced more than two-thirds of the necessary 219 signatures on the petition. Incidentally, I knew nothing of that publication in advance, and was surprised to see it. Only one out of every five House Republicans has signed, according to these reports.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have done our part. We have exceeded the Democratic two-thirds majority in the House with more than two-thirds of the required signatures. It is the Republican refusal to sign which prevents House consideration of the civil rights bill.

At his news conference 2 weeks ago, the President renewed his support of the civil rights bill. According to an article in the Washington Evening Star of January 13, 1960:

> President Eisenhower today urged Congress to pass the moderate civil rights bill now before it gets bogged down with controversial proposals in this field.

The story continues:

> While the President was outlining his views at a news conference, however, members of his own party in the House were refraining from coming to the aid of the bill by signing a petition to bring it to the floor.
>
> The President underscored Republican Minority Leader HALLECK'S assurance to his GOP colleagues that they were free politically to sign the petition for the immediate floor action.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is strange that only a handful of Republicans have availed themselves of this political freedom to sign the petition since the Republican caucus meeting almost 2 weeks ago. The gentleman from Missouri made quite a point of emphasizing the overwhelming support of Republicans for the bill. If they really believe in the importance of civil rights legislation, why is 80 percent of the Republican membership of the House so reluctant in bringing the bill to the floor?

The gentleman alludes to reports of the deal between Republicans and southern Democrats involving the Landrum-Griffin bill and civil rights legislation.

If such a deal does exist, I submit that Republicans have already carried out their part of the bargain by their votes on the labor bill in the last session and the votes of Republicans on the Judiciary Committee to water down the original civil rights bill. Unless the alleged deal extends to many other types of legislation in this session, it would seem to this observer that Republicans have more than done their share of the blocking of needed legislation and would now be free to support the civil rights bill.

The gentleman from Missouri seems to have some doubt in his mind about the existence of a coalition between Republicans and some southern Democrats here in the House.

I refer the gentleman to the statistical analyses of the coalition voting alinements published by the impartial Congressional Quarterly News Features during the past several years—1957 Congressional Quarterly Almanac, page 813; 1958 Congressional Quarterly Almanac, page 764; Congressional Quarterly weekly reports of February 13, 1959, and December 4, 1959.

Based on last year's analysis, the average House Republican voted with the coalition 82 percent of the time on these coalition rollcall votes. Republicans and Southern Democrats hold 264 seats in the House, 45 more than a constitutional majority needed to pass or defeat any bill.

The operation of the coalition is a matter of record and has been most successful on legislation such as education, social welfare, public housing, immigration, taxes, labor antitrust, civil rights, public works, and resource development.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a research paper on this subject which reviews the history of the Republican-southern Democratic coalition in the House from 1937 to 1959:

The Republican-Southern Democratic coalition, or conservative coalition, as it is sometimes called, has exerted vast influence over the outcome of various types of legislation since its loose formation 22 years ago.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress saw a tightening of the coalition's voting alliance under the leadership of Minority Leader HALLECK and Judge SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee.

The scope and effectiveness of the coalition as described in this study is limited to legislation reaching the House floor, where its impact can be measured by analysis of rollcall votes. Of course, much of the important work of the coalition takes place in standing committees, and particularly in the House Rules Committee, where many measures are pigeonholded or watered down before a rule is granted. These aspects of coalition activity are not subject to the same type of precise analysis.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the party lineup in the 86th Congress and to briefly review the history of the Republican-Southern Democratic coalition since its beginnings in 1937 so that its operation in the present Congress may be placed in proper perspective.

THE 86TH CONGRESS—BASIC ARITHMETIC

An understanding of the role of the coalition in the 86th Congress must begin with an analysis of the real party alinement in the House. On paper it would appear that the Democratic majority in the House is the largest since New Deal days—280 Democrats, 152 Republicans. The party lineups are:

Southern Democrats	104
Border Democrats	24
Northern and western Democrats	152
Republicans	152
Total	[1] 432

[1] Excludes vacancies (Illinois, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania).

But on the basis of three key rollcall votes in the first session on which the conservative coalition achieved its maximum strength (Thomas amendment—housing bill financing; H.R. 3—States rights issue; Landrum-Griffin substitute—labor bill), the approximate real party alinement is:

Coalition

Southern Democrats	80
Border Democrats	9
Northern and western Democrats	6
Republicans	130
Total	225

Liberals

Southern Democrats	20
Border Democrats	15
Northern and western Democrats	143
Republicans	18
Total	196

Absentees and vacancies, 16.

THE CONSERVATIVE COALITION, 1959

A congressional quarterly study of Republican-Southern Democrats voting alinements during the first session of the 86th Congress shows that a majority of both groups opposed a majority of northern and western Democrats on 11 of the 87 House rollcall votes.[1] The coalition won on 10 of the 11, or 91 percent. By comparison, the coalition won on 64 percent of the showdown votes in 1958 and 81 percent in the 1957 session.

A separate Congressional Quarterly study[2] also reveals that southerners split with the rest of the House Democrats on 23 percent of all rollcalls during the 1959 session. They included votes on such issues as housing, civil rights, taxes, labor legislation, States rights (H.R. 3), farm price supports, surplus disposal policies, and Hawaiian statehood.

During the 1959 session, southern Democrats cast 82 percent of their votes with the Republicans and against the majority of their own party on these coalition rollcalls. The 12 southern Democratic committee chairmen cast 86.5 percent of their votes with the Republicans on these coalition rollcalls, only 10 percent with the majority of their own party.

On these same votes, 79 percent of the northern and western Democratic votes were cast with the party majority. Republicans cast 88 percent of their votes with southerners on these key rollcalls, only 9 percent with northern and western Democrats.

Coalition voting frequency would have been ever greater if the House Rules Committee had permitted such measures as the area redevelopment bill, the civil rights bill, and Federal aid school bill to reach the House floor.

THE COALITION GERMINATES: 1937

Beginnings of the Republican-Southern Democratic coalition in Congress can be traced back to 1937, the 1st session of the 75th Congress.

Franklin Roosevelt had just won his landslide reelection victory over Alf Landon and Democrats controlled the House by a 333 to 89 margin. Major New Deal reform measures were already on the statute books and the overwhelming Democratic victory in 1936 had provided a clear mandate for the Roosevelt administration to continue its New Deal reform and economic recovery programs.

But there were rumblings of discontent among powerful conservative forces in the Nation. The Supreme Court had already ruled several New Deal programs unconstitutional. Southerners were smarting over the repeal of the two-thirds nominating rule at the 1936 Democratic Convention, which denied them their traditional veto power over presidential choices. Resentment against the White House efforts to pack the Supreme Court began to grow in Congress.

On the national scene, organized labor was beginning to assert itself as an economic force, aided by enactment of the Wagner and Walsh-Healy Acts. Sitdown strikes became a new economic weapon in the hands of unions. Organizational strikes were being conducted in the basic industries. However, the Liberty League was strongly resisting these inroads and confidently expected the Supreme Court to rule the Wagner Act unconstitutional in a test case.

When the Court upheld the act in April 1937, it became clear to many conservatives in the industrial North and the low-wage farm areas of the South that only by forging a bipartisan conservative alliance in Congress could they hope to stem the tide of new dealism, with its growing emphasis on the needs of city dwellers, minority groups, workers, small farmers, and other underprivileged segments of the population.

This was the year that conservatives succeeded in seizing control of the House Rules Committee. They were able to change its role from that of a traffic cop in scheduling measures reported by standing committees for floor action, subject to majority leadership decisions, to that of a policy-making body—dictating to all Members which bills it deemed worthy of being considered on the House floor.

During the 1937 session, almost 10 percent of all House rollcalls showed Republicans and a majority of southern Democrats voting against a majority of Democrats from the rest of the country. Democrats divided sharply on such votes as those to authorize an investigation of sitdown strikes, on antilynching legislation, alien relief, and immigration measures. The coalition also succeeded in blocking consideration of the fair labor standards bill for the remainder of the session. However, a concerted drive by the administration resulted in passage of the bill in the second session, after it was pried out of the Rules Committee by a discharge petition.

EARLY COALITION VICTORIES

During the 1st session of the 76th Congress, the coalition won two important victories—forcing an investigation of the NLRB because of alleged "prolabor" rulings and in passing the Hatch Act to prohibit political activity by Federal employees. Cleavages between northern and southern Democrats widened on such issues as housing, civil rights, labor legislation, immigration bills, relief measures, and regulation of business.

THE COALITION DURING WORLD WAR II

Although the outbreak of World War II in Europe curtailed the New Deal domestic programs, the influence of the conservative coalition continue to grow. By 1941, coalition voting frequently had increased to more than 13 percent of all House rollcalls.

[1] Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Dec. 4, 1959. See also Congressional Quarterly, Feb. 13, 1959.

[2] Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Nov. 20, 1959.

During the war years, the coalition succeeded in passing the Smith antistrike bill, a States rights armed services' voting bill, established the Un-American Activities Committee as a permanent House committee, and watered down the price control program and the excess profits tax measures.

By 1945, coalition voting alinements took place on 16 percent of all House rollcalls, as a combination of Rules Committee power, seniority, and attrition among northern Democratic in off-year elections helped conservatives strengthen their grip on the legislative machinery of the House.

THE COALITION IN POSTWAR YEARS

In the immediate postwar period of the 79th Congress the coalition used its power to pass the Case strike-control bill, to exclude farm labor from NLRB jurisdiction, to turn over the U.S. Employment Service to the States, and to take the first steps toward gutting the price control program. This latter action soon resulted in a wave of speculation, profiteering, and inflation, costing the American public billions of dollars in lost purchasing power.

After the election of the Republican 80th Congress in 1946, the coalition achieved its greatest numerical strength. It succeeded in passing the Taft-Hartley Act and in overriding President Truman's veto of the measure. It reduced coverage under the Social Security Act, overrode Truman's veto of the "rich man's" tax reduction bill, and further weakened price and rent controls.

The hand of the coalition was also seen in blocking such measures as an effective public housing program, Federal aid to education, civil rights, an increase in the minimum wage, an adequate farm program, and other legislation which President Truman proposed to the 80th Congress. His 1948 "whistle stop" campaign against the "special interests" which dominated the 80th Congress won for him his upset victory over Dewey and formed the basic planks of his Fair Deal program.

THE COALITION VERSUS THE FAIR DEAL

The Republican-Southren Democratic coalition in the 81st Congress was a major force in blocking enactment of important segments of the Truman legislative program and in watering down others. A majority of Republicans and southern Democrats voted together against administration proposals on about 30 percent of all substantive rollcalls in the House.

The high frequency of coalition voting is at least patrially explained by the change in House rules on the opening day of the session. The House Rules Committee was stripped of its power to pigeonhole bills reported by standing committees by adoption of the 21-day rule, which permitted committee chairmen to call up bills reported by his committee, if they were not acted upon by the Rules Committee within a 21-day period. This meant that many of the controversial administration bills reached the floor for debate and vote which otherwise would have been held up in the Rules Committee.

Among the measures brought to the floor under the new 21-day rule were Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood bills, a rivers and harbors bill, the National Science Foundation bill, an antipoll tax bill, a VA hospital bill, and a joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in international organizations. In addition, the threat of using the new rule forced a reluctant Rules Committee to act on minimum wage, social security, and public housing legislation, all of which were subsequently enacted into law.

The conservative coalition did succeed in defeating an attempt to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; in rejecting the Brannan farm plan; in permitting "local option" decontrol of rents; in defeating the National Minerals Act; in watering down the minimum wage bill; in passing the natural gas and basing point bills (both vetoed); in reducing foreign aid funds and funds for public housing; in rejecting controls over commodity speculation, and in watering-down an FEPC bill.

A coalition attempt to repeal the 21-day rule early in the 2d session of the 81st Congress failed. However, the new rule was repealed by the coalition on the opening day of the 82d Congress. Since that time, the Rules Committee has tightened its hold over the legislative machinery of the House.

THE COALITION DURING THE EISENHOWER YEARS

During the Eisenhower administration, the coalition has continued to play a dominant role. It has won a number of important victories, including those in which it turned over offshore oil resources to a few coastal States, reduced funds for the soil conservation program, blocked liberalization of the unemployment compensation system, watered-down several public housing bills, passed the natural gas bill, defeated school construction legislation, watered-down a minimum wage bill increasing the extent of coverage, blocked an investigation of administration fiscal and monetary policies, defeated the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill, blocked consideration of the community facility loan program.

The coalition has also appeared on such issues as antitrust legislation, water pollution control measures, civil rights, natural resource development, public works, foreign aid, H.E.W. appropriation measures, and legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

SUMMARY

Over the years since 1937, the Republican-Southern Democratic voting coalition has operated with varying degrees of effectiveness, being most successful on legislation dealing with education, social welfare, labor, regulation of business, public works and resource development, civil rights, immigration, taxes and other economic issues, and those where States' rights have been involved.

It is in these areas that the major differences between the Republican and Democratic parties are to be found. These are also the types of issues of such vital concern to Northern and Western Democrats in the 1960 campaign.

Scholars and political writers have attempted to explain the basis for the Republican-Southern Democratic coalition in these broad areas of legislation. Many factors have been mentioned, including the high degree of party discipline among Republicans and the correspondingly low degree of party unity, loyalty, and responsibility to the party platform among congressional Democrats from the South.

Other factors often mentioned are the procedural roadblocks in the House legislative machinery, controlled by coalition leaders; the seniority system which assures conservatives of the chairmanships of a majority of the committees and subcommittees; the one-party system in most Southern States; the lack of communication and unity of purpose among Northern and Western Democrats; the antiquated apportionment formulas in many States, which gives rural areas disproportionate representation in State legislatures and in Congress; and the basic need for a realinement of the American political party system.

Going back now to the remarks last Monday of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], I would like to comment on his remarks concerning the northern and southern Democrats who make up our National Democratic Party. Certainly there are basic differences of opinion within our party, just as there are differences of opinion within his own party. We all realize that the sharpest conflict within the Democratic Party is over the civil rights issue.

I can understand why the gentleman is anxious to delay action on the pending civil rights bill as long as he can, so that his party may perhaps gain political advantage from the unhealed split in our ranks near convention time. However, I seriously question his wisdom in such a course of action. The American people are not going to be fooled by such a transparent scheme. It is my opinion that the overwhelming majority of our citizens will resent this effort to play cheap partisan politics with the civil rights issue.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, it will not go unnoticed that Mr. NIXON'S major self-appointed supporters in the House have thus far refused to sign the discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill to the floor for action. They will also take note of the fact that his ambitious and available running mate, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], has refused to cooperate in obtaining early action on the bill as the President has requested and has used his office of minority leader to block our efforts to consider the bill on its merits.

We Democrats have our differences because we are a national party facing up to national issues of importance to all Americans. But even a narrow-interest, sectional party like the Republicans are scrapping behind the scenes. Surely none of us has forgotten the bitter struggle of last January which saw a change in Republican leadership in the House. Nor have we overlooked the backstage struggle of last week over the chairmanship of the Republican congressional committee, which saw the distinguished former chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], walk out of the meeting in protest over the treatment afforded members of the Taft-Martin wing of the Republican Party.

Certainly, no one missed the significance of the dispute over whether or not Gov. Nelson Rockefeller would appear on the nationwide, closed-circuit TV show of the 80 fund-raising Dinners With Ike to be held on January 27.

Not satisfied with having torpedoed any possibility of Governor Rockefeller's challenging Vice President NIXON for the nomination, the Republican high command has apparently taken elaborate steps to bar the New York Republican from speaking over the TV circuit.

I read from a story by Betty Beale in the Washington Evening Star for January 20, 1960:

The telephone wires between New York, Washington, and Los Angeles are still burning over this city's fundraising dinner with Ike, one of the 80 dinners to be held January 27.

As a result of the dispute as to whether guest speaker Governor Rockefeller would appear on the GOP nationwide closed-circuit TV show, interest in the dinner has shot up * * *

One disputed point has not been settled. Governor Rockefeller demanded that there be a head table, knowing that he would be lost in the crowd seated on the floor otherwise. So at the dinner committee meeting held here yesterday afternoon, it was agreed

that there would be a small head table in each of the two rooms. He will appear in person to speak in each room.

But thus far Hollywood star George Murphy, who's in charge of the closed-circuit show, has made no provision to carry Nelson's speech along with the speeches of President Eisenhower (from Los Angeles), Vice President NIXON (from Chicago) and Chairman Thruston Morton (from New York).

George, who is very pro-NIXON, must have great qualms about Rockefeller's charms. Instead of Republicans across the country hearing the one-time contestant, the Nation's Capital will be represented on the TV show by the Howard University choir. The choir will sing two numbers, "God Bless America" and "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

But whether or not the TV cameras will pick up a wave, greeting, or even a smile from Nelson, is still not known. And it probably won't be known until that night, which makes this dinner the most fascinating one of the entire 80 being held next Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that there is the distinct possibility that the TV dinners with Ike will be just as rigged as the Republican convention in Chicago next July. I am sure that the Howard University Choir will do a fine job on the nationwide hookup, just as they did last year on the nationwide TV celebration of Harry Truman's birthday.

It is fitting that one of their numbers will be the "Battle Hymn of the Republic-ans." By their desperate efforts to keep the short-lived Republican presidential hopeful off the TV screens the Republican stage managers are proving that they believe in political monopoly as well as the economic variety.

The gentleman from Missouri boldly suggests that all that needs to be done to bring the civil rights bill to the floor is for northern Democrats to supply three votes on the Rules Committee, to vote with the four Republicans at a meeting called to consider the bill. Yet in an interview with Washington Post reporter Richard L. Lyons slightly more than 2 weeks ago, not one Republican on the Rules Committee would commit himself to vote for the bill. One Republican member of the committee voted against the 1957 civil rights bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], has stated on the floor of the House the appropriate steps he has taken in requesting the Rules Committee to grant a rule on the civil rights bill. They have refused to do so. As a diligent chairman, determined to obtain action on the bill reported by his committee, Mr. CELLER has filed a discharge petition to force action. This is an unwelcome turn of events for the Republicans, who like to talk civil rights but will not even take the trouble to sign their names on a discharge petition to guarantee House consideration of the bill.

In his remarks the gentleman from Missouri pictures himself as quite the expert and protector of House rules. He takes a dim view of the discharge rule and states that he has never availed himself of the privilege of signing such a petition. That is his right. However, as an expert on the rules I know that he would want the RECORD to be straight with regard to the history of the discharge rule, Calendar Wednesday, and the makeup of the Rules Committee.

First, the revolt against Speaker Cannon in 1910 established a Rules Committee of 10, not 12 members—6 of the majority and 4 of the minority party. The number was changed to 11 in the 62d Congress, 13 in the 65th Congress, then to 12 members until the 76th Congress when it was increased to 14, and finally it was set at 12 members in the 80th Congress—8 majority and 4 minority—by agreement of the present Speaker and the former minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The Calendar Wednesday rule did not proceed from weaknesses in the establishment of the reformed Rules Committee as the gentleman from Missouri has suggested. Actually, this rule was first adopted by the House on March 1, 1909, a year preceding the major revolt against Speaker Cannon. It was amended in the 64th and 72d Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Missouri wants accurately to record the history of these rules. He must be aware of the fact that the discharge rule was first established on June 17, 1910, as part of the anti-Cannon revolt. It was supported by Republican insurgents and Democrats and came on the heels of the Rules Committee reform. Republicans then controlled the House by a 217 to 173 margin.

There have been six different discharge rules in effect. Three have been supported by Republican majorities—the first in 1910, the fourth in 1924, and the fifth in 1925. Three discharge rules have been supported by Democratic majorities—the second in 1911, the third in 1912, and the sixth in 1931. The total number of signatures required has varied from 145 to the present majority of the total membership of the House.

There is an honest difference of opinion over the value of the discharge rule. Over the years, Members from both sides of the aisle have attacked and defended it with vigor. One distinguished predecessor from the gentleman's own State of Missouri, former Speaker of the House, Champ Clark, said at the time the first rule was introduced in 1910 that it simply provides the machinery by which the House can consider a bill which a committee fails, refuses, or neglects to report when the House desires it. At the time, Clark was the Democratic floor leader. He went on to say that if the rule is adopted it will not have to be used, but would be held over the heads of the members of the committee as a "terrorem."

Mr. Speaker, if it were not for obstructionist tactics in the House, the discharge rule would not need to be employed. I do not sign a discharge petition without much sober reflection and soul searching. It is not an action to be taken lightly. But, as in the present situation, the rule must be used when it is clear that there is no other way to obtain prompt action on important legislation such as the civil rights bill.

I suspect that the Republicans have never had much love for the discharge rule since it was sucessfully used to bring about consideration and eventual passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 after it had been blocked by the coalition.

The gentleman from Missouri puts great faith in the Calendar Wednesday rule, despite the obvious shortcomings of its use where controversial legislation is involved. He well knows that the rule has not been used in the House since 1956, and is rarely used on controversial legislation—for good reasons.

The most notable legislative struggle involving the use of Calendar Wednesday took place in 1950 over the bill to establish a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission. Since neither I nor the gentleman from Missouri were Members of the House during this time, it would be useful to review briefly this use of the Calendar Wednesday rule. We can then see whether this is a sound and responsible way to legislate.

In many ways that situation was similar to the present one. The FEPC bill had been reported during the 1st session of the 81st Congress. The Republican-Southern Democratic coalition on the House Rules Committee refused to grant a rule, despite the efforts of the then chairman, the late beloved Congressman Adolph Sabath, of Illinois. Plans were then made to bring the FEPC bill to the House floor in January 1950 through use of the new 21-day rule, which permitted a chairman to call up a bill reported by his committee if it had not been acted upon by the Rules Committee.

In a sudden move all Republicans and southern Democrats on the Rules Committee then backed a resolution to repeal the 21-day rule. This would have the effect of blocking efforts to bring the FEPC bill to the floor. The resolution was brought to the House floor for action only 3 days before the 21-day rule was to have been invoked on the FEPC bill. The repeal resolution was defeated 236 to 183 on January 20, 1950. Sixty-one percent of the House Republicans including all four Republicans on the Rules Committee, voted to repeal the 21-day rule—the originally scheduled vehicle for consideration of the FEPC bill.

By this time, most Republicans had apparently forgotten that their 1948 platform contained this pledge:

> The right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment of just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

Parliamentary maneuvering continued as the Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood bills were then called up under the 21-day rule. A discharge petition was filed on the FEPC bill. Then, as now, most Republicans refused to sign the petition to bring the bill to the floor.

Meanwhile, efforts by Chairman Sabath to obtain a rule again failed. A 5–5 tie vote—a Republican vote plus two Republican absences—blocked consideration. Reluctantly, proponents of the FEPC bill decided to try the Calendar Wednesday procedure.

FEPC opponents employed delaying tactics during the next 5 weeks when Calendar

Wednesday took place. Repeated quorum calls, motions to adjourn, and other parliamentary roadblocks were thrown up.

A final effort to obtain a rule failed by a 6–6 tie vote, as Republicans again teamed up with Southern Democrats on the Rules Committee to block action.

The bill was finally called up on February 22, 1950, under the Calendar Wednesday rule. Thus it took from August 2, 1949—when the bill was first reported—to February 22, 1950, to bring the bill to the floor. This was despite the fact that only 5 committees intervened in the alphabetical listing in the order of call under Calendar Wednesday.

By way of contrast, the call now rests with the Agriculture Committee. The Judiciary Committee is 12 committees below on the alphabetical listing. Surely, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is not serious when he suggests that Calendar Wednesday could be used to bring the present civil rights bill to the floor during this abbreviated session.

He suggests that "all the Committee on Judiciary has to do is to wait until its turn" and says "no other committee has any bill ready, as I understand it and the committee could probably get an early Wednesday."

The gentleman realizes, of course, that bills reported last session may still be called by the respective committee chairmen. I refer him to the calendars of the House, the Union Calendar on pages 19–27 and the House Calendar on pages 31–32, which list several dozen bills reported by the 11 committees which would be called before Judiciary. At this rate, the Judiciary Committee might get "an early Wednesday"—that is, early in the fall, if the Congress remained in session that long.

Certainly, I would favor any attempt to reinstitute Calendar Wednesday as a way in bringing up other legislation reported by standing committees and blocked by the Rules Committee. There are several committees high up in the alphabet with important bills to be called up, such as the area redevelopment bill, the Murray-Metcalf education bill, the Clark-Reuss bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946, and other measures which should be considered on the floor. I submit, however, that this procedure is not the way to obtain prompt action on the civil rights bill.

Returning to a discussion of the 1950 experience under Calendar Wednesday, the parliamentary delaying tactics used against the FEPC bill resulted in seven rollcalls, three quorum calls, and six teller votes. The day's session lasted 15 hours. The bill finally passed was virtually meaningless. There was little opportunity for reasoned debate on the merits of the measure because of the dilatory tactics of the bill's opponents.

It is impossible to legislate intelligently under these conditions. Yet the gentleman from Missouri insists that the only way to consider the civil rights bill is by use of the Calendar Wednesday rule. I say to him that such action would serve to ridicule the institutions of the representative government in the House of Representatives and would provide propaganda for the enemies of democracy throughout the non-Caucasian areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the gentleman from Missouri and his Republican colleagues heed the words of the present chairman of their party's national committee, Mr. THRUSTON MORTON, who, as a Representative from Kentucky, said during the 1950 FEPC debacle:

> It is time that we faced up to this issue and not hide behind parliamentary tricks, or the Committee on Rules, or anything else.

If Republican Members of the House are genuinely concerned over the obvious need for this legislation, they will promptly sign the discharge petition. Otherwise, they will be again repudiating their own party platform and publicly proclaiming their surrender to political expediency. It is abundantly clear that the only way in which the pending civil rights bill, H.R. 8061 can be considered on the floor of the House, be strengthened and made more effective by amendments, and ultimately be passed is through the discharge procedure.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES].

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief.

I welcome the initiative that has been taken by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and others here this afternoon, to enable us to have this full and free discussion.

There is no question in my mind that civil rights is one of the central challenges of our age. It is a major testing ground for American democracy in the eyes of people everywhere, at home and abroad.

Because it is such a crucial and sensitive issue, it offers endless temptations to all politicians who are more interested in a devisive, demagogic issue than they are in promoting honest and meaningful progress. It should now be clear to everyone that the Republican Party has again found these temptations irresistible.

Decent forward-looking Americans want civil rights to be recognized for what it is: a continuing national problem challenging the individual conscience of every American citizen in every American community. By its actions and its failure to act, however, the Republican Party apparently intends to do everything it can to promote sectional controversy, to divide group from group, and to accelerate partisanship.

Those of us who hope for progress on civil rights know that progress must occur on a national and nonpartisan basis. At the moment the Republican leadership here in the Congress is clearly less interested in progress than in promoting sectional controversy for partisan gain.

I should like to make three brief and simple points in this connection:

First. It has been 5½ years since the Supreme Court held that compulsory segregation of public schools was unconstitutional. This decision obviously presented the executive branch of our Government with a major invitation to leadership. For 5½ years the Republican administration has simply defaulted on this obligation to lead. Someone has said that it has given us very little between the platitudes and the bayonets.

The situation has required persistent efforts to call out the best in our national conscience and in constructive community endeavor. It has required the use of all the power and prestige of the Presidency in molding minds and evoking positive responses.

For 5½ long years we have heard the Republican administration tell us that civil rights is largely a question of the hearts and minds of people. Of course it is. But what the Republican administration has given us is a halfhearted, legalistic approach. It has forgotten that time alone will not solve problems; what solves them is the constructive use of time.

Second. I am in full agreement with many of my colleagues here this afternoon on the urgent importance of improved civil rights legislation in this session of Congress, especially in the field of protecting the right to vote. But I earnestly hope that the country will not be diverted by the controversy in Congress. After all, while we debate, the administration could act.

President Roosevelt's wartime FEPC was established by executive order and it diminished racial job discrimination in the war effort. Discrimination in the Armed Forces was ended as a result of President Truman's executive order. In the last 7 years presidential initiative has been wholly lacking.

And yet there is so much that could be done. The President's own Civil Rights Commission, composed exclusively of Democrats from the South and Republicans and Independents from the North, has urged the administration to act. The Commission's report unanimously urged a specific executive order implementing the right to equal opportunity in housing.

The Commission unanimously made four additional recommendations designed to end discrimination in particular Federal housing programs, all of which should be carried out within the executive branch without further congressional action.

The Commission specifically urged the Attorney General to bring civil suits under the 1957 Civil Rights Act in a larger number of districts, saying that the previous efforts of the Justice Department have been "disappointing in number, nature, and results." Instead, the Republican administration prefers to talk and relax on this issue when it might have acted and still can act to perform a historic service.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if there is any remaining doubt of the preoccupation of the Republican leaders in politics and the lack of genuine interest in civil rights we have only to look around us to see what is going on.

While the Attorney General is talking in the morning papers about new legislation on voting rights, we need only three of the four Republican votes on the Rules Committee to report out a civil rights bill. Because these three votes have not been forthcoming we Democrats have taken the lead in preparing and

signing the discharge petition which will bring civil rights legislation to the floor of the House. Our Democratic signatures on that petition now outnumber the Republican more than 5 to 1.

We have heard much about the enormous persuasive power of both the minority leader and of the Vice President of the United States. I do not question their capacity to sway their Republican associates.

I merely express my own sense of frustration that this power is not being used to help us produce the civil rights legislation which the American people want.

If I may be pardoned for saying so I find this modern Republican behavior particularly ironic as we approach the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's inauguration.

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

Mr. BOWLES. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true that the President's heart is not in civil rights? That he merely expresses words but does not follow them up with any action implementing those words?

Mr. BOWLES. I think I am correct when I say the President once said that he had never told even his wife whether he thought the Supreme Court decision was right or wrong. He simply said, "I have been placed in this job to uphold the law. I will do that. I pass no judgment on the rights or wrongs involved."

I would like to make one further observation and that is that this is basically and primarily a moral question. The Congress is left with the responsibility of doing what it can under admittedly very difficult circumstances. It has been brought out here today several times that the Democrats who have signed the discharge petition outnumber the Republicans five to one.

I hardly pick up a newspaper these days or turn on a television set but what I read of some tribute to the persuasive powers of either the minority leader or the Vice President of the United States. These are very realistic statements about persuasive powers and there is considerable frustration that those persuasive powers are not being used.

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

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

Mr. HECHLER. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from New York regarding the President's position on civil rights, I would like to underline what he said at a press conference yesterday on that subject. When asked about the proposals of the Civil Rights Commission the President responded, in response to the question, "Do you have anything new that you could say?":

> Yes. I think that you will—the Attorney General has another plan that he thinks, within the framework of existing law, will improve very much the procedures that have been followed. And it is somewhat technical, exactly what the jurisdiction and the action possible for judges to take. So I would suggest to get the thing exactly, so it is not subject to misinterpretation, you should go to him, because it is a bit of a—it is a legalistic amendment that it would be difficult for me to describe in detail.

Later, the President was asked to expand on the Attorney General's civil rights proposals, and all the President could say was:

> We stand by the recommendations we've already made. But he thinks he's got a scheme that will make the insurance of the voting right more firm, and that is the thing you should talk to him about so then you know exactly what he's got in mind.

This underlines the point that if the President wished to exert leadership on this civil rights, he certainly would not have passed the buck; he would have spoken forcefully instead of the way he did in his press conference yesterday.

Mr. BOWLES. I think the gentleman is quite right.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would not my good friend, who has made such a distinguished career in the part of the world where the challenge of communism is so great, comment to some degree as to whether or not the failure to pass an effective civil rights bill will not seriously hamper us in our effort to hold and to maintain allies who are against communism in the world?

Mr. BOWLES. I think the gentleman is right. This is very fundamental to our world position. Two-thirds of the people of the world have darker skins than most of us. This is the issue to many of them as they look at the democratic West constantly asking the question: Do we really mean the things that we say? Does the Declaration of Independence mean what it says, that all men are created equal?

This is a fundamental weakness of our country as we stand here today. I would like to stress, however, the fact that we have made a great deal of progress. We have probably made more progress in the last 15 years since the war than in any comparable period in our history. But the pressure to make still further progress is greatly increased in the meantime, and we lag behind in the course of world events. The gap between our action and the hopes and beliefs of multitudes of other people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is growing greater all the time. This is a crucial question not only for us as citizens living in a democracy, but for our world security—for our whole position in the world.

I would like to say finally that I hope we will do the things that are required, not because we are afraid of Russia or afraid of any other foreign power, but because we know these things are right and we are acting on them basically with that in mind.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut for his very constructive statement.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to associate myself with the splendid talk that was just given by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I have the honor to serve, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and with all of the statements that he made in connection with civil rights. I also want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] who presented a very, very fine statement in connection with civil rights.

Thirdly, I was extremely interested in the presentation of the history of the Committee on Rules and in connection with the methods which were used to inspire the rules relating to Calendar Wednesday and the rules relating to the discharge petition. I must slightly disagree with the gentleman who yielded to me when he modified the procedure by calling it extraordinary. In my own view I do not consider the procedure extraordinary, relating to the use of this means to get a bill before the House. All of the rules that are presented to the Members of the House are entitled to equal consideration. While some of the rules are seldom used, they all show the method by which legislation can be brought to the floor, and I think that the method used here is legitimate, qualified, and a proper method in order to bring legislation before the Members of the House so that they can decide how they want to vote. Therefore, I feel that the smokescreen should be set aside and the method which has been used for the purpose of bringing this legislation to the floor should be supported.

Mr. Speaker, the present civil rights bill which is the subject of the petition for signatures is a watered down version of the bill originally presented by the administration in the first half of the 86th Congress. It contains only those titles which could pass the Judiciary Committee after the rejection of title III which was sponsored by Chairman CELLER, of the committee. The other rejected titles were part of the administration's alleged civil rights programs.

In view of this situation, how can the Republican Members in a sincere manner avoid signing the petition merely on the pretext of a procedural objection? Some of the minority Members have had the sincerity to sign the petition because they believe that the civil rights bill should be considered by the Congress despite some procedural difficulties. Others, however, have apparently availed themselves of the opportunity to hide behind the device of the technical procedural difficulty. The Democrats who have signed the petition are supporting a bill containing Republican-sponsored provisions. The Republicans who do not sign are not even supporting their own administration. Why don't the Republicans join the Democrats in supporting the petition to get the bill to the floor which at least represents the administration's position on civil rights? This will eliminate the question regarding the sincerity of the Members of Congress in connection with their interest in civil rights legislation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks uttered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the

chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I subscribe heartily to what they said about charges of lack of good faith on the part of some members of the Republican Party.

The right to vote is the cornerstone of the Republic, and the key to all other civil rights. Upon this American fundamental, in the course of enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1957, there was agreement between Democrat and Republican, North and South, executive and legislative branches. Today no such agreement exists. The President on the one hand speaks of civil rights then does not act. The Attorney General at the late hour presents a bill which eliminates the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, eliminates the recommendations of the Judiciary Committee, and at this late hour submits a bill this day.

The Republican Members who supported the civil rights bill in 1957 are silent. They sit, with the exception of a few, just gloating about the inability of this House to obtain an effective civil rights bill. In 1957 the Republicans indicated what they thought about it. What has happened to change their points of view?

In 1957 the then Attorney General, Herbert Brownell said:

> The right to vote is really the cornerstone of our representative form of government. I would say that it is the one right, perhaps more than any other, upon which all other constitutional rights depend for their effective protection, and accordingly it must be zealously safeguarded.

The majority leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, a Democrat from Texas, in 1957 stated:

> I voted for the civil rights bill because I believe that the right to vote is the most important instrument for securing justice. I was convinced that steps were needed to safeguard that right.

Said Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts:

> No one can deny that the right to vote is a fundamental, inalienable right of all people in a democracy. Every other constitutional right depends upon it. Without this, we have only an illusion of true democracy; history has shown us that when this basic right is abrogated democracy and freedom fail.

Said Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois:

> If we can help to restore and maintain this right to vote, many of the other present discriminations practiced against Negroes, Indians, and Mexican-Americans will be self-correcting.

The history of democracy in the United States is essentially the story of a great ideal of the dignity and rights of every human being, a cautious constitutional beginning of self-government, and then a long, still unfinished growth toward realization of the ideal. No feature of that growth has been more significant than the evolution which has occurred in the American concept of voting. The new Nation began with a prevailing attitude that the right to vote should be limited to the few who prove themselves qualified, usually by ownership of property. Gradually the Nation shifted to the modern concept that voting is a right which belongs to every citizen except the few who are specifically disqualified by the qualification requirements of their States.

One of the most unpleasant facts for many years in many areas of our country is the inability of citizens to vote because of their race or color. Certain States have imposed obstacles either in the form of poll taxes or artificial barriers.

In 1944, a presidential election year—and I do not know whether the number of citizens voting then has brought the present thinking of the Republican Party and whether that is why they may be acting as they are—in the poll tax States, of which there were eight, 18 percent of of the people voted for the President. In the nonpoll tax States, 68 percent of the people voted for President. Such obstacles which have been put up in front of the voters in these poll tax States have been unfair to the American citizen. The Nation has been deeply concerned with it.

Some people want to remove the obstacles and others to make them more difficult. In recent times there has grown up a strong national determination to end racial discrimination in all its forms. It is particularly important today in voting. Discrimination in that field is totally inconsistent with our democratic system and our way of life. Then, too, the opportunity to use the ballot is a principal means by which other forms of racial discrimination may be combated.

Today one of the newspaper writers in the Washington Daily News has this to say about the recommendation made by the Attorney General only this day:

> Attorney General William P. Rogers' new plan to have Federal district court judges name U.S. voting referees to certify that qualified citizens can vote in both Federal and State elections represents a sharp shift in administration civil rights policy.
>
> In his January 13 press conference, President Eisenhower raised doubts about the constitutionality of a Civil Rights Commission recommendation to have him name temporary Federal election registrars. Their function would be to register for Federal elections any citizens denied their legal voting rights by reason of race or color.
>
> Also, the President said he didn't want anything to get in the road of his administration's six civil rights amendments now pending before Congress.
>
> If there was any idea this dash of cold water would freeze the proposal for Federal supervision of election machinery, it was wrong. There is more steam pressure behind this recommendation than had been figured. Also, the arguments in favor of its constitutionality are more than ample.
>
> So instead of opposing the idea and saying that it is unworkable, Attorney General Rogers has come up with an administration proposal which he thinks even better.
>
> Civil Rights Commission's original recommendation may have been administratively bad in that it piled a heavy workload on the already overburdened White House.
>
> The President would have had to receive many thousand affidavits on denial of voting rights. He would then have had to appoint the Federal registrars to take corrective action.
>
> Civil Rights Commission's idea in this was that the registrars would need Presidential authority behind them to get respect and compliance with their orders.
>
> Attorney General Rogers thinks he has found a way to sweep all this responsibility off the President's desk. If a citizen qualified to vote under State law is denied his right to register and vote, he could go to the U.S. district attorney's office, the FBI, a U.S. commissioner, or a Federal court to file his complaint.
>
> The Federal judge would then appoint a voting referee—similar to a referee in bankruptcy or a special master—who could certify to State officials that the applicant is entitled to register and vote.
>
> Court appointed referees would be given further powers to visit the polls on election day to insure that certified voters do vote and that their votes are counted. If voters are denied these rights, referees could then report back to the court and contempt proceedings could be initiated against State election officials, or the States themselves, if the officials vacate their offices.
>
> It is conceded that this new, seventh administration civil rights proposal cannot be enacted by Congress in time to be effective in the 1960 elections. Even if the amendment is passed, there are bound to be obstructions. States rights Senators might even filibuster to defeat it.

This bill at this late date is a camouflage to hide the intent of the Republican Party to prevent civil rights legislation this year and to avoid blame for the failure to pass a civil rights bill.

The bill presented by the Attorney General, before it can be considered by the House, must be considered by the Judiciary Committee, then it must obtain a rule. If we cannot obtain a rule for H.R. 8601, which is on the desk and for which we are signing a petition, do you think we can get a rule on the Attorney General's bill? Of course we cannot. Other available procedures have been demonstrated by previous speakers to be ineffective.

This civil rights bill has not only domestic effects, but international implications. The great internationalist Member of this House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES], pointed out the importance of this legislation.

During my trips to the Far East, I recognized the fact that the people are looking to the United States for leadership in democracy. The President has asked for $4,200 million to spread around the world to teach people the elements and fundamentals of democracy. Two billion dollars of that sum is going for economic recovery. We tell these people, "You should become Democrats in spirit and you should follow the spirit of democracy." Yet, here at home we refuse minority groups the right to vote. We say to the peoples in foreign lands, "Do not look at what we do—just listen to what we say."

Mr. Speaker, if we do not practice democracy in the United States, do you think the peoples of the world who are looking to us for leadership in the field of democracy will follow our lead? Certainly, we know that they are looking for that leadership. This Congress does not have it in the field of civil rights. The administration has not been able to tell the members of their party that they should come up here and sign this petition. I commend those Republicans who have signed the petition. Those who have not signed it have made their choice—they are against civil rights.

The record is there for all to see. A missing name means opposition to the right of citizens to vote. Any explanation or rationalization will not remove the stigma or the responsibility. In conclusion, I say to the Republicans, to those who are in the Chamber or to those who may read the RECORD later—"Republicans arise and sign the petition, or else you shall ever be condemned."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his fine statement.

THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT, GROWTH, AND PRICE LEVELS PROVIDES THE FACTS UNDERLYING CENTRAL ECONOMIC ISSUES; PROVIDES AN IMPORTANT POLICY GUIDE FOR CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was almost a year ago that the Joint Economic Committee embarked upon one of the most intensive and thoroughgoing investigations and studies of our economic system that has ever been made of any nation's economy. Yesterday the committee filed its report setting out the facts and its conclusions and judgments on a great many of the issues of public policy which have plagued us for several years.

As the Members will recall, this study was authorized by a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House. It was undertaken in response to a widespread desire on the part of Members of Congress, as well as the general public, that the answers be found to some of the major public policy questions which have been under wide discussion—and the subject of some dispute.

THE COMMITTEE HAS DONE A MONUMENTAL JOB

During the course of this study, the committee heard at least a hundred expert witnesses from the Nation's universities, from the Federal bureaus, and from private banking and industry. In addition, the committee has had the benefit of many study papers submitted by competent researchers and experts in particular fields of economics. And beyond that, the committee's expert and devoted staff has collected a monumental amount of information and have themselves contributed detailed analyses and study papers. In this the committee was fortunate to have an expert staff recruited especially for this study, plus several members of its permanent staff. These economists came from academic life—from the Nation's universities—and were chosen by the committee chairman for their high competence and objectivity, without respect to any political preferences these economists may have, if any.

It has been a monumental job and the Congress has, I think, been extremely fortunate to have such a man as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, to chairman this study. Senator DOUGLAS is, as we all know, an economist of the highest stature and accomplishments, a past president of the American Economic Association, and a distinguished teacher and educator before coming to Congress. I have never known any man to go at a task with greater energies, greater devotion, and more objectivity and fairmindedness than Senator DOUGLAS has given to this investigation and study.

Needless to say, the committee's report has not assembled all the wisdom of the ages and it has not discovered all economic truths for all time. Only people who believe in fairy godmothers, government by slogan, and such things, would expect otherwise.

The committee's investigation has, however, extended the frontiers of knowledge in a great degree, and this is the most that reasonable men would expect or even hope for.

All members of the committee do not, of course, agree in all of the conclusions and recommendations. As a member of the committee I myself am in disagreement with some of these conclusions and recommendations, and, in fact, I felt compelled to file supplemental views setting out my disagreements. Furthermore, these points are important and I feel very strongly about them.

In fairness, however, I should say that the differences between my views and those of the majority of the committee are largely differences of degree. They are mostly differences over how far we should go in correcting the problems that have been found. There are almost no differences over questions of fact or over questions of the economic and legal principles involved. In only one instance to my knowledge has the committee's report made a statement which purports to be historical fact but is in error, and in this instance the committee's report simply repeats a common belief about a situation which prevailed prior to the so-called Treasury-Federal Reserve accord of 1951 without going back to review the actual facts of that situation.

I am not speaking, of course, for the minority members of the committee. They did not see fit to join in the report for reasons which they can and, I am sure, will explain for themselves.

What are the most important things we can learn from the committee's report? The most important findings and recommendations, it seems to me, are these.

INFLATION NOT CAUSED BY TOO MUCH MONEY; MONETARY POLICIES SHOULD BE CHANGED

First, the question of inflation. All the evidence shows that the increases in prices since the end of the Korean hostilities have not been caused by monetary inflation. In other words, the price increases have not been a result of too many dollars chasing too few goods. On the contrary, the price increases have come from other causes and the committee has found that actually there are not enough dollars. The Federal Reserve has not permitted the money supply to increase as rapidly as the economy was trying to grow, and it has, therefore, retarded the normal increase in the gross national product.

In other words, the financial doctors have been fighting the inflation disease with the wrong medicine and this medicine has had several near-disastrous side effects. It has changed the income distribution, cut into consumer demand, had an especially adverse impact on housing, retarded school building and construction of other community facilities, tended to squeeze out small business, and, as I have indicated, slowed our annual rate of economic growth.

In the light of the fact that the committee has found that the wrong medicine has been and is being used, the committee recommends less reliance in the future upon this particular medicine. It recommends that the Federal Reserve permit the money supply to increase at the same rate at which the output of goods and services increases. This is the idea on which the Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913, and was one of the basic reasons for establishing the Federal Reserve System.

What then should the Government do to help maintain economic stability? The committee recommends more reliance upon sound fiscal practices. It feels that when recessions set in, there should be temporary but quick and substantial tax cuts to stimulate demand. On the other side of the coin, the committee recommends that in prosperous times, we pay off some of the Federal debt. Further, the committee recommends a variety of things to close what it calls loopholes in the tax laws to help add to budget surpluses.

HOW INTEREST RATES CAN AND SHOULD BE LOWERED

Second, on the question of interest rates. The committee finds that interest rates are now much too high and have been for most of the period since the present administration embarked upon an all-out tight-money and high-interest policy as a way of trying to combat inflation. Consequently, the committee does not support the idea of lifting the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds. It strongly recommends just the opposite, namely, that interest yields on Government bonds be brought down and, consequently, that all interest rates be brought down.

NO REASON TO REMOVE THE CEILING ON GOVERNMENT BOND RATES

If the Federal Reserve System promptly changes its policy and allows some of the accumulated deficit in the money supply to be removed, interest rates will immediately drop.

Beyond this, the committee recommends several reforms in practices of both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury which will also bring about reductions in the level of interest rates even beyond those which a proper increase in the money supply will bring about. There is now high-interest bias in the attitudes of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury, and the committee's recommendations would eliminate some of the practices by which the high-interest bias is effectuated. Principally the recommendations are these:

First. The Treasury should depend upon its own staff advice for determining what the interest rates and other terms should be on the new securities it issues, rather than depending upon the

advice of certain advisory committees drawn from the financial groups who are going to purchase these securities.

Second. That the Treasury sell its long-term securities on the basis of competitive bidding rather than on the basis of what is now an essentially negotiated price system. Further, that the Treasury sell long-term securities at times when interest rates are low, which would be a reversal of its present policy. Despite all the statements we have heard about the necessity of lengthening the Federal debt, shifting more of the debt to the long term, the Treasury has, on the whole, shifted the maturity of the debt and it has followed the practice of issuing short-term securities at times when interest rates were relatively low and issued long-term securities only at times when interest rates were extremely high. This practice results, of course, in the Federal Government's paying the maximum amount of carrying charges on the Federal debt rather than the minimum amount.

Third. That the Federal Reserve abandon its so-called "bills only" policy. This means that when and as the Federal Reserve purchases Government securities in the future, it should purchase a variety of securities at different maturities and not just the short-term Treasury bills. I might explain that this "bills only" policy is one which the Federal Reserve adopted itself and tied its own hands in 1953. It was not a policy prior to that time. And I might illustrate the consequences. In early 1958, the Federal Reserve was following a policy of what it called "monetary ease." It was deliberately bringing about reductions in interest rates for the purpose of stimulating investment. Yet it was following a policy of buying Treasury bills on the theory that there is such a close and immediate connection between short-term rates and long-term rates that by bringing the short-term rates down it would bring the long-term rates down. In truth it succeeded in bringing the long-term rates down very little, yet these are the rates which most directly affect investment in new productive facilities, investment in housing, school buildings, and so on.

TO INCREASE ITS MONEY SUPPLY, THE FEDERAL RESERVE SHOULD BUY GOVERNMENT SECURITIES, NOT REDUCE RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Finally, as another most important means of bringing down interest rates, as well as stopping a diversion of Treasury revenues, the committee recommends that when the Federal Reserve brings about a given increase in the money supply, it do so by purchasing Government securities in the open market and thus add to its holdings of these securities, rather than by reducing reserve requirements of the member banks. Increasing the money supply by the method the committee recommends means that the Federal Reserve will acquire more Government securities which will, in effect, be taken off the market, and the interest payments on these securities will go back into the Treasury and help reduce the Federal debt. The alternative method which the Federal Reserve has been following recently means that the private banks are permitted to create a larger proportion of any new money that is created. The private banks thus acquire more Government securities and the interest payments on these securities go into bank profits.

CAUSES OF INFLATION IDENTIFIED

The causes of inflation: The facts are indisputable that price increases have not been caused by an excessive money supply. On the contrary, the Federal Reserve has steadily reduced the supply of money and credit relative to the gross national product of the country. While the amount of goods and services being produced has been increasing at an average rate of 2½ percent a year, the Federal Reserve has consciously and deliberately held down increases in the money supply and made available less money and credit to finance production and transactions in these goods and services. The price increases have not resulted from too much consumer demand, with certain exceptions, and even in these exceptions tightening the money supply does not correct the problem. There have been shortages in certain services, such as medical services, and increasing costs in these fields have accompanied the supply-demand situation, which is what we would expect and, indeed, what we would wish to happen in a properly operating supply-demand price system.

On the other hand, the price increases in the big administered price industries have not reflected a supply-demand situation. They have come about as a result of great concentrations of market power and the arbitrary jacking up of prices even in the face of falling demand. These big corporations can and have increased prices to meet wage demands of the big labor unions and to increase their profits as well.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHECKING INFLATION

The committee recommends, therefore, a step by which it hopes to bring about more voluntary restraints in the exercise of great market power, both on the part of the unions and the big industries. It recommends an annual conference of the leaders of labor, management, and Government. And it recommends also, at least on a standby basis, a Government factfinding procedure in important price and wage disputes.

RECOMMENDS REPEAL OF FEDERAL DEBT CEILING—THE REASONS

In addition, the committee makes several recommendations for strengthening the antitrust laws and for tariff reductions, by which it is hoped that there will be a gradual injection or restoration of more competition into the administered price industries.

As to the Federal debt ceiling. The committee recommends its repeal. On careful investigation of the causes of the 1957–58 recession, it became clear that the recession was precipitated by the sudden and sharp cutback in defense expenditures in the summer of 1957. At that time the Federal debt was pressing against the then prevailing legal debt limitation. And for reasons best known to itself, the administration preferred not to ask for an increase in the debt ceiling, but instead made a sharp suspension in the funds which had been appropriated for defense purposes. Then, of course, after the recession had come into full bloom, the administration asked Congress early in 1958 to lift the debt ceiling. This was promptly done. Defense spending was restored, and this began to pull the economy out of the recession by mid-1958, which many people consider to be a record time from recession to recovery. But it would have been much better not to have had the recession in the first place. We should not have had the great unemployment, the human suffering, the loss of production, and the Federal deficit which resulted.

To avoid the possibility that some administration may in the future be inclined to follow such a course rather than face what it considers to be a political embarrassment in asking for an increase in the debt ceiling, the committee feels that the debt ceiling should be repealed.

The committee has not attempted to make any findings as to how the administration's actions in 1957 may have affected the Nation's defense preparedness. Later I expect to discuss my personal views on this subject.

Finally, the committee's other major recommendations lie in the field of taxes. It recommends, as I have indicated, quick and substantial but temporary cutbacks (reductions) in taxes when recession forces set in. Furthermore, it recommends a variety of amendments to the tax laws to close what it has called loopholes, to bring about better enforcement of the tax laws and, it believes, to bring about increases in tax revenues.

On the whole, the committee's report deals factually and objectively with the problems of inflation, unemployment, light interest policies, economic stagnation versus economic growth, and many other facets of our economic system. And it advances for the most part sound proposals for dealing with these problems.

As I have indicated, however, I feel that the committee's proposals are weak in certain respects and that two or three of its recommendations are bad.

Let me summarize the points on which I disagree.

1. CONGRESS SHOULD SPECIFY THE RATE AT WHICH THE FEDERAL RESERVE IS TO INCREASE THE MONEY SUPPLY

The committee's recommendations on this point are not specific enough and they do not include proposals by which Congress can assure itself that economic policies enacted by constitutional means will be carried out.

The committee recommends less reliance on monetary controls and it recommends a specific rate at which the money supply should be allowed to increase. This rate would suggest that there is to be very little reliance on monetary controls. But there is nothing to prevent the Federal Reserve from going its headlong way, as it has in the past, imposing tight money and high interest. I feel that Congress should pass legislation at the beginning of each year specifying the rate at which the money supply shall be

permitted to increase. After all, this is a responsibility of the Congress. The Congress has the power and the duty under the Constitution to create money and regulate its value.

2. CONGRESS SHOULD FIX A CEILING BEYOND WHICH THE FEDERAL RESERVE CANNOT INCREASE BOND YIELDS

The committee's report strongly recommends that the Federal Reserve bring down interest yields on Government bonds and, consequently, bring down all interest rates. But it is not specific as to what the maximum yield on Government bonds should be. In fact, the committee's report repeatedly states that it is not recommending any specific maximum, which would be what it calls "bond pegging." This recommendation is based upon an erroneous impression of the facts concerning the period in which the Government did have a ceiling of 2½ percent on long-term bonds. The committee's report repeats a much publicized fallacy which is to this effect: In order to maintain a ceiling of 2½ percent on Government bond yields in the post-World War II period, the Federal Reserve was forced to buy vast amounts of these bonds from the open market. And furthermore—although the logic does not necessarily follow—buying these bonds increased bank reserves, permitted the banks to create too much money, and this caused inflation.

The fact is that the Federal Reserve had to buy Government securities on very few occasions in order to keep the bond yield at a maximum of 2½ percent. All it had to do was announce it stood ready to buy Government securities.

IN POST WORLD WAR II YEARS THE FEDERAL RESERVE KEPT BONDS YIELDS AT A CEILING OF 2½ PERCENT, WHILE REDUCING ITS HOLDINGS OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

And contrary to all of the allegations, a look at the record will show that in the 4 postwar years immediately preceding the so-called Treasury-Federal Reserve accord of February 1951, the Federal Reserve did not increase its holdings of Government securities at all. In point of fact, it reduced its holdings by $2.5 billion during this period.

Furthermore, a look at the record will show that in these years the real increase in the gross national product—that is, in constant dollars—was 12.6 percent. The money supply was permitted to increase by only 5.6 percent, or considerably less than half the real growth in the economy.

In the year 1950, just preceding the accord, the money supply was increased by 2½ percent while the real increase in the gross national product was 8.7 percent, or 3½ times the rate of increase in the money supply. So obviously the facts do not accord with the theory that the price increases of the preaccord years was a monetary inflation. The money supply in these years was increased at a much lesser rate than the rule which the committee now recommends, which is that the money supply should increase at the same rate as the increase in the gross national product.

Let me add a postscript to this point. The committee strongly recommends that monetary policy should be coordinated with the Government's other policies and this is, in my view, a right step and a very badly needed step. Prior to the so-called accord of 1951, the Government's policies were coordinated. There was even a clear and a firm understanding as to what the Federal Reserve would do. There was an understanding that it would not raise interest rates to the point where yields on Government bonds exceeded 2½ percent. There should be that same degree of coordination today, and the maximum yield on Government bonds should be established at 2½ percent.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE HAS VETOED POLICIES ESTABLISHED BY CONSTITUTIONAL MEANS; SOMEONE SHOULD HAVE RESPONSIBILITY TO THE PEOPLE FOR ITS DECISIONS

Furthermore, the Federal Reserve System should be brought back into the Government, from which it has seceded. The accord of 1951, while it may have seemed innocent enough at the time, has been taken as a basis for this administration's disclaiming any responsibility for the Federal Reserve's tight-money and high-interest policies. It has been taken as the basis for setting the Federal Reserve up in the public view as an independent fourth branch of the Government, making political decisions affecting and disrupting the whole economy and carrying no political responsibility to the people for its actions.

To illustrate, the committee now finds that the biggest impact of the tight-money and high-interest policies has been on the housing industry. This means that the Federal Reserve has pursued policies which have overruled and counteracted policies established by constitutional means. The Congress has passed bills and the President has signed bills to increase homebuilding, and the Federal Reserve has imposed policies which decreased homebuilding. The same can be said for small business credit.

Furthermore, there should be at least one essential reform within the Federal Reserve. At present, the Federal Reserve Open Market Committee determines credit and interest-rate policies for the United States, and this committee is composed of seven public members—the Board of Governors—and five elected representatives of the private bankers. The Open Market Committee should be abolished and its duties—such as those that will remain—should be put in the hands of a board of publicly appointed members.

3. CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS ARE NOT NEEDED; WILL BE USED TO ELIMINATE COMPETITION

Consumer credit controls: The Committee's report recommends that the Federal Reserve be given standby authority to regulate consumer credit. This authority would mean that the Federal Reserve could at any time it saw fit to issue regulations setting minimum downpayments and maximum terms of payment for consumer credit, extended not only by the member banks, but by finance companies, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and other financial institutions in the consumer-credit field.

This recommendation may sound harmless enough since the controls are to be only standby controls. The suggestion would seem to be that the authority would be used only in the event it is actually needed. There is no foreseeable need for the authority, however, and it very likely would be used and with some very unwholesome consequences.

Certain segments of the financial community have been conducting a tremendous campaign for these standby controls ever since 1955, and the campaign has been no less vigorous in recession times than it has been in boom times. It has all the earmarks of the campaign which ended in 1935 with the passage of the law which prohibits commercial banks from paying interest to their depositors on demand deposits. What could not be accomplished by private means was accomplished by law. Competition among the commercial banks for the patronage of depositors was stopped and the commercial banks now receive, as it were, their raw materials free of charge.

The principal competition for the consumer credit business today is in the variety of terms as to downpayments and payment periods which the various types of financial institutions offer the consumer. And those institutions which cannot meet, or do not care to meet the more generous terms as to downpayments and periods of payment have to try to entice the consumer with lower interest rates. If we permit the Federal Reserve to bring about a standardization in downpayments and terms of payment and thus stop competition in these services, the elimination of competition in interest rates will quickly follow. Therefore, I am opposed to giving the Federal Reserve authority to regulate consumer installment credit. It will be under tremendous pressure to use that authority. It is already under pressure to recommend the authority.

UNDER CONSUMER CREDIT REGULATION, FEDERAL RESERVE SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SET MAXIMUM INTEREST CHARGES ON CONSUMERS

If the Congress should take a different view of this matter and give the Federal Reserve such authority, it should certainly include a requirement that the Federal Reserve set maximum interest rates which consumers could be charged, for two reasons:

(a) This would tend to give the consumer some safeguard against exorbitant interest charges which competition now tends to provide.

(b) While the proposal appears to be for the purpose of restraining consumer demand in periods when it is too high, it does not provide for stimulating consumer demand when it is too low, which is the more usual state. Therefore, the Federal Reserve should be required to reduce interest rates on consumer credit in such periods in order to stimulate consumer purchases.

BUSINESS CREDIT CONTROLS ARE MOST NEEDED; FEDERAL RESERVE HAS SQUEEZED CONSUMER CREDIT TO STOP BUSINESS INVESTMENT BOOM

Furthermore, if the Federal Reserve is to be authorized to operate selective credit controls, then it must, by all means, be authorized to control business

credit. This is where the real need is. The Federal Reserve has repeatedly used its blunderbuss method of tight money and high interest on the whole economy when all it was trying to do was restrain business investment. And this blunderbuss, as usual, hit, and with devastating results, everything except what it was intended to hit. Let me illustrate:

At the end of the disastrous credit squeeze of 1957, we had the Federal Reserve authorities before the House Small Business Committee and asked them specifically what it was in the economic situation they were trying to correct by their tight-money and high-interest policies. They finally gave, which is quite unusual, a plain and simple answer. They said that they felt that the expansion of business capacity was going too fast, that capacity was outrunning growth in consumer demand, and that if the investment boom were not dampened, then it would lead to a worse "bust" later. Finally, after the recession had been brought on and these authorities were asked what was to be done, their position was that nothing was to be done, that "adjustments would take place in the market," and they hoped soon business investments would pick up again and pull us out of the recession. The point is that the consumer demand which had not been increasing fast enough in the Federal Reserve's view was being siphoned off by the very high-interest policy they were using to try to correct the problem.

HAS GIVEN AWAY GOVERNMENT SECURITIES TO HELP CONSUMERS OUT OF A RECESSION

As to what the Federal Reserve actually did do, supposedly in an effort to help get the country out of recession, was to reduce required reserves of the member banks. Their explanation for this action was that it was intended that the banks would create the additional money they were permitted to create to extend credit to business and consumers and help stimulate economic activity. But what the banks did do was to use this money-creating power to acquire an additional $10.5 billion of Government securities, and, as I have indicated, despite this giveaway, the Federal Reserve still did not bring about much of a reduction in the long-term rate. It had its own hands tied with its own "bills only" policy. And it had both its hands and its heart tied with its own pigheaded determination to allow the banks to acquire, free of charge, more Government securities in an amount equal to the wealth of many nations, rather than acquiring those securities themselves.

Yes; the country came out of the recession in spite of everything the Federal Reserve did, not because of anything the Federal Reserve did. But it came out more deeply in debt and more firmly committed to the high-interest policy than ever before.

There is another aspect of business investment which is recognized as an even more chronic, destabilizing influence in the economy than plant expansions. This is the periodic "booms" and "busts" in inventories—inventory speculations and then inventory liquidations.

If the Federal Reserve is to be permitted to try to regulate the economic system at all—which I oppose—then it should certainly have authority to operate selective controls over business credit. Furthermore, this authority should extend to the insurance companies, the investment banks, the investment trusts, the mutual savings banks, and the other sources of business credit.

I might note that the American Bankers Association has warmly applauded the recommendation for consumer credit controls. It has, however, strongly objected to the proposal that the question of business credit controls even be studied.

4. RESERVE BANK CREDIT TO THE MEMBER BANKS SHOULD NOT ALL BE CHANNELLED THROUGH THE NEW YORK BANKS AND THE PROFESSIONAL SECURITIES DEALERS

The committee recommends that substantially all credit extended by the Federal Reserve System to the member banks be extended through the open-market operations of the New York bank. It would have the other 11 regional banks extend no credit to the member banks except when a particular member bank "is in serious difficulty." I believe this recommendation is wrong.

Contrary to the public impression recently created, the member banks of the Federal Reserve System have no automatic privilege of borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks, by means of loans, rediscounts, or otherwise. The member banks now hold about $50 billion in U.S. Government securities, long term and short term. Again contrary to the recently created public impression, one type of Federal debt obligation is no more eligible as security for a member bank loan with a Federal Reserve bank than any other type of Federal debt obligation. Furthermore, if member bank borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks were limited only by their ability to pledge Government securities and their willingness to pay the going discount rate, it is probable that substantially all of the $50 billion of Federal securities they hold would now be so pledged. Yet at the current writing, the Federal Reserve bank credit outstanding to the member banks is in the neighborhood of only $1 billion. The fact is that extensions of credit by the regional banks is rigidly limited by rules and regulations of the Board of Governors.

The danger, as I see it, is not that the Federal Reserve banks may extend credit to the member banks in excess of the amounts contemplated by the Open Market Committee policy determinations, but that an insufficient portion of Federal Reserve credit is extended through the regional banks.

True, as a general rule increases in Federal Reserve credit should be made through open market activities—that is, by the Federal Reserve's acquiring more Government securities from the open market. I heartily agree with the Commmittee's recommendation on this point and applaud them for making it.

5. THE FED'S BUYING AND SELLING GOVERNMENT SECURITIES THROUGH WALL STREET DEALERS HELPS NEW YORK BANKS MOST, NOT BANKS IN THE REST OF THE COUNTRY

Putting bank reserves into the system at New York or taking them out at New York does not, however, provide an adequate means for taking care of regional differences in credit needs. Indeed, there are times when the country as a whole is enjoying prosperity and particular regions of the country are experiencing something less than prosperity. Furthermore, the professional Government securities dealers cannot be counted on to serve adequately the smaller banks removed from urban centers as a means of adjusting their bank reserves. This may need a word of explanation. The so-called open market dealers are, as the Committee's report points out, few indeed. There are only 17, though there are said to be certain professional sub-dealers trading in Government securities in some of the cities other than New York.

When the Open Market Committee operations were established, the Federal Reserve authorities tried to model these operations, it appears, much on the operations of the Bank of England. The Bank of England, it is understood, puts in or takes out reserves from the banking system at one city—London. Credit adjustments made at this one "money market" are then transmitted throughout the land by reason of the existence of chain banks, with headquarters in London. In the absence of such scale banking in the United States, the Federal Reserve authorities brought the professional securities dealers into the system, as a buffer between the Federal Reserve and its member banks, to carry on this function of distributing available credit among the various regions and localities in accordance with their relative demands for credit. Thus additional reserves are put into the banking system at New York where the initial loan or investment may be made by the New York banks and from whence the reserves may flow to other areas as banks deposits are transferred to other areas in the course of commerce. Or banks in the other areas of the country may sell some of their holdings of Government securities to a securities dealer and thus obtain cash which may be deposited with a regional Federal Reserve bank to obtain increased reserves.

In the nonurban areas, however, the member banks have difficulties in obtaining prompt market quotations from the professional dealers as they also have difficulties in knowing what the dealers' usual bid and offer prices are. It is partly for this reason that the various regional banks buy and sell Government securities for the member banks, at their request.

One of the absurdities of the present practices of the Open Market Committee is, however, that the New York Federal Reserve Bank, which does the buying and selling of Government securities for the whole system, is not permitted to buy directly from other Federal Reserve banks or sell directly to other Federal Reserve banks. In other words, at the very time a regional Federal Reserve

bank may be selling Government securities, as an agent for the member bank, to a professional securities dealer, the New York bank may be buying the identical securities from the same or another professional securities dealer. Presumably the securities dealers make a customary profit on both transactions and the Federal Reserve banks are, in effect, paying a double profit to the securities dealer for transferring Government securities from one Federal Reserve bank to another.

It is my view that the New York Federal Reserve Bank should buy and sell Government securities directly for the other Federal Reserve banks. It is also my view that what little flexibility and what little practical powers the Federal Reserve banks other than the New York bank have left for serving the credit needs of the various regions should not be further reduced.

Furthermore, I am strongly inclined to think that the Federal Reserve should drop its system of making adjustments in bank reserves through the toll gate of the 17 Wall Street dealers. It might do better to announce its price and then do its buying and selling of Government securities directly with the member banks. In this way it would equalize credit availability and interest rates over the country, and it would avoid what is presently a rigged market in Government securities.

6. MORE STRENGTHENING OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS IS NEEDED

While the committee has made a number of specific recommendations for strengthening the antitrust laws, I do not believe these go far enough. Furthermore, one of its recommendations, while well-meaning, involves a bad principle. This is the recommendation that the Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust be given subpena powers to investigate civil violations of the Sherman Act. To give an officer of the executive branch powers to bypass the grand jury would, in effect, bypass a fundamental constitutional safeguard.

I have suggested a number of other steps to strengthen the antitrust laws which I will not deal with in detail at this time. Mostly they go to this objective: Our antitrust laws should give small business a better chance to compete. They should make competition, as we know it, less a contest of market power and more a contest of efficiency. I believe that the man who can build, sell, and deliver a mousetrap for 5 cents should have a chance to survive against the big corporation which builds, sells, and delivers a mousetrap for 10 cents. But under present circumstances it is the big corporation with the 10-cent mousetrap that wins out and the small man with the 5-cent mousetrap that loses out.

Further, there should be legislation to correct the abuses of settling antitrust suits by consent decrees. These abuses have recently been most flagrant.

7. MORE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF FEDERAL TAXES IS NEEDED

Federal taxes. It is on this subject that I think the committee's report is weakest, principally because the committee has not sufficiently considered the impact of Federal taxes, and I believe that this is reflected in its report. Thus it recommends tightening up employee expense accounts and repealing the dividend-received and exclusion provision, but it completely overlooks abuses of the notorious stock option schemes. Similarly, the report recommends reducing depletion allowances for two commodities, namely, oil and gas, but is silent on the question of reducing the depletion allowances for oystershells, iron ore, timber, and numerous other commodities.

Finally, the committee's report places much confidence in discretionary tax reductions in times of recession. It does not, however, make clear at whose discretion the tax reductions are to be made. All of the committee's recommendations on taxes should, I think, be thought through most carefully. And most particularly the committee should, I think, investigate to see what extent the impact of Federal taxes is discriminating against small and medium size firms, and are thus tending to weaken the competitive structure which the committee wishes to strengthen.

8. THE RIGGED MARKET FOR GOVERNMENT SECURITIES SHOULD BE PUT UNDER GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION

The committee has described the Government securities market as one in which competition is imperfect. On the facts revealed by the investigation it would be more accurate to say that the rigging in this market is almost perfect. Only a handful of Wall Street banks, professional dealers, and other operators in Government securities buy substantially all of the Treasury issues. And each one of these big buyers knows in advance how much all of the others are going to subscribe to any particular issue.

In terms of the amounts traded, the so-called Government securities market is the biggest market in the world. This is about $200 billion a year, which is more than the trading in all of the stock exchanges and commodity markets in the country. But in terms of the number of traders in this market, it is the smallest market in the world. There are only 17 professional so-called open market dealers carrying on this trading in Wall Street. The trading is by telephone and they even have a party-line telephone system.

This so-called market should be put under Government regulation immediately. It is amazing to me that the Government should regulate the markets in which the farmers' commodities are traded, and regulate the stock exchanges in which corporate securities are traded, yet refuse to regulate the so-called market in which speculating and trading in the Government's own securities are carried on.

9. BANK RESERVES SHOULD BE INCREASED

The committee strongly recommends against any further reduction in reserve requirements of the member banks. It recommends, as it should, that when the Federal Reserve brings about future increases in the money supply it should do so by acquiring more Government securities, so that the interest payments on these securities will go back into the Treasury instead of into bank profits. But when the committee recommends, as it does, that reserve requirements should be held as they are now, it is wrong. This will not return to the Government the tens of billions of dollars in Government securities which the Federal Reserve has given away since 1951 as a part of its program of reducing required reserves. We now have the clear facts on bank reserves. They have not been created by deposits of the banks' money or by deposits of the banks' depositors' money. They have been created by the Federal Reserve System itself as a free gift to the banks. Since 1917 the Federal Reserve has created $47 billion of bank reserves, $29 billion of which has been paid out to the banks in currency and the other $18 billion of which still remains as reserves on which the banks are permitted to create money at the rate of about $8 for each $1 of reserves.

POLICIES HAVE TAKEN INCOME FROM THE MANY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE FEW

There has been no justification whatever for the high-interest and tight-money policies, nor for the Federal Reserve policy of reducing reserve requirements of the member banks and diverting huge shares of the Nation's income into profits for the banks and other financial institutions. In no year when interest rates were highest has the total demand for savings—including saving for consumer credit—been as much a percentage of the national income as in 1952 and 1953, when interest rates were kept low. Furthermore, the American people have saved no larger percentage of their incomes in periods when interest rates were high than in periods when interest rates were low. The Nation has simply paid more for the same amount of savings and for the same amount of financial management of the people's money.

Since 1952 personal income alone from interest has increased from $12 billion a year to $24 billion a year and is now about 2½ times the total farm income.

This redistribution of the income has helped less than 1 percent of the people—the financial elite—and has come out of the economic hides of all the rest of the people.

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

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, once again the House is confronted with the spectacle of a civil rights bill, bottled

up in the Rules Committee by the joint opposition of a minority of the Members on this side of the aisle and a majority of the leaders and Members on the Republican side. The rules prevent me from specifying the precise numbers involved, but the press has kept the American people informed of the fact that the discharge petition—the only reasonable method by which this bill can, apparently, be brought to the House floor, has thus far been signed almost exclusively by Members on this side of the aisle. For whatever reason, the pending civil rights legislation seems to have aroused controversy, and partisan differences, entirely beyond the scope of its very minimal provisions.

It is with complete sincerity that I say to my colleagues that I cannot understand the degree of controversy surrounding this bill. Like most Members, I receive, in the mail, large quantities of the papers and magazines put out by the lunatic fringe of hate-mongers. These papers, as might be expected, talk about the pending civil rights bill in terms of "forcible social integration," and they even refer, in blood-curdling tones, to that ancient bugaboo, "intermarriage." But these analyses are, of course, completely beside the point. The pending legislation is truly moderate legislation.

There is nothing in the bill before the Rules Committee which would change existing voting qualifications in any State. There is nothing in the present bill to expand the scope of Federal activity in the civil rights field into the areas which were embodied in part III of the civil rights bill of 1957—that area which was, so unfortunately, left out of the Civil Rights Act of that year as it was finally enacted.

The Committee on the Judiciary, in spite of the truly heroic leadership of its chairman, had to operate under the shadow of the same coalition that now holds this bill in the Rules Committee. For this reason, many needed civil rights proposals were left behind in the committee.

I do not wish even to seem to be critical of the leadership of our Committee on the Judiciary. The able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has worked too long and too hard in this field to require compliments from his colleagues. In bringing through the Judiciary Committee even the minimal bill about which we are today talking, MANNY CELLER has once again performed a remarkable feat of dedication to the principle which has always guided his actions in this field—the principle that every American is entitled to equal treatment before the law. To MANNY CELLER, every American, whatever his color, whatever his creed, owes a deep debt of gratitude.

But what, after all the shouting and the horrendous slogans are set aside, is actually in the bills which we are working today to bring before the House? What will these bills actually do?

First, these bills provide criminal penalties for violent interference with the enforcement of orders of the Federal courts in school segregation cases. This is surely not a radical proposal. I think every Member of this body, North or South, Democratic or Republican, would agree that mobs ought not to be allowed to interfere, by force, or the threat of force, with the carrying out of any order of any court. All of us adhere to the idea that our Nation should be ruled by law, not by mob violence. This bill would help to prevent the subversion of this basic American ideal.

Second, the bill provides that it shall be a Federal offense to flee prosecution for damaging schools, churches, and other public or private property by crossing State lines. In the wave of bombings which so recently shocked the Nation, the responsible leaders of every section of the country spoke out in sincere horror at the spectacle of cowardly bigots resorting to the vicious practice of destroying places of worship and places of instruction. These same cowardly bigots then fled from the retribution which would have been visited upon them by sneaking across State lines. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this section of the bill is not a radical proposal in anyone's view. These bombings have occurred in both Southern and Northern States—a reminder, and one which is always salutary, that bigotry knows no geography—and both southern and northern leaders have done their best to find and prosecute the culprits. Why is Federal legislation to make their apprehension possible considered as radical in its intent or scope?

The bill continues by providing that election returns, in elections for Federal officers, shall be preserved for a period of 2 years. Alteration of these records or their destruction or theft will incur a penalty. Although these records are to be made available to the Justice Department, their contents cannot be revealed by that Department except to a committee of the Congress, or to a court or grand jury. Mr. Speaker, again I fail to see that this is a radical proposal. It does not involve any new voting qualifications or any new voting procedures. It simply provides that the Federal Government may have an opportunity to see whether the election of Federal officials have been carried on in accordance with the Constitution and with the laws of the States involved. We are constantly assured that the election laws of every State in the Union forbid arbitrary or discriminatory deprivation of the ballot. "Every qualified voter," we are told, "has free access to the ballot box." Fine, Mr. Speaker. If this is true, then the preservation of these records will make it easier to prove. If not, certainly the election officials in the States themselves would want to know if their own election laws are being violated.

Title IV of the proposed bill would extend the Civil Rights Commission for a period of 2 years. This Commission had a hard time getting started, partly because of administration indifference, and it has had a difficult time in carrying out the functions assigned to it by the Congress, partly due to the obstructionist attitude of some local officials. In spite of these difficulties, the Civil Rights Commission has issued a superb report to the Nation on the condition of civil rights in our country. The Commission has pointed out—and again I say this is a healthy thing to have pointed out—that Americans are being deprived of their rights in the North as well as in the South. It has made some legislative recommendations. But it has not had time to do the job which the Congress has assigned to it. That time, as a very minimum, should be given to the Commission. The Commission's basic function is to ascertain facts. Facts, Mr. Speaker, have never hurt anyone who had nothing to hide, nothing of which he was ashamed. The fact-finding function of the Commission is one which I, personally, believe could profitably be extended indefinitely. H.R. 8601 does not do this. But, insofar as H.R. 8601 extends the Commission for 2 years, it is a step forward.

H.R. 8601 does not embody any of the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission.

Many of these recommendations, especially those involving Federal registrars, are worthy of support by the Congress. I regret that the President has not seen fit to urge the adoption of these proposals, and I regret that the bill we are discussing does not embody these proposals. I hope that the House can turn to the Federal registrar idea in time to allow millions of Americans to be assured of free access to the ballot box in the 1960 election. Unfortunately, the coalition which is blocking this bill does not seem to share this view.

H.R. 8601 closes by providing for procedures, inspired by the existing and highly successful Federal impact programs, to see that the children of members of the armed services, who happen to be stationed in areas where local schools have been closed down, can receive an education.

This is one part of this bill which I feel deserves particular attention. At the beginning of this Congress, I received a postcard from one of my constituents. She expressed a certain impatience with the legal and extra-legal maneuvering being practiced by some of the enemies of school desegregation, and closed her comment with a sentence which read something like: "I don't care about all this maneuvering. What I want to know is, are the children in school?"

This is, of course, the burning question.

It is one thing for politicians to play with the desegregation issue to seek political advantage for themselves. If their posturings and shouts of defiance could be limited to the vacation months, when the schools are closed anyway, they might be relatively harmless. But when these men, in order to defend a dying order, reach out and visit their vengeance on school children, denying them access to their classrooms for months on end, then the game of politics has gone beyond its proper bounds. Particularly tragic is the case of the children of members of the armed services stationed in their localities.

Under present law, the Defense Department can only provide directly for the education of these children when they live on a military reservation. Most do not. Most of these children are the children of men and women who have

freely given years of their lives to the service of their country. They do not choose to be sent to school crisis areas. They find themselves in the midst of a situation in which most of them have no immediate, direct interest. Yet these children are deprived of schooling right along with the children of the demagogs who bring these situations about.

Mr. Speaker, if the white supremacists of some American cities are willing to have their own children deprived of a year of school in order to make good their un-American defiance of the Federal Constitution and the Federal courts, then that is their privilege. But they should not be in a position to punish the children of other men—men who have no voice in where they will be sent, and no opportunity to send their children away to schools in other parts of the country.

Title V of H.R. 8601 is, in my opinion, the most badly needed part of the entire bill. Is it so radical as to generate the kind of opposition which this bill has generated? I find it hard to believe that it is so.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me state a belief which is a fundamental part of my own personal creed.

I believe, with all the faith of which I am capable, that America will not much longer be untrue to itself and to its heritage. The day is coming, irresistibly and inevitably, when every American can walk erect in the sure knowledge that the laws of his country will treat him with the same kind of equality as that with which the laws of nature and of nature's God treat him. The day of racial discrimination, of disability because of such irrelevancies as skin color, is disappearing inexorably. America will be true to the words of a great Virginian, and Americans will enjoy equal and inalienable rights, with which they have been endowed by virtue of the equality of their birth.

The America of tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow, will still know differences, of course. Men are born with unequal ability—a phenomenon with which skin color has no correlation whatever—but they will be born with equal opportunity to make whatever they can of their ability. Men will continue to attend different churches, to dream different dreams, and aim for different goals. Their skins will continue to have different amounts of pigment. But the law of this land—the law which has created this Congress, and which enshrines all the devices which free men have contrived to enable themselves to govern themselves—the law, Mr. Speaker, will look upon every American with impartiality and with justice.

To this end we are moving by little steps. H.R. 8601 is one of those little steps. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 was another. The civil rights legislation of the future will be more little steps. These steps are halting, they are infrequent, they are not always firm. But they are inevitable.

To those who seek to halt these steps and turn them backward toward an older and a darker day, there exists no hope of final success.

In the mouth of Abraham Lincoln, our poet, Stephen Vincent Benét, has put this moving soliloquy:

There was a man I knew near Pigeon Creek
Who kept a kennel full of hunting dogs,
Young dogs and old, smart hounds and silly hounds.
He'd sell the young ones every now and then,
Smart as they were, and slick as they could run.
But the one dog he'd never sell or lend
Was an old half-deaf foolish-looking hound
You wouldn't think had sense to scratch a flea
Unless the flea were old and sickly too.
Most days he used to lie beside the stove
Or sleeping in a piece of sun outside.
Folks used to plague the man about that dog
And he'd agree to everything they said,
"No—he ain't much on looks—or much on speed—
A young dog can outrun him any time,
Outlook him and outeat him and outleap him,
But, mister, that dog's hell on a cold scent
And, once he gets his teeth in what he's after,
He don't let go until he knows he's dead."

I am that old, deaf hunting-dog, O Lord,
And the world's kennel holds 10,000 hounds
Smarter and faster and with finer coats
To hunt your hidden purpose up the wind
And bell upon the trace you leave behind.
But, when even they fail and lose the scent,
I will keep on because I must keep on
Until You utterly reveal Yourself
And sink my teeth in justice soon or late.

* * * * *

We can fail and fail,
But, deep against the failure, something wars,
Something goes forward, something lights a match,
Something gets up from Sangamon County ground
Armed with a bitten and a blunted axe
And after twenty thousand wasted strokes
Brings the tall hemlock crashing to the ground.

The only issue left, Mr. Speaker, is how long.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is immensely encouraging to all of us who are deeply concerned about the problem of finding sound ways in which the Congress of the United States can help translate into reality the bright promise of the Declaration of Independence that we should be having this discussion this afternoon. I think far too often we forget the legitimate role that Government can play in making real the rights set forth in the Declaration of Independence. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would like in this connection to quote those noble and eloquent lines of the Declaration of Independence to which I referred:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men,

The final words of that magnificent statement fully justify the discussion we are having here this afternoon, for it is precisely our purpose here today to analyze sound and effective ways in which the Government of the United States can help secure to the men and women of America their unalieanble rights.

Certainly one of the most encouraging signs in recent years to those Americans who are concerned that every citizen of our country should enjoy equality of opportunity is the splendid report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights. Few, indeed, were the Americans who would have thought, when the Commission was named by President Eisenhower, that any very useful result would come from the group. Nonetheless, the Civil Rights Commission report set forth a number of first-class recommendations. One of these recommendations deals with the important problem of securing to every American, a right fundamental in any democracy, the right to vote. One of the ways, indeed the major way in which the members of the Civil Rights Commission—five out of six of the members, including two distinguished southern members of the Commission—suggested that we could effectively implement the right to vote was the Federal registrar approach which has been the subject of discussion these last few weeks in both bodies of Congress and before the bar of public opinion as well.

Perhaps one of the finest statements in support of the Federal registrar plan was made before the Senate Committee on Rules last week by a very distinguished American, a very distinguished southerner, a man who is the former president of the American Bar Association, the former dean of Southern Methodist Law School and a constitutional law expert who served on the Hoover Commission. I refer, of course, Mr. Speaker, to a great Texan, Dean Robert G. Storey, who served as Vice Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at this point Dean Storey's statement before the Senate Rules Committee on January 18, 1960, showing why the Federal registrar plan is not only constitutionally appropriate under the 15th amendment but is also amply justified by other constitutional provisions.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT G. STOREY, VICE CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a welcome privilege to accept the committee's invitation to appear here to discuss the Commission's recommendation on temporary Federal registrars. The Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, Dr. John A. Hannah, is unable to be here because he is meeting with the Permanent Joint Board of Defense today in Florida. He also expressed the wish that I appear to represent the views of the Commission.

At the outset, I feel obligated to make perfectly plain the position of the Commission

on Civil Rights with respect to the several legislative proposals now before you which seek to implement our recommendation. Our Commission, as charged by the Congress, diligently undertook the investigation of alleged denials of the right to vote; and in accord with the will of Congress we made certain findings of fact and recommendations, one of which is the subject under present discussion. It is our conclusion that certain citizens are being deprived of the right to vote, and that the recommendation here under consideration, if enacted by appropriate legislation, would lead to further progress in guaranteeing the right to vote to every citizen, regardless of race, color, religion or national origin. It must be understood clearly that the Commissioners do not take the position of advocates for or against any of the bills under discussion. Nor do we feel that the Commission asserts any monopoly of wisdom which makes our proposal, or any part thereof, the absolute which this committee must follow in its consideration of pending legislation. We fully recognize that other recommendations may be meritorious and that there may be suggestions which are more effective and appropriate than those which we have advanced, but they have not occurred to us. We believe the recommendation for the appointment of temporary Federal registrars would be a progressive step in solving some of the problems posed by certain discriminatory denials of the right to vote. In our discussions today, we have outlined the essential features of this step leaving to the wisdom of the Congress—with its wealth of experience in drafting sound legislative measures—and acting with the guidance of your committee, the choice of method and language and the clarification of technical points to implement our recommendation.

The Commission on Civil Rights recommended that the Congress enact a law providing for the appointment of temporary Federal registrars. Five of the six Commission members voted for this recommendation. This recommendation was not hastily nor lightly promulgated. As reflected by the Commission's findings, the Commission unanimously found that substantial numbers of citizens qualified to vote under State registration and election laws are being denied the right to register, and thus the right to vote, by reason of their race and color. Evidence compiled by the Commission amply bears out the verity of this finding. For example, 25 Negro residents of Macon County, Ala., testified under oath that they had been denied the right to register; most of these witnesses had repeatedly made efforts to register. Fourteen of these 25 witnesses were college graduates; some of them had more than one college degree. Three additional witnesses were graduates of nursing schools. Four of these witnesses previously had voted in the following States: Arkansas, California, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, and Texas. Under any reasonable view of voter qualifications, it would seem self-evident that at least these persons having these qualifications are eminently suited to participate in the suffrage. Yet, when we conducted our hearings and investigations, they and many others, whose educational background may not be as noteworthy but whose qualifications equally seemed apparent, were still being denied the right to vote.

The day when Negroes openly were denied the right to vote by State law spread upon the statute books or embodied in the governing codes of political parties is past. Nevertheless, in many places, the same end is achieved through discriminatory administration of State laws which seem fair upon their face. Witnesses from several Alabama counties testified under oath as to the specific methods by which certain persons entrusted with the administration of State voter registration laws have effectively excluded virtually all Negroes from the suffrage. Some were denied the opportunity to submit an application for registration by virtue of arbitrary and unauthorized oral examinations conducted by registrars. Many found great difficulty in seeking to register by virtue of the discriminatory effect of the voucher system. Most Negroes who managed successfully to file their applications and fully complied with the requirements of State law never received any word at all concerning their efforts to register. The effect of this practice is to preclude the opportunity of judicial review of even the most arbitrary and capricious action. And, in more than one county, the determined efforts of Negro-American citizens were frustrated by reason of the registrars' open and notorious failure to discharge their responsibility under State law. For example, again turning to Macon County, Ala., the board of registrars has failed to function for more than 4⅓ years of the past 14 years. The documented information on only the most recent failures shows that this board did not function for the 16 months between January 16, 1956 and June 3, 1957. Between this 1957 date and the date of the Commission's first hearing in Alabama December 8, 1958, there were many days on which this board failed to accept any applications from prospective Negro registrants. Immediately after the Commission's hearing all members of this board resigned. New appointees were named in July of 1959—over 6 months later—but they refused to serve. Other new appointees were named in December of 1959, rounding out a full year during which it was impossible for any prospective Negro registrants to apply, but, to our knowledge, only one member of this board has accepted his appointment. In these and other instances where the voting machinery of the State has failed to protect the constitutional right of a citizen to vote regardless of his color, against discrimination, it is then and only then that the recommendation of the Commission providing for local temporary voting registrars would take effect.

In an independent action, the U.S. Attorney General brought a civil action, as authorized under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, to compel registration of some 17 Negroes who had appeared as witnesses at the Commission's hearing, together with other apparently qualified Negroes. The suit was dismissed in the lower court for the lack of a proper party defendant since the registrars had all resigned. This case is now being considered on appeal by the U.S. Supreme Court, and before Congress acts upon the proposed legislation it will undoubtedly have the benefit and guidance of the Court's opinion. This opinion should help Congress in appraising the effectiveness of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

I should like here to interject a personal observation. By my repeated references to examples of denials of the right to vote in Alabama, I do not wish to suggest that Alabama is the only State in which such things occur, nor to imply that the situation is more aggravated there than elsewhere. I cite these examples because the Commission was able to secure a more complete picture of the situation—based upon sworn testimony given in open hearing—in this State. As you know, our efforts to secure the same kind of information about similar situations in Louisiana were halted by a court order which, today, is being submitted to the Supreme Court of the United States for review. May I ask, therefore, that you consider our report on voting, which enumerates other denials in other States, as an extended citation of additional examples.

Under these circumstances and in the absence of final determination by the courts which might enable us to fully appraise the effectiveness of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, it is not surprising that five of the six members of the Commission concluded that existing remedies are not sufficient to secure and protect the right to vote of such citizens.

We fully appreciate that mere mention of the name "Federal Registrars" is anathema to some people. But, we believe that fair study of the facts shown by our findings, as included in our report, does disclose that some remedial action along the lines we have proposed is warranted. And, our studies also confirm that such action is within the power of the Congress to prescribe under the Constitution of the United States.

Without any intent to be presumptuous, may I say just a few words about the power of the Congress to legislate upon those Federal elections to which our recommendation is addressed. First, by article 1, section 4, the Constitution has reserved plenary power to the Congress to legislate upon the "times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives"; second, by section 2 of the 15th amendment, the Congress is explicitly given power to legislate to protect the right to vote of all citizens of the United States against abridgement by either the Federal Government or the government of any State on grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It appears to me, in principle at least, that these two provisions alone fully warrant so much of our recommendation as pertains to legislation by the Congress to protect the right to vote for its own Members—in both Houses—against denial or abridgment on the grounds expressly stated in the 15th amendment. Furthermore, section 5 of the 14th amendment categorically gives the Congress power to legislate for the enforcement of the substantive provisions of that amendment. The provision of the 14th amendment germane to our recommendation is that, "No State shall * * * deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws," a provision whose protection has repeatedly been held to extend to members of various religious groups, and to aliens, as well as to American citizens. As explicitly provided by the Congress in the directive of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, that the Commission investigate alleged denials of the right to vote upon four stated grounds, we have included "religion and national origin in the terms of our recommendation. For, as the Supreme Court said in *Hernandez* v. *Texas*, 347 U.S. 475, 478 (1954), a case in which the rights of a Mexican-American were protected," the 14th amendment is not directed solely against discrimination based upon differences between white and Negro.

Our recommendation, however, includes the executive officers and presidential electors, as well as the Members of the House and the Senate. The constitutional power of the Congress to legislate upon the subject of presidential electors differs from its power to legislate with respect to election of its own Members. The pertinent provisions of the Constitution are found in article 2, section 1, and in the 12th amendment. While popular elections for presidential electors is the current general practice, there has been no change in the provision that "each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors." And, the case-law giving definition to the power of Congress to legislate upon this subject is limited. However, it must be noted that both the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution are equally applicable to these provisions, and the 15th amendment—which expressly protects the right to vote—is by its express terms addressed to both Federal and State Governments. Hence, we find no general lack of power in the Congress to legislate to protect the right to vote for presidential electors against discrimination. Too, this is covered by the express provision of part 4 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. We would concede, however, that the drafting of proper legislation addressed to such elections presents a more

difficult and intricate problem than legislation addressed solely to election of the Members of the Congress.

The Commission's recommendation for the appointment of a temporary Federal registrar contemplates that the machinery of the Federal Government may be set in action by the receipt of a sufficient number of complaints of discrimination from a particular political subdivision of a State. The number specified in the Commission's recommendation might seem somewhat arbitrary, but it was intended to require a sufficient number in order to insure the likelihood of substance in the matters complained of; this number might well have been a lesser or greater number. These complaints would be investigated by members of the Commission's staff in precisely the same manner as complaints addressed to this Commission during its short life span have been investigated in the past. The Commission was moved to follow the sound principle of separation of powers in entrusting the duty to investigate to a department of the Government other than that having the power to appoint the temporary Federal registrars in those cases where such appointments would be warranted; furthermore, it was entrusted to the Commission to avoid the possibility that the responsibility for investigation and certification would be placed upon the agency which later might have the duty to prosecute civil or criminal suits for violations of voting rights. The Commission, upon review of the results of such investigations, would be authorized alternatively to dismiss unfounded complaints, and to certify any and all well-founded complaints to the President of the United States to such temporary registrars as he then might designate. And, because of the importance of the matter, it is the Commission's view that a local Federal officer or employee would be designated directly by the President of the United States to act temporarily as a registrar for Federal elections. You will note, too, that the Commission's recommendation contemplates that a local person on the Federal payroll be designated to act, rather than suggest an outsider be sent into any community to administer the local registration laws.

Existing circumstances compelled the Commission to recommend direct action by the Federal Government for the protection of the right of American citizens to participate in the right to vote. However, the Commission carefully sought to avoid any undue interference with the rights of the several States in this most important activity in our American Federal system: its recommendation contemplates that the temporary Federal registrars will test the fitness of applicants for registration according to the voter qualification laws of the respective States in which they may act. Furthermore, persons registered by Federal registrars shall, as a consequence thereof, have the right to vote under this law only in Federal elections.

The Commission's recommendation throughout rests upon the firm conviction that present denials of the right to vote on grounds of racial discrimination are an evil which promptly can be cured by forthright and direct action. In keeping with this view it has included a provision that the jurisdiction of Federal registrars will continue only until such time as the President determines that the presence of appointed registrars is no longer necessary.

The Commission, in making this proposal, fully recognizes with understanding and appreciation that adherence to the principles of this country as a federation of State sovereignties with concomitant States' rights would almost inevitably result in responsible State officials taking the necessary action to protect the right to vote in preference to the designation of a Federal official to serve as a registrar. By its very enactment we believe the recommendation may be almost as effective as by its actual use.

To facilitate our discussion of legislation to implement the Commission's recommendation, particularly with respect to those matters which we have deferred to the wisdom of the Congress, I should like simply to enumerate the salient features which should be included. This enumeration might be considered as a helpful frame of reference in which the committee may proceed to consider the several bills presently before it. As a result of our study of this proposal for temporary Federal registrar legislation, we are fully aware of the fact that the actual drafting of legislation will undoubtedly reveal difficult problems which will require time for exploration and consideration. The staff of the Commission is willing to cooperate to resolve these problems. The Department of Justice has assured us of their cooperation.

1. All Federal elections as defined in part IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 must be covered by any effective Temporary Federal Registrar Act.

2. Sworn affidavits by citizens who believe that they have been denied the right to vote in Federal elections because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, but who believe that they are qualified to vote under existing State law should be filed with the President of the United States. Effective legislation should therefore provide that temporary Federal registrar machinery should be set in action upon the initiative of those who believe they have been denied the right to vote solely on such grounds. Clearly, such affidavits should comply with the minimum requirements for a valid complaint under 104(a)(1) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

3. As a matter of sound administration, the measure should require receipt of a sufficient number of complaints fairly to warrant the assumption that there is some substance to the allegations of denials of the right to vote, before the machinery of the Federal Government is set into motion. We agreed upon the number nine as sufficient; the Congress, in its wisdom, might agree upon some lesser or greater number.

4. In the view of the Commission, it might be unwise to vest the responsibility for the conduct of the investigations in a body which, conceivably, might later be charged with the duty to conduct the prosecution of other civil or criminal remedies under existing law.

5. Effective temporary registrar legislation must include some factfinding procedure by which the allegations of the affidavits are investigated. The sole function of this investigation should be to eliminate frivolous and unfounded affidavits, that is affidavits which, upon investigation, show that there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the affiant's right to vote has been denied because of his race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

6. But it is of greater importance—because it is a matter of principle, if investigation of the complaints reveals that even one single complaint seems well founded, certification should promptly be made to the President and whomever he shall then designate as Federal registrar.

7. We regard this whole matter of sufficient importance to warrant that the authority to designate temporary Federal registrars be vested in the Office of the President of the United States.

8. Effective temporary Federal registrar legislation should include a provision for the designation of a local Federal employee, such as a postmaster, court clerk, or local marshal, to serve as the temporary Federal registrar. Such an official should have the power to administer the State voter qualification laws to all citizens eligible to vote in Federal elections but previously barred from voting through improper discrimination.

9. Effective temporary Federal registrar legislation must include some provision which will guarantee that such registrants will be permitted to vote in Federal elections and have that vote counted. Congress may wish to consider appropriate sanctions, equitable or otherwise, to assure that the vote may be cast and counted.

10. Temporary Federal registrar legislation must contain some effective and prompt means of removing registration from a temporary local Federal official at such time when it is determined that the right to vote in the locality is not being denied on grounds of race, color, religion, national origin, and ancestry.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe so deeply in the importance of securing to all Americans the right to vote and because I believe that practices which are followed in some States of our country which deny the right to vote to many Americans through literacy tests, poll taxes, and other devices, I last year introduced a resolution for a constitutional amendment in the House of Representatives, an amendment that would guarantee the right to vote to all Americans.

The proposed constitutional amendment reads as follows:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State or by any person for any cause except inability to meet State age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all persons within the State, or legal confinement at the time of registration or election. This right to vote shall include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

A companion resolution was offered for a similar constitutional amendment in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY. This universal suffrage amendment was urged by three of the six members of the Civil Rights Commission. Among the members of the Commission who gave their strong support to the universal suffrage amendment was the distinguished president of the University of Notre Dame, a great university located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C. Indeed, because of the strong support that Father Hesburgh has given to this universal suffrage amendment I would like to describe it as the Hesburgh amendment. It is an amendment which would insure the right to vote in elections to every citizen who meets his State's age and residence requirements and who is not legally confined at the time of registration or election.

I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that one of my constituents, Father Hesburgh, has shown such splendid leadership in this entire area of civil rights. It may be of interest to Members to know that at the University of Notre Dame on the 14th of February there is to be held a 1-day conference on the recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights and on civil rights measures now pending in Congress. It is the thought of the president of the University of Notre Dame, of the distinguished dean of the Notre Dame Law School, Dean Joseph O'Meara, and of others concerned with the problem of civil

rights that before Congress takes action on this subject at this session it would be extremely helpful to have as much discussion of the issues as possible among legislators, members of law school faculties, and other interested persons. For this reason an invitation to take part in a nonpartisan conference, the Notre Dame Conference on Civil Rights, on February 14, 1960, has been extended to all U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress, Democrats and Republicans, from the States of Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin, as well as to all the Governors of those States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and many other national leaders, from both Government and private life.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included a list of the distinguished guests who have been invited to take part in the Notre Dame Civil Rights Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

LIST OF GUESTS INVITED, CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, NOTRE DAME LAW SCHOOL, FEBRUARY 14, 1960

All Governors and Senators and Representatives in Congress from Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

The Attorney General of the United States, or his designee.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or his designee.

The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or his designee.

The members of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The Staff Director and Acting Deputy Staff Director of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, chairman, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, or his designee.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, House Judiciary Committee, or his designee.

The deans, or their designees, of the law schools of the University of Indiana, the University of Illinois, the University of Chicago, Northwestern University, the University of Kentucky, Ohio State University, and the University of Michigan.

The chairmen, or their designees, of the State Advisory Committees of the Commission on Civil Rights, for the States of Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Ohio, and Michigan.

Prof. Wylie H. Davis, University of Illinois College of Law, Urbana, Ill.

Prof. Ralph Fuchs, University of Indiana Law School, Bloomington, Ind.

Rev. William J. Kenealy, S.J., professor of law, Loyola University Law School, Chicago, Ill.

Prof. Willard Wirtz, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Herman Edelsburg, chairman, National Civil Liberties Clearing House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Harold Fleming, executive director, the Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Clarence Mitchell, Washington Representative of NAACP, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Lester Granger, president, the National Urban League.

Rev. Martin Luther King, president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Atlanta, Ga.

Miss Frances Levenson, executive director, National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, New York City.

Judge Justine Wise Polier, justice of the domestic relations court, New York City.

Mr. Shad Polier, chairman, Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress.

Mr. James H. Scheuer, president, Citizens Housing and Planning Council, New York City.

Mr. Earl B. Schwulst, chairman, Commission on Race and Housing, president, Bowery Savings Bank, New York City.

Mr. Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., president, Board of Education of the City of Chicago, president, Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago.

Mr. Vernon Eagle, executive director, the New World Foundation, Chicago.

Mr. Dean Rusk, president, the Rockefeller Foundation, New York City.

Dr. Robert K. Carr, president, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; executive secretary, the President's Committee on Civil Rights, 1947.

Mr. BRADEMAS. We are today talking about the prospects for civil rights legislation. Many of us feel that the picture is not as bright as perhaps it might be. Indeed, I have before me a splendid editorial published on January 21 in the La Porte, Ind., Herald-Angus entitled "Picture Not Bright." The first lines of this editorial say:

The cynic who declaims that never, and he means never, will any appreciable gains be made for Negro rights in the Deep South can trot out some strong evidence these days. The picture for those Americans who believe the Nation should give more than lipservice to civil rights provisions of the Constitution and to the momentous 1954 Supreme Court decision calling for integration of schools is admittedly a dark picture. And there are few rays of light.

We are all aware of the fact that there are serious problems in the southern part of the United States with respect to the implementation of the 1954 Supreme Court order for desegregating the public schools. Nonetheless, I think Mr. Speaker, that those of us who live in the northern part of the United States ought not to be too self-righteous about this matter. As the La Porte Herald-Argus editorial goes on to say:

Closer home in the North, which is inclined to wrap a cloak of righteousness about it in pointing to the South's disregard for fundamental rights, discrimination against Negroes in housing, employment, social acceptance continues with little abatement. Like a cancer, prejudice against race continues to make mockery of our professions to democracy. And the rest of the world knows it.

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

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask if it is not the understandiing of the gentleman from Indiana that the civil rights bill would give to the Attorney General's Office a specifically additional power to function in these specific spots; therefore, we are not interested in protecting civil rights just on a sectional basis, because what we do want and are fighting for is civil rights for all American citizens everywhere in our country.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman from California makes a splendid point. I think one of the great contributions made by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES], from his long experience in the field of international as well as domestic affairs, is that the problem of achieving equality of opportunity for all Americans is not a regional problem, it is a national problem. If we do not make substantial progress in putting into effect here at home the promises of the Declaration of Independence, we have a tarnished shield to present to the rest of mankind throughout the world.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman probably knows that the original bill I offered contained the so-called part 3, which would give the Attorney General the right by way of injunction to enforce civil rights on all levels of American life, in education, on a political horizon, in transportation, and in housing. It would be an all-pervasive right to the Attorney General to insure the granting of civil rights and the prevention of the withholding of those rights in every walk of life on all levels of American life. But it was again that unholy alliance between the Members from the South and some of the Republicans on my committee that struck that provision from the bill. That was most unfortunate. If, as we hope, this bill comes up and we have the privilege of amending it, I shall undoubtedly offer that as an amendment, that is, the so-called part 3, to the pending bill.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his valuable contribution.

The gentleman from New York makes reference to the gutting of the civil-rights bill by the dropping out of title 3 and I am thereby moved to reflect on the fact that most of us believe in the redemptibility of human nature from sin. Therefore, those members of the Republican Party on the Judiciary Committee who took part in helping to weaken the civil-rights bill by voting to strip title III from the bill will have an opportunity to redeem themselves if they will exercise their influence with their Republican colleagues by urging them to sign their names, today or any day this week, to the discharge petition on the civil-rights bill. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that if the Republican Members of the House genuinely want civil-rights legislation, they can easily take a big step in that direction by signing the petition to release the civil-rights bill from the Rules Committee where it is now bottled up.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in the RECORD the La Porte Herald-Argus editorial of January 21, 1960, to which I have referred.

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

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

PICTURE NOT BRIGHT

The cynic who declaims that never, and he means never, will any appreciable gains be made for Negro rights in the Deep South, can trot out some strong evidence these days. The picture for those Americans who believe the Nation should give more

than lipservice to civil rights provisions of the Constitution and to the momentous 1954 Supreme Court decision calling for integration of schools is admittedly a dark picture. And there are few rays of light.

In the sixth year after the Supreme Court's integration decision the Deep South, principally South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Louisiana, stands firm in bitter opposition to even token integration. In general the sentiment, at least as expressed by politicians with an eye to votes, is that "we'll close our public school systems before we will allow any integration." In the five States mentioned there are no racially mixed classes in schools. And in many other Southern States the integration is on a token basis only.

The other day at Biloxi, Miss., a Federal grand jury refused to indict the killers of Mack Charles Parker, lynched at Poplarville, Miss., even though the FBI provided names and evidence. Last April the county grand jury declined to even consider the case, thereby condoning the murder of the young Negro. There have been more than 500 lynchings in Mississippi since 1882 and never a conviction.

Closer home in the North, which is inclined to wrap a cloak of righteousness about it in pointing to the South's disregard for fundamental rights, discrimination against Negroes in housing, employment, social acceptance continues with little abatement. Like a cancer, prejudice against race continues to make mockery of our professions to democracy. And the rest of the world knows it.

In Washington there is talk again of civil rights legislation, but with southern Congressmen dominating important committees in both Houses and with even President Eisenhower only mildly interested in new legislation, prospects are dismal.

In the Senate are measures, recommended by the Civil Rights Commission, which would empower the President to designate temporary Federal registrars to register voters for Federal elections who are qualified under State registration laws but are nevertheless denied the right to register.

In the House, locked up in the southern-dominated Rules Committee, is a weak proposal which would give the Justice Department authority to subpena State voting records in cases where registrars in the State practice discrimination. This was an Eisenhower proposal last year.

Even though the Federal Government is on firm legal as well as moral ground in demanding that qualified voters be allowed to vote in Federal elections, it is now rather obvious that this election year will be taken as the excuse for doing nothing of any real significance in giving Negroes Federal voting privileges. And in the Deep South the bitter, we-will-never-budge attitude toward the Negro's aspirations to first-class citizenship remains as adamant as ever.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say those of us who take seriously our responsibilities as U.S. Representatives, that is to say, Representatives who have a responsibility to the Nation as a whole as well as a responsibility to the citizens of our own congressional districts, should, I believe, work and work hard now in the year 1960 to pass effective legislation which will make real the equality of opportunity which we believe is the cornerstone of a free society. The right to vote is perhaps as fine a symbol of a free society as any one of us can conceive. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that only those persons who deny the Hebrew-Christian tradition of respect for the dignity of the individual human being as a child of God can deny to an American citizen the right to vote in free elections.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] for his contribution to this discussion.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks immediately following the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement on this subject, which I think is apropos at this moment?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I really hesitate to make a statement with reference to the discussion we have had here during the last 3 hours or so. I have many good friends who participated in the discussion. I do, however, feel impelled to say a few words. I want to say, first of all, I long ago signed the discharge petition. I want to commend those speakers who stuck to the facts about the need for good civil rights legislation. On the other hand, I deplore the planned effort which has been made here to shift the responsibility from where it belongs, that is, with the majority party, onto the minority party. So I have no general comment upon all of the talks that have been made so far. It is my personal opinion that these are simply and truly a matter of political propaganda, a massive and well planned attack, in my opinion, an alibi for the bankrupt leadership of the majority party. I, for one, realize what this pitch is. I think the American people are not going to be fooled. I think they realize what this pitch is. I have listened, as we all have, to these many excuses and alibis by the Democratic Members for this abdication of responsible leadership. I think these excuses are an admission that the majority party positively cannot deliver on the promises it makes to the American people at the time of an election.

Furthermore, it is most disheartening to me to see these political maneuvers applied to such an important issue as civil rights. I feel, and I believe I know, the American people will not swallow this attempt to shift the responsibility from the party who have a 2 to 1 majority, to the minority party.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the majority party examine its own party situation and its promises to the American people. It is plain to me that the majority party falls far short of carrying out its promises as a responsible party.

I think the American people now realize it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I congratulate the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] for having the wisdom of signing the discharge petition, but I regret the gentleman's indiscriminate appraisal of this discussion as political propaganda, because I am certain, as the debate unfolds, we will make out a strong case that the Democrats in this Congress have done everything humanly possible to maintain the pledges of the party to our people.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] whether he has heard of or read the editorial in the New York Times of last Sunday, which clearly stated—and I do not think he would want to accuse the New York Times of issuing political propaganda—that the time had come to recognize that the Republicans had been boycotting an attempt to bring the civil rights bill to action in the House, and that to attack the Democratic Party as having some members in it opposed to civil rights does not in any sense show a justifiable reason for the Republican Party doing nothing about it. As I said earlier in the debate, the easiest possible way if you want to make it a nonpartisan issue, instead of having the 30 Republican signatures out of 190, a pitifully small, meager amount, let them come forward with the rest of the Republican signatures and get this bill on the floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for his remarks.

I cannot yield further, because I have some remarks of my own that I want to contribute to this conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the previous speakers who have engaged in this discussion today on the need of enacting civil rights legislation in this session. I feel that I come eminently prepared to plead the cause of civil rights, because I happen to come from an ethnic group that struck one of the first blows for civil rights in this country, a blow that predated the Civil War, predated the American Revolution, going back to 1619, when Captain Smith arrived in America and discovered that he could not indeed form and build a successful colony without industry, without skilled artisans, and people with ideas. From his travels in Europe Captain Smith recalled in his visits to Poland that he had met many people skilled in the production of tar and pitch, and because that particular territory around Jamestown afforded more opportunities for that industry, Captain Smith had invited a group of Polish immigrants to this country more than 350 years ago. They came here and they made a contribution with their skill, with their art, but because of the peculiar system of the Jamestown Colony in those days, the Polish immigrants were permitted to conduct their work, but they were not permitted to participate in the civic activities in the colony. They were not permitted to own property. They were not permitted to participate in elections. They were not permitted many of the civil rights of citizens of that colony. Remembering the history of their own country, the great struggle for civil rights which the Poles had waged for centuries in Europe,

those people in 1619 staged the first sitdown strike ever recorded in the annals of American history. It is indeed significant that this sitdown strike by the first Poles in America was not for economic remuneration as we know the sitdown strikes of today. Rather, it was a strike for the rights of human dignity. It was a strike for recognition of human rights. In his wisdom Captain Smith recognized the fact that without the help of those Polish immigrants, the Jamestown Colony was doomed to failure. So he summoned a special session of the legislature that day, and in the record of the Virginia General Assembly, recorded on July 21, 1619, we read:

Upon some dispute of the Polonians resident in Virginia, it was now agreed (notwithstanding any former order to the contrary) that they shall be enfranchised, and made as free as any inhabitant there whatsoever.

And indeed I am proud that these Polish immigrants could have struck the first blow for civil rights in this country.

I might point out also that I am proud to come from an ethnic group, one of whose sons, a great hero of the American Revolution, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, came to this country to fight for freedom in America. When the time came for him to return to his native Poland, he left his entire estate in this country, which amounted to a considerable amount of money, to his Negro slave to be used for the creation, formation, and establishment of the first institution of higher learning in America.

I am sure that as this discussion on civil rights unfolds here today and in the days to come we could find equal parallels of great contributions to the recognition of the dignity of man from all of the ethnic groups that have come to this great country; the Germans, the Italians, Scandinavians, Poles, Swedes, Irish, and all the other fine people who make up this country. I am sure that we all have felt as Americans at some time or other in the history of this Nation, either directly or through our forefathers, the pains of discrimination. I ask, Mr. Speaker, how can we as a great Nation demand the restoration of the freedom to vote, the restoration of civil rights in Poland, Czechoslovakia, in Lithuania, in East Germany, in Hungary, in Bulgaria, in Rumania, in all the other enslaved nations of the world who are today living under the domination of international communism, how can we defend, how can we argue, how can we plead for freedom for these people when our own house is not yet in order?

I read today an Associated Press dispatch which just came through on the wires:

WASHINGTON.—Two members of the Cabinet today pledged the administration's "undivided support" for a determined Senate effort to repeal a U.S. veto power over jurisdiction of the World Court. Secretary Herter told the Foreign Relations Committee a repealer resolution has the united backing of President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, the State and Justice Departments.

"There is no division of opinion within the administration," Herter assured Chairman FULBRIGHT. Attorney General William P. Rogers followed Herter to the stand with a strong endorsement of the resolution, sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY.

About 3 weeks ago we heard the President of the United States make his eloquent plea right here before this House in his state of the Union message when he asked repeal of the Connally amendment regarding the World Court.

I should like to remind the administration, and the President, that indeed the chances of his suggestion being adopted by this Congress, would be markedly strengthened if our own house regarding civil rights were in order. It should be no surprise and I am sure it is no secret, that many of those who supported that amendment did so because they feared the Communists would exploit our own civil rights infractions in this country before the World Court, and it is certainly understandable what a harvest of propaganda they could reap before that Court. I indeed feel that if the President really wants to repeal this amendment he ought to add his entire weight to this civil rights legislation because when we put our own house in order we can then proudly, and boldly, and confidently face the World Court. We need not fear then that the Communists are going to exploit our own shortcomings in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln said on July 1, 1854:

Most governments have been based, practically, on the denial of equal rights of men. Ours began by affirming those rights. They said: "Some men are too ignorant and vicious to share in government." "Possibly so," said we, "and by your system you would always keep them ignorant and vicious. We propose to give all a chance; and we expect the weak to grow stronger, the ignorant wiser and all, better and happier together."

I have a most profound respect and admiration for Mr. Lincoln—and while his dedication to the principles of justice and equality have long been an inspiration to me both in my private and public life, unfortunately, he was not instrumental in the formation of my own political party. This I regret. I have, however, chosen Mr. Lincoln's dramatic statement because I believe it is appropriate as Republicans throughout America sit down tonight at dinners in some 82 cities to pay tribute to their party and its record.

I could never hope to inspire the Republican Party to its task with words as eloquently spoken as Mr. Lincoln and I hope as the Republicans delight in burgundy wine and stuffed capon—as they listen to speeches by President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON—as they attempt to appraise their record of the past year—they will pause long enough to reflect that one of their main promises—to perfect our civil rights legislation—still remains to be acted on in this session.

I hope that tonight they will recall the admonition of Lincoln when he spoke in Cincinnati on May 31, 1842:

In what I have done I cannot claim to have acted from any peculiar consideration of the colored people as a separate and distinct class in the community, but from the simple conviction that all the individuals of that class are members of the community, and, in virtue of their manhood, entitled to every original right enjoyed by any other member. We feel, therefore, that all legal distinction between individuals of the same community, founded in any such circumstances as color, origin and the like, are hostile to the genius of our institutions, and incompatible with the true history of American liberty.

The fact that we selected today to conduct this panel on civil rights in the House of Representatives when Republicans are meeting all over the Nation to break bread and launch the forthcoming campaign is purely coincidental. I can assure you I had not noticed the Republican dinners until earlier today—and certainly I did not notice the Republican dinners when I requested the special order for today.

Fate, however, moves in strange manners—perhaps it is just as well, that, by coincidence, we should have selected today for our discussion of civil rights—I hope that when our colleagues return, inspired by the oratory of tonight's Republican dinners, they will ponder our own discussion in the House of Representatives today and join us in signing the discharge petition on civil rights so that in this session we can write into law a formula which will restore this Nation to a position of respect and inspiration throughout the world.

As they return to Washington, I hope my Republican colleagues will recall the inspiring words of President Eisenhower—the leader of their party—when he stood here delivering his state of the Union message just 3 weeks ago.

The President said:

Still another issue relates to civil rights. In all our hopes and plans for a better world we all recognize that provincial and racial prejudices must be combated. In the long perspective of history, the right to vote has been one of the strongest pillars of a free society. In spite of constitutional guarantees, and notwithstanding much progress of recent years, bias still deprives some persons in this country of equal protection of the laws.

Early in your last session, I recommended legislation which would help eliminate several practices discriminating against the basic rights of Americans. The Civil Rights Commission has developed additional constructive recommendations. I hope that these will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session. I trust that Congress will thus signal to the world that our Government is striving for equality under law for all our people.

I wholeheartedly agree with President Eisenhower.

This issue of civil rights lgislation, in my humble opinion, must never be permitted to deteriorate to a partisan level—the Republican Party—as well as the Democratic Party—must recognize the pledge it made to the American people in their respective platforms in 1956—I do not accept the doctrine that since the Democrats control Congress civil rights legislation is their own partisan responsibility.

It is crystal clear to all present here, and to the entire world, that there is a division of opinion—a tragic, nevertheless a deep-rooted division—in the Democratic Party regarding civil rights legislation.

But I would not be honest with myself if I did not admit that while I personally cannot condone the views of my Democratic colleagues from the South, I must respect their right to their own opinion. This is the very dynamics of our democ-

racy—this is the very heart of our Republic—the right to respect for your own views. It is indeed a cruel hoax that is being perpetrated on the American people by those who would idly sit by and blame the Democratic majority for failing to deal with the civil rights question.

I need only remind my colleagues that the majority of Democrats in this House already have signed the discharge petition in keeping with our party platform of 1956. This in no way means that we have any less respect for those members of our party who—guided by their own conscience in doing what they, in their own opinion, believe to be right—have failed to join us in this noble cause.

Earlier this week, one of our Republican colleagues deplored the lack of unity among the Democrats in this House. The speaker who uttered these words has shown a demonstrable lack of understanding of the very dynamics of our Democratic Party.

If the day ever comes when all Democrats must march in a single cadence, we will indeed have lost that priceless ingredient which has given the Democratic Party its strength, we will then lose the diversity from which spring all great ideas, we will rob our party of that precious quality which distinguishes man from all other orders—his determination to think for himself—as Admiral Rickover once said, "His determination to be different."

I hope and pray the day will never come when all Democrats must be corralled into a single unity of thought—for we shall then drive the Nation into the limbo of conformity and ultimate intellectual serfdom. I might add, I pray the same for the Republicans.

But my fellow Congressmen, the Republicans cannot shirk their responsibility by trying to create the impression that civil rights is a problem for the Democrats. They cannot shirk their responsibility unless they are willing to concede a total lack of understanding of legislative process in a republic such as ours.

I need only to remind you that ours is the most complex form of government ever devised by man. But within the complexities of our Republic we have been able to afford most of our citizens the greatest degree of freedom ever conceived by man. It is no accident that under the rules of the House, we can work the will of Congress by way of the discharge petition when insurmountable roadblocks are placed in our way by a committee to thwart our action within normal procedures. It took a long time to perfect the discharge petition procedure but it is now accepted and it can work. I make no apology for signing this discharge petition. In so doing, those of my colleagues who have joined me in this act have epitomized the very essence of democratic process in this noble body. If the discharge petition was repugnant; if it is in conflict with the spirit of an unfettered legislative body such as is this Congress, I am confident that the formulators of precedents in this historic assembly would have overruled it long ago—we have had the good fortune to have outstanding Americans from both parties sit in the Presiding Officer's chair in this House, including our present Speaker, the gentleman from Texas. They have all recognized the need to let Congress work its will regardless of odds—and so this discharge petition procedure finally was conceived.

I believe the fallacy of those who would criticize use of the discharge petition becomes readily apparent when we recall that under the present rule, five measures were entered in the calendar and one actually passed the House since it was adopted in the 72d Congress.

The Republican membership of this House has as much responsibility toward bringing the civil-rights measure to the floor as the Democrats—particularly when we recall the Republican platform of 1956, which stated:

> We support the enactment of the civil-rights program already presented by the President to the 84th Congress.

The Republican Party's pledge cannot be considered as accomplished by passage of the act in the 85th Congress. Particularly is this true when we consider the further plank in the 1956 Republican platform on civil rights, which stated:

> The Republican Party has unequivocally recognized that the supreme law of the land is embodied in the Constitution, which guarantees to all people the blessing of liberty, due process, and equal protection of the laws. It confers upon all native-born and naturalized citizens not only citizenship in the State where the individual resides but citizenship of the United States as well. This is an unqualified right, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Were these but hollow words—political sops—written into a platform to attract a certain segment of our voting population, or were they words written into a party platform by a responsible political movement which intends to make good on its promise?

The least that can be said about our southern Democratic colleagues who have refused to support civil rights legislation is that their position was made clearly known in 1956, just as it is today. The most that can be said about their action is that they are consistent in their determined refusal to alter their position.

I believe the time has come when the Republican leadership in this Congress should stop playing cat and mouse with civil rights and face up to its pledges. Not all Republicans. I am certain that just as some of our Democrats have their reasons for opposing civil rights, there must undoubtedly be some Republicans with similar views. But surely in a membership of 153 Republicans in the House, there must be at least a simple majority who take their party platform seriously enough to support the petition.

I believe that President Eisenhower should exert the same kind of leadership toward solving this issue as he did when he took to the airwaves on labor-management reform, on support of his multibillion-dollar foreign-aid program, and on his persistent demands for removing ceilings controlling interest rates on long-term Government bonds.

I believe the time has come when Vice President NIXON should make his own position known and help the Democratic majority in the Congress get started on a workable civil rights bill.

The overwhelming majority of those Democrats who have signed the discharge petition have demonstrated time and again their ability to put the good of the Nation above partisan politics and have supported President Eisenhower on many of his key issues. I am happy that I can be included in this group. The time indeed has come when the Republicans in this House and the Republicans in this administration, starting with President Eisenhower, should demonstrate the same type of nonpartisan responsibility and help in getting on with this legislation, in getting this legislation to the floor for action.

The Republican Party will hold its convention this summer in Chicago, the largest city in the "Land of Lincoln." It has been suggested that the theme of the convention should be centered around the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's election to the Presidency of the United States. What a mockery the Republicans will make of history if they go to Chicago without having supported the principles for which Lincoln so earnestly stood; his determined belief that all men were endowed with equal opportunity by their Creator. What a sham will be the great speeches about Lincoln if the Republicans fail to add their own weight to this effort toward enacting effective civil rights legislation in this session.

Somehow, however, Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that this will not happen. We shall always have politics in America. I hope the day never comes when we will not. But I, for one, am perfectly willing to remove partisanship from this issue because how could any dedicated American play politics with human misery? I can think of nothing that will destroy the human soul faster than the loss of freedom, respect, dignity, and the right of self-determination.

How can anyone equate the very humane issue with political expediency? How can any American fail to recognize that the right to self-respect for all citizens, regardless of race, color, creed, or ethnic background, is the very lifeblood of our system? Take away a man's respect and what is there left for him to live for?

This is the great challenge of this Congress. We are dealing with human beings; we are not dealing with robots, with chattels. We are dealing with human life, people that have a right to freedom and self-respect and self-dignity. This is the challenge of this body.

It is not important whether the signatures on the discharge petition come from this side of the aisle or the other side of the aisle. The important thing is that we as Members of this Congress, as statesmen of the most responsible Nation in the world today, the Nation to which the whole world is looking for leadership, inspiration, and guidance, face up to this great challenge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois on his excellent statement, and I commend especially his final point, that the

question here this afternoon is that we as Members, regardless of whether we are Republicans or Democrats, put enough signatures on the petition. We sign in our own names. The title of the job we hold on both sides is U.S. Representative. It is not "Democratic Representative" or "Republican Representative." We are Representatives not merely from our districts and from our States—we are U.S. Representatives; and when we take that oath of office, we are expected to live up to our obligations under the Constitution.

It seems to me our constitutional obligations are clear. In at least two places in the Constitution where the question of the right to vote is discussed, there is a very short, simple statement that "The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Nothing could be plainer, therefore, than that each of us bears the obligation of office, each Member bears one four-hundred-and-thirty-seventh part of the total burden of the work of the House of Representatives. No Member is exempted from his obligations to the House by reason of the discipline which he may have from some other Member of his own party or from his own State. Each Member is under the obligation of the discipline of his own conscience under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for his fine statement. Would the gentleman be good enough to yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am one who has signed the petition because I believe the only way we can enforce the Constitution by appropriate legislation is to bring that legislation before the House. However, as one who has campaigned in his own precinct and in his own district and in his own State, I have discovered that the limitations of the right to vote, which are the limitations with which we are most concerned here, are not limitations which are known only to a few States—nor are the limitations on the right to vote solely those of one race. Indeed, I find there are many limitations on the right to vote, most of which have no constitutional basis. The Constitution makes it clear that whenever any State shall deprive any person, male, 21 years of age and over, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, of the right to vote, that State may have its representation in the House of Representatives reduced in proportion to its denial of the right to vote. This is a clear constitutional power, and I might say obligation upon the Congress of the United States to help to enforce adequate voting rights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to extend in the RECORD tables on qualifications for voting prepared by the Library of Congress as of January 1, 1959.

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

There was no objection.

The tables referred to are as follows:

TABLE I.—*Residence requirements*

State	Time in State	Time in county	Time in precinct or ward
Alabama	2 years	1 year	3 months.
Alaska	1 year		30 days.
Arizona	do	30 days	Do.
Arkansas	12 months	6 months	1 month.
California	1 year	90 days	54 days.
Colorado	do	90 days (30 days in city or town).	15 days.
Connecticut	do	6 months	
Delaware	do	3 months	30 days.
Florida	do	6 months	
Georgia	do	do	
Idaho	6 months	30 days	
Illinois	1 year	90 days	Do.
Indiana	6 months	60 days in township	Do.
Iowa	do	60 days	
Kansas	do		Do.
Kentucky	1 year	6 months	60 days.
Louisiana	do	1 year in parish	3 months.
Maine	6 months	3 months in city, town, etc.	
Maryland	1 year	6 months	6 months.
Massachusetts	do	6 months in city or town	
Michigan	6 months	30 days in city or township.	
Minnesota	do		30 days.
Mississippi	2 years	1 year in city or town	1 year.
Missouri	1 year	60 days	
Montana	do	30 days	
Nebraska	6 months	40 days	10 days.
Nevada	6 months	30 days	10 days.
New Hampshire	do	6 months in town	
New Jersey	do	60 days	15 days (in city of 4th class).
New Mexico	12 months	90 days	30 days.
New York	1 year	4 months	Do.
North Carolina	do		Do.
North Dakota	do	90 days	Do.
Ohio	do	40 days	40 days.
Oklahoma	do	6 months	30 days.
Oregon	6 months		
Pennsylvania	1 year		2 months.
Rhode Island	do	6 months in town or city	
South Carolina	2 years	1 year	4 months.
South Dakota	1 year	90 days	30 days.
Tennessee	12 months	3 months	
Texas	1 year	6 months	
Utah	do	4 months	60 days.
Vermont	do	3 months in town (to vote for representatives to general assembly or justices).	
Virginia	do	6 months	
Washington	do	90 days	30 days.
West Virginia	do	60 days	
Wisconsin	do		10 days.
Wyoming	do	do	Do.

TABLE II.—*Other requirements*

State	U.S. citizenship required	Age	Literacy required	Poll tax prerequisite for voting	Loyalty oath
Alabama	X	21	X	X	X.
Alaska	X	19	X		
Arizona	X	21	X		
Arkansas	X	21		X	
California	X [1]	21	X		
Colorado	X	21			
Connecticut	X	21	X		X.
Delaware	X	21	X		
Florida	X	21			X.
Georgia	X	18	X [2]		
Idaho	X	21			X.
Illinois	X	21			
Indiana	X	21			
Iowa	X	21			
Kansas	X	21			
Kentucky	X	18			
Louisiana	X	21	X [2]		
Maine	X	21	X		
Maryland	X	21			
Massachusetts	X	21	X		
Michigan	X	21			
Minnesota	X [3]	21			
Mississippi	X	21	X	X	X.
Missouri	X	21			
Montana	X [4]	21			
Nebraska	X	21	(5)		
Nevada	X	21	(5)		
New Hampshire	X	21	X [2]		
New Jersey	X	21			
New Mexico	X	21			
New York	X [1]	21	X		
North Carolina	X	21	(5)		X.
North Dakota	X	21			
Ohio	X	21			
Oklahoma	X	21	(5)		
Oregon	X	21	X		
Pennsylvania	X [6]	21			
Rhode Island	X	21	(5)		
South Carolina	X	21	X [2]		
South Dakota	X [6]	21			
Tennessee	X	21			
Texas	X	21		X	
Utah	X [7]	21			
Vermont	X	21			X.
Virginia	X	21	(5)	X	
Washington	X	21	X [2]		
West Virginia	X	21			
Wisconsin	X	21			
Wyoming	X	21	X		

[1] At least 90 days before election.
[2] See body of report for details.
[3] At least 3 months before election.
[4] By election.
[5] At least 1 month.
[6] Must have resided in United States 5 years.
[7] For 90 days.

TABLE III.—*Persons disqualified from voting*

State	Idiots, insane, under guardianship	Commission of felony or infamous crime	Paupers	Others
Alabama	X	X		Vagrants and others.
Alaska	X	X[1]		
Arizona	X	X[1]		
Arkansas	X	X		
California	X	X		Aliens ineligible to citizenship.
Colorado	X			While in prison.
Connecticut	X	X[1]		
Delaware	X	X	X	Convicted of election offenses; disfranchised 10 years.
Florida	X	X[1]		Interested in election wager.
Georgia	X	X[1]		
Idaho	X	X[1]		Chinese or Mongolian descendants not born in United States.
Illinois	X	X[1]		
Indiana	X	X[1]		While imprisoned.
Iowa	X	X		
Kansas	X	X[1]		Dishonorably discharged soldier, bribery.
Kentucky	X	X[1]		In prison for penal offense.
Louisiana	X	X[1]		Inmates of prison or charitable institution, deserters and those dishonorably discharged from armed services unless reinstated.
Maine	X		X	
Maryland	X	X[1]		
Massachusetts	X		X	Corrupt election practices, disfranchised for 3 years.
Michigan				
Minnesota	X	X[1]		See body of report under "Qualifications for Voting" regarding Indians.
Mississippi	X	X		Indians not taxed.
Missouri	X	X[2]		While in prison or poorhouse.
Montana	X	X[1]		
Nebraska	X	X[1]		
Nevada	X	X[1]		Duel.
New Hampshire	X	X[1]	X(1)	Violation of election law.[1]
New Jersey	X	X		Do.
New Mexico	X	X[1]		
New York	X	X[1]		Election offenses, shall not vote at such election.
North Carolina	X	X[1]		
North Dakota	X	X[1]		
Ohio	X	X[1]		2d offense under election laws.
Oklahoma	X	X[1]		While in poorhouse or prison.
Oregon	X	X[1]		
Pennsylvania				Election offense, disfranchised 4 years. Bribery at election * * * for such election.
Rhode Island	X	X[1]	X	Residing on lands ceded by Rhode Island to United States.
South Carolina	X	X[1]	X	While in prison.
South Dakota	X	X[1]		
Tennessee		X[1]		
Texas	X	X[1]	X	Soldiers, sailors, and seamen while in Regular service of United States.
Utah	X	X[1][2]		
Vermont				Bribery for vote, disfranchised for such election.
Virginia	X	X	X	Duel.
Washington	X	X[1]		Indians not taxed; subversive activities.
West Virginia	X	X[4]	X	Bribery in election (while under conviction).
Wisconsin	X	X[1]		Bribery; [1] duel; election wager, disfranchised for such election.
Wyoming	X	X[1]		

[1] Unless civil rights have been restored.
[2] Connected with election.
[4] While under conviction.
[3] Treason or election offense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, these tables show that there is a lack of uniformity among the States with respect to the right to vote. But the most common requirement, and the one which strikes the right to vote from the most citizens is, surprisingly, the residence requirement. I have had a study made, and I find that at least 3 percent of our population move from one county to another county within any given year within the same State. In many States they must have had from 3 months to 6 months or even a year of residence within the county in order to be able to vote. Thus, we may disenfranchise as many as 3 percent of our adult citizens merely by stringent residence requirements for those moving within the same States.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, I find that about 3 percent of our people move from one State to another within any given year. It is my campaign experience that even these persons who are denied the right to vote, not by reason of race and not by reason of literacy requirements or illiteracy, but only by reason of the accident of employment and geography, feel just as outraged by their loss of the right to vote as do those who have lost it for any other reason. Every American views his right to vote as a precious right. Its denial is one which offends him. There has been very little attention paid to this issue because time heals this disqualification for any one person providing he stays put. Yet, there are persons in our society whose employment requires them to move frequently.

I have met people who have not voted as many as six elections, consecutively, because they were constantly on the move, and they never acquired residence.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, I have discovered that it is possible for a resident of the United States, born in the United States, and living here all his life, not to have residence in any one of the States. This appears to be true because he can lose his residence by a move from a State where he has been a resident without acquiring residence in the State in which he moves.

Therefore, I suggest that the Congress might well give attention to taking such steps as might help us to secure legislation in each of the 50 States which would provide a uniform rule of residence or as close as we could come to that uniform rule. I suggest, for example, that no person be allowed to lose his residence in a State where he last enjoyed it until he has gained residence in the State to which he has moved.

Many States do have absentee voting laws. But many of the States say, "If you move away you have lost your residence, and therefore the absentee ballot is only for those who intend to come back." So, absentee ballots are an inadequate protection. One State requires 2 years' residence. Most States require 1 year. Some of the States use the 6-month's residence requirement.

Residence is legally the function of the purpose for which the residence rule was imposed. For example, if you are driving an automobile and move into a State, the license authorities of most States will ask you within 30 days to buy a license for your automobile in that State. On the other hand, if you move into a State and want to go hunting, they apply the nonresident hunting license, where the fee is higher, because they contend you are not a resident until you have been there for 12 months.

With respect to property taxes, the moment you buy a piece of property, or the moment you start to pay rent on property, for all practical purposes, you are being taxed under the property tax. The income tax is likely to treat you as a resident as soon as you draw income within a State, unless you can demonstrate you are not a resident.

The estate tax is so drawn that it is possible to be a resident in two States at the same time. We appear eager to attach a tax to your estate. It might be well for the Congress to seek to develop a uniform residence purposes law for all.

The Judiciary Committee and the Congress might give consideration to giving a shorter uniform rule of residence. I suggest 30 days, 60 days or not more than 90 days as an adequate length of time to acquire residence within any State, and not more than 30 days' residence within a county. Those provisions would be more generous than those now in use.

Acts of Congress now support longer residence requirements.

The present provisions of the Social Security Act, for example, in the public assistance sections provide that the Federal Government will permit States to require 1 year of continuous residence preceding the date of application in a State where an application is filed, and it will allow a further requirement of 5 years in the previous 9 years. Many States impose such residence requirements before a citizen of the United States, who has paid taxes all of his life, may be eligible to apply for relief under a Federal statute.

It clearly seems to me that Congress has the obligation, if it is concerned about civil rights, to reexamine the residence requirements that we impose, and to cooperate with the States and see if we might devise some uniform rule of residence.

But there are other limitations on the franchise. Literacy is required in 18 States. You may say, "This is a good

thing." If one talks with people representing the new democracies in Asia and Africa one very quickly must conclude that a literacy requirement is an undemocratic action. It is interesting that India conducted a great democratic election in which there was a heavier participation by the populace than in the United States. Even though the majority of Indians are as yet illiterate, they can recognize symbols, and party symbols have been successfully used. I think the cause of democracy has been advanced by that action.

So I would think we would want to examine the literacy requirement. In any event but 18 States use it.

Then we come to the poll tax. In only five States is the poll tax used. It is interesting that only six States do not disqualify idiots and insane people.

Only four States do not disqualify persons for felony or infamous crime. These include my own State of Colorado as well as Maine, Massachusetts, and Michigan. This is the only disqualification which is constitutionally permitted and we have found its absence no significant handicap to good government in Colorado.

Paupers are still disqualified in nine States. Four States have very severe restrictions on absentee voting. The Members will recall the Congress established a Federal voting assistance program in 1955. This program simplifies both the registration and ballot application by providing a uniform Federal post card application form. Every State now accepts its use for members in the Armed Forces and half the States have adopted all the changes recommended. Twelve States restrict its use to members of the Armed Forces and dependents, and 13 States restrict its use to members of the Armed Forces only for purposes of ballot application. States have been almost as generous in extending the simplified registration form. Twenty-three States cover all categories. Ten take care of members of the Armed Forces and dependents, and 10 States take care of members of the Armed Forces only.

The second report of the Department of Defense on the Federal voting assistance program has just been released and summarizes developments in detail.

The Congress has several courses of action it might well pursue in seeking to broaden the franchise. The first is to pass the civil rights legislation which is the subject of the discharge petition under discussion this afternoon. The second is to extend that bill before passage by including Federal referees or Federal registrars so that no person will be denied registration by the refusal or unwillingness of state and local authorities to abide by their constitutional obligations.

The third would be to undertake a full congressional investigation of all of the restrictions on the right to vote in every state as a prelude to possible action under the 14th amendment. If we do not act within the next year, it will be 10 years before we have another suitable occasion to exercise this power.

Finally, the Congress might well undertake a general study of the whole question of residence requirements and related privileges and immunities of citizens so as to develop some method whereby a citizen of the United States would be certain to be a citizen of 1 and only 1 of its 50 States. It is unfair and inequitable to accept without question a legal structure which makes some citizens simultaneously residents of two or more States while denying other citizens the right to be a citizen of even one of the States. I am hopeful that this last course of action might secure favorable action.

Certainly the taxpayers of this country would be relieved of many unfair burdens if a uniform rule of residence could be established.

As a suggested procedure, I would like to see a Federal-State conference designed to devise a uniform draft for State residence laws as well as appropriate Federal draft statutes. We are not likely to make progress in extending this protection to our citizens until we have examined the present jungle of law and arrived at a reasonable standard toward which each State might then move by its own constitutional processes.

I hope we will pass the pending bill. But let us not assume that when we have passed it that we have fulfilled our obligations or met the needs which face us. Our work will still have only begun.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which I feel constitutes a sound approach to a gradual solution of our national debt management.

The national debt and its propensity for increase has been a thorn for all Americans and especially for those of us in government. The seriousness of our financial posture cannot be belittled by either political party because the desire for a sound fiscal policy transcends political partisanship. It cannot be alleviated by verbal exhortations for fiscal responsibility; it must be confronted head on—by constriction, resolve and positive action. It must be coped with in the arena of bipartisanship because it is a "plague on both of our houses."

The ugly specter of our financial posture cannot unfold unless we trace its ascendancy factually and logically. The gradual rise of our national debt, of course, emanates as a result of increased spending. This is an elementary statement except for the fact that I feel bound to trace the graduation of this spending in order that we may fully appreciate the problem we face more lucidly. At this point I wish to include a chronological record of total expenditures under the administrations of both President Truman and President Eisenhower:

Truman:	Billion
1946	$60.4
1947	39.0
1948	33.0
1949	39.5
1950	39.6
1951	44.0
1952	65.4
1953	74.2
Total	[1] 395.4

[1] Totals do not agree because of rounding.

Eisenhower:	Billion
1954	$67.7
1955	64.5
1956	66.5
1957	69.4
1958	71.9
1959	80.8
1960 (estimated)	77.0
Total	[1] 499.8

[1] Totals do not agree because of rounding.

Now, to place into focus the entire picture it is necessary that we trace the status of our national debt from the last years of the Truman administration up to and including the last fiscal year of the present administration, and at this point in the RECORD I insert the appropriate figures:

	Gross public debt
June 30, 1946	$269,422,099,173
June 30, 1953	266,071,061,639
June 30, 1959 (estimated)	285,000,000,000

I am not trying to indulge in political semantics because I believe, as I stated before, that the problem deserves an atmosphere free and clear of any partisanship. The charges and countercharges of who is responsible for the national debt are merely arguments over the symptoms but offer no sustenance or cure for this ailing patient. The legislation which I have sponsored today is an approach which I think is sound, feasible, and within the capacity of the American people to sustain.

My bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury issue a special stamp in multiples of $5 up to a total issue of $2 billion for each year with certain discretionary powers to reduce or increase the issue under special circumstances. The stamp shall bear interest at the annual rate of 4¼ percent compounded semiannually as presently required for U.S. savings bonds. The revenue derived from the sale shall be applied to the principal of the national debt only. Such stamps may be used only as a credit against income and estate taxes imposed by the United States—but only after the expiration of a 2-year period which begins on the date of issue of such stamps. Provisions are made for redemption in cash to take care of situations arising in case of no tax liability in the event of death or taxes withheld from wages.

This bill will enable the American people to purchase up to $2 billion in stamps upon the condition that their money will be applied solely for payment on the principal of the national debt. They will be paid back in tax credits on their income or estate taxes after 2 years. It is in the nature of a grassroots mandatory injunction directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $2 billion annually on the national debt.

These stamp purchases will not actually reflect a reduction of the national debt until the stamps are surrendered as tax credits after the expiration of 2 years. The amount of tax credits are predetermined on the basis of sales 2 years before redemption and, therefore, these tax credits cannot be computed or considered as available anticipated revenue in budget planning. It is at this point that the reduction of our national debt will start its operation.

Our rising national debt has passed the $290 billion mark. Balanced budgets will not stop this rise. During the last 6 fiscal years Congress has not appropriated more money than the President asked, and still we have had deficits totaling $12.5 billion. We must try another approach. I believe my plan is a step in this direction.

CIVIL RIGHTS

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

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

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

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on at least three or four occasions the Republicans charged political football. I will not allege, propose, or suggest that civil rights is being used as a political football even on the part of the Republican Party. I think their actions speak for themselves. I think the issue has been well made by my colleagues. The civil rights petition is there for them to sign if they believe in it and for those who do not have that belief they may refrain from doing so.

The thing that discourages me, Mr. Speaker, is that every time the Democrats move for constructive legislation the Republicans accuse the Democrats of political footballing; but when the shoe is on the other foot—and I might say the shoe is on the other foot very seldom—but when the shoe is on the other foot then, of course, the support of legislation by the Republican Party is in the name of integrity. I am quite confident this is an insult to the intelligence of the American people and that they will not be deceived by it.

I must say that I was somewhat amazed to hear one of the Republican Members suggest that he was honored, honored to see that the Republican Party was getting the credit for stagnating action on the civil rights bill, or words to that effect. This may not have been his true intent, for the honor is dubious indeed. I merely suggest that if he did mean it that they can have that most dubious honor; they deserve it; it is theirs.

Contrary to previous denials, the fact is that a coalition exists between Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans. I am quite confident in my own mind that somewhere, somehow, by somebody, either in this House or outside of it, the Republicans have had their soul sold on the civil rights issue; and despite my complete disagreement with my colleagues from the South on this particular subject, I certainly can better understand their position than I can that of the Republicans from the North. The Democrats from the South have been consistent in their opposition and they have been honest in stating their opposition to civil rights legislation. We cannot say this is true for the other party.

Mr. Speaker, from the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the study of three particular aspects; namely, voting, housing and education, has allowed them to see the organic nature of the problem as a whole.

> The problem is one of securing the full rights of citizenship to those Americans who are being denied in any degree that vital recognition of human dignity, the equal protection of the laws.

The Commission reports further that this is now largely a racial problem. With but one exception, the only denials of the right to vote brought to the attention of the Commission, were reasons of race or color. This is clearly the issue in education, they so state, as well as it is true in public housing.

The Commission concludes from these findings that—

> If a way can be found to secure and protect the civil rights of this minority group, if a way can be opened for them to finish moving up from slavery to the full human dignity of first-class citizenship, then America will be well on its way toward fulfilling the great promises of the Constitution.

I recognize that the task of undoing more than a century of unequal treatment is one of Goliath proportions. But this does not and should not indicate that it shall not or cannot be done. In fact this gives cause for greater challenge and greater effort so that the 14th and 15th amendments of the Constitution should not stand nullified. It is obvious that this task has not been made easier by extreme lawlessness, violence, and unparalleled disregard and open defiance of court decisions.

It is noteworthy, I believe, to recall that just a few short months ago, the hue and cry for individual rights or equal rights within labor unions was loud and clear. However, it was odd to note that some of those using that argument most forcibly are those who refuse to sign the discharge petition and therefore to grant really true justice to all Americans, under different circumstances, even insofar as the right to vote is concerned. Now I have been in politics long enough to know that there are two sides to every coin, but outright "tomfoolery" is easily recognized as I am confident it is in this case.

In the Civil Rights Act of 1957, Congress recognized that enforcement of constitutional guarantees is a matter of concern to the people as a whole.

The world recognizes that, for us to point to our Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution in furthering or exemplifying democracy, but denying some of the most basic and fundamental rights of that Constitution, may indeed indicate a weakness in democracy itself. We cannot and should not allow this misconception to either spread or exist.

Equal civil rights is, incidentally, morally and ethically proper in every sense of the word. Equal rights has worldwide significance and great effect on our democratic processes as viewed on the overall screen of symbolic hope, and offers an escape for all from the shackles of dictatorship.

Let me but remind you, that we as whites and Americans are nothing more than a cornerstone of a minority.

There are more people in the world who are of the nonwhite race than white.

There are more illiterate in the world than there are literate.

There are more hungry and impoverished than there are well fed.

There are more homeless in the world than there are having homes as we Americans know them.

There are more suppressed peoples than there are nonsuppressed—and from many standpoints.

There are more sick and diseased than there are healthy and well born and yet some stand embossed with the idea that somehow, somewhere, for some reason we are a superior majority. In every one of these instances we stand out as a glaring, overall minority in the eyes of the world—and we are.

It has often been said and, equally often admitted, that Little Rock damaged our standing in the world more than Soviet Russia's launching of the first sputnik.

Prejudice and denial result in overall, weak, economic stagnation at home as well. It results in unfairly denied employment and job upgrading. It results in discriminatory promotion opportunity. It results in denial of income and security, inferior food, housing, education, and even medical care. Nonwhite life expectancy is 8 years shorter than is white life expectancy. In fact lawlessness has erupted as a result of this degeneration, lives have been lost in hate bombings, swastikas have been painted on synagogues, hangings have resulted without due process of law. These acts must be stopped.

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

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Chairman CELLER of the Judiciary Committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and other Members for setting aside time today for calling to the attention of Congress the necessity to debate and pass effective civil rights legislation early in this session of Congress. After the Judiciary Committee reported out the civil rights bill last August, Chairman CELLER requested the chairman of the Rules Committee to set down a date for a hearing on this bill. Unfortunately, the legislation was not presented earlier in the 1st session of the 86th Congress in order to have sufficient time to consider the same both in the House and on the Senate side before adjournment. We are now at the beginning of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, and I wish to assure the sponsors of this highly necessary legislation that, both as a Member of Congress and a member of the Rules Committee, I will do everything within my power to have the same heard by the Committee on Rules so that the House and the other body will have plenty of time in this session to legislate on this civil rights bill.

This legislation involves placing into actual practice the fundamental rights as set out in our Constitution. It is unfortunate that in the 85th Congress the effective civil rights bill which passed the House was amended in the other body by the striking out of part 3 which was

really the essence for effective and complete civil rights legislation. That bill which passed the House in its original form if enacted into law would have preserved the constitutional rights and dignities of all individuals, protected their franchise, extended equality of opportunity in all fields of endeavor, including education, employment, housing, transportation, and all relations and privileges given to Americans under our constitution which guarantees complete freedom to all its citizens.

Effective civil rights legislation will aid greatly to wipe out numerous international complications which the Communists and their agitators are promoting throughout Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and other areas on the globe. Effective civil rights legislation will make our struggle for peace and freedom throughout the world easier and aid us in overcoming insidious Soviet propaganda that our American system does not guarantee freedom to all.

We must also not forget that two-thirds of the free people throughout the globe do not possess the same racial complexion as the white-skinned race of people. We are spending billions of American taxpayers' money in order to curb the Communists in their conquest and expansion and in the same sessions of Congress, after this money is appropriated, we find that we cannot effectively pass legislation which will guarantee the privileges of freedom and liberty to all under our system of government.

We have made some progress in the last few years in civil rights legislation, and I do hope that in this session we can continue to pass far more effective legislation along this line than was enacted in the 85th Congress.

I think it is well to mention at this time just a few of the outstanding citizens of the Negro race who have not only done so much for the welfare of our Nation, education, and general advancement along with the constant battle for civil rights legislation. I could call to your attention Ralph Bunche of the United Nations and Nobel prize winner, Booker T. Washington, Carter Woodson, George Washington Carver, Gen. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Federal Judge William H. Hastie, Roy Wilking and Dr. Channing H. Tobias of the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall, Mary McLeod Bethume, Edith Samson, Marian Anderson, and numerous other men and women who have fought for the advancement of their race for many years and will continue as long as their strength and vitality lasts.

All Americans must retain the thought that freedom and constitutional privileges in America is for everybody. We should have no second-class citizens in this country. We have undergone many frustrations, difficulties, and disappointments in our legislative battles. In this fight we are not confined to our shores alone, but we are fighting to win world public opinion; as we know, with the Communist threat, the peace of the free world is at stake.

CIVIL RIGHTS—GAMBLING RACKET IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this day being Wednesday is the day that I have chosen in this session of the Congress to stand in the well of the House and tell the truth concerning the gambling racket in the city of New York. Also this day has been reserved by our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for a symposium on civil rights.

In the remaining time left to me I would like to cover both of these topics. If I was preaching, with my Scripture background, I would take the Book of Numbers on gambling and the one on civil rights would be the Book on Revelations.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few things concerning the civil-rights bill. I decry the bringing of partisanship into the field of civil rights. Civil rights is something that should proceed on a bipartisan basis. I also decry hypocrisy in this field and that is why I have so much respect for our colleagues from the other side of the Mason-Dixon line. They are honest. They proclaim both here and outside of Congress, by their vote and by their speech, their attitude. That is honesty. But too many of our northern colleagues say one thing here and another thing outside or say one thing outside and vote the opposite here. That is hypocrisy.

Specifically, I would like to refer to the housing bill of last year to point this up. When the housing bill came up here I introduced the Powell amendment to ban all discrimination in the entire housing bill. When I did that just a handful of my colleagues from this side of the aisle, the Republican side, stood up and voted with us on this side. The next day, if there was one particular part of the housing bill that our colleagues on the Republican side did not want, it was the public-housing feature. So one of the gentlemen, who the preceding day had voted against the civil-rights amendment, introduced my amendment, but only to that public-housing feature. I took the leadership that day in marching down the aisle to kill that civil-rights amendment because it was hypocrisy.

I believe in this year it is going to be of serious damage to the Republicans if they continue to proclaim one thing and refuse to sign that petition there.

I can say very objectively I do not think the Republicans should feel that their candidate for President, Mr. NIXON, is in.

I felt that way once before about a gentleman named Mr. Dewey. And Mr. Truman, on the basis of civil rights mainly, in the last few days of the campaign, in the face of every poll against him, came through and won. NIXON is not in. NIXON can be defeated, and it may well be that what is happening here in this Chamber on this particular issue, the issue of civil rights, might be the thing that will defeat the candidate for President of the Republican Party. What is happening here is being watched very closely, very closely by the minority press in this country, and being reported by them. So, as I present that issue from the "book of revelations," I close that and move on to the other one, "book of numbers."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that since we began this series of weekly exposes of the sordidness of gambling in New York, the pauperizing of the poor, and the criminalization of the people in the ghetto, that within the past 3 weeks several high officials of the police department have resigned their office, one within just the past 48 hours; that the mayor of our city has held today, at city hall, a conference on corruption in city departments, and one of the invited officials present in that off-the-record conference was the police commissioner of New York; that on this past Sunday the speaker of the assembly of the New York Legislature, Carmen Carlino, on television pointed out that what I was saying was correct, but more than that he made the serious charge that all I was revealing was just the beginning; that this unholy alliance between the mafia and the syndicate and the combine in New York City and numbers and racketeering and narcotics and prostitution was an unholy alliance even with some top officials. That was his statement. I would like to point out, in contrast, what has happened in Chicago and not happened in New York. In Chicago, when the details became apparent that some of the men on the police force were in collusion with men of the underworld, a shakeup took place. In New York City no shakeup has taken place. I think that a shakeup in the nature of the removal of every inspector, deputy, chief, and precinct inspector should take place in the Borough of Manhattan as a signal that there is going to be a new regime of honesty. I do not mean that these men who are in position in Manhattan are dishonest. I do not mean that they should be removed from office, but transferred to other boroughs so that those who now roll our streets and walk our streets as known criminals know that the day of being scofflaws has passed.

Now I would like to put into the RECORD another series of names and addresses. So far in the names and addresses I have listed, I have made only one error and I would like to rectify that first. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week I listed as one of the number gambling drops in New York the E. J. TV Appliance Store at 3638 Broadway. On checking that I find out that the number is 3648 Broadway—3638 Broadway is occupied by two eminent gentlemen, Mr. Carl Tomlinson, who operates a restaurant known as Carl's Restaurant, and Mr. Alexander Rosenklatz who operates a very fine Thrifty Store at that address. As I told you, last week I mentioned the names of two individuals who I did not have their last names of, and during the past few hours I have received information concerning them. I mentioned Sol and Tom. Sol and Tom's last name is Capaldo. They operate and own a vege-

table market at 2016 Amsterdam Avenue. I am reading the report that comes back:

These two have been in this district for 10 years to my knowledge. They have about 10 runners and comptrollers working for them. These two bankers, the most defiant bunch you have ever seen with respect to the law. They work Amsterdam Avenue from 6 a.m. to 9 o'clock at night. The police just pass them up.

Even during the reporting of their addresses and names last week until now they are still operating freely. They must be paying out. If not, why don't they pick them up when they see them? They know their spots. It is a shame to see these bums taking this money even off of relief clients that are being supported by the taxpayers of New York. I figured that if I wrote you you would be able to investigate why the police of the 30th precinct, Washington Heights and also the headquarters men of the special squads including the Police Commissioner's Confidential Squad, why they don't run these bums out of this neighborhood once and for all?

Is there any way and why are not arrangements made so that these fellows are turned over to Federal authorities for evading their taxes, especially the gambling tax?

I wish to assure the writer of this letter than I have done this and am working in complete cooperation with the collector of internal revenue.

I only hope that with the help of God you will be able to continue on with your crusade against this rotten element. I have lived in this district for over a quarter of a century and between you and myself have never seen gambling as wide open as it has been going on in this precinct for the past 5 years. We know where the fault lies. It is nowhere but in the Police Department. They look the other way. Honest people are not blind and we are not afraid to say something that may hurt their feelings.

I will try to itemize addresses of stores that they operate from and will watch them carefully but in the meantime I give you these addresses.

The K and T Shoe Shine Parlor at 500 West 160th Street. Open all day Sunday. Known to pick up bets for the following day. Also they sell wine and whisky. This, therefore, is a Federal offense.

Then he gives me the license number of a car of one of those who operates with them. It is 3565BX 1959, not renewed as yet, a red and white sports model brand new Oldsmobile, 1959.

There is also George Capaldo, who is the father of Sol and Tom. He operates the candy store next door to the shoe shine parlor at 502 West 160th Street.

Then there is the Dexter Tavern, 160th Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

The next part of this letter I must delete because it is very important. I have already informed District Attorney Hogan in New York concerning this by telephone this afternoon.

I would like to bring in some more names that have just been phoned to me.

The Sol and Tom operation, 501 West 160th Street.

Sam's Food Store, 518 West 159th Street.

Harry's New Broadway, 2498 West 159th Street.

And then a banker, Lou Waltman, 521 West 156th Street, Apartment 1–A.

Then the Lucky Lunch at 2070 Amsterdam Avenue.

I will bring before this body next Wednesday more information with the hope that in some way what I do here may stimulate the conscience of the leadership of our police department in New York to clean up the force and make our town a better town in which decent people can live with dignity and without fear.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for an hour's time and yet I can say all that would cover the subject in a few sentences and still could not exhaust the subject if I spoke for many days. The laws of human deportment and our relationship to our Maker and our fellow man are set forth in a relatively few sentences in the Ten Commandments, but countless millions of words written and spoken in many generations have given them a richness of interpretation and of understanding adaptation to changing conditions as mankind ascends, ever higher, in the climb to the mountain's top.

And so I could say briefly that if we believe in our democracy—and with us our Constitution is a sacred document of political faith and not an instrument of mockery—we cannot hide behind a fence of excuses when the signing of a discharge petition means the opening of the way for millions of our fellow Americans to come into full enjoyment of their constitutional right of participation as electors in a government of, for, and by all the people.

Unless the discharge petition reaches the required number of signatures, civil rights legislation is doomed, and any Member of this body, Democrat or Republican, who refuses to sign the petition must individually take the responsibility of being party to a conspiracy to continue to hold in political bondage millions of his fellow Americans. It is that simple.

I seek to be charitable with all my colleagues, as I trust my colleagues will be charitable with me. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues from the North who have not as yet signed the discharge petition would counsel with their consciences. Yes, there may be a political expediency in withholding their signatures, saying the responsibility is upon the Democratic Party and the Democratic Party is in the majority in numbers in this Chamber; but to their own conscience that cannot be satisfying. They know that on the Rules Committee are all of the Republican members of that committee joined with two Democrats, two Democrats from the South, to keep bottled up the legislation that decency demands and that our security in a troubled world demands. These colleagues of mine on the other side who have not signed the petition know that that is a fact, but I suppose with a sense of political expediency, thinking that the responsibility can be thrown onto the Democratic side, they are withholding their signatures. This may be a partisan advantage, according to the reasoning of some, but in good conscience no advantage is worth the price of continuing on millions of our fellow Americans the chains of political bondage.

Mr. Speaker, I remember in the 81st Congress I was on the committee that wrote a housing bill and my heart was in the enactment of that great piece of legislation. The vote we knew would be very close, and many felt that the adoption of an antisegregation amendment would doom the measure. The leadership regarded the amendment as a device to kill the bill.

There was a teller vote. I saw some of my liberal colleagues from the North, just as sincere in their opposition to segregation as I am, line up and vote against the amendment to save as they felt the housing bill that meant so much to all our people in that period of critical housing shortage. I voted for the amendment. The amendment was defeated by one vote. Had it carried, possibly I would have borne the responsibility of having killed that great housing bill. But I could not have lived with myself unless I had done as I did. Each man must make his own decisions, and I am sure that in this body always they are honest decisions, varying with different philosophies and different approaches. I happen to believe that no material advantage is worth the abandonment of a moral principle.

I was not surprised when I heard a brilliant and distinguished colleague of mine, a Republican from Illinois, Congresswoman MARGARET STITT CHURCH, say that she had signed the discharge petition, and she did it, I know, because of her conscience. She was not thinking as a Republican when she signed the petition nor was I thinking as a Democrat when I signed the petition. You cannot duck conscience in a pool of partisan waters. You cannot play politics with morals. I hope that all my colleagues from the North on the other side of the aisle who sincerely believe in civil rights and who believe that everyone of our Americans should have an equal opportunity to vote regardless of any political expediency and regardless of any whispered counsel from their leadership will come and sign this petition.

Now I am not judging our Democrats from the South. It is not given to me to judge any of my colleagues. They at least are consistent. They realize they are standing for a dying order. An order that has gone and will never return. But they are still standing for it, on the fringe of a lost battlefield. When we had civil rights legislation before the House in the last Congress, it was late in July, I think, a beautiful summer day. Summer was in the full bloom of its enrapturement. Yet, my friends, summer than had been on the path of death for more than a month. Although everything spoke of summer, it was a dying and not a borning summer. Summer was on its way out. That is how it is with the changing order now.

So my southern colleagues cannot be accused of hypocrisy or insincerity when they are fighting this legislation which will hasten the coming to the South of a new order and which, when the dread of a change from the status quo is gone, the South will find a much better order.

But what about my colleagues from the North who profess to believe in the equality of the races and who yet are taking this legislation down to certain death and because of a certain weird calculation of political expediency are withholding their names from the discharge petition? Everyone knows the condition in this House. Everyone knows that the Democratic Party elected a majority of the Members of this body, and everyone knows that the Republican leadership outnumbered, formed a coalition with certain Democrats. These Democrats from the South had something they were interested in and the Republicans of the North agreed to play in partnership with them. The price exacted from the Republican leadership was aid in defeating civil rights legislation. We know the condition here. I do not imagine anyone in the country is much fooled. Four Republican members of the Rules Committee joined up with 2 Southern Democratic members to keep civil rights legislation bottled up in the Rules Committee is so self-evident that any civics teacher in any high school would be ashamed of any pupil who missed the point.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I gladly yield to my distinguished and beloved friend from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman, my dear friend, states that four Republican members of the Rules Committee voted to kill this legislation. I do not believe there has been a vote on it yet in the Committee on Rules; is that not so?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very sorry that my inadequacy in handling the English language caused me to be misunderstood by my distinguished colleague. Would the gentleman say there are any Republican members on the Committee on Rules who have shown any interest at all in voting out this bill? Will he give me the name of one member?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In answer to the gentleman, I think the only way you can know the truth is to have the majority party bring the matter up for a vote so that that could be determined. I do not believe that we, as responsible members of this important body, can go on the basis of guesswork.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I think the gentleman is right—there should not be any guesswork about it. But where I find a great moral issue involved and find on one side four members, and they are Republicans and they are from the North, standing up like a stone wall with two Southern Democrats and not moving—I do not think I have to resort to any guesswork.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say to the gentleman that it is a well-known fact that the members of the Rules Committee may request a meeting of the Rules Committee at any time. Certain Democratic members have indicated a desire to have that meeting. They have not been able to have it, but if just one of the Republicans joined with them in that request they could have a meeting, but as long as they are not able to get one Republican, a meeting cannot go forward. If three or four members would indicate that they would come to that meeting, the Democrat members have already indicated that they are happy to join them. But until their Republican friends do that, there is nothing to happen in the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad to yield. I am looking for some logic on your side.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; and I will spell it out to you. I am looking for some logic on your side other than the political maneuvering that is going on here today. You made this statement: The Rules Committee has four Republicans voting with two Democrats, and they could get this legislation out. Earlier in your remarks, and I congratulate you for it, you said it is the responsibility of the majority party to bring about this legislation. My question is this: Do you feel that six of the Democratic members on the Rules Committee are not in favor of bringing out this legislation?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do not know that I have any feeling at all, except what one may have when he sees something just as plain as one's hand before one's eyes. I see on the Rules Committee four Republicans and two Democrats joined up against the solid Northern Democratic membership of that Committee. I know that if one of the four Republicans budged we would have this legislation out.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am wondering, then, if there is involved in your comment a criticism of the other Democratic members of the Rules Committee? If the leadership is in favor of this legislation why could they not make a change in the personnel on the majority side of the Rules Committee, which is within their power to do? In other words, when this Congress was organized in January, the members of the various committees were drafted and approved by the leaderships on both sides. If this matter is as desperate as many think it is and it is bogged down and we are having all this controversy, if the Democratic leadership is genuinely interested in getting this out without making a political football out of it, it would seem to me the Democratic leadership could make a change in the Democratic membership on the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. My friend, let me say this. I was seeking to sympathize. I do not like to see my Republican colleagues from the North put on the rack by their own leadership. It will be hard for them to explain. May I ask the gentleman, Has he signed the discharge petition?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman from Nebraska has signed the discharge petition as I stated before.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I congratulate the gentleman, but I am not surprised. While there is no one on his side of the aisle who is more loyal to his party, and we all recognize his ability, I have observed that on moral issues like this he votes with his conscience.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman makes the statement that he just made because that is the basis on which it ought to be determined and not on a political basis.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The last remark of the gentleman from Nebraska I think is illustrative of the type of argument which has obstructed us very much.

He knows as well as I do or anybody else in the House does that to change the members of a committee at this time in this session would be simply asking for the impossible. We also know that actually it was a question, as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has said, a question of the individual. Four of them we know honestly and conscientiously do not want a civil rights bill. Four of the Democrats have said openly they want one and would vote for it. Four members on the Republican side have said they would support the civil rights legislation. It is simply a question of arithmetic then. Why will not the four Republican members who profess to be for civil rights join with the four Democratic members who are for civil rights and get the bill out? Why can we not argue it on the basis of merit rather than of partisanship? Let the four Republican members who said they are for civil rights show it by their actions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a response to the gentleman from California?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. After I have yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I promised him I would yield.

Mr. YATES. I have a statement to make. May I make my statement?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I will very much appreciate my friend and colleague joining me in the well.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Illinois in his excellent statement this afternoon.

The debate this afternoon is a most important one in making clear the position taken by the Democratic Party and the Republican Party in the field of human welfare and civil rights. Of late, the Republican Party has professed to be the champion of the little man and of minority groups. Its members are loud and strong in their profession of advocacy of the civil rights program; but there is little action to support their

protestations. They are now continuing the record they have made over the years, and they cannot deny it.

Let us look at the record. The record shows it was the Democratic Party through the New Deal and Fair Deal which first gave impetus to the hopes of the minority groups in America. Their programs brought a social revolution which changed the people's attitude toward their government.

As explained by Republican editor William Allen White, the victory of the Democrats indicated a firm desire on the part of the American people to use government as an agency of human welfare.

Under this concept, the powers of government were used by Democratic administrations to assure the American people of the right to a useful and remunerative job; of the right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and recreation; of the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which would give him and his family a decent living; of the right of every businessman to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies; of the right to a decent home; of the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; of the right to a good education for their children; and of the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

Taking action to achieve these goals, the Democratic Party initiated legislation for a minimum wage law; for a full employment law; for a Federal aid to education bill; for raising health standards through adequate medical care; for good housing, including public housing; for a farm bill that would permit farmers to live in decency; for unemployment compensation and for social security.

And all this time what were the Republicans doing? They were opposing every single one of the New Deal measures. The record shows that all the social reforms which are recognized today as being an essential part of our democratic way of life were enacted into law in spite of—not because of—the Republican Party.

Why did they oppose such reforms? They said they were socialistic.

Socialistic: Not to all Republicans. The Democratic program was not socialistic to Dr. Channing H. Tobias, for example, who at the time was an independent Republican. He said that he proposed to support President Roosevelt in 1944 "because his philosophy of government and the generally progressive course he has followed for the past 12 years have vested the common man of every race, creed, and color with a dignity and inspired him with a hope that he has never known before."

Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, after looking carefully at the record, was convinced "without the slightest doubt that Franklin D. Roosevelt has done more for the uplift and progress of the American Negro than any President since Abraham Lincoln."

And with respect to President Truman, Mr. Thurgood Marshall—one of the most respected attorneys in Washington—had this to say in a radio interview when he was asked about possible presidential candidates in the last presidential election:

> The candidate that gets nearest to Harry S. Truman will more than likely get the votes of the people who believe in civil rights. That's my belief.

It is to be expected that these outstanding leaders would so express themselves. The rise of the average American under the Roosevelt reforms was unbelievable. Knowing that there could be no true freedom unless there is freedom from want, the New Deal of the Democratic Party set about first the elimination of the ravaging effects of poverty, and bringing a dignity to the forgotten man that he never before enjoyed. Both the President and Mrs. Roosevelt gave him a recognition and the feeling that he was a necessary part of the community—that he belonged.

And as for Harry Truman, he became the symbol of progress in the field of human rights. It was he who established the first commission to study the complex problems of assuring every citizen's constitutional rights. It was he who fathered the greatest all-round legislative program in the field of civil and constitutional rights this country has ever known.

Yes, and it was he who stayed by that program right through the 1948 Democratic Convention and right through the election, even though he knew it might split his own party and cost him the Presidency. And year after year President Truman kept urging his program on the Congress.

Just compare President Truman's actions with those of the present administration. Under President Truman the Federal Government stood squarely behind the constitutional rights of all individuals. Shortly before he left office he stated his view of the responsibility of Federal Government in this field.

> I am not one of those—

He said—

> who feel that we can leave these matters up to the States alone, or that we can rely solely upon the efforts of men of good will. * * * The full force and power of the Federal Government must stand behind the protection of rights guaranteed by our Federal Constitution.

I was in the 81st Congress when the civil rights bills were filed to implement the civil rights program, as recommended by President Truman's Commission. They might have been passed if the Northern Democrats had received the cooperation rather than the opposition of the Northern Republicans. But because most of the members of the Republican Party chose to work with reactionary Democrats from the South, the bills were defeated.

For example, I remember very well the fight on an FEPC bill in 1950 because I was right in the middle of it. After months of maneuvering the bill finally came to the floor on Washington's birthday, February 22d. The Southern Congressmen who opposed the bill fought it with the only filibuster that the House knows, quorum calls and roll calls. Even though the bill had been made the legislative business of the day, after completion of the reading of Washington's address, which is always done on his birthday, Congressman Cox of Georgia got up and moved that the House adjourn out of respect to the memory of George Washington. Time after time that day I watched Republican Members of the House walk off the floor so that a quorum call could be made by a Southern Member. A quorum call takes 40 minutes. There were about 10 of them.

We got a vote on FEPC at 3 o'clock the next morning. Those of us who favored the strong bill, watched with dismay when a substitute bill which took away all the enforcement powers of FEPC was offered. Was it offered by a Southern Democrat? It was not. It was offered by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Republicans approved it. On that vote, a majority of the Democrats voted against the substitute bill. Sixty-eight percent of the Republicans voted for it.

In all the legislative battles when Southern Democrats have fought civil-rights measures, it was the Northern Democrats, rather than the Republicans, who led the fight against them. A few years ago Congressman WINSTEAD, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to the Selective Service Act which gave the right to every inductee to serve in a segregated outfit, if he chose. That amendment, which was approved by the House Armed Services Committee, was defeated on the floor of the House because of a magnificent speech by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago, delivered in support of the motion to strike it out filed by another Democrat, Congressman PRICE, of Illinois. Congressman DAWSON, a Democrat, is the first Negro chairman of a major congressional committee in the history of the Nation.

Nor is Congressman DAWSON the only member of the Negro race in Congress. Three other Negro Members grace these Halls—and all are in the Democratic Party. None are from the Republican Party.

The record shows that the Republican Party has fought public housing; it has fought the minimum wage law and subsequent increases; it has fought social security and increased coverage and benefits; it has fought unemployment compensation; it has fought appropriations for health measures and hospitals; it has fought FEPC; it has fought Federal aid to education. It has fought all progressive legislation.

But now the Republicans say forget the past. We have a new Republican Party. We are now the party of Eisenhower. We are "modern Republicans." Forget the fact that the Republican Party did little to help the average man when it was in power. Forget that the Republican Party fought all measures for the people. Forget that it is the party of big business. This is a new party, say the Republicans.

Well, former President Calvin Coolidge was once asked the question: "Mr. President, do the people where you come from say a hen lays or a hen lies?" Mr. Coolidge replied: "The people where I come from, sir, lift her up to see."

Let us lift up the hen and take a look at the new Republican Party. What has the President done in the field of civil rights? In contrast to the fighting leadership given to the civil rights program by Harry Truman, President Eisenhower has done little or nothing. During the first 3 years of his administration he presented no civil rights program at all to the Congress. And when the Supreme Court handed down its decision in 1954, regarding school desegregation cases, did the President hail the decision? Did he take steps to implement or encourage communities to carry it out? He did not. He has not to this day declared that he favors that decision. He has not declared at any time that he favors the elimination of segregated schools.

Did President Eisenhower include FEPC in his program? He did not. The President has stated that he is opposed to FEPC. A few years ago when Secretary of Labor Mitchell testified before a Senate committee that he favored a strong FEPC with enforcement provisions, the President declared that Secretary Mitchell was entitled to his opinion. As far as he, the President, was concerned, he did not agree with him.

A civil rights bill was passed a few years ago, the first one in 80 years. It was a democratic Congress which passed it and it is true that many Republicans helped by voting for the bill. It is also true that the bill that was passed had the support of the administration. Passage of that bill established the fact that in order to obtain passage of civil rights measures, Republicans must join with Democrats in supporting the legislation. And Republicans helped pass that bill.

Why, then, should they now refuse to take similar action on the pending bill? It is a moderate bill. They have no reason to oppose it. Why do they not join with Northern Democrats in signing the discharge petition so that the bill may be considered by the Congress? Why does the minority leader draw himself up in parliamentary dignity and declare that he favors orderly procedures for the bill and that "this is a Democratic Congress. The Democrats have the responsibility for enacting the bill." He knows very well that the Democratic Party, being a national party, and having Members from the South, will find a number of Democrats refusing to vote for the bill. That same attitude prevails among Republican Members from the South and from the border States as can clearly be disclosed by an examination of the voting records of Members from such States. But Republicans from northern States have no reason to act like their southern brothers. The Republicans from the North are not bound by southern prejudices and customs on civil rights legislation.

In a few days the Republican Party will represent itself as the party of Abraham Lincoln in speeches and banquets all over the United States, made and held to celebrate the martyred President's birthday, but if Abraham Lincoln were to see the manner in which the members of the Republican Party were procrastinating on the civil rights bill he would abjure his party membership.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is clear. Almost without exception, Democrats from the North have signed the discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill to the floor. Almost without exception, Republicans have refused to sign it. They will make excuses, but they cannot gainsay their record. Let them, if they can, henceforth go to the people and state again that they favor civil rights legislation in the face of that record.

The point of President Coolidge's story which I related earlier becomes clear. The hen has been lifted and the results speak for themselves.

I listened to what my good friend from Illinois said a few moments ago of the time that both he and I were in the 81st Congress. We had certain legislation that we had to consider. I am sure that he recalls, as I do, the fight we had for the passage of the FEPC bill and that we learned at that time of the coalition, which is echoed today, the coalition of the reactionary or conservative Democrats from the South and the conservative Republicans from the North. I recall after months of maneuvering how the FEPC bill came to the floor. It was Calendar Wednesday. It was Washington's Birthday, as a matter of fact. I recall that immediately following the reading of Washington's farewell address, Mr. Cox of Georgia got up and moved that the House adjourn out of respect for the memory of the ex-President. Of course, that was voted down. But there was quorum call after quorum call when Republican Members left the floor in order to permit the Democrats from the South to make a point of no quorum. There were 10 or 12 quorum calls that were resorted to because it is only through quorum calls that a filibuster can be carried on in the House. It was 4 o'clock in the morning that we finally got a vote on the FEPC bill.

The gentlemen will recall that one of the votes we had touched upon the question as to whether or not we should have a strong FEPC bill or whether we should have a weak FEPC bill. There was a substitute offered for that FEPC bill which pretty much weakened it. The gentleman will recall who offered that amendment. It was not a Democrat from the South who offered that amendment. It was the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Education and Labor. That amendment carried because of the votes of the Southern Democrats and the Republicans. On that vote a majority of the Democrats voted against the substitute bill. Sixty-eight percent of the Republicans voted for it.

In all the legislative battles in which Southern Democrats have fought civil rights measures, it was the Northern Democrats rather than the Republicans who led the fight against their brethren from the South.

A few years ago the gentlemen will recall when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] offered an amendment in the Armed Services Committee to permit segregation in the Armed Forces because of race. When that bill came to the floor of the House one of our colleagues from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] offered an amendment to delete the Winstead proposal from the armed services bill, and it was a Member from Illinois, Mr. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, a Democrat, the first Negro chairman of a major congressional committee, who made the speech that swept the House and resulted in elimination of the so-called Winstead amendment.

I think we should point out, insofar as party adherence to civil rights is concerned, and the loyalty of minority groups to either party, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] is not the only member of his race in the House of Representatives. There are other Members, but all of them without exception are in the Democratic Party. None of them is in the Republican Party.

The record shows that the Republican Party has fought public housing, it has fought the minimum wage law, it has fought social security, and increased coverage and benefits; it has fought unemployment compensation; it has fought appropriations for health measures and hospitalization; it has fought FEPC, Federal aid to education. It has fought all progressive legislation. But now the Republicans are saying this: They were saying this when they declared that they were modern Republicans. They said, "We have a new Republican Party. We are not the party of Eisenhower. Let us forget the fact that the Republican Party did little to help the average man when it was in power; forget that the Republican Party fought all the measures of the people, that the Republican Party supported all the measures of big business. This is a new party," now say the Republicans.

My colleagues will recall former President Calvin Coolidge who was once asked the question: "Mr. President, do the people where you come from say 'A hen lays' or 'A hen lies'?" Mr. Coolidge relied: "The people where I come from, sir, lift her up to see."

Let us look at the record. Let us lift up the hen and take a look and see whether the new Republican Party is a champion of civil rights. What has the President done in the field of civil rights and what has his party done in the field of civil rights in contrast to the fighting leadership which was given to the civil rights program by President Harry Truman? President Eisenhower has done little or nothing, certainly during the first 3 years of his administration, at a time, sir, when the Republican Party was in control not only of the White House, but when the Republican Party, during the 83d Congress was in control of both Houses of Congress. Not one step was taken to implement a civil rights program. There were no Democratic chairmen of committees at that time to whom the Republicans now point to and say "Look what is happening." At that time the committee chairmen were all Republicans and yet there was no program that was given to the Congress. There

was no program that emanated from the Republican Congress in support of civil rights. And, when the Supreme Court handed down its decision in 1954 in the school desegregation cases, did the President hail the decision? He did not. Did he take steps to implement it? Did he take steps to encourage communities to carry it out? He did not. As far as I have been able to determine nowhere have I read that the President of the United States has declared that he favors the decision of the Supreme Court in the school desegregation cases. He has declared only that it is the law and that he proposes to carry it out. And, has President Eisenhower, since he made that statement recommending civil rights, included FEPC in the program? He has not. FEPC was last heard of by a President when Harry Truman was in the White House. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower has declared that he opposes FEPC, and this declaration of opposition came in response to a question by the press after Secretary of Labor Mitchell had declared before a Senate committee that he favored FEPC. The President was asked whether he agreed with Secretary of Labor Mitchell, and he said, "No, the Secretary is entitled to his own opinion."

A civil rights bill was passed a few years ago, the first one in 80 years. It was a Democratic Congress which passed that bill. And, it is true that the Republicans helped by voting for that bill. It is also true that the bill had the support of the administration. I suggest and urge my friend from Nebraska to listen to this, if I may, because of the interchange which occurred a few moments ago, because of the passage of that bill I think the principle was established that the Republicans, if they favor civil rights, must join with Democrats who favored civil rights in the passage of that bill, too. The Republicans helped pass that bill. Why do they not now help in passing civil rights legislation? Why do they not join with Northern Democrats in signing the discharge petition so that the bill may be considered by the Congress? Why does the minority leader draw himself up in parliamentary dignity and declare that he favors orderly procedure for the bill and also states that this is a Democratic Congress and that the Democrats have the responsibility for enacting this legislation? He knows very well that the Democrats, being a national party, have members from the South who will refuse to vote for the bill. But, let me point out, too, that there are a few Members of Congress who are Republicans who come from Southern and border States, and these, too, have demonstrated, and the record is clear on this, they have demonstrated in every vote that has come up that they will vote in accordance with the same standards and in accordance with the same customs as the Democrats from the South vote. The Republicans from the North, however, are not bound by southern prejudices, they are not bound by southern customs on civil rights legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I said earlier, that is another in a series of excuses and alibis because the gentleman's party does not assert and cannot assert responsible leadership. So they alibi here. Speaker after speaker all afternoon has talked about their dear friends in the South, who have their convictions and their ties, but they cannot and do not sign the petition. That is just an excuse, an alibi.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman deny that it was a combination of Republicans and Democrats who passed the first civil rights bill in 80 years during the 84th Congress and only because there was a union of voting of Republicans and Democrats that the bill was passed? The gentleman now, after having accused us of making political capital and political maneuvering, seeks to state that we are making excuses. We are making no excuses. We are declaring that those who come from the South, whether they be Republicans or whether they be Democrats—and the record is clear to substantiate this point—if they come from the South they will vote against civil rights legislation. That is why it is essential that those who come from the North, if they favor passage of civil rights legislation, should join in support of it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I should like to make the observation in view of what has been said that it must just be a coincidence then that for the first time in 80-odd years we had a civil rights bill, and that is when we had a Republican in the White House.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary. It was a coincidence that that occurred, but it was a coincidence, too, that the Republicans joined with the Democrats. The Republicans did not join with the Democrats in earlier days. Let me point out that with respect to the other body, part of the difficulty lay in their filibuster rule, and the one who saddled that filibuster rule until the recent change, upon the other body, was not a Democrat, but the late Senator Wherry, a Republican from Nebraska, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It has been stated here—it was a surprise to me, just lately after hearing all of the other talks—that there are some northern Members of the gentleman's party who have not signed. The impression has been given that all of the northern Members have signed, and it was just the southern Members who have not signed.

Mr. YATES. I do not know just what the situation is with respect to the signing of the petition, but I would declare without that knowledge, and I would be willing to bet upon it, that almost without exception the Democratic Members from the North have signed that petition. There are some who have not. I would be willing to declare further that almost without exception the Members from the North in the Republican Party have not signed that petition. I would be willing to place that petition in the RECORD, if it were in accordance with the rules. But I think that my assertions will be substantiated.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would only suggest that with the few signatures that are still needed the responsible members of the majority party pushing this petition might want to convince their northern members that they ought to sign, and if they did that maybe they would have enough signatures.

Mr. YATES. I would suggest to the gentleman that if every Democrat from the North were to sign that petition it would still not make up the necessary number to bring the bill to the floor. But, regardless of that point, the gentleman has been very vociferous in urging that politics not be a part of this deliberation. Why should not members of the Republican Party from the North join Democrats from the North in bringing the bill to the floor and permitting us to work its will on it? Does the gentleman not favor it? Of course he does, because he signed the petition.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am sorry that the gentleman was not on the floor earlier when that subject was thoroughly discussed. If he had been, he would know, from having listened to the various speeches that they were loaded with political implications and the presentation this afternoon is clearly a political matter.

Mr. YATES. What is a very political matter?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That this whole afternoon was a political maneuver, a very critical series of statements that brought politics into this, directed at the minority party.

Mr. YATES. I am glad the gentleman recognizes a political maneuver, because certainly the Republican Party has been engaged in political maneuvering with the Southern members of our party for a long time. I am sure that if there is any political maneuvering going on the Republican Party is well aware of it. I think it is appropriate that we have this discussion at this time because in about 2 weeks the Republicans will go back to their districts all over the country and will attend Lincoln birthday banquets and will pose as the champions of civil rights in the name of Abraham Lincoln. I declare that if Abraham Lincoln were to see the way in which Members of the Republican Party are procrastinating now in asserting their championing of the cause of civil rights—and this is the test; this bill is the test—I feel quite sure he would abjure his party membership.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The fact remains that the Democratic Party has a 2 to 1 majority. It has a strong platform on civil rights. I presume that you speakers went up and down the country proclaiming the platform in order to secure votes. The people saw fit to give you a 2 to 1 majority here in the Congress. One of the things that you said you were going to do was to pass civil rights legislation. The simple fact is that you have not done it; you have not been able to bring civil rights legislation to the floor of this House of Representatives. The people are going to know that the responsibility rests upon your shoulders, and no amount of alibiing and excuses can change that.

Mr. YATES. I would suggest to the gentleman that the people will know where the responsibility lies. The administration has declared that it is for civil rights. The gentleman cannot tell me that if the administration wanted the members of the Rules Committee from the gentleman's department to clear the civil rights bill to the floor—and we have four members on our side of the Rules Committee who are willing to bring the bill out—it would not do so. There has been no indication from the President or from the White House that this is what he wants.

Secondly, you cannot tell me that if the members of the gentleman's party wanted to consider civil rights legislation, and they say they want to consider it, they could not have it by signing the discharge petition.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. On the statement the gentleman has just presented, by the same token if the leadership on his side of the aisle, the Speaker and the majority leader, also wanted civil rights legislation passed, they certainly would have just as much influence on your eight members as the President would have on our four members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. YATES. I do not say to the gentleman that they have not used any, but I say to the gentleman he was exactly wrong because I am sure that just as he stated that members of my party went through the length and breadth of the land in the North and through our districts campaigning on a program of civil rights, so did members of my party go through their districts in the South campaigning against the program of civil rights and that those members of the Committee on Rules who voted for such a bill would be going against their pledges to their people.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would only make the observation at this point that your party evidently runs on two different platforms.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, while I am very happy to yield to all my colleagues, and I believe I have been generous in yielding time, my time is running out. I am happy that the conscience of my good friend from Nebraska is clear since he signed the discharge petition. I do not want to remain in the embarrassing position of continuing to apologize for his colleagues who have not signed the petition.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I shall not do that, and may I say to my colleagues I have not done that. It is clear to me that all of the apology comes from the Democratic side of the aisle. Theirs must be an extremely embarrassing position. I recognize their situation. I have charity in my heart for them. I have charity in my heart for anyone that is down on his luck. So I signed the petition—I want to help them out.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in the colloquy of the two gentlemen from Illinois and the gentleman from Nebraska on this subject. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Nebraska that this subject should not be a subject of partisan concern. It ought to be a subject and an issue on which Americans of good will in both parties can unite. I want to express my appreciation to both of the gentlemen from Illinois, who are in the well and the other Members who have taken time this afternoon to bring this issue to the attention of the House and the American people. I would like to join with them, Mr. Speaker, particularly to appeal to my colleagues in New York State and, particularly, in the upstate area of New York, part of which I have the honor to represent, to join with me regardless of party in signing the discharge petition. It is my understanding that very few of the gentlemen from my area of the State on the other side of the aisle have signed this petition. I hope, as the result of the discussion that has been had here today, they will reconsider their decision and see fit to join us in our endeavor to bring this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this body, I was somewhat concerned as to whether one should sign a discharge petition and whether this was really a proper device to use. We have heard reference today to doing things in an orderly fashion. Well, let me say that I have examined the situation and ascertained to my satisfaction, at least, that this was the only practicable way in which adequate civil rights legislation could be brought before this body for action. Therefore, it seemed to me that anyone who is genuinely in favor of civil rights he had a personal responsibility to sign the petition which, as a practical matter, would alone make it possible for the House to take action on civil rights. We have heard references today to people in either party who may or may not be in favor of the principle of civil rights, and there are certainly many in my own party who have made it clear that they are vigorously opposed to civil rights. But just because of this fact, Mr. Speaker, there is all the more responsibility on those Members who have previously expressed themselves as being in favor of civil rights to join in taking the only step that can be taken to get this bill out and onto the floor of the House. In fact I think there is some degree of responsibility on the part of every single Member who says he favors civil rights and yet who hesitates to sign this petition—a real responsibility that he will have to face up to later on in terms of his own conscience, and, perhaps, to the electorate if this legislation does not get onto the floor for action. Indeed, those who would suggest that the petition not be signed are suggesting that Members abdicate a responsibiliity which I believe they cannot abdicate.

May I say, having had the opportunity over the recess to visit in a number of countries abroad, I think the world is looking to us for leadership in this matter. Oftentimes we have been inclined to think of this kind of leadership just as a matter of passing out a few million or billion dollars. Here is an opportunity for us to assume real world leadership and it is not going to cost us a nickel. This legislation is a matter of moral leadership which may in the long run be even more effective than some of the money we have been spending in past years.

So I want to urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, particularly from the upstate area of New York, where we, too, are concerned with the problem of civil rights, to join with us in signing the discharge petition. I thank the gentleman for being so courteous and for yielding so that I might make this statement in support of his point of view.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. Almost without exception, as I stated before, the Democrats from the North have signed the petition, and almost without exception the Republicans have not signed the petition.

In passing, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Nebraska for having signed the petition.

I wish that his influence and his example could prevail upon his colleagues to join with him. But we will hear excuses from the Republicans. We have been accused of making excuses, but the fact is we are taking every step we can to bring the civil rights bill to the floor, and the Republicans are not joining with us. Let them, therefore, if they can, henceforth go to the people and state again that they favor civil rights legislation in the face of that record.

Mr. Speaker, the point of President Coolidge's story as I related earlier, becomes clear. The hen has been lifted, and the results speak for themselves.

I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois for his valuable and inspiring contribution.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] be allowed to insert his remarks at the conclusion of those of the gentleman from Illinois.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his stirring addresses this afternoon, and also commend the other speakers, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the others who made such fine presentations this afternoon.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the issue has been made clear. The Speaker of this House, and the majority leader both have encouraged Democratic Members of this body to sign the discharge petition, and that is something most unusual for the leadership. It is because of a realization on the part of the Speaker and of the majority leader that there is involved in this a great moral issue—and the strong and effective

civil rights legislation—to which the Democratic Party is pledged. So they have encouraged the Democratic membership to do the unusual thing as a recommendation of the leadership, to sign the discharge petition.

As I understand it, practically all of the Northern Democrats have signed the petition. I doubt that there are any Northern Democrats who have not signed. Relatively few of the Republican Members have signed the petition. If more Republican Members from the North do not sign, civil rights legislation is dead.

I know that in my district I will be judged not by what my colleagues from the South might have done or anybody else might have done; I will be judged in my district by the fact that my name is on the discharge petition. I am sure that will be true of every Member of this body, Republican as well as Democrat. People are not fools. People have common sense. You cannot go in the northern districts and say: "Well, I am for civil rights but when I had the opportunity to bring about the consideration and enactment of strong civil rights legislation I held back." No, no; people do not take that sort of thing.

And I am not criticizing any of my colleagues. I know how sincere the gentleman from Nebraska was when he was standing up here making a fight, I will not say for the honor of his Republican colleagues, but certainly his conscience was bothering him for them. He had signed the petition; there was not any holding back on his part. He did not say: "Well, now, maybe there will be a party advantage in not signing this discharge petition; maybe we can put the Democrats on the spot; maybe we can say that Speaker RAYBURN and Leader MCCORMACK and the Democrats killed this"; no, he went in and signed the discharge petition. Then, I think a little bit concerned for his Republican colleagues who had not taken the same step, he stood up valiantly fighting against reason, logic, and common sense to preserve their honor, as it were.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska. He and I have a common interest. We both have signed the discharge petition.

Mr CUNNINGHAM. I want to make just a brief comment. I have always had a clear conscience and I do not worry about the other fellow's. That is no one's business but his own.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I congratulate and commend the gentleman.

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

Mr. OHARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In relation to the observation my friend just made, may I say that when my conscience is clear I am sometimes very much concerned about the conscience of some of my friends.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about conscience. This brings my thoughts back to World War II in Europe. At that time I was Chief of Training in ETOUSA Headquarters. We received a directive which was inspired by our great war leader, President Roosevelt. It came through Eisenhower's headquarters directing my section to develop a policy for the integration of Negro soldiers into our white American units. As you may know, in those days we had Negro tank battalions, infantry battalions and truck companies. I was privileged with another Member on the other side of the aisle who was then an officer in my section to write the initial policy for this integration. Later I had an opportunity to visit some of the units into which the Negro soldier had been integrated. I saw Negroes fighting and dying shoulder to shoulder with our white American citizens.

Today it would seem to me President Eisenhower might search his conscience and make an effort to assist those same Negro soldiers who fought so well in Europe to secure the right to vote. In the light of his great influence, he could do so much with a few words addressed to the right people to urge our Republican colleagues to sign the discharge petition.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my distinguished colleague from Connecticut for his valuable contribution and his poignant suggestion of a Presidential directive to the Republican Members of the House who have not signed the discharge petition. I have no doubt a word from the President, or even a quiet word from the able minority leader, would have results.

I have not any doubt that many of our Republican colleagues who have not signed the discharge petition are thoroughly sincere. I think they are just as sincere as our colleagues from the South who have not signed. They are against civil rights legislation. But I do wish they would come out and let us know. We can respect any man if we believe he has sincerity in his convictions. But we do not like hypocrisy. We do not like them saying, "Yes, we are for civil rights," when they are not. We do not like people playing both sides of the fence.

The issue, Mr. Speaker, is crystal clear. He who signs the discharge petition is for the enactment of strong civil rights legislation. He who refuses to sign, under whatever pretext, is on the other side of the fence.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my Democratic colleagues in urging prompt action on the civil rights bill.

I wholeheartedly concur with the sentiments expressed by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] on the floor of the House Monday. I know that he would be here today reaffirming his support for the civil rights bill if it were not for the fact that he is attending an important housing meeting in Pittsburgh today.

As he pointed out in his speech Monday, signature of the discharge petition "would be our divining rod" to separate the real attitude of the two political parties on civil rights. I commend our colleagues to Congressman MOORHEAD's penetrating remarks on the dismal record of the Republican Party in failing to produce needed signatures to the discharge petition.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the civil rights bill will not be considered by the House unless a sufficient number of Republicans sign the discharge petition. This is not a partisan issue. Both parties have adopted strong civil rights planks in their platforms. It is a matter of performance. We now have the opportunity to bring to the floor a sound and reasonable civil rights bill containing provisions to strengthen present laws to guarantee basic rights to all citizens.

I urge my colleagues who have not already done so to sign the discharge petition so that we may proceed to consider this important legislation without further delay.

CIVIL RIGHTS

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here this afternoon to speak of the "American Dilemma" which is the so-called Negro problem and specifically to focus attention on the opportunity which we now have to enact sound civil rights legislation.

It is my view that we are talking about the "American Dilemma," that is, that this is, in the first place, the problem of all Americans. Furthermore, in the second place, we recognize that this is not a problem created by those who are discriminated against themselves, but by those who discriminate and, finally, by those who permit discrimination, the American people.

It is a mistaken view that the civil rights issue is created by the Negro citizens themselves. The often-expressed idea that "they," meaning these Negroes, "keep pushing and forcing the issue" and that such "pushing" creates the civil rights issue is shortsighted and naive.

The fact is that the civil rights issue exists because we have too long allowed continued discrimination in America. For this reason, I say it is the problem of America. This is generally the significance of the phrase "An American Dilemma" as Economist and Sociologist Gunnar Myrdall used it to title his masterful work on the subject.

The authors and signers of the Declaration of Independence "intended to include all men," Lincoln reminds us. "They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral development, or social capacity." But they did consider all men equal in their God-given and hence "unalienable" civil rights. They so declared, Lincoln urged, in order that enforcement "might follow as fast as circumstances should permit." He added:

"They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approxi-

mated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere."

In a world where colored people constitute a majority of the human race, where many new free governments are being formed, where self-government is everywhere being tested, where the basic human dignity of the individual person is being denied by totalitarian systems, it is more than ever essential that American principles and historic purposes be understood. These standards—these ideas and ideals—are what America is all about.

I wish to quote the Reverend H. Solomon Hill, a constituent of mine in the Seventh District of California, who is pastor of the First African Methodist Episcopal Church in Oakland, Calif., and chairman of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People housing committee in that city. Recently, in response to a charge that implied in substance that the Negro community was making the issue in a local dispute over public housing, Reverend Hill said:

Erase 150 years of slavery, erase 80 years of low wages, segregation, and having doors slammed in our faces. Then you might find some moral reason for condemning instead of helping. But don't continue to push these people into a vicious circle and then blame them for being there.

Our first admission must be that all Americans have a direct responsibility in this matter, whether from California, Illinois, New York, or Mississippi.

Let me quote from the recent speech of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHESTER BOWLES, who said at the May 22, 1959, conference of the Health and Welfare Council here in Washington:

We must recognize the problem of discrimination as a national, not a sectional one.

Yet many northerners still smugly look at racial discrimination as a sectional problem. Thus they condemn what they consider to be the slow pace of integration in the South, while remaining indifferent or nearly so to the discrimination all around them.

In most northern cities the professed equal protection of the laws still hides extensive segregation in fact—by residential exclusion and by the natural selection of poverty.

Nothing will speak more persuasively to the South than a better example among the too-ready critics farther north.

In these remarks, the gentleman from Connecticut spelled out some of the specific reasons why we must face this issue on a local level throughout the Nation. In itself, this is not precisely the same point to which I have been speaking, but elsewhere Mr. BOWLES made the larger point, saying:

For we must go on in fulfilling the promises of the Constitution and of our national conscience. We can pause for reappraisal, but we cannot stop or go back.

The two points complement one another. In short, while the civil rights issue is on our national conscience—or should be—it is also a practical problem in virtually every community in the Nation. The Nation—as a nation—faces the moral problem, as well as the practical problem of discrimination.

We cannot sectionalize our conscience as Americans any more than we can sectionalize our economy, our national defense, or our law. We cannot have 50 distinct and separate codes, legal, ethical, or moral.

Let us look for a moment at the history behind civil rights legislation, for it shows—to a greater extent than we realize—that this issue has been progressing nationwide.

Today we know the need for Federal antilynching legislation. The issue has most recently been dramatized by the discouraging developments in the Mack Charles Parker case in Mississippi. The precedent for such legislation can be found in South Carolina and Texas where, in 1949 to 1951, antilynching laws were adopted on a State level.

Today we can point to real progress, although spotty, in the area of bans on discrimination in employment. In 1948 it was President Truman whose Executive Order No. 9980 banned discrimination in employment in Federal agencies. That same year President Truman created the Federal Fair Employment Board to investigate complaints in civil service.

In the State of California alone, local fair employment practices legislation has a noteworthy history. The city of Richmond, Calif., adopted such an ordinance in 1948.

Other similar ordinances have been on the books for some time in the cities of Bakersfield, Calif., and San Francisco. In Los Angeles, in 1951, local laws were passed forbidding discrimination in the more limited field of construction workers on urban redevelopment projects.

Statewise in California, antidiscrimination revisions were made affecting civil service workers in 1949. Discrimination in the hiring of teachers was banned in 1955. Finally, last year, in 1959, a California Fair Employment Practices Act, authored, incidentally, by the Honorable Byron Rumford, State assemblyman from the city of Berkeley, which is also my own home, was passed.

The State of California's Fair Employment Practices Act establishes a legal principle in one specific area in the State which is of particular pertinence to our present deliberations in Congress in 1960.

That law provides that a five-man State FEP commission need not wait for the filing of formal complaints to go into action. The Commission itself is authorized to make investigations where it thinks discriminatory activities are going on.

Early last year, in testifying before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 in support of H.R. 3147, the original civil rights bill which is now soon to be before us in modified form as H.R. 8601, I pointed out that this kind of authority for enforcement by a governmental agency is of utmost importance.

I spoke in favor of the so-called part 3 authority which was at that time still a part of the House civil rights bill and mentioned our California Fair Employment Practices Act by way of emphasizing the point that the need for somewhat similar authority was recognized and enacted in that legislation.

In passing FEP legislation with this kind of enforcement clause, the California State Legislature, speaking for the citizens of the State, made it quite clear that we realize enforcement of civil rights cannot be left to the private citizen alone. In California we have recognized that civil rights are not enjoyed in a consistent manner and to the same degree in all areas when the burden of enforcement is placed upon private citizens.

California is just one section of the Nation where this continuing work to end discrimination is taking place today. There are many others, in all portions of the country.

I would suggest, however, that this kind of local action—incomplete as it may be—is the precedent for the Federal legislation we are now considering.

I would suggest that we want a new Federal Civil Rights Act which includes the part 3 authority we have mentioned, the antilynching ban we have mentioned, and the Federal registrar authority that is now under consideration in the other House. This as well as the provisions of H.R. 8601.

In support of civil rights legislation, I submit the following statements by two distinguished Americans:

ADDENDUM I—QUOTATION FROM REMARKS OF HENRY CABOT LODGE, AMBASSADOR OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

If we are to win the struggle for the minds of men—particularly in Asia and Africa—we must show at home that we practice what we preach about equal rights for all, and that what we do is animated by spiritual values.

I believe that the man in Africa and Asia sees the big difference between the Soviet Union and the United States—in that the United States has proven that man's material well-being can be improved without violence, without coercion, and without sacrificing his civil rights.

It is up to us to live up to our own standards. When in Asia and Africa men read of the happenings in Little Rock, for example, our country's interests suffer. When photographs appear in the press of Negro children in school in Virginia, great good will for the United States is created.

Our greatest struggle, therefore, is with ourselves rather than with the Soviet Union. We face the simple fact that enthusiasm for a bad idea can prevail over lack of enthusiasm for a good idea.

ADDENDUM II—QUOTATION FROM AN ARTICLE BY ADLAI STEVENSON WHICH APPEARED IN THE FEBRUARY 7, 1959, ISSUE OF THE SATURDAY REVIEW

The issue of the rights and status of our colored citizens is our small share of a worldwide problem. The 400 years' dominance of men of white skin is ending. The vast colored majority of mankind is seeking the opportunity and the respect that white people have been lucky enough to enjoy for so long—sometimes at the colored people's expense. But, within this worldwide crisis, we in America, with our colored minority, have a major role to play—for good or evil. The unfinished work that Lincoln left us, of creating a society in which all men can hold up their heads as equals and self-respecting citizens, can never be accomplished unless there are enough white men and women who resist in the core of their being the moral evil of treating any of God's children as essentially inferior.

Nor is this simply a question of our own national community. It is a painful fact that the Communists show a worldwide con-

cern, which is largely lacking among the men of the West; the whole human race is their horizon. Their "brotherhood" is materialist, collectivist, atheist, and we dislike it, but it embraces everybody, and it is the framework of policies that takes the missionaries of their new order to the ends of the earth. We have no corresponding commitment to our fellow men. For hundreds of years, we have preached the Christian promise of brotherhood, but today, when vanishing space and scientific revolution have turned our planet into a single neighborhood, the ideal means little in terms of concern or conviction, in terms of policy or action.

Here we are in the Atlantic world, 16 percent of the world's peoples consuming 70 percent of the world's wealth. We cannot be indifferent to the moral implications of this gap. I do not know how we can gain a new perspective about the narrow world of plenty and poverty in which we live unless moral insights of justice and compassion stir us to understand the privileged position in which we live.

CIVIL RIGHTS

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

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, first permit me to commend the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and all of our many other colleagues who have participated today in this discussion of the important matter of civil rights.

It is appropriate for me to again call attention to that nice phrase which we found in the President's state of the Union message, to wit, "a storm of semantic disorder." No phrase more aptly describes the conduct of this administration, from its inception to date, on both the national and the international scene. The words and conduct of the President with reference to civil rights emphasizes the point I make.

When the President wants to spend more Government money, when he wants to increase the cost of government, when he wants to make the big banks richer by increasing interest rates, he does not hesitate to send for his Republican congressional leaders and tell them what he wants and how to get it for him, nor does he hesitate to send his Cabinet officers to the Hill to pressure congressional members of his Republican Party to do his bidding.

But when it comes to civil rights we get nothing but empty words from him—fine phrases but no action. I am being a little too harsh on him when I say no action. Did he not appoint a Commission to look into the matter? Of course, he did. Did he not pick outstanding Americans to do the job for him? Of course, he did. Did they not bring in a good report with fine recommendations? Of course, they did. Then what did he do? He turned his back on them.

We recall all too well the number of times that the President's Republican congressional leaders stood on the floor of this House and told us what the President wanted and what he needed and what he demanded by way of legislation. But when it comes to civil rights all we hear from them are excuses as to why they will not help us get a civil rights bill to the floor.

I can understand why no Member, Republican or Democrat, who comes from any of the Southern States will sign a discharge petition to bring the bill to the floor. Right or wrong, almost all of them campaigned for reelection on promises, explicit or implicit, that they would oppose civil rights legislation. But every other Member of Congress is in duty bound, yes, in honor bound, to do all within his power to implement the pledges in their party platforms on civil rights.

The Democrats are doing that almost to a man. Unfortunately, the Republicans are running away from that pledge, almost to a man.

I want to reiterate on this floor what I have said off this floor. There is no principle involved that can possibly justify any Member of this House not signing a discharge petition. A man is either for or against the bill. That can be a matter of principle. But if he is for the bill there is no principle that can possibly justify his not using every effort, including putting his signature on a discharge petition, to bring the bill before the House for action. As long as the method of bringing a bill before the House by discharge petition is a part of the House rules, it must be recognized as being good principle to sign a discharge petition and bad principle not to sign it unless one is opposed to the bill. One can even justify signing a discharge petition when he intends to oppose a bill or parts of a bill, because the democratic process should always be used to give the Members of the House an opportunity to work their will with reference to every important piece of legislation.

Let us destroy this veil of camouflage once and for all. The Democratic Party has a majority by numbers in the House of Representatives. When we deduct from that majority the number of Democratic Members who year in and year out have opposed civil rights, the Democratic Party no longer controls a majority of the votes of the House. We can bring a civil rights bill to the floor and pass it only if that large number of Democratic Members are joined by those Members of the Republican Party who pretend to be for civil rights. The test of their good faith is not how they will vote on final passage or on any particular amendment but whether or not they will place their names on record on that discharge petition so as to bring the bill before the House for action.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this demonstration has made its point. I shall not detain the House for long with my remarks. Our point has been a simple one but one we wanted to drive home. Certainly I am hopeful, my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], will take this message back to the members of his party.

The message is simple. It is plain. It is undeniable: The Republicans are blocking the discussion of civil rights legislation on the floor of this House. We do not ask them to subscribe to any particular bill, nor to back what the President's Commission recommends with respect to Federal registrars or anything else, but merely to sign the discharge petition and so prove that they are willing to allow discussion of this legislation on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Of course, I cannot agree with the statement that the gentleman has made. Naturally, I could not relay that message to the members of the minority party. I would reiterate, however, what I said before which is that this legislation is being blocked in some other way. It is hard to discern just who is responsible. With the gentleman's party being in a 2-to-1 majority, I think the American people would expect his party through its leadership to bring legislation of this importance before us in an orderly manner.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman has sat here all afternoon. The point, it seems to me, is clear. Members of my party almost to a man have acted with respect to their declared convictions. Some of them are opposed to civil rights. Most of us are in favor of civil rights and we have either signed or not signed the petition in accordance with our declared convictions.

Now where do your Republican colleagues stand? Have they acted in accordance with their purported convictions? I know where you stand. I know where approximately 36 Members of your party stand, but where do the others stand? I heard your Vice President 2 years ago, when he purported to lead a civil rights fight, but I have not heard him these days at all. I heard your President the other day in this very Chamber say that he wanted everyone to have the right to vote. Where are these leaders? What are they doing? Where are these people with regard to their consciences? If the gentleman would like to speak again, I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman from Oregon asks where my party stands. My answer would be that my party, I am sure, stands on the principle that the majority party in the House of Representatives with a 2-to-1 majority, elected by the people who have placed their confidence in those elected Members, should bring legislation before the Congress in an orderly way.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman will be interested to know that according to the Associated Press dispatch, an advance dispatch, on Vice President NIXON's speech, which he is going to give in Chicago this evening as part of the Republican banquet, the story says:

And he [Mr. NIXON] proposed to accept what he termed the exciting challenges of domestic problems with an improved educational system, constructive civil rights programs—

And so forth and so on.

I presume then that we probably can look forward to the Vice President coming back from his visit to Chicago and leading the members of the Republican Party and helping us to get this discharge petition signed and to get this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman, but I wonder if those words will ever end up as deeds and as signatures by members of the Republican Party on this discharge petition.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It appears to me that this is an excellent opportunity for the Vice President to put his deeds where his words are.

Mr. PORTER. May I say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] that I, without any hesitation at all, ask the Republicans to help in this matter.

We want you to help. You helped us before on this civil rights legislation; we need your help now, we want you in this matter. We are asking for it and you are saying "in an orderly manner." Does the gentleman wish to offer his reply? If so, I would like to yield to him.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is very gracious. I realize the predicament the majority party finds itself in and has been throughout the course of the afternoon perhaps in fair criticism of at least four members of the majority who are serving on the Rules Committee.

I am sure the gentleman will agree that if there is such criticism it would be only fair that the criticism be perhaps directed to the very Members who have spoken here, because each and every one of you voted to name the eight members of your party to the Rules Committee.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman recognizes that only a handful of his party including himself have signed this discharge petition to get this matter on the floor of the House where it can be discussed. But most of the gentleman's Republican colleagues, however, have not offered to help. That is the point of this demonstration. The gentleman called it "a very, very political matter." It is indeed. I think that the American people, the people who voted us all into office will decide who is to blame in keeping this matter from coming before the House. I hope the gentleman will be able to use his influence on at least a few of his colleagues to follow his own course in the matter.

I would like to read the 15th amendment; it takes only a minute. It is very clear and is something that should be brought to our attention at this time.

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The President said in his press conference the other day, against the advice of one of our great lawyers, a member of his Civil Rights Commission, that certain features of the proposed legislation were unconstitutional.

We are looking to the Republican Party in this case for help in getting this matter on the floor, for discussion, not for leadership. The banner over the outdoor religious meeting in "On the Beach" for a small and ever lessening group, proclaims: "There is still time, Brother." And I put the emphasis on the word "brother" in this case because we are talking to you brothers, Republicans. We want and need your help in going ahead to enact some brotherhood legislation.

I will close by reading two verses of an old hymn:

Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise,
Age after age their tragic empires rise,
Built while they dream, and in that dreaming weep,
Would man but wake from out his haunted sleep,
Earth might be fair and all men glad and wise.

Here is the final verse:

Earth shall be fair, and all her people one,
Nor till that hour shall God's whole will be done.
Now, even now, once more from earth to sky
Peals forth in joy man's old undaunted cry,
"Earth shall be fair, and all her folks be one."

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and congratulate the distinguished and able gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for arranging this time to discuss the all-important civil rights bill. His effective leadership in this field has been inspirational, and those of us concerned with the problem of civil rights owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

You, too, Mr. Speaker, deserve the thanks and praise of us all interested in this subject for your stanch support of our efforts to discharge the civil rights bill from the Committee on Rules. Unfortunately, lack of interest among our Republican colleagues has made it difficult to obtain the required number of signatures on the discharge petition. According to the distinguished minority leader, if I understand him correctly, civil rights is a Democratic Party problem. It is our responsibility, he has told the Nation, to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

NEGATIVE ATTITUDE OF ADMINISTRATION

The negative attitude of the Republican leadership should not surprise us because, after all, it comes right from the top as it has all along. A phone call from the White House, Mr. Speaker, would bring the civil rights bill to the floor. But it is a call that will not come. The President, it seems, does not interfere with the legislative process unless it serves his purpose. He took a strong stand on antilabor legislation. He has exhorted the people on foreign aid and adequate defense. These served his purpose. Obviously civil rights does not.

This is not a new attitude, Mr. Speaker. Here is an article by Associated Press news analyst James Marlow entitled "President Remains Unfirm on Southern Resistance." It appeared in newspapers throughout the country on December 11, 1958:

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower has consistently sidestepped saying whether he thinks racial integration in public schools is good or bad. He did say it should go slower.

He's been less consistent in deciding how to enforce the Supreme Court's 1955 order for ending enforced segregation. And he seems as vague today about handling southern resistance as he was when the Court first spoke.

This showed up again Wednesday at his news conference.

He said in the past he had taken an oath to enforce the laws. But as recently as September 11, 1956, he seemed to think he himself couldn't do anything, that the job was up to U.S. marshals.

That day he said: "The Federal Government is not allowed to go into any State unless called upon by the Governor who must show that he is unable with the means at his disposal to preserve order."

And on July 17, 1957, he was saying "I can't imagine any set of circumstances" that would ever induce him to send troops into a State to back up the Court. He added that day: "I believe the common sense of America will never require it."

He reversed his field a couple of months later when Gov. Orval E. Faubus of Arkansas used National Guardsmen to block the court-ordered integration of Little Rock's Central High School.

Then Eisenhower sent in troops, not at Faubus' request but over his protests.

Eisenhower's main theme on achieving integration is that it is a slow process. He has talked of patience, of educating people on the issues. He has said laws can't change the hearts or prejudices of people.

But Wednesday he showed impatience with people who don't obey the law. He was asked how he feels about the refusal of Alabama officials to produce voting records demanded by the Government's Commission on Civil Rights.

The Commission, created by act of Congress, is investigating complaints of Alabama Negroes that State authorities have frustrated their attempts to register and vote.

Eisenhower said: "Well, I don't feel very well about it * * * I think this is a rather sad sort of thing, because all the way around we are running into this refusal of complying with the basic laws of the land, laws that have been upheld by our courts as legal and proper."

He called the performance of the Alabama officials "reprehensible."

But does he have any plans himself for handling southern resistance, such as asking Congress for new laws? He was asked the question: "Do you favor new legislation to bring about the enforcement of integration?"

Eisenhower seemed to have no plans at all, beyond saying he thought the Commission should be allowed more time to do the job of inquiring into civil rights violations. The Commission's 2-year term ends next year.

He said: "Now with respect to any new laws which you are talking about in the whole field of civil rights, I simply will say this, This is something that is studied all the time."

Just where will all the studying lead to? Eisenhower said, "I don't know."

But Wednesday's anger at those who don't comply with the laws was not the same as the attitude he expressed last August 8 when he said: "Mere laws will never solve this problem."

The President's cautious, halfhearted attitude toward adequate civil rights legislation has hurt the cause of civil rights time and time again. How many times has he urged caution in carrying out the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision? How many times has he cut the ground from under supporters of civil rights legislation with statements of doubt and uncertainty? I recall during the debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1957 one of the major issues was section 121 of part III of that bill which would have permitted the Attorney General to institute civil action for preventive relief in civil rights cases. The opponents of the section claimed that it had nothing to do with the protection of voting rights and therefore did not belong in the bill. Those of us, anxious to enact real civil rights legislation, admitted the section went beyond voting rights by providing for Federal action on conspiracies against other civil rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment. This was the heart of the bill. This was the section which would have enabled the Justice Department to enforce the Supreme Court's school decisions. The President was asked at his July 3, 1957, press conference if he were willing to have the bill rewritten to apply only to voting rights—an obvious reference to the pending amendment to strike section 121. His answer was:

Well, I would not want to answer this in detail, because I was reading part of the bill this morning, and there were certain phrases I didn't completely understand. * * * I would want to talk to the Attorney General and see exactly what they do mean.

He emphasized that he was not a lawyer and said, "I know what the objective was that I was seeking, which was to prevent anybody illegally from interfering with any individual's right to vote."

Three weeks later section 121 was eliminated by the Senate. The President's uncertainly, equivocation, backsliding vacillation contributed to this defeat of adequate civil rights legislation.

And the situation, sad to say, Mr. Speaker, has not changed. Last January 13 at another press conference the President was asked about a proposal by his own Civil Rights Commission for Federal voting registrars. Two days before a leading Republican civil rights advocate in the Senate introduced legislation authorizing the President to appoint such officials. The President said, "I do not even know if it is constitutional." Just yesterday a watered-down version of the Commission's proposal was sent to Congress by the administration proposing the use of referees appointed by Federal courts rather than Federal officials acting as registrars.

There seems to be a pattern of Presidential activity in the civil rights field, Mr. Speaker. Whenever he makes a strong statement in support of civil rights, which he has, nothing much happens either in his administration or on the other side of the aisle. But when he makes an equivocal statement, or an uncertain statement, sure as night follows the day, the cause of civil rights suffers another setback in the form of watered-down proposals, anti-civil-rights votes by Republicans in the House and Senate, and the like.

ANALYSIS OF OPPOSITION'S CASE

The halfhearted interest the administration has taken in civil rights plus the outright opposition of anti-civil-rights forces has made the task of enacting adequate civil rights legislation extremely difficult. Those who oppose this bill take a stand against one of the most important pieces of social legislation to come before this body. The eyes of the entire world are on us. The people of the world, especially in Asia and Africa, wonder how long we who advocate freedom and independence for them will continue to tolerate second-class citizenship within our own borders. Today they are the uncommitted. Unless we show them that we mean what we say they may well be committed in the not too distant future to forces unalterably opposed to our way of life.

What is the basis of this fierce opposition to such an important piece of legislation? An examination of the minority views in the report on H.R. 8601 is important if we are to fully understand the thin reed upon which the anti-civil-rights group base their opposition.

Opposition to title I, which proposes to amend the Criminal Code with respect to the obstruction of court orders in school desegregation cases, appears to stem from a deep concern for the Constitution of the United States.

The language of this title—

Says the minority report—

is of a doubtful constitutionality.

The reasons cited for this conclusion is that the language "may be violative of the right to freedom of speech" and it may "fall because the language is vague and indefinite." This concern for the Constitution is heartening but carries little actual weight as a basis for defeating this bill or keeping it bottled up in the Rules Committee.

In the first place, the cry of "unconstitutionality" by opponents to a particular measure is a common argument. Practically every social advance this country has made in the past 50 years has been branded unconstitutional by the opponents of progress. Social security was considered unconstitutional in 1935 by those who opposed it. But it weathered the storm. To raise the specter of unconstitutionality at this juncture is an act of desperation. The bill, reported from the able Committee on the Judiciary, has been carefully studied I am sure by the members, all of whom are lawyers, its able staff, and the House legislative counsel. I doubt if this group would draft legislation violative of the first amendment to the Constitution and to suggest so casts unfair reflection on these individuals. The first objection, therefore, is so questionable that it deserves little merit or consideration. Finally, if the minority of the Judiciary Committee is concerned about the unconstitutionality question I wish they would help bring the bill to the floor to enable the rest of us to have the benefit of their views on this vital question. Not one of them, to my knowledge, has signed the discharge petition. If each of them did, and brought two colleagues along with them, we would have a sufficient number of signatures to bring the bill to the floor for a full-scale debate on the issue of constitutionality.

Opposition to title II, which involves flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or destroying any building or other real or personal property, is based on the reason that it "does not belong in the bill." Legislation to deal with the problem of desecration or destruction of religious or other types of buildings seems peculiarly related to the question of civil and constitutional rights. Many, if not all, of past bombings, have been motivated by religious or racial hatred. When you bomb someone's home because of his color is not civil rights involved? When you bomb a church because of the religion practiced therein, is not civil rights involved? What is civil rights if not these things? When you bomb a church you deprive a person of a place to worship. That is a civil right. When you bomb a school you deprive a person of a place to learn. That is a civil right. When you bomb a home you deprive a person of a place to live. That is a civil right. This bill will protect those rights and title II therefore rightfully belongs in it.

I recall last year, Mr. Speaker, making a similar argument about what does and does not properly belong in a bill during the debate on labor legislation. We were told that the bill under consideration was a labor reform measure designed to bring democracy to union members and prevent corruption in the labor movement. A number of us wondered what the Taft-Hartley amendments were doing in a bill of that nature since they had nothing whatever to do with reform. The 10 members of the minority who all voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill were not concerned then about what does and does not belong in legislation.

Opposition to title III, which involves Federal election records, is also based on the constitutional question as to whether Congress has the authority to enact legislation requiring all records of elections preserved for 2 years from the date of any Federal election. Also according to the minority there is no need, no justification, for this section. According to the majority of the committee:

Experience has shown the need for this legislation. So long as there is lacking a suitable provision for access to voting records during the course of an investigation and prior to the institution of a suit, the authority of the Attorney General is rendered relatively ineffective. The Department

of Justice has no existing power in civil proceedings to require the production of these records during any investigation it may conduct on complaints of a denial to vote because of race. The need for this legislation is evident from the refusal of some State and local authority to permit such inspection.

So there is a valid, justified need for title III. The constitutionality of title III was decided long ago in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U.S. 299) where the authority of Congress to legislate concerning any and all elections affecting Federal offices, whether general, special, or primary, as long as they are "an intricate part of the procedure of choice or where, in fact, the primary effectively controls their choice."

Opposition to title IV, which extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, seems based mainly on the fact that the Commission had not, at the time the minority report was published, issued any reports. Now, House Report 956, containing the minority views in opposition to H.R. 8601, was issued on August 20. Three specific references were made to the fact that the Commission had not filed a report even though it was not required to file such a report until September 9, 1959, on which date it did so. The minority's other argument against extending the Commission was that it was "inconsistent" to make a study of certain aspects of the civil rights problem and, at the same time in the same bill, ask the Congress to enact statutes on the very same subject matter." This does not appear inconsistent at all, Mr. Speaker. Rather it is a recognition of the fact that we know enough about civil rights to enable us to legislate now, but we also know there is even more to learn so we will continue studying it in the meantime. That is just good sense.

Opposition to title V, concerning education of children of members of the Armed Forces, seems based again on the argument that the title is not relevant to the purpose and subject matter of the overall proposal. What does title V do? It merely provides that when a school, receiving Federal funds because of the impact of Federal activity in the area, is closed due to a civil rights dispute, as happened recently in Norfolk, Va., the Federal Government can make arrangements to provide education for the children of the members of the Armed Forces on active duty in the area. If every school in those States where the closure of schools is a possibility somehow all closed down at the same time about 70,000 children of military personnel would be affected. To help these children is considered by the minority as a backdoor approach to Federal aid to education. I think, Mr. Speaker, the argument falls by its own weight. As for the argument that this situation does not involve civil rights I can only say that where a State or a community closes a school because it has been integrated under a court order, thereby depriving children of the Armed Forces personnel of an education, someone's civil rights have been violated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of adequate civil rights legislation and I urge those Members who have not signed the discharge petition to do so in order that we might consider the bill and fully debate it on its merits. No matter how strong their opposition might be they should not thwart the will of the majority of this House.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, perhaps as long as man is man—I think we must face this fact—our constitutional dedication to political and civil equality will never be once and for all completely realized. But to grant the fact of man's imperfectibility is not to condone inaction. Nor may inaction be condoned on grounds that the heart of the discrimination problem lies in beliefs and habits not spontaneously scrapped following enactment of legislation. Indeed, it is because men are less than perfect that laws become necessary. A law is both necessary and good when it accommodates the conduct of those it affects—and with time the beliefs which underlie conduct—to certain moral truths. This bill, H.R. 8601, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is a good start and one that merits the quick approval of men of good will.

MEMORIAL ON CORREGIDOR

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this 2d session of the 86th Congress is faced with many problems of great importance. Momentous decisions must be made for the solution of them in both the domestic and foreign fields.

From long association with the conscientious and competent men who compose Congress, I have every confidence that the legislative recommendations of our committees and acts of Congress will be of substantial benefit to the people of the United States. The burden upon the U.S. Congress will be even heavier in 1960 than is usual and customary in most years.

That is why I rise at this time to call to your attention certain legislation that might be overlooked which I consider to be of very great and far-reaching importance, for reasons which I will explain later. There should be no further delay in completing the memorial on Corregidor, dedicated to the 5 million who served in the far Pacific in World War II, both Americans and Filipinos. This permanent tribute was contemplated by Congress when it created by statute the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission.

A striking contrast exists as to what has been done in Europe and in the Far East. In Europe Congress has erected beautiful memorials to honor those Americans who served in World Wars I and II at an expense of nearly $40 million. They engender a better understanding of America and will continue to be a credit to the character of the United States in the minds of the people of Europe. The European nations are justly proud of the fact that thousands of visitors come to their countries to see them.

In all the Far East, where one of the most remarkable dramas in our entire history occurred, comparatively little of the same kind has been done. There is one beautiful cemetery near Manila, for those who saw service in the American Army, and that is all. Congress has not meant to draw any invidious distinction between the European theater and the Far Eastern theater, and the men who served in each. The Corregidor Memorial when completed will be the answer, and will be cherished by the Philippines and the Far East, as is now the case with our inspirational memorials in Europe.

The Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission was established at the end of 1953 by Public Law 193 of the 83d Congress. Congressman Richards and Congressman CHIPERFIELD filed identical bills, but agreed to use the Richards bill. The powers of the Commission were clarified and broadened by Public Law 298 of the 84th Congress. The Commission is virtually a congressional committee since, of its nine members three are U.S. Senators, three U.S. Representatives, and three are civilians. All serve without compensation. The Commission has stated:

> A complete memorial should be a combination of inspirational and so-called practical value although an inspirational memorial in itself is of the highest practical value. The Corregidor Bataan Memorial contemplates the erection of one beautiful, sensitive, impressive structure with the significant island of Corregidor as its pedestal or base. The memorial will contain a fireproof library, a museum of the memorabilia of the war, the names of all who served, and as a living memorial when completed will actively work at carrying on the cause for which these men died.

Serious study has been undertaken in the United States and the Philippines by specialized groups as to the best use of the completed memorial to develop active living programs in line with the purposes for which men died and sacrificed in World War II.

The design of the memorial was chosen after a nationwide competition was held. Forty-three architectural firms competed anonymously. A special committee, composed of leading architects in the United States and the following: Admiral Nimitz, General Kruger, and General Kenney, recommended the accepted design. Mr. Belluschi, the head of the school of architecture at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was the chairman of the selection committee. The Philippine Shrines' Committee sent a delegation to the United States to confer with the Corregidor Bataan Commission and approved the selection. The jury of awards in its report said in part:

> The final selection was made through gradual elimination. The majority found the winning design to possess sculptural qualities of a high order, to be a simple form to remember, to admire and to love; the jury believed that it had spiritual power and its meaning did not need to be explained any more than the Washington Monument needs to be explained.

The whole island of Corregidor is virtually the base of the memorial. It will

stand at the top of Corregidor which is 500 feet above the surrounding sea. The memorial will rise from that point approximately 250 feet higher or 750 feet above the bay and nearby China Sea. Between its two uplifted arms, reaching toward the East and the West, there will be a perpetual beam of light extending to the sky and throwing its rays far out across the China Sea.

The Philippines has set Corregidor aside as a shrine and directed its commission to work with the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission. They have plans to restore Malinta Tunnel. There was enacted one of the greatest dramas of our history and world history. In the early days of 1942, Malinta Tunnel was the capitol of the Philippines and its great President Quezon was there carrying on for the future of the Philippines. It was the headquarters of General MacArthur and all that was left of the high command of the American forces. It was there that the treasury of the Philippines was located. It was the hospital for the sick, wounded, and dying, as well as the only real shelter for our intrepid starving troops, from the savage bombings by land and air.

General MacArthur said he could never forget their "gaunt faces unafraid." The countless thousands both young and old who will visit memorialized Corregidor for generations to come will feel its deep meaning and will never forget the lessons it teaches.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss the memorial in its many phases, important as they are. Nor is it my intention to give a long list of those who have or are giving their support to the Corregidor Memorial idea, but it is interesting to note the widespread interest. I can mention a few—General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, General Kruger, General Kenney, General Jones, General Wainwright, deceased, General Moore, deceased, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Defenders of Corregidor and Bataan; in the Philippines, the Congress of the Philippines, the veterans almost to a man, and almost every large group of Filipinos. They are hopeful that the actual erection of the memorial will not be further delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss comprehensively the appropriateness, the sentiment, and the value which go into this memorial, both to the United States and the Philippines. I would like to mention briefly a few of them.

It will be a symbol to every participant in the Pacific war of the months and years of his service and sacrifices to preserve liberty against an aggressor bent on conquest, tyranny, and enslavement. Primarily it will be this country's tribute to those who gave their lives to preserve freedom in the world, and the memorial will continue to carry on the things for which they died.

Nearly 19 years have passed since this Nation embarked on 4 years of desperate warfare 8,000 miles from home and its front extended almost halfway around the earth. We had one faithful ally in the Far East, the Philippines. In my opinion, it is most fitting, deserved, and meaningful to place this memorial on Corregidor. The Philippines were a part of the United States for almost one-third of our national existence up to 1946. This beautiful and impressive memorial on their soil will be an expression of our recognition of that fact and of the price they paid for remaining loyal to the United States during the occupation of their homes for 4 years. Their deliberate choice of loyalty to the United States caused them to suffer more loss of life than the combined losses of the American forces in both the European and Pacific areas combined. America and those who believe in freedom should never forget that if the Philippines had not declared by word and deed their adherence to the United States, their losses in life would have been less by several hundred thousand. And today, only 1 hour from Communist China by air, they again defiantly proclaim their loyalty to us.

The Congress has passed four separate pieces of basic and clarifying legislation as to the Corregidor Memorial. The Commission has acted only under the direction of Congress. Only one more legislative act is needed to authorize the total expenditure of not more than $7½ million for the memorial, H.R. 3223. The House voted such an authorization in the 85th Congress, but time ran out before it was acted upon by the Senate.

In my opinion, the Congress should act upon this bill not reluctantly but enthusiastically, for the reasons I have mentioned and many others. Finally, it is the hope that this memorial will not be a glorification of war but a dedication to the cause of lasting peace in the world. I urge the prompt completion of this inspirational memorial on Corregidor.

CIVIL RIGHTS

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

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this late hour on this, the longest legislative day in the current session of Congress, to express the viewpoint of a freshman midwestern Representative to this august body of Congress. I feel that this evening I am expressing not alone my personal viewpoint, but also the viewpoint of those hard-working, God-fearing, virile and honest midwestern citizens who believe in integrity in government, sincerity in politics, and devotion to principle and ideal. I rise to participate in this discussion on the issue of civil rights. Civil rights as it affects America as a whole, civil rights as it affects minority groups within America, civil rights as it binds us as a Nation in the eyes of the people of other lands insofar as justice is concerned in our treatment of minority groups.

I am a 1960 Wisconsin Democrat, in the Congress of these United States. If I were serving this Congress in 1860 I would be serving as a Republican. The Republican Party was organized at Ripon, Wis., in 1856 by a band of revolutionary Democrats who could no longer subscribe to the principle of slavery, which was promulgated and protected by the Democratic Party of that day. Were I living at that time, I would have been one of the lusty band of independent politicians who set out for the sake of principle and justice to organize the new Republican Party in order that they might fight the inherent wrongs of slavery, and promulgate the principle of the equality of man. These independent thinkers were not impressed by the rank oligarchy of the South nor afraid of the threats and intimidations made by those who sponsored the cause of slavery, that fought for a cause that was right in the knowledge that might makes right, and in the belief that they had no moral right to knuckle under to powerful interests that advocated a principle as morally wrong as slavery is. Let me, therefore, the 1960 Democrat, give praise and recognition to the principles and zeal of the Republicans of 1860.

Today in the Halls of Congress, we are fighting to get out of committee, a civil rights bill that will accomplish a bit of that which is needed to guarantee equal rights to the colored people of the United States. By equal rights I mean an equal right to vote without the paying of oppressive poll taxes; an equal right to be educated in the public schools of America; an equal right to work in the factories of our Nation; an equal right of assemblage; an equal right to free speech, and an equal right to enjoy the pleasures of this democracy. The chairman of the committee holding this bill is a southerner. He, and some other members of this committee, refuse to act upon or send this bill to the floor of Congress so that it can be acted upon in a democratic manner. This abuse of power by committee chairman and committee is repulsive and galling to the mind of the honest and independent midwesterner, and they did not send me here to put my stamp of approval upon this practice or to refrain from speaking out against this and other abuses. We have been unable to withdraw this bill from the committee by means of a discharge petition because we have been unable to muster the support of two-thirds of the Members of Congress to join in this fight for the equality of man—219 signatures out of a total membership of approximately 437 are needed. To the present time only 190 signatures have been secured; 30 of these signatures are Republican, 160 signatures are from Democrats, 29 additional signatures are needed before this body can even consider the watered-down civil rights bill which presently is tied up in committee.

Why can we not secure the additional 29 names? Why have only 30 Republicans signed the discharge petition on civil rights? The answer is as clear as the sun that shines in the heavens: The answer is that the great majority of the southern Representatives have come to this body with a closed mind on the issue of civil rights. They are as opposed to a national declaration of the equality of man today as were the southern leaders in 1860 opposed to the abandonment of slavery. England abandoned

slavery long before the United States fought the Civil War. England today is far ahead of us in its civil rights program, yet the same forces of reaction fight against the principles of fairness and justice and equality in this country today that fought against these same principles in the days of Abraham Lincoln. He was not afraid to fight these forces and neither should we be afraid.

Nevertheless, today we see among us representatives who do not come from the South, but who are afraid to take issue with the southern leadership and to oppose the South on this important issue. We see others who follow the principle so prevalent in these Halls—that it is best in order to get along that you go along. Midwestern Wisconsin citizens will not subscribe to this set of principles.

I charge that the real reason why we are unable to secure enough signatures to the discharge petition to get it out of committee is because the Republican Party in Congress through its leadership has entered into an unholy alliance with the Tory Democrats of the South. I charge that the Republican Party of 1960 is as bankrupt in its idealism, and as corrupt in its principles as was the Democratic Party on the issue of slavery in 1860. I charge that the Republican Party has made a deal with southern Democrats wherein they have guaranteed to support the South in its civil rights stand, in its fight against recognition of fairness and fair play for the colored, in its fight against the equality of man, in return for southern congressional support for those issues and principles that the party bosses of the Republican Party here in Congress want to inflict upon the Nation. I refer to the Republican-sponsored hard-money policy. I refer to the Republican-sponsored high interest rates wherein they are permitting the bankers and financiers of the Nation to drain white with excessive interest charges the small businessman, the farmers, the independent borrower, the homeowner, and all those who in the normal course of events must borrow money from time to time. I refer to those antilabor Republicans who used the Republican Party to inflict the Landrum-Griffin bill on working men and women of this Nation, and who in so doing have emasculated the Wagner Act, which was the Magna Carta of all working people. I refer to the Republican advocate of special interest and special legislation, who desires to use the Republican Party to gain special tax considerations and business advantage, at the expense of the American taxpayer and the other citizens. I refer to the Republican bankers who desire to use the Republican Party machinery to pass such bills as the vault cash bill which gave to the members of the Federal Reserve banks the right to $15 billion of the taxpayers' money without one penny of consideration therefor in the year 1959. I charge that the Republican champions of special legislation and special interest have traded the birthright of their party with the southern Tory Democrats in order that both sets of party bosses may succeed in thwarting the true will of the American people and in order that a minority may rule for the benefit of a minority.

As a 1960 Representative in Congress from Wisconsin; the State where the Republican Party was born in revolt against the injustices and wrongs of slavery, I will not be afraid to speak out against the real faults in our legislative processes and against the real culprits of special interests, privileges and abuses who through conspiracy are able to thwart the will of the American people and thereby succeed in continuing a government, controlled by the minority, for the benefit of the self-interests of the minority.

I say to you that the Republicans in the First District of Wisconsin will stand shoulder to shoulder with me, a 1960 Democrat, in fighting these self-same abuses and wrongs that their grandfathers fought in 1860. Party label does not determine the true worth of man. Principle rises above politics and that which men stand for determine the future of the parties. The Republican Party which the Wisconsin people organized in 1860 has today been taken over by the slothful forces that controlled and dominated the Democratic Party in 1860. The only hope of successfully fighting this issue lies in electing more northern, western and eastern Democrats to Congress so that the 160 Democrats that had the fortitude to sign the discharge petition on civil rights may be increased in number so that there will be an adequate number of Democrats in Congress willing to sign not only the discharge petition on civil rights but willing to break the antiquated rules of the congressional fraternity and to vote to discharge any bill, when it is in the public interest that said bill have a public hearing. It is necessary that we in 1960 elect enough northern, western, and eastern Democrats to Congress to insure a majority, so that we can break the stranglehold which big business and big finance has over the Republican leadership, and so that we can break the stranglehold which big bigots and racial haters have upon the Tory Democratic leadership of the South. It is necessary that we elect northern Democrats who will have the fortitude to lead in the assault on both bigot and bossism, by being the first to sign discharge petitions when said discharge petitions are in the public interest.

It is essential that we elect northern Democrats to the next Congress who have the fortitude of Bob La Follette and who regardless of personal feelings and in spite of personal loss are willing to stand up and be counted in the Halls of Congress when issues such as civil rights are being brought up, and to vote, and speak in the public interest. It is essential that we elect at least 36 additional northern, western, and eastern Democrats to Congress, Democrats who have the strength of their convictions and the willingness to vote in the interest of the people, in order that we may eradicate the domination of American Government by big business and big finances and the domination of American Government by southern prejudices and special legislation. It is necessary that we elect at least 36 additional northern Democrats to Congress, Democrats whose voice will be heard and who will be willing to make their voices heard in order that we can stop the constant assault upon human and civil rights, in order that we can stop the constant assault upon the dignity and composition of the Supreme Court of our land. America is not big enough or strong enough to engage in legislation, as did the Bourbon kings of France, for the benefit of the few with tax money forced by the tax collectors from the pockets of the many. There is far too much reaction, votes in the interest of the privileged few, votes against the public interest in the Halls of Congress by people who pride themselves on voting soundly, because they vote, not the way their conscience dictates to them, but, rather, in the manner that the bosses of their party dictates to them.

Let us remember what Lincoln said at Springfield in 1858:

> As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this to the extent of the differences is no democracy.

The elections of 1960 will the the 100th centennial of the election that elevated "Honest Abe" to the Presidency of the United States. He feared not to fight the fight for the right. He feared not stepping upon the toes of those who disagreed with him. He subscribed not to the principle that if one would "get along" he must "go along." He feared not the party bosses or the political bosses of his day. He feared not the men who would become the master of his soul. He dared to fight against oppression in places where oppressions occur. He dared to fight for the right when that fight was necessary. He dared to believe that a Nation divided on basic principle could not stand and grow and prosper and become a strong Nation. He taught us that it is proper to fight to stamp out oppression and to fight for such things as civil rights even though the fight was fretted with some danger and peril rather than to be willing to live side by side with it. He taught us that it was right to take the power of government away from those who abused that power for their special privilege or interest, or who used that power to oppress other human beings. Let us remember the words of Lincoln in Independence Hall, in 1861, when he said:

> I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here and framed and adopted the Declaration of Independence * * * but if this country cannot be saved without giving up principle, I am happy to say, I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender to it. * * * This is what I am willing to live by, and if it be the pleasure of Almighty God—to die by.

The issue of civil rights abridges political rights because political rights spring from man, whereas the right of freedom and equality, fraternity, and liberty spring from God and is part and parcel

of the essence of human dignity. I am proud and happy to have the opportunity in these hallowed halls of Congress to participate in the fight against those evil forces of greed, avarice, and hate, which sponsor the theory that man whose skin is black may be denied equality in this, the greatest, Nation under the roof of heaven, with men whose skin is white or any other color. I am equally happy and indeed it is the realization of a lifelong ambition to be privileged in these same hallowed halls in this 86th Congress to fight those forces of reaction which today dominate the Republican Party and which have stolen from the Republican Party the idealism and principles which were infused into that party by its founding fathers at Rippon, Wis., in 1856. I am eager to fight those fatcats of greed, avarice, and special privilege who have been using and today are using the machinery of the Republican Party to secure special advantage and consideration for those, whose large contributions to that party make possible a continuation of that which I complain. I refer in particular to passage of legislation such as the Vault Cash bill in 1959, and to the principles of "hard money" and high interest rates, to which the Republican Party is principally dedicated through those leaders who dominate and control it. I call upon the citizens of this country, upon the honest, God-fearing men and women of all classes, to do in 1960 what the same type of God-fearing men and women did in 1860; to wit, to leave the party of their fathers and join hands with the northern Democrats in the only political group currently upon the American scene with the ability and willingness to fight the forces of special interest, special legislation, greed, hate, and avarice that dominate both the Republican Party and the Tory Democratic Party of the South. I call upon these people to elect more northern Democratic Congressmen to Congress in 1960 in order that a true attack may be made upon the archaic rules that bind Congress to the past; rules that make Congress fail to respond to the needs and requirements of the present and the future. I ask for the election of these northern Democrats in order that we may change the rules that permit a committee of Congress to bottle up bills, such as the civil rights bill, which we are discussing here this evening, and to make those needed changes which will be in the interest of all of the people rather than in the interest of the few, or in the special interest of those who contribute heavily to political campaigns. I beseech every Member of this body to recognize that it is the law above that demands passage of a civil rights bill. I ask every Member to give their support to the passage of a bill that will brand the United States the world around as being still the land of liberty and freedom and a land where it may truly be said that all men are not only born equal, but that all men retain that equality throughout their entire life.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of the House at this time to urge consideration of H.R. 8601, the so-called civil rights bill, and to urge the enactment of the same, along with such appropriate amendments pertaining to the appointment of Federal registrars as may be offered.

I stand here, not because I am a member of the Judiciary Committee; nor because the civil rights issue is a flaming issue in my district. On the contrary, my district is made up of persons, 98.5 percent of whom are members of the Caucasian race—probably as high a percentage as that of any other congressional district in the country. I do not stand here, Mr. Speaker, because of any political gain which might be mine from so doing. In fact, I believe it demonstrable that there is not one other Member of this body who would stand to gain less, politically speaking, by taking sides on the issue of civil rights, than I.

I stand here, therefore, because I feel it is right to do so, and for no other reason.

I signed the discharge petition. The record will show that my signature was one of the first—No. 20, I believe—out of some 190 signatures. I am proud of this fact.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the issue here is as basic as democracy itself. Stated simply, it is whether the blessings of democracy are intended for all people, or whether they are intended for those to whom birth has accorded a more favorable social or political position.

Seen in its historical perspective, the enactment of H.R. 8601 is a necessary and inevitable step forward in a long struggle to make democracy in America a living reality.

"Democracy" is the most glorious word in our political lexicon. This word derives from the Greek words "demos," meaning the people, and "kratein," meaning to rule. Democracy is the rule of the people. It is the rule of all the people.

The issue, then, is simply this: When we refer to ours as the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," do we mean what we say, or do we not mean what we say? The issue is as simple as that.

Let me first of all destroy a historical fallacy which has beclouded our thinking on this subject.

This fallacy is that the winning of the American Revolutionary War marked the end of the battle to enfranchise all Americans. The facts are that the American Revolution marked, not the end, but the beginning of this battle. This debate today, constitutes one of the many skirmishes in that battle, and there will be others.

In 1789 the law was fairly general that only those freeholders who met certain property qualifications were entitled to vote. These constituted about 10 percent of the total while male population. They included no women, and, of course, no slaves.

Moreover, the right to vote itself, insofar as it applied to national offices, was far less significant then than it is today, even to those who enjoyed it.

The voter did not vote directly for the President nor the Vice President, but only for electors who, in turn, made their own independent selection of those men who were to fill these high offices. Moreover, the voter did not vote directly for the Members of the U.S. Senate. The latter were selected by the respective legislatures of the various States.

Students of constitutional law know of the bitter battles which were fought and won, to make possible the enactment of the 13th, 14th, 15th, 17th, and 19th, amendments, and of the evolution of the electoral college and of the party system, all of which have had the effect of broadening the basis of suffrage in the United States, to make the word "democracy" more literal, and more meaningful.

Yet today, we are informed by the President's own Civil Rights Commission that there are large, ugly patches on our Nation's map in which second-class citizenship is enforced by quasi-legal practices and social customs. Entire segments of our population are in effect deprived of the right to vote through subterfuges and legal manipulation.

These practices are morally indefensible in any country, and especially in a country whose roots and foundations are solidly embedded in the rich traditions of fair play and equal rights for all.

If that be true, and no one in this House dares stand up to deny it, then why are we having so much difficulty in getting a majority of the House to sign the discharge petition? I shall leave the answer to that question to the historians, and conclude by calling upon all fairminded Members of this body to do their best to secure the passage of this much-needed bill.

No peroration could improve on the simple words of Edwin Markham, with which words I close:

> The crest and crowning of all good,
> Life's final star, is brotherhood.

STAMP OUT BIGOTRY

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Neo-Nazis in Germany, in defacing synagogues and church buildings makes all right-minded people apprehensive as to whether or not the virus with which Hitler infected Germany has been completely eradicated.

Chancellor Adenauer's statements concerning these outrages and his promise of speedy punishment if those responsible are apprehended have done much to reassure not only the people of Jewish faith, but all others who were shocked and amazed at this rebirth of bigotry and prejudice. However, definite action must be taken now.

It would seem that it is immediately necessary for the West German Government to review the internal situation in West Germany to determine whether or not former Nazi leaders, influential or otherwise, have again resumed activities, and also whether or not any of them have positions of authority, either on the local or national level, or in any civic activities even of a minor nature. It would appear also to be essential to

examine the real objectives of the various political parties in West Germany to ascertain whether they are being directed and influenced by those who have any sympathy for the Nazi philosophy which brought so much misery and suffering to the German people as a whole.

As for the race goons in our own city and elsewhere in the United States, upon detection, prompt action should be taken to meet out swift justice and adequate punishment to them. We cannot tolerate in any degree the introduction into our American way of life the practice of this despicable ideology and bigotry inspiring these depredations and desecrations. Meantime, the police in Philadelphia and elsewhere, I am certain, will diligently patrol the areas surrounding synagogues and churches in order to give maximum protection possible in order to prevent a recurrence of these base incidents.

IMPORTANCE OF CIVIL RIGHTS TO THE U.S. POSITION IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a rather unusual thing happened a few years ago, but very few people seemed to notice or comment upon it. It happened at a news conference held by the then Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. One of the newsmen seriously asked the Secretary if a certain purely domestic event was going to hurt the conduct of our foreign policy.

The strange aspect of this event is this: that we, today, do not think such a question improper or irrelevant. Yet such a question would surely never, seriously, have been asked in this country before World War II, and I doubt that such a question, even today, crops up very often, if at all, in any other country in the world.

But nobody thought it strange that our Secretary of State should be asked about the integration problem, and specifically about the Little Rock affair. And no one was surprised when the Secretary expressed his concern about the reaction to Little Rock in the foreign press or when he advanced the idea that such incidents hurt the position of the United States in its dealings with other nations.

The fact is—and every thinking person knows this—that we have assumed a position of leadership in the world, that this position carries with it a heavy responsibility, that in occupying this position our national life, our political, social, economic, and cultural behavior, has become an open book. Like it or not, the walls of our house have turned to clear glass. Like it or not, to use a hoary phrase, we are become the cynosure of the world's eyes. Like it or not, we are our own prime exhibit as to the value of the democratic way of life we are fond of preaching to the rest of the world.

The banner we wave before the world has emblazoned upon it one awesome principle: the protection of the rights of the individual. That principle is at the core of the ideology we champion. That is the principle totalitarians detest. You cannot come to a political accommodation on it. Either you are for it or you are against it; there is no halfway about it.

The rest of the world rightly looks to America for guidance in the struggle to achieve and then to protect the rights of the individual. How can we appear to practice one policy abroad and another at home and expect to keep the respect of our friends and those we wish to make our friends?

Discrimination in America costs us something we cannot afford to lose—the good will and trust of all nonwhite countries the world over, and even the respect of other democratic countries like Great Britain and France. Acts of discrimination in this country make us appear unworthy of our position of leadership. They foster in nonwhite peoples a cynical view of all our pronouncements. Such acts oil the anti-American propaganda machinery in the Soviet bloc and of their sympathizers outside the bloc.

We simply cannot hope to win the propaganda war against communism while racial discrimination in the United States exists as a blatant contradiction to the whole theory of democracy. Two-thirds of the world is nonwhite. Two-thirds of the world has suffered from and is reacting to centuries of colonial oppression. Two-thirds of the world is understandably suspicious and skeptical of a white man's offer of assistance and friendship. Every unfortunate racial incident in this country is gleefully swooped upon by the anti-American and antiwhite press of the world and blown up to fantastic propaganda proportions, all to the detriment of our foreign policy.

There is no lack of illustrations for my point. In 1954, after the historic decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation case, virtually the entire press of Western Europe reacted with enthusiastic approval. Publications usually lukewarm to U.S. policies, or opposed to them, joined in this approval. Among these were the following: In England, the Labor Party's Daily Herald and the highly respected Observer; in France, the neutralist spokesman, Le Monde; in Switzerland, the Tribune de Geneve; in Germany, the influential Stuttgarter Zeitung. Some idea of the ideological impact of that decision is reflected by the fact that papers like L'Humanite, the leading French Communist daily, did not print a single word about it while it was front-page news in practically every non-Communist publication.

That is what happens when we implement our principles. What happens when we flout them? I quote a few paragraphs from a letter by Kenneth Holland, president of the Institute of International Education, published in the New York Times on October 13, 1957:

> The events in Little Rock during the last few weeks have done more to lower the prestige of the United States in the eyes of foreigners than anything that has happened in recent years.
>
> In France, Germany, and now Poland our friends ask, "Is it really true?" Our enemies gloat over our failure to provide basic human rights. Students everywhere ask many questions; older people are sometimes too polite. * * *
>
> Practically every newspaper in Europe has used the photographs and dispatches from Little Rock on the front page. The Communist press has outdone itself in bringing to its readers the story of Little Rock. These papers have never before had such ready-made copy.

CHESTER BOWLES, now a Congressman from Connecticut, returned to this country from a trip abroad immediately after the Little Rock affair and warned America of the particularly harmful blow to U.S. prestige in the Middle East. Reports from Mexico, Japan, South Korea, Egypt, the Sudan, India, Ghana, Sweden, West Germany, Italy, and a host of other countries described the resentment, the consternation, the bitterness, the shock, the contempt with which news of Little Rock was greeted.

The reaction to the reports of such disgraceful American incidents hurts us abroad in at least three ways. First, our own prestige as a nation is hurt. Second, the prestige of the ideology we espouse is hurt. Finally, and just as importantly, the prestige of the foreigners, in or out of power, who stand up as our friends, this too is diminished. What diminishes us, diminishes our cause and our allies.

Our response to this problem must be unequivocal. The President of the United States spoke for us all when he declared:

> Whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America.

Racial discrimination, discrimination against any minority, must be erased from the American scene, not only for the sake of our own souls, but also for the sake of the future of the world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an article by the editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Erwin D. Canham. This article appeared in a special section of the New York Times January 17, 1960. It is entitled "The Rights of Man":

> THE RIGHTS OF MAN
>
> (By Erwin D. Canham)
>
> The acid test of a good society is its respect for the rights of man, of individual man.
>
> The problem of race relations is part of the problem of the rights of man. The society whose members respect and guard the dignity and ineffable worth of individual man is the good society. It would be wonderful if we could banish forever that phrase "race relations," and think solely of human relations: of man's relation to man.
>
> This does not mean that we ignore the fact of race or color in the total human relationship. It has to be taken into account, as one of many elements in the complex pattern of society. It is fortunate that the United States is a nation of many races. As we face and solve the problem of relations between diverse peoples—peoples of different religious and ethnic origins, talents, and cultures—we prepare ourselves for world leadership, for citizenship in a very diverse world. Had we been an isolated and homogeneous people, living in an artificial compartment of congruence, we would have been ill-equipped for life in the world as it is.

Failure to respect the rights of man is the evil influence which poisons any society. It is as harmful when it runs, as it so often does, between white and white, Negro and Negro, Asian and Asian, as it is when it crosses racial lines. It should not be isolated and narrowed to the mere relationship of races, for it is a universal human problem.

For centuries, men almost everywhere failed to respect the rights of women. In some societies, otherwise quite advanced, women have even now not gained their full status as sovereign human individuals. Wives are in some places not yet accorded their legal and human rights. The rights of children are not guaranteed and protected in many societies. Workingmen in many nations have not gained the right to bargain with their employers on just terms. And in all totalitarian societies, which for adventitious reasons may have very good practices in race relations, there are deep and fundamental denials of the rights of man.

Taking the world as a whole, there is more denial of basic human rights between members of a single race than there is between members of different races. Even some newly liberated societies, escaping from ancient bonds, have forged for themselves new fetters of arrogance, greed, and hate.

So let us put the American problem in its true context, and recognize how broad and general is the denial of rights between men. We can solve it better, I am sure, by getting at the wellsprings of hate and prejudice which are not merely interracial. And yet the race problem, narrowly viewed, challenges and threatens the good society in America. It is a historical inheritance, with deep roots. It is not merely sectional. It can spring up in the industrial ghettos of the North viciously, just as it exists in the agrarian society of the South. The difference between North and South is put in a familiar, shrewd observation which is almost a folk saying, "In the South, it doesn't matter how close you get as long as you don't get too high; in the North, it doesn't matter how high you get as long as you don't get too close." The problem of race relations—of human relations—may be much graver in the northern cities in the next decade than it will be in the South.

Hence the problem must be recognized and handled as a national problem, and a problem far transcending color. If it is not solved—and we must recognize both the progress that has been made toward its solution and the very long way we still have to go—the United States cannot be a world leader. We cannot raise a banner to which desperate, disadvantaged, awakening people can repair. We will take our place with the declining societies of the past, and we will fail in our historic mission.

I do not think we will fail. I think we are turning the corner. But the corner we are turning must be that of the recognition of the rights of all men, seen and understood as individuals. What are some of these rights? One is the right to opportunity. The chance to advance one's self, to make one's best contribution to the well-being of humanity—which will also be the best contribution one can make to one's self and to one's loved ones—is a right which must not be denied. Another basic right is the right of choice. Individuals must be free to decide for themselves in what direction they will travel and aspire, what training and education they will seek, provided they can qualify under rules which are applied fairly to all. The right to work, trammeled only by ability, is another basic right. And there are many others.

But no rights are absolute. All are exercised in the framework of the rights of others. Society must make rules. The problem of America is to make sure that its essential rules apply fairly to all. And there are some situations where rights are not absolute and there are no rules, or should be no rules. Here the balancing and moderation of the rights of all can usually be handled only by a decent sense of the fitness of things. It is important to distinguish between interracial or interhuman situations where rights are involved and where rights are not involved. It is as useful to understand what one does not have a right to do as it is to be sure of one's rights. And yet, of course, the battle of justice continues on the positive side for the affirmation and implementation of rights.

Let me be specific. Take housing. There is terrible trouble in many all-white housing developments, just because families have not yet learned the elements of neighborliness and decent living together in respect for the rights of others. The whole neighborhood suffers. A Gresham's law of boorishness, and, indeed, of delinquency and crime, sets in. This is a problem of education, of social work, of strains and stresses and maladjustments which need to be healed.

At base, it is precisely the same problem when it is on an interracial plane. But many have not yet seen it to be the same problem. Many white people still resist the Negro neighbor, only because he is a Negro. And I suppose that some Negroes resist whites, just because they are white. The challenge is deeper than color. It is good neighborliness. And we face the same task of education and of healing, often on both sides.

One of the most profound but simple solutions of an interracial problem was written years ago in the New Yorker, by Robert Nathan. He said that a certain king one day solved the Jewish problem. He simply issued a decree abolishing Jews. Henceforth, in that happy kingdom, there were no more Jews, but only people. And everybody got along as well as people can be expected to get along, which is all we can ask.

In setting the race problem in its broadest context of human relations, I am not seeking to blur the dreadful problem we face, the horrible abuses of which we have been guilty. Failure sooner to recognize and act upon our commitment to the rights of man has laid a taint on our society. But I am persuaded we will not remove the taint merely by coping with a racial problem. If by some miracle we could wipe out all denial of rights between members of different races, we would still be faced by the broader, deeper task. So we must press forward with the single mission of ending all men's inhumanity to all men.

In presenting the problem as that of man's relationship to man, I have stopped one step short of how I should like to describe the real situation. It is really a problem of man's relationship to God. Man's selfhood rests upon his being as the son of the Creator. The rights of man are rights with which he was endowed by God: "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." However humanistic might be our faith, however agnostic, we can still agree that man's selfhood has within it a transcendent and spiritual validity. And that is enough to raise man's duty to his brother man above the level of materialism, of politics, of passion, to the level of true and eternal social justice. In respecting the rights of man—the rights inherent in all men, everywhere—we are recognizing man's status, to use the religious words, as the image and likeness of God. The fact can be described in perfectly acceptable, but nonreligious terms.

And so the United States, which was founded with the deep insight of men who identified the rights of man, however poorly even they were able to live their ideals, must rise above the forces of evil which now as ever would deny the true place of man. The affirmation and exemplification of the rights of man are the banner, the song, and the evidence by which we who strive for a free society can sweep away the false miasma of totalitarianism. Hate, greed, prejudice, fear are warring for the soul of man at the heart of the free societies, just as they challenge from the launching pads of the police state. They battle for every man's soul within himself. But they can be mastered by knowing and living the rights of man. This is our birthright, imperfectly expressed, imperfectly lived, but ever available and—once lived—ever invincible.

CANAL ZONE INCOME MEETS FOREIGN TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have read many statements in the press concerning the Panama Canal but seldom any discussion of the economic problems involved in the operation of one of the greatest transportation projects in the world.

Thus I noted with particular interest an informative news story in the December 26, 1959, issue of the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun which presents important information of economic angles. It shows that Panama receives more than $71 million annually from Canal Zone sources, which is $12 million more than the annual budget of that republic. As to the foreign trade of Panama, it points out that imports in 1958 were $92,800,000 as compared to exports of $21,200,000—a deficit made up by income from Canal Zone sources.

The indicated news story follows:

CANAL PAYS PANAMA 12 MILLION MORE THAN ITS ANNUAL BUDGET

PANAMA, December 26.—Twenty-seven ships laden with freight and passengers are lifted and lowered 85 feet from one ocean to another on a daily average. Fifty million tons of cargo go out through the Panama Canal's locks between the Atlantic and the Pacific every year.

That is what the shortcut waterway means in trade 45 years after its building.

What does it mean to Panama? What more does Panama want?

In money the U.S.-operated Canal Zone means more than $71 million yearly to the country it divides. This is some $12 million more than the national budget. It makes up Panama's own foreign trade deficit, the difference between what it sells and what it busy.

WANT MORE MONEY

Yet some of Panama's million poverty-stricken inhabitants are unhappy. They want more money from the "colossus of the north" in return for use of the strip 10 miles wide across their country. Most of all, they say, they want their flag to fly over it.

Panamanians feel their sovereign rights were sold out to the United States by the French engineer, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, when the fledgling government of Panama sent him to Washington in 1903 to sign a treaty with Secretary of State John Hay.

The United States in its urge to build the canal had encouraged Panama to cut off from Colombia. French private interests

having failed at the loss of 22,000 men to dig a big ditch across the isthmus. The United States bought their property and rights for $40 million in 1904.

RIGHT TO GOVERN ZONE

The treaty Bunau-Varilla signed granted the United States the right to govern the zone for all time "as if it were sovereign." Panamanians say Bunau-Varilla did it to get back some of the money the French had sunk in the swamp jungles.

The United States paid the infant Republic $10 million outright and began paying a yearly rent of $230,000. It finished the lock-type canal in 10 years at a cost of $425 million. At the same time, it made tropical Panama a healthy place to live.

Exercising sovereign rights through the Canal Zone Government and operating the waterway through the Panama Canal Company, the United States signed further treaties with Panama in 1936 and 1955. These, among other things, granted certain commercial concessions to this rapidly growing country.

TWENTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR

Canal Zone authorities say direct benefits to Panama now amount to $24,600,000 a year. This is paid in wages to 16,000 Panamanians who work in the zone, in contracts for construction and services, for food, and supplies.

In addition, they estimate that $47 million are pumped into the economy of Panama through the payrolls and purchases of other U.S. agencies, the spending of Canal Zone families, and the U.S. Armed Forces on guard over the canal, disability relief payments to former employees, and the spending of U.S. tourists.

This compares with the Panama Government's budget for 1959 of approximately $58 million. The total equals the deficit between Panama's imports of $92,800,000 in 1958 and its exports of about $21,200,000, mainly of bananas, shrimp, and cocoa beans.

LIVE LARGELY OFF CANAL

U.S. authorities say that Panama thus lives largely off the canal. Yet many Panamanians resent the 11,000 Americans who live and work in the zone, look enviously at the way they live. They think much of the money finds its way into the wealth of the first families who form one of Latin America's last remaining oligarchies.

They resent different wage scales for Panamanian and U.S. employees of the canal. Authorities say the wages of Panamanian employees in the zone run from 20 to 150 percent higher than in Panama, where only now a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour is under consideration.

A U.S. agreement that the zone would buy food and supplies from Panama if feasible is interpreted differently on opposite sides of the boundary. Panamanians seem to feel that "feasible" means "available." Americans say products available in Panama are not always up to the quality zone residents want.

WANT ONE-HALF OF REVENUE

Some Panamanian politicians are demanding half of the gross revenue from the canal tolls, which was $83,100,000 in 1958. The net revenue last year was $2,700,000. Panama has been collecting a rent of $1,930,000 yearly since 1955.

Throughout its 45 years, the canal's tolls have remained the same. Some Panamanians propose an increase to provide more money for Panama. Canal authorities, on the other hand, say their aim is to serve shipping of the world on the most economic basis possible.

"The canal still plays a role in Uncle Sam's defense picture but modern war techniques have diminished its importance for the movement of combat vesels," says Maj. Gen. William E. Potter, the zone's Governor. "Its primary mission is in the world trade, providing safe and expeditious transit for vessels of all nations from one ocean to another."

EMPTINESS OF THE DEMOCRATIC ARSENAL

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, some may have failed to perceive that the intemperate, extravagant, adjectival characterizations filling the air at the Sheraton Park rally Saturday last revealed the pitiful emptiness of the Democratic arsenal of weapons for political debate in 1960.

The solid achievements of the Eisenhower administration: the preservation of economic freedom in an era of abundance and the maintenance of peace without ignominious concessions are unassailable. This was the admission Democrats made Saturday by resorting to the only attack left them—invective and epithet.

"Juvenile delinquent," "neglect and indecision," "8 gray years," "stagnation in our national morality and character," "slickers," were stinkbombs which little men hurled at the wall of the Eisenhower record. The wall was undamaged but the throwers were drenched in the odor.

The thinking citizen, to whom we all must appeal, will be driven to the Republican standard by such advertising gimmicks, catchwords, and character assassinations.

RAILROAD EMPLOYMENT

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress, and the general public, the remarks of S. C. Phillips, assistant president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, made January 15, 1960, at the railroad workers rally held in Milwaukee, Wis.

I feel the remarks of Mr. Phillips merit the reading and attention of our colleagues.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF S. C. PHILLIPS, ASSISTANT PRESIDENT, BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE FIREMEN AND ENGINEMEN, AT THE RAILROAD WORKERS RALLY, MILWAUKEE, WIS., JANUARY 15, 1960

Mr. Chairman, sisters and brothers, it is indeed a privilege to be here on this auspicious occasion. I feel honored to have been asked to share this platform with outstanding representatives of labor and government as are here this evening and to take part in this meeting of railroad workers whose very presence here tonight indicates a burning desire on their part to defend the good name of railroad labor.

I was on the stage of the Chicago rally last November but little did I think then I would appear as a speaker at a similar rally 2 months hence. Let me say that the committee which has made all the arrangements for this very successful meeting is indeed to be congratulated for the fine work they have done in preparation for this gathering.

The spirit generated in Chicago inspired this meeting tonight. I know the spirit and determination in evidence here in Milwaukee will set off a spark in other communities where railroad workers want to tell the Nation that they are not featherbedders; that they are not economic drags on a supposedly sick industry, but rather are dedicated, unselfish, forthright workers who serve our country 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

I keep remembering the Chicago rally. You know President Meany of the AFL–CIO was with us that night and he drew a clear parallel between the situation in the steel industry and the issues which have been raised in the railroad industry. Although the steel strike has been settled the parallels hold true and bear repeating.

When two major industries—railroads and steel—follow the same course of employee abuse through paid advertisements we have to assume that there is some basic plan in the background or underground.

The steel industry kept raising its prices every time wages were increased to impress on the public mind that high prices went hand in hand with higher wages. Nothing was said about record corporation profits as a cause of inflation.

In our own industry the railroad presidents went to Congress with their hats in their hands to plead for relief because the railroads were supposed to be one step from bankruptcy. They wangled public sympathy and enough of a nod from Congress to start wrecking passenger service. Once they had the help of the Smathers bill, the railroad corporations kept the ball rolling and tried to channel public sympathy for railroads in a negative way toward the employees. The great featherbedding campaign got under way.

Much was said in the recent steel dispute about featherbedding. Newspaper readers were subjected to the same type of advertising against steel workers as are the featherbedding ads of the railroads.

But just 10 days ago a big bubble burst in Washington. The featherbedding bubble of the steel magnates turned out to be vulnerable to the sharp eyes of public opinion. And when it burst, did anyone find a list of featherbedding abuses by employees? No, they did not. As a matter of fact, there wasn't anything in it but hot air—all the hot air that the Madison Avenue peddlers of deceit have been throwing at the citizens of this country for nearly a year.

The railroads featherbedding bubble is made of the same material, and contains the same ingredient—Madison Avenue hot air.

You know they used to say that no one wins in a strike. That used to be true until the advertising boys got a foot in the door. The companies lose profits and customers, workers lose wages and savings, but the ad agencies collect their fees. If there's an increase in steel prices it won't be to pay for the wage increase given the steelworkers. No, steelbuyers will be paying the advertising bills of the steel companies.

As many of you know, I have been in railroading for a good many years and for more than 40 years I have been an active rail unionist. I started out as a fireman, became an engineer and still hold seniority

as such on the western division of the Southern Pacific, Pacific Lines, at Oakland, Calif.

It may surprise some of you younger men here tonight but 40 years ago the railroads were complaining about the same things they complain about today. True, Madison Avenue probably had brownstone houses instead of ad agencies in the 1920's, but the railroads used other less expensive means to complain about the mileage basis of pay, safety regulations which we fought to bring about, and all the other items that railroad corporations lump together and call featherbedding.

To be honest, we didn't have too much 40 years ago compared to today, but even then the railroads thought what we did have constituted featherbedding.

It's the same old tune played over and over again. I will say, however, that in all my years of railroading, I have never seen as vicious, as misleading, or as false a campaign against railroad workers as the one which the railroad managements of this country are now conducting.

What is behind this campaign? The most obvious answer, of course, is that a 3-year moratorium on changes in wages and working conditions on the railroads expired November 1, 1959. When Dan Loomis, as spokesman for the railroads, launched this campaign last February in a speech in St. Louis, he and the industry were already starting to set the stage for the then forthcoming negotiations. In this connection, the aim of the campaign is to try to create an atmosphere which would give the railroads a psychological advantage in collective bargaining.

However, the railroads also have other motives, less obvious, in undertaking this massive effort to brainwash the American people.

It is important to remember that under the Railway Labor Act, every major dispute that cannot be resolved between the workers and management eventually goes before a Presidential Emergency Board which issues a report on the facts and recommends what it regards as a fair settlement. A major purpose of the railroads in their current propaganda campaign is to brainwash all potential referees and arbitrators, as well as the general public, to such an extent that it will be impossible for railroad workers to secure a fair and equitable report and recommendations from such a board.

Coupled with their charges of "featherbedding" is the steady propaganda line that the railroads are in a bad state of economic health, that they are now unable to compete with other forms of transport, and that they must have Government help in order to survive.

They have done a good job in creating in the public's mind an equally false notion that the railroads of this Nation are near bankruptcy. This, of course, also is helpful to them in their bargaining position, but it is, I believe, of even more value to the railroads in their lobbying and legislative efforts to win tax concessions, exemptions from regulatory measures, and other special favors.

Before I turn to the specific issue of featherbedding, therefore, I want to briefly touch upon this related question of the present state of health of the railroad industry. The truth, here, too, is quite different from what the railroads would have the public believe. Although the railroads are crying "wolf," the fact is that they are today in sounder financial shape than at any prior time in their history.

Moreover, railroad companies today are still the largest and most important carriers in the transportation field, and they are still the most profitable of any form of transport. They realize a margin on gross revenues that is two to three times larger than those of the domestic airlines and trucklines, and their margin also is more favorable than that of inland waterway shipping.

Let us also compare the railroads' present earnings with past profits. In the period from 1921, when the Government relinquished its wartime control and operations, through 1958, the average annual net earnings of the railroads was $499 million a year. In 1958, which the railroads called a very bad year and which was a recession year for all American industry, the railroads nevertheless reported a net income, after taxes and all expenses, of $602 million. In addition, they took another $600 million out of their operating revenues and placed it in their capital account for "depreciation," which they are able to utilize in any way they see fit.

These are the official Interstate Commerce Commission statistics for the industry as a whole, and I defy anyone to show that they support in any way the carriers' propaganda that they are going bankrupt.

The charge of featherbedding is being made against railroad workers with the primary intent of taking away from the workers a major share of their present income. The carriers have set the amount involved at half a billion dollars a year, and while they say that the public is paying this cost, I want to point out that the railroads have indicated no intention of reducing their rates to the public by this amount, if they succeed in cutting the pay of their workers.

Strangely enough, throughout their propaganda campaign, the railroads never have given the public a breakdown of how they arrived at their figure of $500 million as the alleged cost of featherbedding. Although this figure has no foundation in fact, newspaper writers and others have been repeating it without question until it has probably become the most widely disseminated of modern myths.

On last November 2, however, the date arrived for the carriers to make public just what changes they had in mind in the present working rules which supposedly will eliminate this fantastic amount of alleged waste and at the same time, according to their propaganda, will halt what they refer to as "the needless destruction of jobs in the railroad industry. Now that they have served notices we can determine the strange arithmetic by which the industry's propagandists have arrived at this fantastic figure.

First, say the railroads, more than $200 million of this total is made up of the wages now paid to firemen in freight and yard service, whom the railroads want to eliminate. Passing over for the moment the completely unrealistic—and dangerous—nature of this proposal, I am unable to understand how the destruction of jobs in the railroad industry is halted by a proposal to eliminate many thousands of jobs now in existence.

Next, the railroads say that they would save $150 million a year by revising the so-called dual basis of pay for train service employees. This is nothing other than a proposal to cut the present piece rate earnings of these employes by this amount. It is a pay cut proposal, pure and simple.

Another $100 million of the figure is attributed to the wages now paid to other workers who, the railroads say, fill "useless crew positions on trains". Presumably, these are primarily brakemen, although the railroads have not spelled this out in any detail. I shall explain later just how fantastic and dangerous this proposal to eliminate these jobs is in the light of the realities of present-day railroading, but once again I must ask, how do you stop the needless destruction of jobs by further destroying them?

Finally, the railroads say that $50 million of their figure represents the money railroads pay out because of "full crew" laws and other safety statutes in 23 States. Those laws were enacted because the people of those States, speaking through their elected representatives, determined, under our democratic processes, that the railroads could not be relied upon without such legislation to take adequate safety precautions to protect the interests of the traveling public and railroad employees alike.

This breakdown of the railroads' phony $500 million figure for the cost of alleged "featherbedding," on its very face, reveals just how tenuous and misleading the industry's propaganda claim has been. Look at the facts about railroad operations, which lead all practical railroad operating men to vigorously oppose the proposed changes in the work rules which the carriers have called for.

In the first place, of the present 800,000 workers in the railroad industry in the United States, only 200,000 workers are employed in these so-called operating positions. Of that total, approximately half are engaged in yard service and are paid on an hourly basis, so that the so-called dual basis of pay, which is the basis of the railroad's "featherbedding" propaganda, applies only to about 100,000 train and engine service employees who are engaged in so-called road service and are required to work under conditions which are not present in any other industry.

The minimum train crew in road freight service is only five men—an engineer, a fireman, a conductor, and two brakemen. This has been the standard minimum crew for considerably over 40 years, and it hasn't increased today despite the fact that trains are many times longer, heavier, faster, and potentially more destructive of job opportunities than ever before.

The pay system by which road operating workers are compensated is a piece rate incentive system, where the unit of pay is the miles run. One hundred miles is merely a unit of work for which a unit of pay is received.

When you consider how much greater is the responsibility of these railroadmen, upon whom depends the safety of equipment and lading worth several million dollars per average train plus the lives and security of many passengers, it is clear that the 100-mile measure used to pay operating employees clearly is not intended to represent a day's work in the usual sense, but rather is only a unit of work.

The railroads now propose to run their crews 160 miles for less money they now pay for 100 miles. In other words, they are asking these employees to take a pay cut of more than 60 percent for the work to be performed.

It might be well to point out here that the railroads charge shippers and passengers on a basis of per mile carried. That is why the dual basis of pay was put into effect at the insistence of management because it relates wage costs directly to operating income. Despite all their propaganda, there is no evidence that increased train speeds and other factors will ever mean any substantial reduction in freight rates or passenger fares. Since living costs generally are rising, it's more likely that both will be increased.

As a matter of fact, they would already have gone up more if the railroads in recent years had not been the beneficiaries of the greatest increase in productivity among their employees of any industry. In the past decade, the productivity of railroad labor has soared an amazing 100 percent—and it has been rising in recent years at a steadily increasing rate, faster than in any manufacturing industry.

The carriers argue that higher train speeds, because of dieselization, make present day

scales archaic. But in 1946, before the U.S. roads turned to diesel power in freight service, the average train speed was only two miles per hour less than the average freight train speed of 18.9 miles per hour in 1958. Steam engines could move just as fast as Diesels, but it took more engines and more crew members and that's where productivity tells the real story.

A 100-car freight train with two to four steam engines had a crew for each engine. Now one engineer and one fireman are responsible for any number of diesel units operating in multiple and they can, and do, run as high as 9 and 10 units hauling trains of 200 to 300 cars.

In any piece rate system, there are always some operations which pay comparatively high wages, and when the railroads in their propaganda cite runs where they claim two so-called "days' pay" is being earned in a few hours they are referring to these exceptional and infrequent "Red Apple" runs.

Such runs are held by less than one percent of all railroad employees, and they are held only by employees who have worked up the seniority ladder step by step by putting in 25 to 30 years or more of service under conditions and pay rates which are decidedly sub-standard in terms of modern industrial wage scales and working practices. For every example which the railroads cite as "featherbedding," there are scores of instances at the other end of the pay structure where the employees are clearly grossly underpaid.

As a matter of fact, if the railroads were to go on a straight time basis similar to that in other industries, they would, on the basis of 1957 employment, have to pay out some $647 million a year more to their employees than they actually did. That, let me point out, means that any fair and equitable adjustment of the dual basis of pay system to modern industrial standards would cost the railroads well over $100 million more than their alleged $500 million cost of "featherbedding."

Let me point out that, under their present pay system, most of the overtime worked by railroad employees in road service is paid for at the straight-time rate, and working days of as much as 16 hours at the straight time rates are not at all uncommon. In addition, these employees get no night-shift differentials and no premium pay for Sunday and holiday work. They do not get paid for the time they must spend in regular service away from home at the far terminal, and in no instance do they receive allowance for their "away from home" expenses while they are waiting to make the homeward run. Under such conditions, it is clear that the compensation even on the higher paid runs cited by the railroads quickly evaporates.

When the railroads talk about modernizing the working rules for the operating employees in road service, of course, they aren't proposing adjustments of this kind. All that they really mean, we now know, is that they want to preserve these conditions but make their employees perform 60 percent more work for less pay.

To offset this clearly unbearable loss in take-home pay, the railroads also are advancing another proposal involving the mileage ceilings of engine crews. At present the average crew operates between 4,000 and 4,800 miles per month in passenger service and between 3,200 and 3,800 miles per month in freight service.

What would this proposed rules change really mean? Frankly, it would place thousands of enginemen out of work, while a few high-seniority men would be allowed to make higher overall earnings, but at a great increase in their total working hours. Here a safety factor enters, because higher speed trains mean greater strain upon the enginemen and consequently greater fatigue. Instead of lengthening hours as train speeds rise, the requirements of safety demand that the total be steadily reduced.

A third rules change which has been asked by the railroads involves the location of terminal points. Railroad management is asking for authority to establish and relocate existing terminal points at its own discretion. On the surface, such a proposal may not seem too significant, but let's look at some of its implications.

What is involved here is literally the creation of ghost towns in many areas and the destruction of billions of dollars in property values with no appreciable advantages to the railroads. Railroad communities, and there are many of them, depend almost solely upon the men and women who work and live there. If income among railroad workers drops or disappears, all of the business establishments in these communities suffer.

Whenever one of these terminal points is moved, a great economic and social upheaval occurs for the people involved. Engine and train crewmen, who have usually purchased homes in these communities, must move in order to preserve their jobs and their source of income. Dispatchers, yardmen, shopmen, and clerks must follow. These railroad families, whose life savings have been invested in homes near the abolished terminal point, thus find much of their equity wiped out because they must try to dispose of them at a time when the market has completely vanished. With the departure of these railroad families goes the reason many towns have for existing. Schools, recreational facilities, municipal buildings—all erected at a considerable cost by the community—stand empty and unused, and these once prosperous communities plunge into decline. The economic loss is made all the more tragic by the uprooting of the lives of good citizens, whose roots and friendships are in the communities which the railroad wants the unilateral right to abolish.

Also involved in this proposal is the seniority protection of the men who operate from one division point to another. The carriers seek to disrupt the seniority that years of faithful service has gained for those who have spent 5, 10, 20, and even 30 and more years in the industry.

There's a human element in every industry and business and I think we too often mistake production, automation, and technological progress as controlling factors in life rather than relate them to the overall concept of human values. We have human needs, human desires, and human rights. Machines should not supersede those things nor should they control our outlook on life. Machines should work for humanity.

A certain amount of specialization exists in the railroad industry. The shopmen know their jobs well, as do switchmen, brakemen, conductors, firemen, and engineers.

Another type of specialization is found in the difference between yard and road assignments among engine and traincrews. It is one thing for an engineer and his fireman to know the intricate switching assignments of a huge yard and another to know the roadbed, track curvature, and grade, and other requirements of a road assignment. The same is applicable to trainmen and yard switchmen. Their jobs demand distinct knowledge and skill which provides for safe and efficient operation.

A yard crew cannot be seriously expected to take a long freight train over tracks foreign to them. Nor can a road crew coming off a run be expected to perform yard switching in surroundings and conditions dangerously unfamiliar to them.

It's something like a railroad vice president of personnel being asked to spend the last 2 hours of his day as superintendent of the electrical shop. He'd be a hazard.

The coming of diesels to the railroads brought an end to an era that most railroaders recall with a feeling of nostalgia. The puffing steam engines created a lot of smoke and soot, but they had a special charm no one could deny. Aboard these engines the locomotive firemen fed the "iron hog" for nearly a century. First they used wood. Then came coal and later there were the automatic stokers that eliminated most of the coal shoveling even though coal was still used as fuel.

Dieselization brought an end to the great old "puffers" and their stimulating whistle became a thing of the past. The fireman, however, did not fade into history. Instead, he exchanged his coal shovel and knowledge of automatic stokers for a new set of work tools. These tools were diesel engine trouble-shooting books, a working knowledge of the great new power that uses oil to generate electricity.

His name didn't change—probably because of his proud tradition—but his duties in many respects became more complicated and certainly more important. The fireman retained his regular work as safety lookout on the left side of the cab and his duties in assisting the engineer and training to be an engineer himself one day. To those he added the responsibility of supervising the power-producing units of any number of diesel units operating in multiple as one locomotive.

Perhaps you already know that when a train is in operation, engine malfunctions cause warning signals to light up in the locomotive cab. It is the fireman who first of all has the responsibility and secondly the skill to investigate these trouble calls, locate the disorder and if possible restore the unit to operating conditions without interfering with the continuous operation of the train.

He's readily available when and if an engineer becomes incapacitated, and no matter what grandiose claims are made about the dead-man's control there is no better safety device than the engineer and his fireman working as a team. I might add that those are the sentiments of many top railroad officials, as well as railroad operating workers without exception.

None of the automatic devices introduced in railroading makes the fireman obsolete, because he is one employee who is responsible for checking and supervising the power production of the technological device involved—the diesel engine.

In summary, the locomotive fireman is indispensable to railroad safety, to the proper and efficient operation of trains, and he is needed to provide the supply of new workers undergoing training to become locomotive engineers.

Just as railroad management is ignoring all of the demands of safety in its reckless proposal to remove firemen from freight and yard service operations, it is similarly irresponsible in its effort to eliminate what Mr. Loomis has referred to as the "brakeman who handles no brakes on power-brake-equipped freight trains."

It just happens that the Interstate Commerce Commission regularly reports casualties to employees of the railroads in many subclassifications and among them is one involving the accidents sustained in the "operation of handbrakes." If brakemen are handling no brakes, as Mr. Loomis alleges, how then did it happen that in 1954 there were 3 train servicemen killed and 688 injured (and disabled for more than 3 days) in the operation of handbrakes? In 1955, 6 were killed and 793 injured in the operation of handbrakes. In 1956, there were 5 killed and 863 injured in the operation of handbrakes. More than 12 percent of all casualties to brakemen in those 3 years occurred in the operation of those handbrakes that have supposedly vanished.

Brakemen not only are clearly performing an important and dangerous function, but the steady increase in their casualty rate shows that the need for an adequate number in the interests of safety is increasing, and not diminishing as railroad management contends.

Similar to management's proposal to eliminate firemen is its demand that it have the sole right to determine the use of conductors, brakemen, and engineers.

There is a popular conception circulating in management circles that the managers of an industry must have the exclusive right to decide when and where employees will be used. This greater flexibility, they say, will enable the industry to receive full benefit of automated techniques.

Let's look at that proposition in the case of the railroad industry. It, too, wants to decide when and where it can use employees. Employees have their rights, too, and have the power and right to protect themselves against unwise management encroachment.

But consider another aspect. The railroad industry has demonstrated over the years an inability to provide safe, efficient operation without the guidance of Government agencies and the checkrein influences of our labor organizations. Insurance companies still classify railroad operating work as hazardous and charge considerably higher rates on these job classifications.

It was the railroad brotherhoods that fought for and helped bring about every safety regulation and device we now take for granted on the railroads. These include even such basic requirements as electric headlights, automatic car couplers, locomotive inspection, and even the entire signal system in use in this country. Labor's efforts to improve railroad safety have always been bitterly opposed by railroad management at every turn.

That situation is still true today. Over 2 years ago we asked management to work with us in setting up a joint labor-management safety committee to try to halt the steady rise in railroad accidents that has been taking place. We could not secure the railroads' cooperation, and therefore the organizations set up a safety committee of their own.

Safety legislation inaugurated by the rail unions or in support of Interstate Commerce Commission actions in this respect invariably gets the tag of "make work" legislation or "legalized featherbedding" pinned on it by rail management.

Kenneth Tuggle, Chairman of the ICC, however, has defended such legislation as necessary to employee and public safety and says it does not in any manner have the purpose of creating jobs.

Historically, the financial interests that control our railroads have always placed profit above safety, and that is what they are doing now in their present featherbedding campaign.

Given the prerogative to assign crews at its own discretion, railroad management most assuredly would follow its past attempts to milk as much work from the least number of employees possible without regard to safe operation and efficient service to shippers and the traveling public.

Yes, my friends, the railroads say they are going to modernize once they can clear the tracks of all the featherbedding. But look at the definition the railroads give to the word "modern."

To the financiers modern railroading means less employees and fewer trains serving less customers and fewer communities. You can see the philosophy of retrenchment in the demands that have been served on us. Four major objectives are hidden in the legal prose of the slide-rule artists that concocted them.

First of all, the proposals place 350,000 railroad jobs in jeopardy. Our friend, Dan Loomis, disputes this figure as untrue but then goes on to say that some jobs are involved. Well, if 350,000 jobs are not on the line, I hope Mr. Loomis can tell us how many are. If he reads his own proposals he'll note that he's asking that two men be dropped from every train and yard crew. Elimination of terminals eliminates the jobs of the nonoperating employees at those terminals. Throwing out the mileage regulations cuts the operating personnel even more as does the destruction of the demarcation line between yard and road work. Mr. Loomis may deny it, but we stand on our statement. The demands of the railroads would cut the railroad work force by 350,000 men and women. The attendant impact on the economy and the national defense is a question for Mr. Loomis to answer.

I have already mentioned that the railroads seek elimination of terminals. This proposal represents a very real threat to the prosperity of 2,000 to 3,000 communities that are either totally or partially dependent on railroad wages.

These rule changes have a direct bearing on our paychecks. The railroads aren't publicizing the fact but taken together the wage and rules demands of the carriers, if put into effect, would wipe out 12 years of wage increases for operating employees.

An example of this is the engineer in passenger service who was paid an average of $11.83 for 100 miles in 1948. The carriers now propose that the same engineer be paid $11.48 for running 160 miles in 1960.

Maybe you already know that the year 1948 is one of the years used as the base for the Consumer Price Index—the cost-of-living index. Since 1949 the index has increased 25.6 percent and that increase came over the same period that the carriers now want to subtract from wage history. It sounds ridiculous in the light of the steel settlement, but it's in black and white, friends, and the railroads have pulled out all stops to get what they want.

The fourth item in the notices which might not be discernible at first glance is best represented by the phrase "management shall have the unrestricted right." This phrase is the crux of issue and appears more than a few times in the notices. What does it mean? It simply means that management wants the authority to write, enforce, and abolish the rules under which we will work. In other words, management wants the right to tear up a union contract when the worker is getting too much of a break.

These four objectives represent the purpose for the million-dollar campaign against rail employees.

Incidentally, the carriers' very pious claim that it's the rules not the workers that they are attacking is refuted in the four objectives. The only way you can take a job away from a man and then tell him that he is not being affected is through the use of doubletalk, and we are dealing with masters of that art.

We who work in the railroad industry have unlimited faith in its future. We know just how far more efficient a form of transportation the railroads could be if they were only properly used. We would like to work with management toward that end, because we believe that jobs in the industry can best be preserved, not by seeking to destroy safety standards, but by doing constantly better the transportation job which only the railroads are equipped to do.

As a result, railroad labor in this country has never fought the introduction of labor-saving devices when they have contributed to more efficient—and safe—railroading. The unmatched productivity increase among workers in the railroad industry is ample testimony to this fact.

Railroad management should settle disagreements with its workers in the traditional way—at the bargaining table and not in propaganda campaigns in the public press.

We hope such an era of labor-management cooperation on the railroads is in the offing.

In closing it seems fitting and apropos to quote for you a statement of Chairman G. E. Leighty on the steel settlement:

"All of American labor owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the United Steelworkers for their firm stand in defense of safe, sanitary, and humane working conditions in the face of the industry's demand that existing agreements be wiped out and these matters left exclusively to management.

"The preservation of work rules in the steel industry is, of course, a matter of particular interest to railroad workers, who are now confronted with a similar campaign of unprecedented intensity by railroad management which seeks to wipe out rules which are designed to protect the safety of both railroad employees and the traveling public against the steadily increasing hazards of railroading. The costly strike which steel management forced upon its employees over this issue should be an indication to railroad management that neither American workers nor the American public in general will ever permit a return to the jungle days of railroad operations when management, and management alone, was the sole judge of what constituted proper and safe working and operating conditions.

"The settlement of the steel dispute conclusively proves that management's contention that protective work rules are equivalent to featherbedding is completely unfounded. Moreover, the victory of labor in the steel industry shows that management cannot win its current ill-advised efforts to set back the clock of industrial relations through a return to arbitrary management rule in place of mutually agreed upon rules governing conditions of employment.

"Railroad workers, like their brothers in the steel industry, intend to do all in their power to insure to the American people that our industry will not be the one which opens the breach for an assault by reactionary managements upon the democratic processes of collective bargaining and the protective labor standards which have come to symbolize a large part of the American way of life.

"Likewise, while we do not regard the wage gains won in the steel industry as necessarily setting a pattern for all others to follow, we do point out that these advances emphasize the lag which has taken place in the wages of railroad workers in recent years and make our pending modest demands all the more reasonable. At the same time they make the railroads' insistence that their employees—who lead all other workers in the Nation in increased productivity—take a 15-cent hourly pay cut fantastic, unrealistic and completely ridiculous."

Your kind attention and indulgence has been appreciated and for which I thank you very much.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, America is at another crisis in the field of civil rights. The civil rights bill, H.R. 8601, which offers significant opportunity for

advancement in the field of human rights, lies dormant in the House Rules Committee blocked by a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats. Three Republican votes, which can be easily gotten in support of this administration measure by either the Republican minority leader or by the President, are not forthcoming for want of action by either the minority leadership or by the White House.

The other method of bringing this legislation to the floor is a discharge petition filed and sponsored by the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and by the Democratic study group.

According to reports in the press this discharge petition which will bring the civil rights bill, H.R. 8601, to the floor has approximately 175 signatures of which less than 30 are those of Republicans.

In order to bring civil rights legislation to the floor, Members of this House must drop partisanship and join in the signing of this discharge petition. Floor consideration of this matter is so near and so easy to achieve if our Republican colleagues will but join us in this drive to protect the rights of everyone.

Failure to secure the required 219 signatures will also prevent any strengthening amendments being offered to the bill, such as the provisions of my bill to establish a system of Federal registrars to guarantee all citizens the right to vote, and my bill to authorize the Attorney General to institute civil injunctive proceedings to protect all civil rights of all persons and not just voting rights as authorized by the 1957 act.

H.R. 8601, THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to raise my voice with my Democratic colleagues in support of prompt action on H.R. 8601, the civil rights bill. The overwhelming majority of the American people believe in equal rights and equal opportunities for all citizens. They are opposed to second-class economic or political citizenship for racial, ethnic or religious reasons. Although some progress in the field of civil rights was made during the past 2 years, there is unmistakable evidence that the Civil Rights Act of 1957 needs to be reinforced. The bill reported by the House Judiciary Committee, H.R. 8601, would assure that the Nation will move forward in the long struggle to achieve full rights for all citizens.

H.R. 8601 is a good, constructive bill which deserves the wholehearted support of all Members who believe that constitutional rights must be translated from theory into reality. As one of its first signers, I am heartened by the number of signatures now appearing on the discharge petition, and I am proud of the support given it by my Democratic colleagues. It is most disappointing that so few on the Republican side have cooperated in this move to facilitate consideration of this most important measure. I appeal to my Republican colleagus to delay no longer in enabling this legislation to come before the floor for a vote. Nothing will be accomplished by words, no matter how noble and eloquent. It is past time for action, decisive action to meet this grave issue. The discharge petition is designed for that purpose.

The Congress must continue to devote itself to the solution of this problem until all the innumerable injustices that arise from racial prejudice have been stamped out. I urge approval of H.R. 8601.

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. THOMPSON of Texas, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 20 minutes, on Thursday, February 4.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 10 minutes, today and tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday and Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(At the request of Mr. DADDARIO and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. MOORE.

Mr. SHORT.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1508. An act to provide for economic regulation of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution proposing observance of week beginning January 31, 1960, as National Junior Achievement Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 28, 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:

1732. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during December 1959 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.

1733. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1734. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the Department of Defense relative to its disposition of foreign excess personal property for fiscal year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1735. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 39th Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1736. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by relieving the FCC of the duty of making the annual report of personnel as now required by subsection (3) of section 4(k)"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1737. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. First interim report on Project Mercury (Rept. No. 1228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 713. An act to revise the boundaries of the Zion National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 9969. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9970. A bill to provide for the disposition of the Fort Mifflin Naval Ammunition Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9971. A bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 9972. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 9973. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9974. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 9975. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duty on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9976. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9977. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9978. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9979. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 9980. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9981. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 9983. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 9984. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9985. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, for 1 year, to increase domestic beet sugar and mainland cane sugar quotas, to authorize the President to reduce quotas of certain foreign nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 9986. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9987. A bill to provide for the issuance of interest-bearing stamps by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining funds to reduce the principal amount of the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 9988. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 to qualify for disability insurance benefits, and to permit the payment of such benefits from the beginning of the individual's disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9989. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 9990. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to pay for the destruction on Uganik and Kodiak Islands of livestock by bears from the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 9991. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 9992. A bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit the sale by coin-operated machines of insurance policies covering loss of life or personal injury suffered in aircraft accidents by airline passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9993. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9994. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9995. A bill to provide for the disposition of the Fort Mifflin Naval Ammunition Depot, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 9996. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to prescribe procedures to insure that foreign excess property which is disposed of overseas will not be imported into the United States to the injury of the economy of this country; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 9997. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9998. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize the construction or alteration of certain buildings in foreign countries for use by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 9999. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 10000. A bill to amend further certain provisions of the District of Columbia tax laws relating to overpayments and refunds of taxes erroneously collected; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.J. Res. 587. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for an appropriate permanent national memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.J. Res. 588. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an Annual Youth Appreciation and Honor Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.J. Res. 590. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an Annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 526. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 527. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 528. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship and other sacred sites; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. Res. 430. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the feasibility of raising and restoring the Union ironclad vessel known as the *Monitor*; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 431. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. Res. 432. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. Res. 433. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend Public Law 550, 82d Congress, relating to education and training benefits, to service men and women as long as the draft continues, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOWLES:

H.R. 10001. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Barbier Zimmitti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 10002. A bill for the relief of Ida Exle (nee Ida Sterio); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 10003. A bill for the relief of Kyoko Suti Stanton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 10004. A bill for the relief of Maria Rubi Lupisan Anit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10005. A bill for the relief of Tokutaro Gomi and Fusae Gomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10006. A bill for the relief of Stephan A. Clemente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10007. A bill for the relief of Gus Nihoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10008. A bill for the relief of Takaichi Miyamoto and Misayo Miyamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 10009. A bill for the relief of Jonas Cernauskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 10010. A bill to authorize the sale of a portion of the former light station property in Scituate, Mass.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 10011. A bill for the relief of Zuzanna Katarzyna Sobus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10012. A bill for the relief of Mihailo Vuksan and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10013. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Wojewodzka Gorna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 10014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Birdie E. Polley; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 10015. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Wenceslao Alavez Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10016. A bill for the relief of Pablo Santana Castellon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXVI,

323. Mr. FORAND presented a petition of Dominic Brogan of Pawtucket, R.I., and others, relative to requesting favorable consideration of the lowering of the social security retirement age to 60 instead of 65, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Removal of Disability Payments Age Limit Under Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill removing the 50-year age limit for persons receiving disability payments under the Social Security Act, and permitting the payment of such benefits from the beginning of an individual's disability.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that Congress will thoroughly examine and evaluate the social security program during the present session of Congress. It is apparent to a great many Americans that measures such as the removal of the disability age limit are urgently needed to improve and update Federal programs for the assistance of aged, disabled, and needy persons in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why a person should have to wait until he is 50 years old before he can qualify for disability relief under the social security program. Such relief should begin when it is needed most; namely, immediately upon the determination that a person who has been paying into the social security trust fund has become totally or permanently disabled. This to me is the only fair and just approach to the overwhelming human problems involved in a person being injured or becoming so seriously ill as to prevent him from pursuing his regular line of work.

In introducing this bill today, I add my voice to those calling for fairer and better treatment of the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed following these remarks:

H.R. 9988

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained age 50 to qualify for disability insurance benefits, and to permit the payment of such benefits from the beginning of the individual's disability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subparagraph (B) of section 223(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "has attained the age of 50 and".

(b) The last sentence of section 223(c) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 2. (a) Subparagraph (C) of section 223(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "while under a disability (as defined in subsection (c)(2))" after "benefits".

(b) Subparagraph (D) of section 223(a)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(D) has been under such disability throughout a period of at least six consecutive calendar months, or dies as a direct result of such disability".

(c) Section 223(a)(1) of such Act is further amended by striking out "beginning with the first month after his waiting period (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) in which he becomes so entitled to such insurance benefits" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "beginning with the first month in which he satisfies subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C)".

(d) Section 223(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "in the first month of his waiting period" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the first month in which he is under the disability described in paragraph (1)(C)".

(e) Section 223(c) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows paragraph (2).

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, or based upon the wages and self-employment income of an individual entitled to such benefits for months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

We Must Act Now: Tomorrow May Never Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, as the year 1960 comes upon us nearly 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, Negro Americans in some States are still being denied the right to vote, the right to equal education, the right to equality in the courts, the right to protection of their person, the right to protection of their property and a recognition of the dignity of their person. In almost every State they are denied equality in housing and employment.

This disgraceful and appalling situation does exist in the United States and it is known to every responsible figure in Government, religion, business and labor, from the President of the United States down to the candlestick maker. Neither the moral forces of the Presidency nor the united moral forces of Christendom has been directed with vigorous purpose to eliminate this evil. This is true despite the fact that in today's world, dynamic and explosive ideas joined with frustrations among the

people of many lands have rewritten history and overturned governments in China, Indonesia, India, Indochina, Burma, Ceylon, Pakistan, Tunisia, Cuba, Syria, Moravia, Egypt, Sudan, Guinea, Nigeria, Ghana, and the Cameroons are now at work in other areas as well as in one of our most vulnerable points—Panama.

We all recognize the fact that even with its imperfections the United States is the undisputed world leader, but we must also recognize that the leader is being challenged from every point on the globe. Her morals, her laws, her Christianity, her intent, her sincerity are all under question and therefore suspect. It is, therefore, necessary to assume that the 800 million peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and elsewhere, will judge the United States, will trust the United States, not by the old assurances of equality, justice, morality, and good intentions toward all men, but that their trust will largely depend on what is done by the United States to set its house in order. It is reasonable to assume that if our house is set in order, we will establish a true basis for the trust, confidence, and respect of men everywhere.

If, on the other hand, the United States permits repetitions of the Mack Charles Parker disgrace and the double standard of pseudojustice of the Florida rape cases, and the flagrant violations of the Negro's right to vote as well as other countless inequities, we will justly deserve the revulsion of the peoples of the world who can only conclude that we know the words of justice and godliness, but that we have lost the substance and meaning of Magna Charta, Bill of Rights, Constitution of the United States, and of Christianity.

In this hour of our greatest decision we dare not again forget that "what happens to the least of men anywhere, happens in time to all men everywhere and it will follow as day follows night; that by turning our backs on the wrongs we have the power to prevent, we must share the blame with those responsible for those wrongs."

This year of 1960 demands that the 2d session of the 86th Congress pass civil rights legislation assuring liberty and justice to all thereby proving to all nations that the United States truly believes that "whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law of the prophets."

As a realist, I must note that there are among my fellow Americans some who flatly reject my statements. To these I recommend reflection, reason, and analysis.

There are others who hold themselves aloof from our conflict and agony, from the problems of the present and the hope of tomorrow. To these I say, you stab your country in the back by withholding your intellectual and moral judgment in this hour of imminent peril.

But to those millions who believe in the American dream, who are convinced that our destiny is linked with that of the uncommitted people of the world, I say the 2d session of the 86th Congress will pass positive and meaningful, as well as vocative, civil rights legislation and remove the roadblock to the peaceful and equal progress of all our citizens; we will root out, expose, and destroy the apostles of fear, ignorance, and demagoguery; we must never permit our freedom, our democracy, and our leadership to be sacrificed on the altar of prejudice.

Democratic Spending Policies Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in a recent news column, our colleague, DON MAGNUSON, of Washington, took issue with the contention by some that the Democrats are out to spend President Eisenhower's predicted $4.2 billion surplus at the end of fiscal 1961. On the contrary, as the column points out, there is serious doubt there will be a surplus of anywhere near the expected amount.

Mr. MAGNUSON, a member of the Appropriations Committee, and three of its subcmomittees, is certainly in a position to know what he is talking about. I concur with him that the Democratic spending policies will remain sound, based on the country's needs.

The column follows:

DEMOCRATIC SPENDING POLICIES SOUND
(By DON MAGNUSON, U.S. Congressman, Seventh District)

WASHINGTON.—As a Democrat in Congress, it is most aggravating to see and hear the constant assumption that President Eisenhower's prediction of a $4,200 million surplus at the end of fiscal 1961 will result in increased spending by the Democratic Congress.

I have seen it stated repeatedly in the Nation's press that "the Democrats have their eyes on that $4.2 billion melon"; "the Democrats are planning to seize upon the projected surplus as an excuse for increased spending," etc.

I know of no Democrat—in the leadership or in the ranks—who has given the slightest hint that the President's rosy prophecy will have any effect whatsoever on Democratic spending policies.

Yet, one sees in print almost daily the implication—if not the outright statement—that this is true, as if it were declared policy of our party.

In the first place, I also know of no Democrat who does not take the prediction of the big surplus with a large grain of salt. I know I do.

The President's hope for a surplus of $4,200 million is predicated on an enormous increase in revenues—an estimated $84 billion in fiscal 1961 as against an estimated $78,600 million in fiscal 1960, which will end June 30. It seems to me this is pretty risky figuring, based more on wishful thinking than on reliable indexes.

In the meantime, of course, it makes fine campaign fodder.

Let's look at the record of the Eisenhower administration, fiscally speaking, since the famous general campaigned his way into the White House on a platform of economy and reduction of the national debt. When he became President, the national debt was $266 billion. Next June 30, it is estimated, it will be $284,500 million.

The curve of the national debt throughout Eisenhower's 7 years has been constantly upward. There is nothing to lead me to believe that that trend will be reversed in his last year in office. So much for the "surplus."

Democratic spending policies are based upon our estimates of national needs, from military to human. For my part, the President's looking through rose-colored glasses will not affect my votes on money measures one iota, and I know I speak for the party's leadership in Congress and the party as a whole.

Geneva Test Ban Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I made relating to the Geneva test ban negotiations at Pontiac, Mich., on October 30. The speech dealt with the Geneva negotiations for a treaty on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

During the course of my remarks I advanced a proposal in an effort to prevent a deadlock in the negotiations from developing. This proposal would seek a treaty banning, under effective control and inspection, all nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, underwater, in outer space, and underground down to a level of about 5 kilotons. The level of about 5 kilotons was selected because from the scientific evidence then available it appeared to me that the number of onsite inspections required to check on suspicious events, that is, unidentified earth disturbances, of 5 kilotons and above would not be too great. In fact, I suggested that between 25 and 50 inspections within the Soviet Union might be sufficient.

News reports appearing within the last few days indicate that the United States is now about to advance such a proposal to the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. According to these reports we shall propose an agreement to ban tests underground down to a certain size depending in part on the number of onsite inspections that can be negotiated.

One important aspect of the proposal to be offered by the United States, however, is not clear. In my Pontiac speech I suggested that the United States should be willing to agree not to test in the range below the 5-kiloton threshold for 2 years pending the outcome of a research program and an evaluation of the experience of the control system. To me a 2-year moratorium on tests below the range of the inspection level was a risk worth taking. If we found the Soviets testing in that range then we likewise would be free to test. But we have a much greater chance of detecting even small tests with the control system in operation than we have now with only our national stations to rely on.

It is possible that the pro-testers within the administration will prevail. If

they do, any threshold agreement proposed will be as high as possible, say 20 or 30 kilotons, so that the range of testing allowed will be large. Furthermore, the pro-testers will argue against the concept of a 2-year agreement not to test in the range below the threshold. They would not be willing to await the outcome of a research program. This is not strange since the pro-testers have done nothing that I can see to start research programs within the United States designed to improve our ability to detect and identify underground explosions.

I hope that the pro-testers will not win their case. I am heartened, nevertheless, that a threshold proposal along the lines I outlined at Pontiac is now apparently about to be offered at the Geneva test-ban negotiations.

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

NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS PROPOSAL TO BREAK IMPASSE

(Excerpts from speech by Senator HUMPHREY in Pontiac, Mich., Oct. 30, 1959)

I want to discuss with you tonight the problem of disarmament—a subject which lies at the very heart of international relations and military policy.

A few months ago, a congressional committee was informed by experts that a surprise nuclear attack on the United States would last just a few hours, but would cost the lives of about 50 million people—just about one-third of the population.

The large nations of the world have just about given up the old concepts of strategy—soldier against soldier, ship against ship, army against army. Now our military calculations involve the bombing of cities, the destruction of populated centers, the elimination of production facilities. These measures mean death to millions of people at a time.

And the most frightening thing is that we have almost grown accustomed to it.

But it does no good to express horror, or to display moral indignation.

The problem is also a practical one, and we must solve it practically. We must insist on a fair solution even as the loaded guns are pointed.

In his speech at the U.N., Mr. Khrushchev stated that the Russians want to reduce arms at the present time. This is encouraging. But up to now, they have shown little willingness to allow international officials to inspect the Soviet Union to ascertain whether they are performing according to agreement.

The job of American diplomats is twofold; first, to persuade the Russians to accept inspection, and second, to be sure that our inspection demands are reasonable and necessary to police an agreement effectively. We must not yield on any essential, because an agreement without real inspection would be worthless. But we must recognize that the Russians have a historic passion for secrecy, and that the thought of foreign inspectors traveling freely around their country is repugnant to them. We must make sure that our demands entail the maximum in control and the minimum in complexity.

This is the general task of American diplomats. I want to become more specific.

If the world is to witness any progress toward ending the arms race and toward reducing the burden of vast expenditures for defense, we must determine whether the Soviets mean it when they claim they are willing to accept controls. Our main, and at the moment, only opportunity to find out is through the nuclear test ban negotiations now in progress in Geneva.

I wish to discuss these negotiations with you tonight because they bear so directly on whether a breakthrough in the disarmament question is possible. If these negotiations succeed, then future arms control talks can be conducted in a much more favorable atmosphere than if they fail or become stalemated indefinitely. The negotiations are a test of Soviet willingness to accept controls.

My purpose tonight is to report briefly the status of the negotiations and also to share with you a specific proposal for breaking what is fast becoming an impasse in the test ban talks.

The three nuclear powers—the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union—have been negotiating for 1 year. Definite progress has been made.

Soviet representatives are beginning to accept some concepts of control to police a nuclear weapons test ban. They have indicated a willingness to cooperate with the other nuclear powers in sending satellites into space to help detect nuclear tests hundreds of miles above the earth. They have agreed that a specified number, roughly 20, fixed control posts will be established within their borders to house a variety of instruments to record signals of possible nuclear explosions. And they have accepted the idea that on a few occasions a year a mobile inspection team consisting of foreigners and nationals may go to the site of an unidentified event registered at the control posts to determine whether such an unidentified event is a nuclear explosion.

For a country in which secrecy and suspicion are almost a cult, the willingness of the Soviets to accept the above controls is an advance over previous arms control negotiations. Never in 13 years of talks on disarming have the Soviets come this close to accepting controls in specified treaty language.

However, the United States finds that the Soviet position on controls is still inadequate in three major respects.

First, our Government says the control posts should contain a higher proportion of foreigners than the Soviet Union has yet been willing to accept. The United States has asked for a ratio of two foreigners to every national. The U.S. position perhaps could be modified and I believe that if both sides wish to reach an agreement the difference between the two sides on this point can be compromised.

The second criticism of the Soviet position concerns the budget. The Soviet Union has tried to insist that the budget for the International Control Organization should be adopted unanimously; in other words, it should be subjected to a veto by any one of the three nuclear powers. But the Soviet Union has not always demanded a veto in the adoption of budgets, to name for example, the International Atomic Energy Agency. So it is very conceivable that this obstacle need not remain one for long.

Now I come to the third area in which the United States maintains that the Soviet position on control is inadequate. And this is the most important and the most difficult of all. On this point, the negotiations could fail or stalemate. This question is the number of times that a mobile inspection team may travel to the site of an event which could be suspected of being a nuclear explosion. As I have said, the Soviets maintain that this will be necessary only a few times each year.

The United States objects to the restriction of a few. But on this question the United States has no counterproposal of its own. We object to the few sought by the Soviet Union but have nothing to offer in return. We say that the number of mobile inspection visits should be related to the number of unidentified events which might be suspicious. U.S. scientists have attempted to estimate how many unidentified events there might be, particularly those underground. Their estimate is based on calculating about how many earthquakes there will be in the Soviet Union and of these how many the control posts will be able to assert are definitely earthquakes and not nuclear explosions. Some of our scientists calculate that the number of events that could be subject to inspection is a very large one. This figure, in fact, is so large that our negotiators are quite certain that the Soviet Union will never accept mobile inspection teams investigating the site of every one of hundreds of unidentified earthquakes.

The big problem, then, is how many of the hundreds of unidentified earthquakes should be subject to inspection to give a high degree of assurance that the Soviet Union is not able secretly to conduct a militarily significant series of nuclear weapons tests.

I have presented to you as objectively and as briefly as I can the major issues that are before the nuclear powers as they resume their negotiations at Geneva. I have indicated that with respect to the first two of the major unresolved issues, on staffing and on budget, the differences can probably be reconciled. On the third issue I am not so sure a reconciliation is possible. I say this because the Soviet Union gives little indication that it will submit to mobile inspection more than a few times a year. And the United States is not even able to say how many inspections it thinks would be necessary. So you have a situation in which the Soviet Union maintains a position that is highly unsatisfactory to us and in which the United States has no position at all. Without a position on the part of the United States, it is difficult to see how any compromise can be reached.

What is the answer to this apparent impassé? I have urged the administration to reach some position on the question of the number of inspections. Its answer is that no position is possible until the Soviet Union is willing to discuss the technical complexities of the problem. The Soviet Union, contending that it spent an entire summer discussing the technical difficulties, prefers to solve the problem by picking a number out of a hat, and a low number at that.

Many people, particularly those inside or close to the Atomic Energy Commission, would solve the impasse by advocating a nuclear weapons test ban that covers only atmospheric tests. They say that because atmospheric tests are so much more easily detected than those underground or at high altitudes, such a limited agreement would eliminate the necessity of any mobile inspection teams at all. The Soviet Union, thus far, has claimed that it wants a comprehensive agreement; that is, one that covers all nuclear weapons tests. It has rejected an atmospheric ban.

I believe that an atmospheric ban is better than no agreement. I believe that it is less desirable than a total ban because it would allow not only the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union to continue testing, but it would also allow other countries, such as Communist China and France and many others, to become nuclear powers.

Furthermore, if all our testing were done underground, I think this could result in an increase rather than a reduction of world tension. With all countries burrowing down into the ground to test their weapons each would have less knowledge of what the other was doing, thereby increasing suspicion and distrust.

If the Soviet Union is unwilling to discuss the technical complications of a comprehensive agreement and if the United States is unwilling to reach a negotiating position regarding the number of annual inspections it believes would be both safe and reason-

able, then some other way out of the impasse must be found. For we must not let the Geneva negotiations fail.

I do not pretend to have the perfect solution to this problem. But I offer here tonight one possibility for your consideration and discussion.

For a comprehensive test ban our scientists believe that the number of unidentified events in the Soviet Union alone would number several hundred, obviously too many to inspect. However, this number drops drastically as the size of the nuclear explosion or earthquake increases. For example, if the control organization had to inspect only for explosions of approximately 5 kilotons or larger, the number of inspections needed in the Soviet Union would be somewhere in the range of 25 to 50. Such a range does not appear to me to be too high, either from a practical point of view or from the viewpoint of the Soviet Union with its suspicious outlook toward any inspection or control.

My proposal, therefore, is as follows:

Point 1: Let the United States extend its general moratorium on all nuclear tests now scheduled to end on December 31 for a maximum of 1 year. This would give the nuclear powers ample chance to reach agreement. I would not extend this moratorium more than 1 year, if the Soviets stall longer than that, it is a sign they are trying to get a test ban with no controls whatsoever. I think the United States must not allow this to happen.

Point 2: We should be prepared to enter into an agreement banning nuclear tests equal to and above 5-kiloton explosions. The agreement would specify that all unidentified events with a signal equal to and above a 5-kiloton explosion would be subject to inspection. The ceiling on the number of mobile inspections would be somewhere between 25 to 50. In this way I believe we could arrive at a number of mobile inspections that would correspond to our present best educated guesses from a scientific point of view as to what is necessary.

Point 3: We should be prepared to join with the other countries for 2 years from the time the agreement goes into effect in a moratorium on tests below 5 kilotons. At the end of that time we shall know two things: (1) whether the Soviet Union and other countries are cooperating in installng the control posts; and (2) whether by observation and further research the control posts can be improved to detect and identify most of the unidentified events below a size of 5 kilotons.

Point 4: During the 2-year period in which the control posts and inspection system for the 5 kiloton threshold agreement were being established we should conduct a comprehensive research program in cooperation with the Soviets, with the United Nations, and also by ourselves. Such a program would be designed to find ways of improving the control system so that all suspicious events would be subject to inspection within a reasonable ceiling.

Point 5: The agreement should specify that if the international control posts or our own detection system gave evidence that the Soviet Union was not cooperating in the moratorium on tests below 5 kilotons—those not subject for 2 years to mobile inspection—then we would be free ourselves to test in this range. We would present our evidence to the international control commission to show that the moratorium had been violated. And if the Soviets do not agree to install appropriate and reasonable controls for tests below 5 kilotons we should be free to test in this range if our defense requires it.

My proposal is one I believe can be reached within a short time, given the sincere desire to reach agreement on the part of the Soviet Union and the United States. This is one that should be offered rather than have the negotiations fail or continue indefinitely as a stalemate. This proposal covers the requirements of the United States, namely that a control system should be based on what scientists estimate can be done. It also covers the requirements of the Soviet Union, that a control system must not be confused with extreme complexity, which to them looks like espionage. And it is a proposal which gives considerable assurance that we can have a total and effective test ban agreement.

In advancing this proposal before you tonight I believe some important and related points should be stressed.

A cessation of atomic tests is arms control, but it is not real disarmament. It is only a first step toward disarmament.

We believe that disarmament is necessary, that it must eventually come, and that without it, the whole world is in danger. We are willing to accept the kind of international inspection which alone can make disarmament effective and meaningful.

Well, then, why don't we say it? Why don't we identify our country with these goals? Why don't we let the peace-loving people of the world understand that the United States is the leader in the great quest for peace?

Why do we leave it to Khrushchev to go before the United Nations General Assembly and proclaim the great goal of complete disarmament, as though he had invented it?

I think the present administration has been extremely negligent in allowing this idea to become associated, in the eyes of the world, with the Soviet Union, when in fact, it has been an American idea.

In addition to proclaiming our sincere and dedicated conviction to a system of comprehensive disarmament, we must also be prepared with the necessary technical studies for control and inspection in each stage of disarmament. And we must also be prepared to change a vast segment of our production from arms manufacturing to peacetime pursuits.

There is no doubt in my mind that money saved on armaments will find other uses. It would make it possible to shift emphasis to many urgent peacetime tasks. To discuss the many opportunities that we would have to make use of savings from a reduction of defense expenditures is another speech. I am certain this audience will forgive me if I refrain from giving you another speech this evening.

The big question is, will we find these other uses quickly enough, and will these other uses employ the very people and the very facilities that formerly were engaged in military production?

It will take considerable planning to make the transition smooth. Healthy reconversion is not just one big overall problem. Rather, it consists of thousands of specific problems, involving particular groups of employees. The fact that the general national level of prosperity will continue offers no reassurance to individual workers who would lose jobs.

Finally, I want to conclude by underlining the point that—when I speak of disarmament, I mean mutual disarmament, under effective controls which will give assurance that all parties are living up to the agreement.

I do no mean unilateral disarmament.

Indeed, I strongly oppose the tendency of the Eisenhower administration to reduce our armed power unilaterally, or try to rely solely on the massive nuclear deterrent because it is cheaper than the conventional forces which are needed for local issues, and to place the budget ahead of national security.

All of this is dangerous to our national defense. It encourages adventures on the part of the Communists which may lead to wars which otherwise might have been avoided. Weak defenses make disarmament more difficult. A nuclear war is horrible to contemplate. But also horrible is the prospect of a United States and a free world so weak that domination by the Soviet dictatorship becomes unavoidable.

Disarmament is at the very center of our foreign relations. I have stressed it tonight because I believe deeply that solutions can be found if our leaders, the Soviet leaders, and the leaders of other nations are convinced that large-scale devastating wars no longer can be made a substitute for resolving disputes in ways that are peaceful, equitable, and just.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this statement indicates the course which I believe our Government should follow relating to the negotiations on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. I am happy to note in the morning press that the recommendations which I made at Pontiac, Mich., on October 30 are now the recommendations of our Government at the Geneva Conference.

Those recommendations include a comprehensive ban on all atomic or nuclear tests in the atmosphere, at high or low altitudes, or in outer space; also underwater tests or submarine tests, as well as the large underground tests which readily lend themselves to inspection and detection.

With respect to the smaller weapons or smaller explosions, my recommendation included a joint cooperative effort by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, through a series of test explosions under United Nations supervision, in order to improve detection and inspection.

Also I called for a vastly expanded program in research on nuclear weapons testing, in order to improve the control and inspection methods.

On Appreciation of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined a number of my colleagues in proposing, by means of a House concurrent resolution, the annual proclamation of a Youth Appreciation Week in America.

Last year I had the opportunity to observe, at first hand, one of the ceremonies climaxing such a week under sponsorship of the Optimist Clubs of Muskogee, Okla.

It was a most impressive occasion, and no observer could mistake the profound impression upon the young people of our community.

The Optimists have proved to me that it pays to accentuate the positive among the young people of America. Their sponsorship of Youth Appreciation

Week has been a real benefit to communities all over the country, and it has been good for both the young people and their parents.

I hope the resolution will soon receive the unanimous approval of the Congress.

The Need for Depressed Area Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as Congress gets down to the business of acting upon the many important issues that must be acted upon in the coming months, it is important that every Member be apprised of two important facts relating to a highly urgent matter:

First. Despite the rising level of general industrial and business activity, there remain surplus labor areas in which thousands of American families are deprived of an opportunity to obtain adequate food, clothing, and shelter; and

Second. President Eisenhower has reiterated his desire for legislation to assist areas of urgent need.

The White House position in this regard should be noted carefully by the Congress. The President has appealed for a law specifically designed to provide assistance to regions of chronic unemployment, but he cannot in conscience subscribe to the catchall bills that have been proposed from time to time for the purpose of attaching to a reasonable and proper measure an assortment of pork barrel projects that have no relevance to distressed areas. Nor can any of us whose immediate concern is for those unemployed citizens who have been looking in vain for Congress to take the lead in stimulating the economy of their neglected communities.

Surplus labor legislation should and must be kept free of political implication, for the savage consequence of prolonged unemployment have no regard for party affiliation. A number of the depressed regions are represented by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I have been working with many of my friends over there for many months on this problem. Those of us who have walked through stricken communities cannot help but resent their situation in a period when most of America is enjoying a high degree of prosperity. Our only recourse is to appeal to Representatives of districts which have fortunately escaped the horror of chronic idleness persisting in our constituencies for many years.

I do not belittle efforts that the Federal Government has put forth in its program to wipe out pockets of unemployment. In many States there is ample evidence of success in the small business programs, financial assistance for urban renewal, public facilities, State and local industrial development corporations, and the procurement of goods and services and construction of Government facilities.

Yet even these projects have their limitations, with some areas almost wholly outside the perimeter of benefits extended. A sound distressed area bill is therefore vital to reinvigorate the economy of those communities which, through no fault of their own, have not been able to take advantage of other Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a distressed area bill soon after the 85th Congress convened in 1958. Similar bills have been proposed by other Republicans and Democrats alike. Which of these measures is enacted is of no significance. I assure you that I shall give my enthusiastic support to whichever one comes up for a vote. I ask only that the House reject any attempts to tack on a myriad of other items that have no relationship to the serious problem which is facing us at this time, and work towards a bill that will become a reality.

General MacArthur Observes 80th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 80th birthday of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. There will be greetings from all over the world as the general observes the occasion in New York City.

General MacArthur is possibly the most decorated soldier in history. He has been described as a hero of St. Mihiel, Bataan, Corregidor, New Guinea, Manila, and Inchon.

As we pause to observe the birthday of this great American, we might well contemplate his contribution to another event—the signing of a 10-year mutual cooperation and security treaty by President Eisenhower and Japanese Prime Minister Kishi. The treaty removed remaining traces of Japan's former occupation status, and in effect will bring that country into alliance with the United States as an equal partner.

The treaty signed last week was in effect another tribute to the general. The conduct of the occupation by General MacArthur, during which time he completely revised and reoriented a former Japanese warlord government toward democracy, and the high principles to which he adhered during the transition, are marked by the huge measure of good will the United States enjoys in that country today. General MacArthur did not enter Tokyo as a vengeful conquerer, but as a partner in rebuilding a country battered both materially and spiritually by war.

History may someday record that the manner in which General MacArthur conducted the occupation of Japan was his greatest contribution to the country he has served so well.

It seems particularly appropriate to call attention to these facts about this outstanding American today on his 80th birthday observance.

Alexander Graham Bell Lecture Delivered by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at Boston University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Boston University was honored to have Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell deliver the first address inaugurating the university's Alexander Graham Bell lecture series on November 12, 1959. In extension of my remarks, I include the excellent address delivered in the Sargent Gymnasium of the university's Charles River campus, as follows:

President Case, distinguished members of the faculty, alumni of Boston University; I am privileged to initiate the Alexander Graham Bell series of lectures.

The theme of this series is "Man's Communication to Man." The hope that underlies this theme is most certainly that as the people of the several nations of earth improve their ability to communicate they will also increase their wisdom to use instruments like the telephone, the telegraph, the television channel, the printing press, and the radio to establish the understanding upon which peace must ultimately rest.

All of us in the free world share that hope.

I think, however, we would be foolish to believe that the means alone are sufficient without a corresponding improvement in man's social orders and in man himself.

For the fact that the human intelligence has broken down time, space, and language barriers should not in itself create in us the false optimism that pervades an age of propaganda, for the record of using these facilities of communication in the interest of individual enlightenment and national understanding is still a comparatively poor one.

Man's genius for devising the technical instruments to aid him in his search for a better world is still in advance of his genius for using those instruments to attain to that great goal.

We still have no guarantee that because an earth satellite may someday soon reflect instantaneous and undistorted messages to earth that those messages themselves will be ones of enduring wisdom, faith, or understanding.

With this clearing away of the obvious, then, I will approach the theme of "Man's Communication to Man" in three of its important aspects:

First, the problem of communication between a free and open society and a controlled, closed society;

Second, the problem of communication within a free society, in which information is power and economic interest is often a deciding factor in the use of communications media;

Third, the problem of communication in a specific part of that free society that is in itself a showcase of American values and the American ability for self-government; namely, the labor-management area.

During the recent American Fair in Moscow, a member of the staff of the Department of Labor stood by a Department exhibit and conversed, for many hours each day, with the Russian people. His experiences, as he told me about them, are illuminating.

His general impressions were these:

The questions the Russian people asked him showed two things: their means of communication, controlled by government, have been used for decades to present a distorted picture of the outside world and especially of the United States, but the Russian people generally do not believe their own propagandists.

The United States was pictured as a land of very poor living conditions, high unemployment, inadequate wages, and general exploitation of the workers by the wealthy owners and of the Negro by the rest of society.

The Russians, however, do not accept this picture at face value. When a professional agitator appeared at the exhibit he would often be silenced by the other spectators and forced to withdraw in embarrassment. Frequently the people would apologize for the incident.

With this cynicism about their own controlled information—the only paper printed outside the Iron Curtain on the Moscow newsstands, for example, was the London Daily Worker—the Russian people have the corresponding problem of not knowing what to believe.

They have existed in an information vacuum for 40 years and they are desperately anxious for news from the outside. Almost every day, after many hours of answering questions, our staff member would be followed as he walked across the exhibit area. If he stopped to converse with a single Russian he would immediately be surrounded by a crowd of 50 or more.

They asked him, generally, four kinds of questions: Those on living standards, including hours of work, earnings, cost of living, minimum wages, industrial disputes, labor standards, workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance and so on; they asked him especially about unemployment, and finally about the status of the Negro in our society and the ability of the ordinary person to get a good education.

Because of the entire popular literature and all of the communications media in Russia is devoted to proving that Marx and Lenin were right, the Russians often found it difficult to understand his answers.

It was almost unconceivable to them, for example, that Americans work, on the average, 8 hours a day for 5 days of the week. This was contrary to what they had always been taught, that in America the rich get richer through exploitation of the so-called working class.

They found it difficult to believe that a worker in the United States could change jobs and location at will.

They were little short of astounded to discover that the average worker in the United States earns $385 a month—four times the Russian average where everyone, even waitresses, are on a piece-rate basis.

They did not know whether to believe it or not that American workers can join unions freely; they were surprised that unions were legal in America.

We approach, then, the problem of communicating the truth, with the knowledge that the truth will be distorted. We face the problem of communicating the truth to a people of rising educational attainment but who are uninformed, curious about the outside world yet unable to form a clear picture of it, cynical about what they are told yet uncertain as to the real truth.

Recent developments within Russia, Mr. Khrushchev's visit to this country, indicate there may be some hope that a freer exchange of information between the Russians and ourselves may be possible, however limited in scope. Certainly we must take that hope for what it is worth.

This means, in the materials we present to them, less criticism of their system and more truthful presentation of our own.

I believe the only effective posture we can take is that of a truthful people.

I think we should report about our unemployment problem, our distressed areas, our migrant farmworkers, in their proper perspective as problem areas in a huge, healthy economy employing 67 million people and supporting the kind of living standard that speaks very well for itself.

I think we should report about the racial problems we have as a part of the whole story of a nation of many diverse creeds and colors and nationalities, and explain some of the things we are doing to solve them.

The lasting hope for peace is that Russian society will join the affairs of the world as an enlightened and informed member. I genuinely believe that the Russian people themselves desire this.

Light will shine into Russia only when the Russian leadership allows it; of that we can be certain. But this should not discourage us from keeping that light shining and steady.

And there are reasons to hope that things are improving. The American and Russian fairs were breaches in the Iron Curtain. The jamming of our broadcasts has stopped. And with the President's coming visit to Russia we have, I feel, a major opportunity to open another door in our relationship.

In his speech before the United Nations in 1958, the President spoke of "a world community of open societies" as the proper condition for permanent peace.

Change, the order of life and the world, can come peacefully or through the use of force. It can come by making of societies armed camps, bases for aggression, or it can come by opening societies to exterior influences and clearing away, piece by piece, bit by bit, the barriers to free communication.

Whether or not such measures can or would successfully deter the rulers of Soviet Russia from their announced determination to bring the change of communism to the world by aggression and force, none can know. We do know this: We must believe at all times in the appeal of the truths of our own society and our own faith in its motives.

This means for us a constant reappraisal of the way we inform our own people, and an honest examination of the problems of communication within our own free society.

Open communication is one of the assumptions of freedom, for in any society information is power. To withhold information from the people is to deny the people power.

Because this is so, free communication is one of the most sensitive and important aspects to American life, but one which poses for us one of the traditional dilemmas of a free people: where there is a freedom, there can be an abuse of it.

At times it seems that in the area of communication the abuses exceed the benefits.

The nature of our society, made up of various self-interest groups and commercial interests in competition for acceptance and popularity, is such that a free use of the communications media can lead to the corruption of those media by giving them over to propagandizing in its most offensive form.

Sooner or later this causes a reaction and cry goes up for regulation. I am not one to join in that cry. I do not believe that in this area an aroused, angered, and embarrassed popular opinion is an infallible guide to corrective action.

I would put my faith, rather, in two sources to guarantee that what we see and what we read and what we hear are truthful.

The first source is ourselves.

The second source is an awakened and enlightened responsibility on the part of the men who manage our communications media—producers, writers, editors, photographers, reporters.

If we were the literal prisoners of our communications media, if we had no choice but to read newspapers and magazines, open our mail, watch television, and listen to the radio, but we still retained the power to change what we saw, then the change we would demand would reflect that condition of bondage—and theoretically government would be the proper instrument to respond.

The present demand for regulation, reflecting the self-righteousness of scandalized individuals, seems to me to imply that we have no choice but to serve these media.

But every person is at liberty to turn his television set off—shoot a hole in it with a shotgun if he wants—close or not buy the magazine, throw the mail into a wastebasket unopened. I believe that reform, when and where needed, should reflect this condition of freedom—and the proper agency to respond are the private agencies that have the responsibility.

But it goes deeper than this.

When Americans ask their Government to change or control something for them, it is an indication they are unable to do it themselves in their private capacities.

So this demand for reform in the communications media leads me to believe there is a serious failing somewhere in the individual's ability to use his freedom of choice. It leads me to believe that he is, to some extent, a prisoner of the popular values that are themselves the corrupting sources of the media he complains about.

The argument ends, of course, here—on the campus of an educational institution and the thousands of others like it.

I said that the first source of reform was ourselves. I meant by that the educational system of America is in our hands, and it is to the educational system that we must look to provide the values that alone make men truly free.

This freeing of the individual, which is the very act of education, must be coupled to an awakening of responsibility by the managers of our media, a responsibility I feel has been suppressed in favor of maintaining competitive position.

The commercial domination of the television industry, to take one important example, has frustrated the brilliant hopes society once had for that medium's ability to enrich and improve lives.

There is no more dangerous form of deception than to create secular appetites in a general populace faced with strict and stern responsibilities to themselves and the rest of the world—yet this is the very substance of commercial programing. One of the most powerful, certainly the most attractive, form of communication ever devised by man has been used not as a spokesman but as a salesman.

And this at the very time in history when there is a desperate national need to be informed—not only of world events but of the striking discoveries being made in the fields of medicine, archeology, astronomy, mathematics, physics, biology, to name just a few.

Imagine the problems we face each day in the field of self-government, race relations, economic growth, city planning and development, education, delinquency, use of manpower—I can go on—yet how much of the substance of these things is squeezed in between the western and the murder mystery?

The American citizen, surrounded by the most effective means of communicating with his fellow man in the history of the race, is often denied the true experience of the realities of our civilization.

Instead he is smothered by fictions. He is deluded into thinking that he will be happier, healthier, more successful if he purchases and uses a certain product. Certainly the deception practiced as a part of the format of any particular program is a small thing when compared to this massive and willful confusion of values.

I have said this many times before, from many public platforms, and I would like to repeat here that we must ask ourselves whether or not an educational system that teaches the prices of everything and the values of nothing is little more than a prelude to gullibility. So long as the experience of education fails to result in a conviction about values, then we will continue to have the problems I am discussing today. On the other hand, a truly educated people would make any regulation of their own means of communicating unnecessary.

In general, the confusion of values evident in the problems of our media are also evident, in another way, in another vital area of communication within our society—that between labor and management.

Here, however, it is not a case of the commercial exploitation of a media but of the commitment in many cases of two institutions, labor and management, to concepts that are no longer true or useful.

The attitudes of labor and management reflect too much of the past and not enough of the future.

The class war is over but too often the rhetoric lingers on.

If you take a copy of many labor newspapers in one hand and a copy of many management newsletters in the other, you will find little objective truth.

Respected men on both sides utter in public the slogans and the battle cries of 50 years ago, until the relationship degenerates into an orgy of name calling that shames them both, and that merely adds to the difficulty of communicating between them.

Instead of responding to creative and compelling new motives—motives of partnership in a troubled world that needs their strength, motives of domestic growth not endangered by self-centered interest, motives of solution to the problems of technological change and foreign competition, to name a few—they too often waste their energy in this self-induced hysteria of sloganeering.

Waging the battles of 1910 on the fields of 1960 is not only wasteful, it is dangerous.

The context that labor and management exist in today is far different than it was as recently as the war. Their actions are no longer isolated. Their responsibilities no longer extend only to their members and shareholders but to the entire national interest in an economy characterized by interdependence and by multiple, private ownership of property.

Yet they are unable to communicate as they should, even while these responsibilities hang over them.

I think there have traditionally been three major barriers to open communication between labor and management—social, political, and economic.

There were once very great social distinctions between company presidents and labor leaders. Today, one can find bargaining sessions in which the company president began his career on the assembly line while the union spokesman is a college-trained lawyer. The unhappy class division that kept them apart—and I sometimes wonder if it ever really existed—no longer exists between American labor and management.

The second barrier has been a political one. It resulted from the centering of both of these institutions around political doctrines that appeared best to further their own ends.

But over the years, not only has the composition of the labor movement changed, not only has the management structure changed, but the political doctrines themselves have changed—as they always have and will in this country.

Yet the old division is maintained, and it can be a block to communication.

With some prominent leaders one has to constantly distinguish between the statements they make as the representatives of their union, or their company, and the statements they make as political personalities.

Just the other day a prominent labor leader, speaking in Washington, said that the invocation of the Taft-Hartley injunction in the steel dispute by the President was a political payoff to the steel companies that had contributed to the 1956 election.

Now how can we expect to rationally meet the problems we face, problems which require reason and discipline to solve, in such an unprincipled political atmosphere.

The third and final barrier between labor and management are differences in economic philosophy. In many cases, these differences are genuine. A labor leader might well believe that full employment and economic growth would result from lifting consumer buying power through wage increases, and that a slight increase in the cost of living is a small price to pay, while a management respresentative might believe just as strongly that increased profits, resulting in increased expenditures for plant and equipment, is the surest way toward growth and full employment.

What is needed here is more communication and not less.

But it has to be a new form of communication, carried on outside the bargaining table, carried on frequently over a period of time, to agree on what they can agree on, and to develop a mutually understandable vocabulary to deal with those problems they cannot agree on.

Let them agree on one idea as a starting point. That idea is this:

Owners and stockholders, union members and employees, the consumers and the public, all have a right to a fair share of increasing productivity.

Let them agree that the time has come when a third chair is at every bargaining table, the chair in which the public sits—the chair in which as consumers and taxpayers they sit themselves.

In our modern economy, the decisions made by labor and management have an impact on the national interest, which is, after all, their interest.

This is certainly not a hard thing to agree to and it is a start.

It is possible to apply this idea to particular industries, if both labor and management within that industry talk it over and talk it out away from the bargaining table.

Labor and management in this country have got to start talking to each other in a more meaningful way. They have to rid themselves of the old social and political divisions that no longer exist, for our economy is the bedrock of the Western World and its strength depends upon the good sense and the good will of the men who operate it.

I have talked considerably longer than is my custom. I would like to take 1 more minute to sum up, generally, this first Alexander Graham Bell lecture.

It is my belief that in communicating with the largest nonfree society of modern times, that we should keep the light shining into that state, even though we know it may be distorted. I think we should stand at all times in a posture of truth, and concentrate our efforts on presenting the true values of our society and not so much criticism of theirs. I hope that doors are beginning to open between us, and we should proceed in the firm conviction that freedom and truth have their own appeal.

To make this effort succeed, however, we must reappraise the means of communication within our own free society, and the use of those means. If regulation is needed to assure that those means will be used to instruct and uplift, it should be the self-regulation that results from education. And the managers of the media have a responsibility they have not exercised to the fullest.

In another area of vital communication, I believe that labor and management in the United States find it difficult to communicate because there are shadow differences between them reflecting an older time, and which are not useful for today and tomorrow.

And finally, if both labor and management can agree to the element of public interest in their deliberations, they can go on to discuss, outside of the bargaining table, the methods by which this understanding can best be implemented in individual industries.

I have been privileged to appear here today. I hope that in future years the memory of Alexander Graham Bell will be honored in the only meaningful way, by a growing understanding among men, a wider peace among nations, and truer virtue in each member of the human family.

The Need Is To Strengthen, Not Weaken, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act—Testimony on Proposed Color Additives Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is at present engaged in important hearings on legislation which passed the Senate in the closing hours of the last session dealing with the use of coal tar and other coloring matter in food and cosmetics. The legislation is primarily intended to aid industries in these fields to continue to use dyes which cannot any longer pass Food and Drug Administration tests for harmlessness.

In my testimony before the committee this morning, I urged a go-slow policy by the committee, pointing out, first of all, that the proposed legislation provides virtually no added protections for the consumers and would, as it passed the Senate, actually weaken the consumer protections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act; and, second, that if any legislation is passed to aid industry and to clear up legal confusions in the use of dyes, that it be only as part of an overall tightening and improvement of the entire Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act. I particularly urged that several loopholes not related to color additives in the 1938 and 1958 acts be closed, and that we now enact as part of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act the same pretesting requirements on ingredients used in cosmetics as we now require for additives used in food processing.

My testimony this morning was as follows:

THE NEED IS TO STRENGHTHEN, NOT WEAKEN, THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

(Testimony of Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on proposed color additives legislation, Wednesday, January 27, 1960)

The tremendous turnout you had here yesterday morning when Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming testified on the color additives issue indicated clearly the widespread interest in the subject matter of these hearings. I doubt if you ever tried to squeeze more spectators into your hearing room. Obviously, this legislation is serious to many groups in our society—to the food and chemical and cosmetics industries, and to the general public—particularly the housewife.

My purpose in appearing before you this morning is to urge you to please take your time on this legislation. I am not going to suggest that you sit on the bills and do nothing about them, but I sincerely urge that you make haste slowly—that you study this matter as carefully as any issue ever to come before the committee, for you are dealing with the health of the American people in the most direct manner possible.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF SENATE ACTION

I make such a point of urging caution because I know you are under strong pressures to act quickly on color additives legislation. We all know that late in the session last year, without any hearings at all and under procedures which seemed to indicate it was a very minor and routine bill, the Senate, by unanimous voice vote, passed a most far-reaching bill on color additives. We know it is a defective bill in a most serious respect. Yet it came out of committee, as I said, without hearings, and was called up under a routine call of the calendar for passage by unanimous consent, with no full explanation and with virtually no debate or even discussion. The only thing we find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the debate which occurred was a colloquy over the effects of S. 2197 on the right of Florida citrus growers to use a not-quite-harmless coal tar color in coloring Florida oranges. When the Senator from Florida was assured that S. 2197 would not interfere with the use of Citrus Red No. 2 on Florida oranges, the bill passed automatically.

Some of the members of the committee will recall that immediately after the Senate acted on this matter last August, I contacted them to urge that there be no such precipitate action in the House. I appreciate the fact that no attempt was made to jam through a bill in the frantic closing hours of the last session. I appreciate the fact that full hearings are now scheduled into the color additives issue.

DELANEY ANTICANCER CLAUSE A MINIMUM REQUIREMENT

I don't want my testimony to imply anything improper on the part of anyone in the Senate—I just think that in the closing rush of last August this bill could not possibly have received the close attention it deserved. Nevertheless, the circumstances of the Senate's action were such that I find it very hard to feel right about this legislation, even if we close up its most glaring loophole by inserting the same kind of anticancer provision which Congressman DELANEY wrote into the food additives bill in 1958. I cannot understand why the bill as it came from the Senate did not include such a clause. Without it, I think this legislation would be far worse than present law covering the use of coal tar colors. Furthermore, by taking out from under the Food Additives Act of 1958 dyes made from other than coal tar bases, it would increase the danger of carcinogens in our diets, unless, of course, the provisions of the Delaney amendment are written into this bill as a minimum requirement.

Obviously, then, despite its impressive title as a bill to protect the public health, S. 2197 as it passed the Senate would weaken the protections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act. And this is certainly no time in our history to be weakening the consumer protections of our laws. On the contrary, our laws to protect the consumer need strengthening, and this is particularly true of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act. We have put a number of patches on it in recent years, but it is far from being as strong as it should be.

HOW WOULD CONSUMERS BENEFIT?

Clearly, some of the shortcomings of the present act do exist in this area of coal tar colors. But I am not convinced the deficiencies are as serious to the consumer as they seem to be to many of the industries affected.

The present law says in effect that no coal tar color can be used in or on food or cosmetics unless it is deemed harmless. This law grew out of the conviction of scientists that coal tar colors are inherently risky and should be circumscribed in use to such an extent that if there is any question at all about their safety they should not be used in or on food, or in other substances which may be ingested. In recent years, new testing methods have shown that some of the coal tar colors previously thought to be harmless are not in fact completely harmless although they may be, and probably are, safe in the manner normally used in commercial products. Nevertheless, because these colors cannot pass the test any longer of being harmless under all circumstances, the law states they cannot be used—they must be withdrawn. As a result some of the yellows used in coloring margarine and butter, some of the reds—most of the reds, I believe—in lipsticks, and various other familiar colors used in foodstuffs are in the process of being delisted—of being prohibited for use on products which people eat (or, in the case of lipsticks, swallow).

Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure I see how the consumer is being damaged by the removal of these colors. Nor do I see why the consumer would benefit from the changes suggested in this legislation. I can readily see why many industries want legislation enacted which would set up entirely new criteria for approving the use of coloring matter, including the setting of tolerances for the use in or on food of apparently harmless quantities of dyes which may not be harmless in greater quantities. But I do not yet see how the consumer interest would benefit from this color additives legislation.

CAN WE BE CERTAIN THAT SAFE LEVELS ARE REALLY SAFE?

True, the proposed legislation would place on the manufacturer, not the Government, the burden of proof for establishing the safe levels of coal tar colors. But as our whole experience with the coal tar colors shows, today's proof of safety may be inadequate in terms of tomorrow's testing methods. Do we then go to the consumer and say, "Sorry, we made a slight mistake; a coal tar color we knew was not completely harmless but which we thought was safe to use in certain concentrations has now turned out to be unsafe and dangerous, and if you've been eating it in your food we're very sorry about it?"

Mr. Chairman, just how important is it to have these artificial colors in foodstuffs if there is any danger whatsoever to the consumer through their use? True, the margarine manufacturers want their product to look like butter; the butter producers want their butter to look like yellow butter regardless of its natural color; the Florida citrus growers want their greenish-looking oranges to be orange in color, and the manufacturers of all sorts of products—sausage casings, cakes, cookies, pies, bread, processed cheese, spreads, canned and frozen vegetables, confectionary, ice cream, gelatin desserts, puddings, and so on—all want to dazzle us with the looks of their products even if they have to create the look artificially with coal tar colors which cannot any longer pass the test of being harmless.

Now we are told that the consumer wants and demands these attractively colored foods and therefore it is an economic necessity for industry to provide them.

CONSUMERS ASSUME DYES ARE SAFE

I do not doubt that a housewife buying oranges will generally select the product which looks more natural by reason of having been dyed to look that way rather than the greenish one next to it which appears to be unripe; I do not doubt that in selecting a lipstick she will want the color which, to her, best matches her complexion and outfit; I do not argue that in buying processed foods, she is attracted by the appearance of the product.

But the point is that the consumer, in buying these brightly colored or natural-looking colored items in the store, believes—takes it for granted—that the coloring dyes used are safe, and that otherwise their use would not be permitted by the Federal Government.

What this proposed legislation would do is to say the coloring matter frequently used may not be entirely safe under all circumstances, but we believe and trust and hope and have reason to think it is safe in the amount used and in the manner used. And so the housewife will then continue to be able to buy margarine which looks like butter, and butter which, because of a deeper yellow shade, looks more like butter, and so on, even if the looks are artificially contrived through use of not-quite-harmless dyes.

Under S. 2197 as it passed the Senate, these dyes could even be cancer-inducing, yet could be used if the manufacturer could establish that the cancer manifested itself only at substantially higher levels of concentration.

CANCER-INDUCTION IS CUMULATIVE PROCESS

This, of course, does not jibe with the findings of outstanding cancer experts that cancer-induction is a cumulative process which begins with the first dose of the cancer-inducing agent. Secretary Flemming referred to this matter at some length in his prepared testimony yesterday and in a technical report he also submitted, so I need not go into it in any detail. Many of you—perhaps all of you— saw the letter I obtained on this matter last year from Dr. Harold F. Blum of the National Cancer Institute and which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 13, pages 17264–17265, in direct reference to the bill which had just passed the Senate and which is now before you. But in view of Secretary Flemming's technical report from the NIH, I think we can now take for granted the fact that carcinogens must not be allowed in food or in anything ingested. Present law already prohibits this as far as all food colors are concerned—the coal tar colors under the basic Food and Drug Act of 1938 and the other colors under the Food Additives Act of 1958.

So, again, I ask how does this legislation help the food consumer?

We are told that the job of analyzing and retesting all of the coal tar colors already in use or authorized for use to see if they are still harmless would take the Food and Drug Administration at present levels of operations at least 20 years. This legislation would throw that burden onto the manufacturers and they would have to complete the task in 2½ years. Frankly, I think what would happen is that at the end of 2½ years we

would either be flooded with anguished demands for an extention of time, or many of the dyes would then go off the market because the cost of proving their safety was too high. I for one would be willing to give the Food and Drug Administration the funds to do this testing itself—under the present law.

BROADEN SCOPE OF HEARINGS

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I am not helping the committee very much if all I do in testifying here is to say "take it easy." I know you have a problem to contend with and many pressures upon the committee to act quickly. Therefore, I think it would be constructive to make this suggestion.

Broaden your hearings and your studies to include not just this one question of coal tar colors and other color additives but to include all of the aspects of the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act. It is time for that kind of look at the overall picture. In the past 6 months or so we have had one explosion after another over phases of the law and its operation—cranberries, stilbestrol in chickens, the lipstick crisis, the food additive clearances, and so on. I think tremendous progress has been made in alerting the general public to some of the issues involved in food, drug, and cosmetics legislation, and that this is an excellent time to take a good, hard look at the basic law and its patchwork amendments and to undertake a tightening of many of their provisions. This would, of course, carry some dangers with it—the danger perhaps that groups which have suffered economically from operation of some of the consumer-protections of the law would attempt to use such hearings and any new legislation as a means for weakening rather than strengthening the law. But I don't think they could succeed—certainly not if all of us who are deeply concerned about this problem are willing to fight off the pressures to weaken the law.

And the end result could well be a general strengthening of the law—so that the Government, for instance, would no longer have to rely on voluntary agreement in the poultry industry to take stilbestrol out of poultry feed; so that, for instance, cosmetics which are now in the twilight zone of Governmental protection can be put under the same stringent tests for safety as our food additives must now pass; so that other loopholes in the law may also be closed.

WE NEED PRETESTING OF COSMETICS

I think color additives legislation in the context of that kind of approach would be far better legislation than either of the bills now before you. For such an omnibus approach would permit you to eliminate the loopholes in the 1938 law under the new drug sanction and the similar loophole in the 1958 amendments which requires FDA to prove the harmfulness of any additive which had previously been sanctioned for use by a governmental agency. Secretary Flemming in his testimony referred to the stilbestrol problem and the unfairness, as well as the danger to the public, of these so-called "grandfather's clauses" covering chemicals once approved and thereafter protected against delisting until the Government can definitely prove their harmfulness.

In the field of cosmetics, the law is hopelessly obsolete. The Government at present cannot move against a suspect cosmetics item until it has proof of the product's harmfulness. My bill, H.R. 1360, and a similar bill by Congressman DELANEY, would provide the same consumer safeguards on ingredients in cosmetics that the food additives amendments of 1958 provided in connection with the use of chemicals in food. These cosmetics bills have been pending before you for some years, without any action or even hearings. I think this is the year and this is the time—in connection with the color additives bills—to take up this closely related subject of safe cosmetics.

The color additives bill makes it imperative that we do so. For the color additives bill would not only change the basis under which coal-tar colors could be used in cosmetics. It would also establish, for the first time, a basis for clearing in advance the safety of non-coal-tar colors used in cosmetics. That would be helpful. But what of all of the other ingredients in cosmetics? If we are going to require manufacturers to prove the safety of their non-coal-tar color additives in cosmetics, why not in the same legislation and at the same time and under the same standards require the manufacturer to establish the safety of all ingredients in his cosmetics product?

At present, as you know, enough women must be harmed by a new cosmetic item to alert the Food and Drug Administration into looking into the matter; then the FDA must prove the product harmful in order to remove it from the market. I receive letters from women from all over the country complaining about various cosmetics they have used—shampoos or wave set products they claim have caused them to lose their hair, polishes which set up allergic reactions, lotions and creams and powders and lipsticks and deodorants and whatnot which caused embarrassment, discomfort, or pain. I usually pass these complaints along to FDA and sometimes they find the product involved warrants a fullscale investigation and other times they will report merely that the reaction was probably a rare allergic one.

WOMEN WANT SAFE LIPSTICKS

But if a woman is allergic, the label on a cosmetics item tells her nothing. She has to learn the hard—and painful—way.

Speaking as a woman as well as in my capacity as a Member of Congress, I urge you, Mr. Chairman, to go slow on this color additives bill and to enlarge the scope of your hearings to include all issues involved at present in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act. As a woman, I am aware of the fact that some of our favorite lipstick shades may soon be off the market unless this color additives bill is passed quickly. But I am not convinced we would be doing the women of this country any favor at all to assure them the continued availability of lipstick shades which are not safe to use. True, it is claimed we don't swallow our lipstick. But I think the people who make that claim don't use the stuff themselves.

We like the bright and light shades but if they cannot safely be produced, then we prefer to do without these particular shades. In any event, I am sure the cosmetics industry is resourceful enough—it is an extremely resourceful industry—often too much so—but I am sure it is resourceful enough to find substitute colors if it has to. And I think every woman would agree that rather than use unsafe coloring matter, we would be quite happy to settle for a darker shade if necessary, just so long as we could be completely assured it was safe.

I don't think, under this proposed legislation, that any such flat and unequivocal guarantee of safety could be made about any coal-tar color for which a tolerance had to be set. I will not and cannot argue with the scientists on that, but it is my personal opinion—if a coal-tar color is unsafe in any quantity, no matter how large, my feeling is it should not be used at all in foods, drugs, or cosmetics.

If, on the other hand, legislation is absolutely necessary to clear up some of the confusion in the color additives field, then I urge that it be done only as part of an omnibus bill closing all loopholes in present law and including comprehensive safe cosmetics legislation.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1960

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 27, 1960)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, in this hour of the world's deep distress we turn to Thee, mindful of our insufficiency. We are but broken reeds, lashed by wild winds that mock our boasting pride uttered in days of calm.

Thine alone, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory.

In this new decade of human destiny deepen in us the sense of surpassing opportunity and of glorious mission to do our full part in averting a global catastrophe as our willful world is given this one last chance.

Hear our prayer: America, America, God mend thine every flaw.

Send us forth to waiting tasks conscious of a great heritage worth living for and dying for, and with a deathless cause that no weapon that has been formed can defeat.

We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 27, 1960, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to express the hope that Senators will be in attendance on the session of the Senate today, in order that we may finish the pending legislation this evening, if at all possible. I am prepared to stay as late as necessary if it seems possible to pass the joint resolution today. If that is not possible, we certainly hope to conclude action on it this week.

Several other bills have been announced as having been cleared by the policy committee. We will have another meeting of the committee in the early part of next week. We expect to follow action on the bills which have already